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WHOSE PERSUASION AND ENCOURAGEMENT
ITS COMPLETION IS CHIEFLY DUE

(Imámí: see pp. 116–117.)
FOURTEEN years have elapsed since the second volume of my *Literary History of Persia*, of which the present work is in fact, if not in name and form, a continuation, was published. That the appearance of this continuation, which comprises the period between Sa'ádí and Jámi, and extends from the death of Hulágú the Mongol to the rise of the Šafáví dynasty (A.D. 1265-1502), has been so long delayed is due to a variety of causes, at one of which, operative for five or six years (A.D. 1907-12), I have hinted in the Preface (p. xx) to my *Persian Revolution of 1905-9*. While Persia was going through what repeatedly appeared to be her death-agony, it was difficult for anyone who loved her to turn his eyes for long from her present sufferings to her past glories. Often, indeed, I almost abandoned all hope of continuing this work, and that I did at last take up, revise and complete what I had already begun to write was due above all else to the urgency and encouragement of my wife, and of one or two of my old friends and colleagues, amongst whom I would especially mention Dr T. W. Arnold and Mr Guy le Strange.

The delay in the production of this volume has not, however, been altogether a matter for regret, since it has enabled me to make use of materials, both printed and manuscript, which would not have been available at an earlier date. In particular it has been my good fortune to acquire

---

1 Of these two volumes, published by Mr T. Fisher Unwin in the "Library of Literary History," the full titles are as follows: *A Literary History of Persia from the earliest times until Firdawsí* (pp. xvi + 521), 1902; and *A Literary History of Persia from Firdawsí to Sa'ádí* (pp. xvi + 568), 1906. In the notes to this volume they are referred to as *Lit. Hist. of Persia, vol. i* or *vol. ii.*
two very fine collections of Persian and Arabic manuscripts which have yielded me much valuable material, namely, at the beginning of 1917, some sixty manuscripts (besides lithographed and printed books published in Persia) from the Library of the late Sir Albert Houtum-Schindler, and at the beginning of 1920 another forty or fifty manuscripts of exceptional rarity and antiquity collected in Persia and Mesopotamia by Ḥájjī ‘Abdu'l-Majīd Belshah. So many Persian works of first-class importance still remain unpublished and generally inaccessible save in a few of the great public libraries of Europe that the possession of a good private library is essential to the student of Persian literature who wishes to extend his researches into its less familiar by-paths.

I regret in some ways that I have had to produce this volume independently of its two predecessors, and not in the same series. Several considerations, however, induced me to adopt this course. Of these the principal ones were that I desired to retain full rights as to granting permission for it to be quoted or translated, should such permission be sought; and that I wished to be able to reproduce the original Persian texts on which my translations were based, in the numerous cases where these were not accessible in printed or lithographed editions, in the proper character. For this reason it was necessary to entrust the printing of the book to a press provided with suitable Oriental types, and no author whose work has been produced by the Cambridge University Press will fail to recognize how much he owes to the skill, care, taste and unfailing courtesy of all responsible for its management.

I hope that none of my Persian friends will take exception to the title which I have given to this volume,

---

1 See my notice of this collection in the *J.R.A.S.* for October 1917, pp. 657–694, entitled *The Persian Manuscripts of the late Sir Albert Houtum-Schindler, K.C.I.E.*
“A History of Persian Literature under Tartar\(^1\) Dominion.”

I have known Persians whose patriotism has so far outrun their historical judgment as to seek to claim as compatriots not only Tímúr but even Chingíz and Húlágu, those scourges of mankind, of whom the two last mentioned in particular did more to compass the ruin of Islamic civilization, especially in Persia, than any other human beings. When we read of the shocking devastation wrought by the Mongols through the length and breadth of Central and Western Asia, we are amazed not so much at what perished at their hands as at what survived their depredations, and it says much for the tenacity of the Persian character that it should have been so much less affected by these barbarians than most other peoples with whom they came in contact. The period covered by this volume begins with the high tide of Mongol ascendency, and ends with the ebb of the succeeding tide of Túránian invasion inaugurated by Tímúr. Politically, during its whole duration, Túrán, represented by Tartars, Turks and Turkmáns, lorded it over Írán, which, nevertheless, continued to live its own intellectual, literary and artistic life, and even to some extent to civilize its invaders. It is my hope and purpose, should circumstances be favourable, to conclude my survey of this spiritual and intellectual life of Persia in one other volume, to be entitled “A History of Persian Literature in Modern Times,” covering the last four hundred years, from the rise of the great Šafawí dynasty, which restored the ancient boundaries and revived the national spirit of Persia, to the present day.

There remains the pleasant duty of expressing my thanks to those of my friends and fellow-students who have most materially helped me in the preparation of this work. Nearly all the proofs were carefully read by two Government of

---

\(^1\) I have yielded to the common usage in adopting this form instead of the more correct “Tatar.” The later and less accurate, though more familiar, form “Tartar” owes its origin, as indicated on pp. 6-7 infra, to a popular etymology which would connect it with Tartarus.
India Research Students of exceptional learning, ability and industry, Muhammad Shafi', a member of my own College and now Professor of Arabic in the Panjáb University, and, on his departure, by Muhammad Iqbal, a young scholar of great promise. To both of these I owe many valuable emendations, corrections and suggestions.

Of the twelve illustrations to this volume four (those facing pp. 8, 66, 74 and 96) have already appeared in the edition of the Ta'rikh-i-Jahán-gushá published in 1912 by the "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Trust" (vol. xvi, i, pp. lxxxvii, 147, 154 and 222), and are reproduced here by the kind permission of my fellow trustees. To my old friend Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, of Columbia University, and to Messrs Macmillan, his publishers, I am indebted for permission to reproduce the photograph of the Tomb of Háfíz at Shíráz which originally appeared in his Persia, Past and Present (p. 332), and here appears facing p. 310. The facsimile of Jámi's autograph facing p. 508 of this volume is reproduced from vol. iii (1886) of the Collections Scientifiques de l'Institut des Langues Orientales du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères à St Pétersbourg: Manuscrits Persans, compiled with so much judgment by the late Baron Victor Rosen, to whose help and encouragement in the early days of my career I am deeply indebted. The six remaining illustrations, which are new, and, as I think will be generally admitted, of exceptional beauty and interest, were selected for me from manuscripts in the British Museum by my friends Mr A. G. Ellis and Mr Edward Edwards, to whose unfailing erudition and kindness I owe more than I can say. Three of them, the portraits of Sa'dí, Háfíz and Sháh-rukh, are from Add. 7468 (ff. 19, 34 and 44 respectively), while the portraits of Húlagú and Tímúr are from Add. 18,803, f. 19, and Add. 18,801, f. 23. The colophon of the beautifully written Qur'án transcribed at Mawsil in A.H. 710 (A.D. 1310–11) for Úljáytú (Khudá-banda) and his two ministers Rashídú'd-Dín
Faḍlu'lláh and Saʿdu’d-Dín is from the recently acquired Or. 4945. All these have been reproduced by Mr R. B. Fleming with his usual taste and skill.

Lastly I am indebted to Miss Gertrude Lowthian Bell, whose later devotion to Arabic has caused her services to Persian letters to be unduly forgotten, for permission to reprint in this volume some of her beautiful translations of the odes of Ḥáfiz, together with her fine appreciation of his position as one of the great poets not only of his own age and country but of the world and of all time.

EDWARD G. BROWNE.

April 5, 1920.

See the first entry in the Descriptive List of the Arabic Manuscripts acquired by the Trustees of the British Museum since 1894, by Mr A. G. Ellis and Mr Edward Edwards (London, 1912).
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ADDENDA

p. 311, l. 11. The date given is evidently wrong, for Karīm Khān reigned from A.H. 1163–1193 (A.D. 1750–1779).

pp. 411, l. 16, and 412, l. 26. One of the two dates (A.D. 1472 and 1474) here given is wrong, but I do not know which.
BOOK I.

CHAPTER I.

THE MONGOL ÍL-KHÁNS OF PERSIA.

Although to the student every period in the history of every nation is more or less interesting, or could be made so with sufficient knowledge, sympathy and imagination, there are in the history of most peoples certain momentous epochs of upheaval and reconstruction about which it behoves every educated person to know something. Of such epochs Persia, for geographical and ethnological reasons, has had her full share. A glance at the map will suffice to remind the reader that this ancient, civilized and homogeneous land, occupying the whole space between the Caspian Sea and the Persian Gulf, forms, as it were, a bridge between Europe and Asia Minor on the one hand and Central and Eastern Asia on the other, across which bridge from the earliest times have passed the invading hosts of the West or the East on their respective paths of conquest. The chief moments at which Persian history thus merges in World-history are as follows:

(1) The Persian invasion of Greece by the Achaemenian kings in the fifth century before Christ.

(2) Alexander’s invasion of Persia on his way to India in the fourth century before Christ, resulting in the overthrow of the Achaemenian dynasty and the extinction of Persia as a Great Power for five centuries and a half.

(3) The restoration of the Persian Empire by the House of Sásán in the third, and their often successful wars with the Romans in the fourth and following centuries after Christ.

(4) The Arab invasion of the seventh century after Christ, which formed part of that extraordinary religious revival of a people hitherto accounted as naught, which in
the course of a few years carried the standards of Islám from the heart of desert Arabia to Spain in the West and the Oxus and Indus in the East.

(5) The Mongol or Tartar invasion of the thirteenth century, which profoundly affected the greater part of Asia and South-eastern Europe, and which may be truly described as one of the most dreadful calamities which ever befel the human race.

(6) The second Tartar invasion of Tamerlane (Ṭīmūr-i-Lang or “Limping Tīmūr”) in the latter part of the fourteenth century.

(7) The Turco-Persian Wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which gave Persia at that time so great an importance in the eyes of Europe as a potential check on Turkish ambitions, and caused her friendship to be so eagerly sought after by the chief Western nations.

Of these seven great epochs in Persian history the fourth and fifth are the most important and have had the greatest and most profound influence. In all points save one, however, the Arab and Mongol invasions were utterly dissimilar. The Arabs came from the South-west, the Tartars from the North-east; the Arabs were inspired by a fiery religious enthusiasm, the Tartars by mere brutish lust of conquest, bloodshed and rapine; the Arabs brought a new civilization and order to replace those which they had destroyed, the Tartars brought mere terror and devastation. In a word, the Tartars were cunning, ruthless and bloodthirsty marauders, while the Arabs were, as even their Spanish foes were fain to admit, “Knights...and gentlemen, albeit Moors.”

The one point of resemblance between the two was the scorn which their scanty equipment and insignificant appearance aroused in their well-armed and richly-equipped antagonists before they had tasted of their quality. This point is well brought out in that charming Arabic history the Kitābu'l-Fakhri, whose author wrote about A.D. 1300, some fifty years after the Tartars had sacked Baghdaδ and
destroyed the Caliphate. After describing the Arab invasion of Persia and the merriment of the Persian satraps and officers at the tattered scabbards, slender lances and small horses of the Arabs, he relates, à propos of this, the account given to him by one of those who "marched out to meet the Tartars on the Western side of Baghdád on the occasion of its supreme catastrophe in the year 656/1258," and tells how to meet one of their splendidly appointed champions in single combat there rode forth from the Mongol ranks "a man mounted on a horse resembling a donkey, having in his hand a spear like a spindle, and wearing neither uniform nor armour, so that all who saw him were moved to laughter." "Yet ere the day was done," he concludes, "theirs was the victory, and they inflicted on us a great defeat, which was the Key of Evil, and after which there befell us what befell us."

It is almost impossible to exaggerate either the historical importance or the horror of this great irruption of barbarians out of Mongolia, Turkistán and Transoxiana in the first half of the thirteenth century. Amongst its results were the destruction of the Arabian Caliphate and disruption of the Muhammadan Empire, the creation of the modern political divisions of Western Asia, the driving into Asia Minor and subsequently into Europe of the Ottoman Turks, the stunting and barbarizing of Russia, and indirectly the Renaissance. As regards the terror universally inspired by the atrocious deeds of the Tartars, d’Ohsson in his admirable Histoire des Mongols observes that we should be tempted to charge the Oriental historians with exaggeration, were it not that their statements are entirely confirmed by the independent testimony of Western historians as to the precisely similar proceedings of the Tartars in South-eastern Europe, where

1 For the full translation of this passage see Lit. Hist. of Persia, vol. i, pp. 197–8.
2 Vol. i, p. vii: "On croirait que l’histoire a exagéré leurs atrocités, si les annales de tous les pays n’étaient d’accord sur ce point."
they ravaged not only Russia, Poland and Hungary, but penetrated to Silesia, Moravia and Dalmatia, and at the fatal battle of Liegnitz (April 9, 1241) defeated an army of 30,000 Germans, Austrians, Hungarians and Poles commanded by Henry the Pious, Duke of Silesia. Already two years before this date the terror which they inspired even in Western Europe was so great that the contemporary chronicler Matthew Paris, writing at St Albans, records under the year A.D. 1238 that for fear of the Mongols the fishermen of Gotland and Friesland dared not cross the North Sea to take part in the herring-fishing at Yarmouth, and that consequently herrings were so cheap and abundant in England that year that forty or fifty were sold for a piece of silver, even at places far from the coast. In the same year an envoy from the Isma‘īlīs or Assassins of Alamūt by the Caspian Sea came to France and England to crave help against those terrible foes by whom they were annihilated twenty years later. He met with little encouragement, however, for the Bishop of Winchester, having heard his appeal, replied: “Let these dogs devour each other and be utterly wiped out, and then we shall see, founded on their ruins, the Universal Catholic Church, and then shall truly be one shepherd and one flock!”

The accounts given by Ibn‘l-Athīr, Yāqūt and other contemporary Muhammadan historians of the Mongol invasion have been cited in part in a previous volume¹ and need not be repeated here, but it is instructive to compare them with what Matthew Paris says about those terrible Tatars, who, for reasons which he indicates, through a popular etymology connecting them with the infernal regions, became known in Europe as “Tartars.” Under the year A.D. 1240 he writes of them as follows²:

“That the joys of mortal man be not enduring, nor

worldly happiness long lasting without lamentations, in this same year a detestable nation of Satan, to wit the countless army of Tartars, broke loose from its mountain-environed home, and, piercing the solid rocks (of the Caucasus) poured forth like devils from the Tartarus, so that they are rightly called 'Tartars' or 'Tartarians.' Swarming like locusts over the face of the earth, they have brought terrible devastation to the eastern parts (of Europe), laying them waste with fire and carnage. After having passed through the land of the Saracens, they have razed cities, cut down forests, overthrown fortresses, pulled up vines, destroyed gardens, killed townspeople and peasants. If perchance they have spared any suppliants, they have forced them, reduced to the lowest condition of slavery, to fight in the foremost ranks against their own neighbours. Those who have feigned to fight, or have hidden in the hope of escaping, have been followed up by the Tartars and butchered. If any have fought bravely for them and conquered, they have got no thanks for reward; and so they have misused their captives as they have their mares. For they are inhuman and beastly, rather monsters than men, thirsting for and drinking blood, tearing and devouring the flesh of dogs and men, dressed in ox-hides, armed with plates of iron, short and stout, thickset, strong, invincible, indefatigable, their backs unprotected, their breasts covered with armour; drinking with delight the pure blood of their flocks, with big, strong horses, which eat branches and even trees, and which they have to mount by the help of three steps on account of the shortness of their thighs. They are without human laws, know no comforts, are more ferocious than lions or bears, have boats made of ox-hides which ten or twelve of them own in common; they are able to swim or manage a boat, so that they can cross the largest and swiftest rivers without let or hindrance, drinking turbid and muddy water when blood fails them (as a beverage). They have one-edged swords and daggers, are wonderful archers, spare neither age, nor sex, nor condition. They know no
other language but their own, which no one else knows; for until now there has been no access to them, nor did they go forth (from their own country); so that there could be no knowledge of their customs or persons through the common intercourse of men. They wander about with their flocks and their wives, who are taught to fight like men. And so they come with the swiftness of lightning to the confines of Christendom, ravaging and slaughtering, striking everyone with terror and incomparable horror. It was for this that the Saracens sought to ally themselves with the Christians, hoping to be able to resist these monsters with their combined forces.”

So far from such alliance taking place, however, it was not long before the ecclesiastical and temporal rulers of Christendom conceived the idea of making use of the Tartars to crush Islám, and so end in their favour once and for all the secular struggle of which the Crusades were the chief manifestation. Communications were opened up between Western Europe and the remote and inhospitable Tartar capital of Qaraqorum; letters and envoys began to pass to and fro; and devoted friars like John of Pian de Carpine and William of Rubruck did not shrink from braving the dangers and hardships of that long and dreary road, or the arrogance and exactions of the Mongols, in the discharge of the missions confided to them. The former, bearing a letter from the Pope dated March 9, 1245, returned to Lyons in the autumn of 1247 after an absence of two years and a half, and delivered to the Pope the written answer of the Mongol Emperor Kuyúk Khán. The latter accomplished his journey in the years 1253–5 and spent about eight months (January—August, 1254) at the camp and capital of Mangu Khán, by whom he was several times received in audience. Both have left narratives of their adventurous and arduous journeys which the Hakluyt Society has rendered easily accessible to English readers1, and of which that of Friar

Bátú, the grandson of Chingiz, holds his Court on the Volga

From an old ms. of the *Jami‘ut-Tawārikh* in the Bibliothèque Nationale
William of Rubruck especially is of engrossing interest and great value. These give us a very vivid picture of the Tartar Court and its ceremonies, the splendour of the presents offered to the Emperor by the numerous envoys of foreign nations and subject peoples, the gluttonous eating and drinking which prevailed (and which, as we shall see, also characterized the Court of Tīmūr 150 years later), and the extraordinary afflux of foreigners, amongst whom were included, besides almost every Asiatic nation, Russians, Georgians, Hungarians, Ruthenians and even Frenchmen. Some of these had spent ten, twenty, or even thirty years amongst the Mongols, were conversant with their language, and were able and willing to inform the missionaries “most fully of all things” without much questioning, and to act as interpreters. The language question, as affecting the answer to the Pope’s letter, presented, however, some difficulties. The Mongols enquired “whether there were any persons with the Lord Pope who understood the written languages of the Ruthenians, or Saracens, or Tartars,” but Friar John advised that the letter should be written in Tartar and carefully translated and explained to them, so that they might make a Latin translation to take back with the original. The Mongol Emperor wished to send envoys of his own to Europe in the company of Friar John, who, however, disapproved this plan for five reasons, of which the first three were: (1) that he feared lest, seeing the wars and dissensions of the Christians, the Tartars might be further encouraged to attack them; (2) that they might act as spies; (3) that some harm might befall them in Europe “as our people are for the most part arrogant and hasty,” and “it is the custom of the Tartars never to make peace with those who have killed their envoys till they have wreaked vengeance upon them.” So Friar John and his

1 M. Léon Cahun in his Introduction à l’Histoire de l’Asie, p. 353, n. 2 ad calc., puts forward the ingenious suggestion that the German Dolmetsch is derived from the Turco-Mongol Tilmāj, both words meaning “Interpreter.”
companions came at last to Kieff on their homeward journey, and were there "congratulated as though they had risen from the dead, and so also throughout Russia, Poland and Bohemia."

The history of the diplomatic missions\(^1\) which passed between Europe and Tartary in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries has been admirably illustrated by Abel-Rémusat in his two classical *Mémoires sur les Relations politiques des Princes Chrétiens, et particulièrement les Rois de France, avec les Empereurs Mongols.* Fac-similes are here given, with printed texts and in some cases Latin or French translations, of nine Mongol letters conveyed by different envoys at different periods to the French Court. The originals of these, measuring in some cases more than six feet in length, may still be seen in the *Archives* in Paris. The arrogance of their tone is very noticeable; still more so the occurrence in the Latin version of a letter to the Pope from Bachú Núyán of a very ominous and characteristic phrase which is also noticed by the contemporary Persian historian Juwayní. "Si vultis super terram vestram, aquam et patrimonium sedere," runs the letter, "oportet ut, tu Papa, in propriâ personâ ad nos venias, et ad eum qui faciem totius terrae continet accedas. Et si tu præceptum Dei stabile et illius qui faciem totius terrae continet non audieris, illud nos nescimus Deus scit?" So Juwayní says\(^3\) that, unlike other great rulers and conquerors, they never indulged in violent and wordy threats when demanding submission or surrender, but "as their utmost warning used to write but this much: 'If they do not submit and obey, what do we know [what may happen]? the Eternal God knows!'" As to what would inevitably happen if the Tartars were resisted (and

---

\(^{1}\) Published in the *Mémoires de l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* in 1821 and 1822, vol. vi, p. 396 and vol. vii, p. 335.

\(^{2}\) See pp. 421–2 of the second memoir mentioned above.

often even if they were not resisted) men were not long left in doubt. "Wherever there was a king, or local ruler, or city warden who ventured to oppose, him they annihilated, together with his family and his clan, kinsmen and strangers alike, to such a degree that, without exaggeration, not a hundred persons were left where there had been a hundred thousand. The proof of this assertion is the account of the happenings in the various towns, each of which has been duly recorded in its proper time and place."

Whether any such letters exist in the records of this country I do not know, but in 1307, shortly after the death of Edward I (to whom they had been accredited), two Mongol ambassadors, whose names are given as Mamlakh and Túmán, came to Northampton and carried back with them an answer from Edward II written in Latin and dated October 16, 1307. The principal object of this and previous missions was to effect an alliance between the Mongols and the European nations against the Muhammadans, especially the Egyptians. To attain this end the wily Mongols constantly represented themselves as disposed to embrace the Christian religion, a deceitful pretence which the more readily succeeded because of the belief prevalent in Europe that there existed somewhere in Central or Eastern Asia a great Christian emperor called "Prester John." "Prester John," generally identified with Úng Khán the ruler of the Karîts (or Kerî'ts), a people akin to the Mongols, with whom at the beginning of his career Chingîz Khán stood in close relations, and who had been converted to Christianity by Nestorian missionaries. But as a matter of fact Islám had been the official religion of

1 Juwayñî, op. cit., p. 17.
2 Called elsewhere "Thomas Ildaci" or "Iouldoutchi" (Yoldúchî).
3 This identification is explicitly made by Abu'l-Faraj Bar-Hebraeus (Beyroud ed. of 1890, p. 394). See also d'Ohsson's Hist. des Mongols, vol. i, pp. 48–9 and 52–3 with the footnotes. Úng or Ong Khán was converted by popular etymology into Yokhnân=Johan.
the Mongol rulers of Persia for at least ten years before the above-mentioned ambassadors obtained audience of Edward II.

The contemporary Oriental histories of the Mongols are singularly full and good, and include in Arabic Ibn 'l-Athir's great chronicle, which comes down to the year 628/1231; Shihābu'd-Dīn Nasā'ī's very full biography of his master Jalālu'd-Dīn Mankobirnī, the gallant Prince of Khwārazm who maintained so heroic and protracted a struggle against the destroyers of his house and his empire; the Christian Abu'l-Faraj Bar-Hebraeus, whose Arabic history (for he wrote a fuller chronicle in Syriac) comes down to 683/1284, two years before his death; and Yāqūt the geographer, most of which have been discussed and quoted in a previous volume. Of the three chief Persian sources, the Ta'rikh-i-Jahān-gushā of Juwaynī, the Ta'rikh-i-Wassāf, and the Jāmi'ü't-Tawārīkh, a good deal will be said in the next chapter, but one may be permitted to express regret that the last-mentioned history, one of the most original, extensive and valuable existing in the Persian language, still remains for the most part unpublished and almost inaccessible.

Of the three best-known European histories of the Mongols, and of the point of view represented by each, something must needs be said here. First there is Baron d'Ohsson's admirable Histoire des Mongols, depuis Tcheinguis Khan jusqu'à Timour Bey ou Tamerlan, a monument of clear exposition based on profound research. While recognizing, as every

1 They are admirably enumerated and described by d'Ohsson, op. cit., vol. i, pp. x–lxvi.
2 I have discussed the materials available for a complete text of this important work in an article published in the J. R. A. S. for 1908, vol. xl, pp. 17–37, entitled Suggestions for a complete edition of the Jāmi'ü't-Tawārīkh of Rashtā'ud-Dīn Faḍlullāh.
3 Published in four volumes at the Hague and Amsterdam, 1834–5.
student of the subject must recognize, the immense importance and far-reaching effects of the Mongol conquests, he finds this people utterly detestable: "their government," he says, "was the triumph of depravity: all that was noble and honourable was abased; while the most corrupt persons, taking service under these ferocious masters, obtained, as the price of their vile devotion, wealth, honours, and the power to oppress their countrymen. The history of the Mongols, stamped by their savagery, presents therefore only hideous pictures; but, closely connected as it is to that of several empires, it is necessary for the proper understanding of the great events of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries."

Next in point of time is Sir Henry Howorth's great History of the Mongols in four large volumes. His view of the Tartars differs somewhat from d'Ohssohn's, for he sees in them "one of those hardy, brawny races, cradled amidst want and hard circumstances, in whose blood there is a good mixture of iron, which are sent periodically to destroy the luxurious and the wealthy, to lay in ashes the arts and culture which only grow under the shelter of wealth and easy circumstances, and to convert into a desert the paradise which man has painfully cultivated. Like the pestilence and the famine the Mongols were essentially an engine of destruction; and if it be a painful, harassing story to read, it is nevertheless a necessary one if we are to understand the great course of human progress." After enumerating other luxurious and civilized peoples who have been similarly renovated by the like drastic methods, he asserts that this "was so to a large extent, with the victims of the Mongol arms; their prosperity was hollow and pretentious,

2 Published in London 1876–1888 and divided into three parts, of which part 2 forms vols. ii and iii. Part 3 (vol. iv) deals with the Mongols of Persia.
3 Op. laud., part i, p. x.
their grandeur very largely but outward glitter, and the diseased body needed a sharp remedy; the apoplexy that was impending could probably only be staved off by much blood-letting, the demoralized cities must be sown with salt and their inhabitants inoculated with fresh streams of vigorous blood from the uncontaminated desert." With more justice he insists on the wonderful bringing together of the most remote peoples of the East and West which was the most important constructive effect of the Mongol conquest, and concludes: "I have no doubt myself...that the art of printing, the mariner's compass, firearms, and a great many details of social life, were not discovered in Europe, but imported by means of Mongol influence from the furthest East."

The third book which demands notice, chiefly on account of its influence in Turkey in generating the Yeşil Tūrān, or Pan-Turanian movement, of which it is not yet possible exactly to appraise the political importance, is M. Léon Cahun's Introduction à l'Histoire de l'Asie: Turcs et Mongols, des Origines à 1405. This writer goes very much further than Howorth in his admiration of the Mongols and the various kindred Turkish peoples who formed the bulk of their following. A note of admiration characterizes his description of their military virtues, their "culte du drapeau, la glorification du nom turc, puis mongol, le chauvinisme"; their political combinations against the Sasanian Persians, and later against the Islamic influences of which Persia was the centre; their courage, hardihood, discipline, hospitality, lack of religious fanaticism, and firm administration. This book, though diffuse, is suggestive, and is in any case worth reading because of its influence on certain chauvinistic circles in Turkey, as is a historical romance about the Mongols by

1 Op. laud., p. 11.
4 Ibid., p. 79.
5 Ibid., pp. 111-118.
the same author, translated into English under the title of The Blue Banner. Of the Yeĕi Tûrân movement I have spoken briefly elsewhere, and this is hardly the place to discuss it more fully, though it has perhaps a greater significance than I was at that time disposed to think. On the literary side it aims at preferring Turkish to Arabic and Persian words, idioms and vehicles of expression, and at combating Arabic and Persian influences and traditions; while on the political side it dreams of amalgamating in one State all the Turkish and kindred peoples west and east of the Caspian Sea (including the Mongols on the one hand and the Bulgarians on the other), and of creating a great Turkish or Turanian Empire more or less coextensive with that of Chingiz Khán. The ideas of this school were chiefly embodied in a fortnightly publication entitled Turk Yurdu (the "Turkish Hearth") inaugurated in December, 1911.

It is not, however, with the Mongol Empire as a whole, but with Persia under Mongol dominion that we are here chiefly concerned, nor is it necessary to record in detail the history of the Mongol Il-kháns who succeeded Húlágú, which can be read in full in the pages of d'Ohsson and Howorth. Considering what Persia suffered at the hands of the Tartars, it is wonderful how much good literature was produced during this period.

Generally speaking the South of Persia, lying apart from the main track of conquest to the West, suffered much less than the North, West and Centre. Ísfahán suffered a massacre in which one famous poet at least perished, but Shíráz, owing to the timely and prudent submission of its ruler, escaped almost scatheless, a fact to which Sa'dí ingeniously alludes in the

---

1 The Press and Poetry of Modern Persia, p. xxxix. An interesting article on this subject, written, I understand, by Mr Arnold Toynbee, also appeared in the Times for Jan. 3, 5 and 7, 1918.

panegyric on his patron prefixed to the *Būstān*, where he says:\footnote{See Graf's edition, last line on p. 22 and first line on p. 23. The *Būstān* was written in 665/1257, a year before the *Gulistān*.}

\begin{quote}
स्कंदर बदियार रौथिन व स्कं, बकरद आज जहाँ राह याजोव ततक,
त्रा सद्र याजोव तैफ़र आज़ररस्त, नह रौथिन जो दियारात सकंदरस्त।
\end{quote}

"Alexander, by means of a Wall of brass and stone, narrowed the road of Gog from the world: Thy barrier to the Gog of Paganism is of gold, not of brass like the Wall of Alexander."

"By the 'Gog of Paganism,'" says the commentator, "Chingiz Khān is meant. The King-Atábek made peace with him by money, so that the Musulmāns of Shiráz were saved from the hands of his tyranny. The author ascribes pre-eminence to his patron because, says he, 'Alexander barred Gog's advance with a brazen barrier, but thou didst check the advance of the Gog of Paganism with gold.'"

Twenty-five years before Sa'dí wrote this, Shamsu‘d-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Qays of Ray, flying before the first fury of the Tartar irruption, had found at Shirāz a haven of refuge wherein to complete his interrupted work on the *Ars Poetica* and prosody of Persia\footnote{See the English Preface (pp. xv–xviii) to Mirzá Muḥammad's edition of his *Mu'jam fi Ma'āyīrī Ash'ārī l-'Ajam*, published in the "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial" Series, vol. x, 1909.}; and the life of Shirāz seems to have gone on fairly tranquilly and suffered relatively little disturbance during those stormy days.

Another point to be noted is that, while all learning suffered from the wholesale massacres of scholars and destruction of mosques, libraries, and other pious foundations, some branches of learning suffered much less than others. For theology and philosophy, for example, the pagan Mongols naturally cared little; but they attached considerable importance to medicine, botany, astronomy and other natural sciences,
were especially desirous that their achievements should be fully and accurately recorded by competent historians, and were not altogether indifferent to the praises of poets. At no other period, as will be pointed out more fully in the next chapter, were so many first-rate histories written in Persian; but it must be remembered that the writers were, as a rule, men whose education reposed on the more scholarly tradition of pre-Mongol days, and that such historical works as the Ta'rīkh-i-Jahān-gushā of Juwaynī and the Jāmi'ut-Tawārīkh of Rashīdu'd-Dīn Faḍlullāh were isolated phenomena, hardly approached in excellence in later days. The Ta'rīkh-i-Guzīda is as inferior to the latter as it is superior to the over-estimated histories of Mīrkhwānd and Khwāndamīr which will be discussed in the concluding chapter of this volume. On the whole, then, it may be safely said that, allowing for the terrible crisis through which Persia was passing, when heathen rulers dominated the land, and Christians and Jews lording it over Muslims, the period of Mongol ascendancy, from the death of Hūlāgū Khān on February 8, 1265, until the death of the last Mongol Īl-khān, Mūsā, in 1337, was wonderfully rich in literary achievements.

Before passing to the detailed consideration of these achievements, a brief sketch must be given of the external history of this period, which is divided into two nearly equal halves by the reign of Ghāzān, who, though not the first Mongol Īl-khān to embrace the religion of Islām, was the first to restore it to its position of supremacy and to purge the land of Mongol heathenism.


The first successor of Hūlāgū was his son Abāqā (or Abaqā), who was crowned on June 19, 1265, a date chosen as auspicious by the famous astronomer and philosopher Naṣīru'd-Dīn of Tūs, whose brilliant scientific and dubious political achievements have been discussed in a previous volume¹. His life was now

¹ Lit. Hist. of Persia, vol. ii, pp. 484–6, etc.
drawing towards its close, but we hear of him once again five years later, in 669/1270-1, when he was called in to treat Aßaqâ, who had been gored by a wild cow on one of his hunting expeditions. The wound suppurated and an abscess formed which none of the Íl-khán's other medical advisers dared to open. Nâširu'd-Dîn successfully performed the operation. He died in the following year at the age of seventy-five. Bar-Hebraeus gives him a brief but laudatory notice in his Muktašarû'd-Duwâl, describing him as "the Keeper of the Observatory at Marâgha and a man of vast learning in all branches of philosophy."

"Under his control," he continues, "were all the religious endowments in all the lands under Mongol rule. He composed many works on logic, the natural sciences and metaphysics, and on Euclid and the Almagest. He also wrote a Persian work on Ethics of the utmost possible merit wherein he collected all the dicta of Plato and Aristotle on practical Philosophy, confirming the opinions of the ancients and solving the doubts of the moderns and the criticisms advanced by them in their writings."

Aßaqâ was thirty-one years of age when he became ruler of Persia, and whether or no there was any truth in the rumour that he was actually baptised into the Christian Church at the desire of his bride Despina, the natural daughter of Michael Palaeologus, he consistently favoured the Christians, and, indeed, appears to have owed his elevation to the throne to their influence, exercised through Döquz Khâtûn, the widow of his father and predecessor Hûlûgû, who survived her husband about a year, and who never failed to befriend her co-religionists in every possible way. Aßaqâ's diplomatic relations with

1 Beyrout ed. of A.D. 1890, pp. 500-1.
2 I.e. the well-known Akhlâq-i-Nâširî, one of the three Persian works on this subject which are most read even at the present day. See Lit. Hist. of Persia, vol. ii, pp. 220, 456, 485.
4 Ibid., p. 218. She belonged to the Christian tribe of Kerâî't (or
the Popes and Christian kings of Europe are, however, in all probability to be ascribed rather to political than religious motives. He was in correspondence with Clement IV, who wrote him a letter from Viterbo in 1267; Gregory X in 1274; and Nicolas III, who in 1278 sent to him and to his overlord the great Qūbilāy ("Kubla") Khán an embassy of five Franciscan monks. One of his embassies even penetrated as far as England and was apparently received by Edward I, but the records of it seem to be scanty or non-existent. The political object of these negotiations was to arrange for a combined attack on the still unsubdued Muslims of Egypt and Syria, the natural and deadly foes of the Mongols; and the inducement held out to the Christians was the possession of the Holy Land for which they had so long striven. Fortunately for the Muhammadans, Islám possessed in the Mamlúk Sultán Baybars, called al-Malik az-Żáhir, a doughty champion well qualified to meet the double peril which menaced his faith and his country. Already in 1260, before he was elected king, he had driven Húlágú’s Mongols out of Ghaza and routed them at ‘Ayn Jálút, driven back the Crusaders in Syria, and broken the power of the Syrian branch of the Assassins; and in April, 1277, he inflicted on the Mongols another great defeat at Abulustayn, leaving nearly 7000 of them dead on the field of battle. When Abáqá subsequently visited the battle-field, he was deeply moved, even to tears, by the numbers of the Mongol slain.

Karít) and was the granddaughter of their ruler Úng or Wang Khán, the original of the “Prester John” of mediaeval legend. Bar-Hebraeus in recording her death (op. cit., p. 497) describes her as “great in her judgement and wisdom.”

1 See Howorth, op. laud., pp. 278-281, and on the whole subject Abel-Rémusat’s classical Mémoires sur les Rélations politiques des Princes Chrétien...avec les Empereurs Mongols in the Mém. de l’Acad. Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, vols. vi and vii, pp. 396 and 335 respectively.

Bitter hatred subsisted during all this period between the Mongol Il-khans and the Egyptian Mamluks, and no more dangerous or damaging charge could be preferred against a subject of the former than an accusation of being in communication with the latter. Every Muslim subject of the Mongols must needs walk very warily if he would avoid such deadly suspicion, and, as we shall see hereafter, the favourite method of ruining a hated rival was to denounce him to the Mongol government as having relations with Egypt.

From our present point of view we are less concerned with the Mongol rulers and generals than with the Persian functionaries whom they found indispensable in the civil service (like the Arabs in earlier times), and amongst whom were included men of remarkable talents. Conspicuous amongst these was the Juwayni family, notably Shamsu’d-Dín Muḥammad the Ṣāḥib-Diwán, his brother ‘Alá’u’d-Dín ‘Atá Malik, and his son Bahá’u’d-Dín. The Ṣāḥib-Diwán’s grandfather, also entitled Shamsu’d-Dín, but distinguished by the epithets Buzurg (“the Great”) and Mūy-dirāz (“the long-haired”), had been Prime Minister to Qūṭbu’d-Dín Khwárazmsháh, while his father, Bahá’u’d-Dín, had held the office of Mustawfi’l-Mamálík (approximately equivalent to Chancellor of the Exchequer). He himself had held the office of Prime Minister for ten years under Húlagú Khán, and was continued in this position by Abáqá. His brother, ‘Alá’u’d-Dín is chiefly interesting to us as one of the finest historians whom Persia ever produced, and in this capacity he will be considered in the next chapter; but he was also a great administrator, and was for twenty-four years governor of Baghdád. His son Bahá’u’d-Dín was governor of Persian ‘Iráq and Fárs, while another son Sharafu’d-Dín

1 He was appointed by Húlagú in 657/1259, one year after the capture of the city by the Mongols. See the Introduction to Mírzá Muḥammad’s edition of the Ta’rikh-i-Jahân-gushá in the “E. J. W. Gibb Memorial” Series, vol. xvi, 1 (1912), pp. xxviii.
Hárún was a poet and a patron of poets. A full and critical account of this talented family, based on researches equally extensive and minute, is given by Mírzá Muḥammad of Qazwín, one of the finest and most critical Persian scholars whom I ever met, in his Introduction to the Taʿrikh-i-Jahán-gushá (vol. i, pp. xix–xcii), to which the reader may refer for much detailed information which considerations of space render it impossible to reproduce here. The Juwaynī family, alike in their love of literature and learning, their princely generosity, their administrative capacity, and their tragic fate, irresistibly recall to one's mind another great Persian family of statesmen, the celebrated House of Barmak or Barmecides of "the Golden Prime of good Haroun Alraschid?" Their influence was great and widespread; their connection with literature, both as writers and as patrons of poets and men of learning, extensive; and the jealousy of less fortunate rivals which embittered their lives and finally brought about their destruction commensurate with the power and high positions which they so long enjoyed. The first to die of those mentioned above, and one of the few who was fortunate enough to die a natural death, was Bahá'u'd-Dín, son of the Sáhib-Díván and governor of Persian 'Iráq. His death took place in 678/1279 at the early age of thirty. He was a terribly stern governor, who inspired the utmost terror in the hearts of his subjects, and whose ferocity went so far that he caused his little son, and he a favourite child, to be put to death by his executioner because in play he had caught hold of his beard. The historian Waṣṣáf gives many other instances of his implacable sternness, of which a selection will be found in Howorth's History of the Mongols; but it is fair to add that under his

---

1 His Díván is very rare, but there is a ms. (Or. 3647) in the British Museum. See Rieu's Pers. Suppl. Cat., No. 254, pp. 166–7.

2 Cf. Mírzá Muḥammad's Introduction to the Jahán-gushá, p. 4.

3 Pt. 3, pp. 221–2, and the Ta'rikh-i-Waṣṣáf (Bombay lith.), pp. 60 et seqq.
spear administration the utmost security prevailed in the
provinces which he administered, while he eagerly cultivated
the society of poets, scholars and artists. His father the
Šāhib-Dīvān mourned his death in the following verse:

"Muḥammad’s son! Thy slave is Heaven high;
One hair of thee the Age’s Mart might buy;
Thy Sire’s support wert thou: bereft of thee
His back is bent as brow o’er beauty’s eye."

The following verse was composed by Hindūshāh to com-
memorate the date of his death:

"On the eve of Saturday the seventeenth of Sha’bān’s month
In the year three score and eighteen and six hundred from the Flight
From the world Bahā’u’d-Dīn, that great wasir, in Iṣfahān
Fled. Ah, when on such another ruler shall Time’s eyes alight?"

This was the first of the misfortunes which befel the
Juwaynī family, and which were largely due to their un-
grateful protégé Majdu’l-Mulk of Yazd, whose

Misfortunes
of Juwaynī family

ambition led him to calumniate both the Šāhib-
Dīvān and his brother ‘Alā’u’l-Mulk ‘Ātā
Malik. While still subordinate to the Šāhib-Dīvān, Majdu
‘l-Mulk addressed to him the following quatrain:

1 Sha’bān 17, 678 = Dec. 23, 1279.
"I said, 'I'll ever in thy service be,  
Not come like larch and go like willow tree":  
He who despairs is bold and sharp of tongue;  
Cause me not, Friend, thus desperate to be!"

By traducing the Šāhib-Dīwān to Abāqā, he finally induced that monarch to associate him in the government with his rival, and this dual control gave rise to endless friction and recriminations. On one occasion he sent another quatrain to the Šāhib-Dīwān as follows:

"Into the Ocean of thy grief I'll dive,  
And either drown, or pearls to gather strive;  
'Tis hard to fight with thee, yet fight I will,  
And die red-throated, or red-cheeked survive."

To this the Šāhib-Dīwān sent the following answer:

"Since to the King complaints thou canst not bear  
Much anguish to consume shall be thy share.  
Through this design on which thou hast embarked  
Thy face and neck alike shall crimson wear."

1 I suppose the writer's meaning is, that he wishes to be a permanent and honoured associate of the minister, not liable to reprimand, humiliation or dismissal, coming in erect as the larch or cypress, and going out after some rebuff bowed down with humiliation like the weeping willow.

2 "Die red-throated," i.e. by decapitation. "Red-cheeked" or "red-faced" means "honoured," the opposite of "black-faced."
Ultimately Majdu’l-Mulk succeeded in arousing Abáqá’s suspicions against the Şáhib-Díwán’s brother, ‘Alá’u’l-Mulk ‘Aţá Malik-i-Juwaynî, who was arrested, paraded through the streets of Baghdád, tortured, and forced to pay large sums of money which he was alleged to have misappropriated. Matters might have gone yet worse with him had not Abáqá’s sudden death on April 1, 1282, put an end to his persecution and brought about his release from prison, while soon afterwards his enemy Majdu’l-Mulk fell a victim to the popular fury, and was torn in pieces by the mob, his dismembered limbs being publicly exhibited in the chief cities of Persia. On this well-merited punishment of the old and inveterate foe of his family ‘Aţá Malik-i-Juwaynî composed the following quatrain:

"For some brief days thy guile did mischief wreak; Position, wealth and increase thou didst seek: Now every limb of thine a land hath ta’en: Thou'st over-run the kingdom in a week!"

‘Aţá Malik, however, did not long survive his foe, for he too died in the spring of 1283.

In one curious particular connected with Abáqá’s death all the historians agree. He had, in the usual Mongol fashion, been drinking deeply with his favourites and boon-companions. Feeling uneasy, he had withdrawn from them for a moment into the palace garden when he suddenly cried out that a large black bird was threatening him, and ordered some of his servants to shoot it with arrows. The servants hastened to him in answer to his call, but no bird was to be seen, and
while they were still searching for it, Abáqá fell down in a swoon from which he never awoke.

A few other events of Abáqá’s reign merit a brief mention. The Assassins, in spite of all they had suffered at the hands of the Mongols, so far recovered themselves as to attempt the life of ‘Atá Malik-i-Juwayní in 670/1271–2, while four years later, in 674/1275–6, they actually succeeded, under the leadership of the son of their last Grand Master Ruknu’d-Dín Khursháh, in regaining possession of Alamút, though they were shortly afterwards subdued and destroyed by Abáqá. Internecine wars between various Mongol princes began to be prevalent in Abáqá’s reign, as, for instance, that between Yúshmút and Nogáy at Aq-sú in 663/1264–5, the year of Abáqá’s accession, and that between Abáqá and Nikúdar the son of Chaghátáy in 667/1268–9. Further turmoil was caused by the repeated raids of the Nikúdarís, and by the revolt of Buráq in Khurásán. The defeat of the latter by Abáqá’s troops was due almost entirely to the valour of Subutáy, in allusion to which a contemporary poet says:

\[
\text{ًشکری عشقی ترا پای مین آورد م و بسً}
\]
\[
	ext{همچند در جنگ برقاء از همه میران سبناً}
\]

“\text{ُنِبِيَتِ قُلَٰلْ عَلَى الْمَلَائِمِ donor of the world, I,}
\text{ِمَنْ ۚتَحْتَ مِنْ آوْرَدَهِمْ وِ بِهِ}
\text{ُۚۚشُجَّعَكَ بِرِّق اَزْهِمُه مِيرَانُ سُبْنُاً}’

A H M A D T A KÚDÁR\textsuperscript{2} (A.D. 1282–1284).

On the death of Abáqá two rival candidates appeared on the scene, his brother Takúdar\textsuperscript{2} (who, on his conversion

1 Abú’l-Faraj Bar-Hebraeus (Beyrout ed. of 1890, p. 505) says that this happened at Hamadán in the house of a Persian named Bihnám who gave a banquet in Abáqá’s honour. He does not explicitly mention the black bird, but says that Abáqá “began to see phantoms in the air.”

2 This name is sometimes given as Nikúdar or Nigúdar, but the Armenian form Tongudar given by Haithon seems decisive. See Howorth, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 310–11.
to Islám took the additional name of Aḥmad) and his son Arghún. A majority of the Mongol nobles preferred the former, and he was accordingly proclaimed on May 6, 1282, under the title of Sultan Aḥmad Takúdar. One of his earliest public acts was to show his devotion to the religion which he had adopted by letters addressed to the doctors of Baghádád and to Qalá’ún, Sultan of Egypt, in which he expressed his desire to protect and foster the religion of Islám and to live on terms of peace and amity with all Muslims. His letter to Qalá’ún, dated Jumáda I, A.H. 681 (August, 1282), was entrusted to two special envoys, Qutbu’d-Dín-i-Shírází and the Atábek Pahlawán, and Qalá’ún’s answer was dated the beginning of Ramádán of the same year (December 3, 1282).

However gratified the Muslims may have been at the conversion of Aḥmad Takúdar and the evidences of sincerity afforded by his conduct, the Mongols were far from sharing this satisfaction, and in the following year (682/1283–4), a formidable conspiracy of Mongol nobles to depose Aḥmad Takúdar and place his nephew Arghún on the throne came to light. Qunqrurátáy, one of the chief conspirators, with a number of his accomplices, was put to death on January 18, 1284, but Arghún successfully revolted against his uncle, whom he ultimately captured and put to death on August 10 of the same year, and was proclaimed King on the following day.

1 See d’Ohsson’s Hist. des Mongols, vol. iii, pp. 553 et seqq.
One of Arghún’s first acts was to make his son Gházán governor of Khurásán, Mázandarán, Ray and Qúmis. His formal recognition as Íl-khán of Persia by his over-lord Qúbiláy Khán (“Kubla Khán”) was brought from China in the following year by Urduugaya.

During the reign of Ahmad Takúdar the fortunes of the Šáhib-Díwán and his family, threatened for a while by the intrigues of Majdu’l-Mulk, revived once more, but they were finally eclipsed by the accession of Arghún. On the death of his master, Shamsu’d-Dín Muḥammad the Šáhib-Díwán, fearing Arghún’s anger, fled to Qum, where he was overtaken by Arghún’s messengers, brought back, and finally put to death at a place called Mú‘ína near Ahar on Sha‘bán 4 or 5, 683 (October 16 or 17, 1284). Before submitting himself to the headsman’s hands he craved a brief respite, which was granted him. After performing the ablution, he took an augury from a Qur’dn which belonged to him, and then wrote the following letter to the ‘ulamd of Tabriz:

“When I sought an augury from the Qur’dn, these were the words which came: ‘Verily those who said “God is our Lord,” and then were steadfast, unto them do the angels descend [saying]: “Fear not, neither be afraid. Receive good tidings of the Paradise which ye were promised!”’ Since the Creator, exalted is He, hath well maintained his servant in this perishable world, and hath not withheld from him any wish, it hath pleased Him even in this world to give him glad tidings of the World Eternal. Therefore he hath deemed it incumbent on himself to convey these glad tidings to Mawláná Muḥiyyu’d-Dín, Mawláná Afdalu’d-

1 This is the last event recorded by Bar-Hebraeus in his history (pp. 521–2 of the Beyrout ed. of 1890).
2 Qur’dn, xli, 30.
Dín, Mawláná Shamsu’d-Dín, Mawláná Humámu’d-Dín and those other great divines whom time and the circumstances do not permit me to mention by name, that they may know that we have severed all ties and so departed. Let them assist me with their prayers!

He also addressed the following farewell letter and testament to his sons:

"Salvation and greeting to my sons and dear ones, may God Almighty preserve them! Let them know that I entrust them to God, Mighty and Glorious is He: verily God doth not suffer that which is entrusted to Him to sustain loss. It was in my mind that perhaps a meeting might be possible, whereat my last wishes might be communicated orally, but my days are ended, and my business is now with the world to come. Do not fall short in the care of my children; incite them to study, and on no account suffer them to have aught to do with the service of the State; let them rather be content with that which God Most High hath assigned to them. If my son Atábek and his mother wish to return home, they have my permission so to do. Let Nawrúz, Mas’úd and their mother remain with Bulqán Khátün, and should she grant them estates, let them accept them and be content therewith. Whither can my chief wife go from Tabríz? Let her then remain there near the grave of me and my brothers. If they can, let them make their dwelling in the monastery of Shaykh Fakhrú’d-Dín and repair thither. Múmina hath received little satisfaction from us: if she wishes to marry again, let her do so. Let Farrukh and his mother remain with Atábek. Let them leave Zakariyyá with the crown lands and other estates which I have given over to Amír Búqá. Let them petition [on his behalf]: if some land should be granted to him, well and good: if not, let him rest content. May the Almighty

1 Ta’rîkh-i-Wassáf, p. 141.
2 The text of this is given in the Mujmal of Faşíhí of Khwáf, ff. 468b–469a of the MS. belonging to the Gibb Trustees.
Creator have mercy upon us, and bless all of them. At this hour my mind is fixed on the Divine Presence, and I can write no more than this. Deal kindly with all, bond and free, and forget us not on the nights when you remember the absent."

The Şahib-Diwân did not perish alone. Four of his sons, Yahyá, Faraju'lláh, Mas'úd and Atábek, were put to death soon after him, and a little later another son, Hárum. "Two brothers and seven sons," according to the Ta’rikh-i-Wassáf, constituted the sacrifice demanded by Mongol ferocity, ever ready to visit the sins of the fathers upon the children, and little disposed to leave alive potential avengers. Added to these losses were the deaths in the years immediately preceding of ‘Alá’u’l-Mulk ‘Aţá Malik-i-Juwaynî and Bahá’u’d-Dín, already mentioned, so that in the course of five or six years this great family of statesmen was practically effaced from the page of history.

Faşíhí, in his Mujmal (f. 469), quotes the two following quatrains composed by the Şahib-Diwân in his last moments:

"O Hand of Fate, which doth my heart's steps stay,
My heart submits to thy desire to slay:
With all my heart I offer thee my life;
For this throughout my life my heart did pray."

"Look, thou who caused'st life's bright lamp to die,
Two hundred worlds thou seest extinguished lie,
Yet do the slain eternal life attain,
And those in chief who are by heathens slain."

1 P. 142.
His death was universally lamented, even in towns like Shíráz where he was known only by his charities and good works, and which he had never visited. Amongst the verses composed on his death are the following:

"The Night in grief hath dyed her cloak, and Morn,
Heaving cold sighs, appears with collar torn:
The Sun's departure stains the sky with gore:
The Moon is veiled, the locks of Venus shorn."

"That minister whose head o'ertopped the skies
Hath earned, in truth, of martyrdom the prize;
The Şāhib-Diwān, who for thirty years
Hath kept the world secure from hurts and fears.
O cruel heavens such a life to ban!
O cruel earth, to slay so great a man!"

There were, however, others who regarded the Şāhib-Diwān's fate as well deserved, on account of the part he had played in respect to his unlucky predecessor Majdu'1-Mulk. This point of view is represented in the following verses, cited in the Ta'rikh-i-Guzīda:

1 Shamsu'd-Dīn, "the Sun of Religion," was the Şāhib-Diwān's name, to which allusion is here made.
Since Majdu'l-Mulk, by God-sent destiny,
A martyr in Naw Shahr's plain did die,
By the Šāhib-Dīwān Muhammad's spite,
Who ruled the land with unrestricted might,
Two years, two months, two weeks went by, and lo,
Fate bade him drain in turn the cup of woe.
Beware how in this world thou workest harm;
Fate's scales hold equal weight of bale and balm!"

A violent death was, however, the common end of those who were rash enough to act as ministers to Mongol sovereigns. Thus Jalālu'd-Dīn Simnānī, who succeeded the Šāhib-Dīwān, was executed in August, 1289; Sa'du'd-Dawla, who succeeded him, was put to death at the end of February, 1291; Ṣadru'd-Dīn Khālidī, who acted as minister to Gaykhātū, suffered the same fate in May, 1298; and Rashīdu'd-Dīn Faḍlullāh, the most accomplished of all, was executed in July, 1318.

Arghūn reigned over Persia for nearly seven years (August, 1284–May, 1291). The embassies which he sent to Europe, and especially that of 1287-1288, of which one of the envoys, Rabban Šawmā, has left us an account in Syriac, mark a revival of Abāqā's policy, which had been reversed by Ahmād Takūdar. During the latter part of Arghūn's reign Sa'du'd-Dawla the Jew was his all-powerful minister. This man, originally a physician, was detested by the Muslims, who ascribed to him the most sinister designs against Islām. He was originally a native of Abhar, and afterwards practised medicine at Baghdād. He was recommended to Arghūn by some of his co-religionists, and, according to the Ta'rīkh-i-Wassāfī, gained the esteem and confidence of that prince not only by his knowledge of the Mongol and


2 p. 236.
Turkish languages, but also by the skilful manner in which he played on Arghún's avarice by the schemes for replenishing the treasury which he unfolded. In the realization of these schemes in Bagh dád he showed such ability that he was entrusted by Arghún with the financial control of the whole kingdom. His co-religionists, hitherto despised and repressed, began to benefit by his ever-increasing power, and to fill many offices of state; so much so that a contemporary poet of Bagh dád wrote as follows:

"The Jews of this our time a rank attain
To which the heavens might aspire in vain.
Their is dominion, wealth to them doth cling,
To them belong both councillor and king.
O people, hear my words of counsel true:
Turn Jews, for heaven itself hath turned a Jew!
Yet wait, and ye shall hear their torment's cry,
And see them fall and perish presently."

Sa'adu'd-Dawla's boldness and open hostility to Islám increased with his power, until he not only induced Arghún to exclude the Muslims from all high civil and military posts, but endeavoured to compass the destruction of their religion. To this end he sought to persuade Arghún that the prophetic function had passed from the Arabs to the Mongols, who were divinely commissioned to chastise the disobedient and degenerate followers of Muḥammad, and proposed to turn the Ka'ba into an idol-temple. He began to prepare a fleet at Bagh dád to attack Mecca, and sent his co-religionist Khwája Najíbu'd-Dín Kaḥhál into Khurásán with a black list of some two hundred notable and influential

1 Ta'rikh-i-Wassaf, p. 238.
2 Ibid., p. 241.
Muslims whose death he desired to compass. A similar but shorter list, containing the names of seventeen notable divines and theologians of Shiráz, was also prepared for him. "It is related," says the author of the Ta’rikh-i-Wassáf, "that when Arghún Khán first ascended the royal throne he greatly disliked bloodshed, so that one day, during the progress of a banquet, he looked at the number of sheep slain, and, moved by excessive compassion, said, ‘Hardness of heart and a cruel disposition alone can prompt man to sacrifice so many innocent beasts for the pleasures of the table.’ Yet this minister (Sa’du’d-Dawla) so constantly applauded evil and represented wrong as right, urging that to clear the garden of empire from the thorns of disaffection, and to purify the wells of endeavour from the impurity of suspects was required alike by prudence and discretion…, that finally, through his evil promptings and misleading counsels, the Íl-khán’s heart became as eager to kill the innocent as are the infidel glances of the fair ones of Khutan, so that on the least suspicion or the slightest fault he would destroy a hundred souls. Such is the effect produced by intercourse with an evil companion and the society of wicked persons."  

But just when Sa’du’d-Dawla’s influence was at its highest and his schemes were approaching maturity, Arghún fell grievously sick at Tabríz. The minister, realizing that he would certainly not long survive his master, became a prey to the most acute and overpowering distress: he was unremitting in his attendance, and also, with the view of propitiating Heaven, gave away vast sums of money in charity, thirty thousand dinárs being distributed in Baghdád and ten thousand amongst the poor of Shiráz. He also liberated many captives and renewed or extended many benefactions. Some of the Mongol priests declared that the execution of Qaráñqay, Húlájú, Júshkab and other Mongol princes had brought this sickness on Arghún; others that he had been bewitched by one of his wives. Sultán Ídájí, who was alleged to have instigated

1 Ibid., pp. 242–3.
the former deed, was sacrificed in expiation, and also Júsh-kab's niece Túqiáq, who was suspected of the ensorcelment of the king; but naught availed to stay the progress of his malady, and towards the end of February, 1291, his condition was so critical that none were allowed to approach him save Júshi and Sa'du'd-Dawla. The latter secretly sent messengers to Gházán, bidding him be ready to claim the throne so soon as Arghún should have breathed his last, but nothing could now avail to save him from his foes, and he was put to death a few days before his master expired, on March 9, 1291.

The death of Sa'du'd-Dawla was the signal for a general persecution of the Jews, who were plundered and in many cases slain. In Baghdád alone more than a hundred of their chief men were killed. The collapse of the Jewish ascendancy was celebrated by Zaynu'd-Dín 'Alí b. Sá'id the preacher in the following Arabic qasida, composed in the same metre and rhyme as that quoted on p. 32 supra:

1. نحید من دار ياسمه الملك،
2. و قارن النحس سعد دولبه،
3. و ست الله شمل ملتهب،
4. و أرسلوا الأموات و انتبهوا,
5. أبتاههم الله عاجلا أبدا,
6. فاستخلصوا الجمال من ديارهم,
7. وأنحرى الأحراش قد هنكلوا,
8. يا أمة الأكفر و الضلال فقد,
9. صادصر في الحقيقة الشباك.

2. Cited from the Ta'rikh-i-Wássaf, p. 247.
ANTI-JEWISH POEMS

1. "His Name we praise who rules the firmament!
   These apish Jews are done away and shent.

2. Ill luck hath whelmed the Fortune of their State;^{1}
   Throughout the lands they're shamed and desolate.

3. God hath dispersed their dominant accord,
   And they are melted by the burnished sword.

4. How long they ruled in fact, though not in name,
   And, sins committing, now are put to shame.

^{1} Sa'du'd-Dawla means the "Fortune," or "Good Luck of the State." There is an antithesis between Sa'd, which applies to the fortunate influence of the auspicious planets, and Nahš, the maleficent influence of the unlucky planets.

3—2
5 God made them wail in woe right speedily,
   After that in their days they laughed with glee.
6 Grim captains made them drink Death's cup of ill,
   Until their skulls the blood-bathed streets did fill,
7 And from their dwellings seized the wealth they'd gained,
   And their well-guarded women's rooms profaned.
8 O wretched dupes of error and despair,
   At length the trap hath caught you in its snare!
9 Grim captains made them drink Death's cup of ill,
   Until their skulls the blood-bathed streets did fill,
10 O wretched dupes of error and despair,
   At length the trap hath caught you in its snare!

11 The Calf you served in place of God; and lo,
   Vain, vain are all your going to and fro!
12 They doomed to death your 'Cleanser' and thereby
   A host of sinful souls did purify,
13 What time they gathered round his head upraised
   Midst dust and stench, and on its features gazed.
14 God sped the soul of him who was their chief
   To hell, whose mirk is dark despair and grief.
15 In molten torments they were prisoned,
   In trailing chains they to their doom were led.
16 Take warning, from this doom without reprieve;
   Recite the verse: "How many did they leave?"
17 Tugháchár, prince fulfilled with strength and zeal,
   Hath caused the pillars of their power to reel.
18 His flashing falchion on their flesh did feed,
   And none would hold him guilty for the deed.
19 Our Shaykh's prediction found fulfilment there,
   What time he saw them rob him of his share;
20 That holy man, our lord Jamálu'd-Dín,
   Aided by God, endowed with angel's mien,
21 Devoted, walking ever in the way
   Of Him the fishes in their seas obey.
22 I penned this satire, hoping to attain
   The Eternal Gardens' lake-encompassed plain,
23 And to refute that poet's words untrue
   Who said, 'Turn Jews, for Heaven hath turned a Jew.'

1 This word Muhadhdhib ("Purifier") probably forms part of some
   such title as Muhadhdhibu'd-Dawla borne by one of the victims.
2 "How many gardens and fountains...did they leave behind them?"
   Qur'án, xliv, 24.
3 Perhaps Jamálu'd-Dín Muhammad ibn Sulaymán an-Naqīb al-
   Maqdisí (d. 698/1298-9) is meant.
GAYKHĀTU (A.D. 1291–1295).

Arghún was succeeded by his brother Gaykhātu, whose coronation did not take place till July 22, 1291, four months and a half after his predecessor's death. During this interval, in spite of the fact that Tughāchār and other chiefs of the Mongols had hastened to appoint governors in the different provinces, anarchy was rampant, and Afrāsyāb, of the House of Hazārasp, which had ruled over Luristān since the middle of the twelfth century, broke out in an abortive revolt and for a while held Isfahān.

Gaykhātu, whom the author of the Habībū's-Siyyāt describes as "the most generous of the children of Hūlāgū," chose Ṣādru'd-Dīn Ahmad Khālidī of Zanjān, better known as Ṣādīr-i-Jahān, as his prime minister. Both the monarch and his minister were disposed to extravagance and prodigality, and the former at any rate to the pleasures of the table and other less reputable enjoyments. Thus it soon happened that the treasury was empty, and, money being urgently required, Ṣādīr-i-Jahān determined to introduce the chao, or paper money, which was current in the Chinese Empire. To this end establishments for manufacturing the chao were erected in all the principal towns, and stringent laws were enacted to restrict the use of the precious metals as far as possible. Full descriptions of the projected paper money are preserved to us in the Ṭarīkh-i-Wassāf1 and other histories of the period. The notes consisted of oblong rectangular pieces of paper inscribed with some words in Chinese, over which stood the Muḥammadan profession of faith, "There is no god but God, Muḥammad is the Apostle of God," in Arabic. Lower down was the scribe's or designer's name, and the value of the note (which varied from half a dirham to ten dīnārs) inscribed in a circle. A further inscription ran as follows: "The King

of the world issued this auspicious chao in the year A.H. 693 [A.D. 1294]. Anyone altering or defacing the same shall be put to death, together with his wife and children, and his property shall be forfeited to the exchequer." Proclamations were also sent to Shíráz and other towns explaining the advantages of the new currency, answering imaginary objections against it, and declaring that:

 že во Агур дер Чабан Рован гродд; ґониқи Мелк ʒaоdан гродд;

"If in the world this chao gains currency, Immortal shall the Empire's glory be,"

and that poverty and distress would entirely disappear. One ingenious provision in the laws affecting the chao was that notes worn and torn by circulation were to be returned to the chao-khána, or Mint, and new notes, less by ten per cent. than the amount thus refunded, were to be given to the person so returning them.

The issue of the chao in Tabriz was fixed for the month of Dhu'l-Qa'da, 693 (Sept.-Oct., 1294). In three days the bazaars of Tabriz were closed and business was practically at a standstill, for no one would accept the chao, and gold and silver had been withdrawn from circulation. The popular rage was largely directed against 'Izzu'd-Dín Muẓaffár, who had been instrumental in introducing the hated paper money, and such verses as the following were composed about him:

\[ \begin{align*} 
\text{تو عزر دينى و ظل جبانى،} & \text{ جبانا هستئ تو نيست درخور،} \\
\text{بس از توحيد حق و الله اكبر;} & \text{ از آن گبر و مسلمان و یبوودی;} \\
\text{همی خوانند از روی تضع؛} & \text{بنزد حضرت دارای داور;} \\
\text{خدايا بر مرا ملیخ هرگرز;} & \text{مبادا در جبان یکدم مظفر؛} \\
\end{align*} \]

"Pride of the Faith, Protection of the Land, Would that thy being from the world were banned!

1 This is the meaning of 'Izzu'd-Dín.
Hence Muslim, Guebre and Jew first magnify
God, and declare His Power and Unity;
Then, humbly praying, bow them in the dust,
And thus invoke the Judge All-wise and Just:—
‘Lord, send him not victorious, we pray:
Cause all his schemes and plans to go astray!’

Similar disturbances broke out at Shiráz and in other
cities, and, yielding to the representations of the Mongol
nobles and others, Gaykhátú finally consented
to recall the obnoxious chao and abolish the
paper currency which had intensified instead of
ameliorating the financial crisis.

Shortly after this untoward experiment, Gaykhátú, in
one of those drunken orgies which were habitual to him,
grossly insulted his cousin Baydú, a grandson
of Húlágú, and caused him to be beaten by one
of his retainers. Next morning, when he came
to his senses, he repented of his action, and endeavoured to
conciliate Baydú by means of gifts and honours. Baydú,
for reasons of expediency, concealed his resentment for the
time, but soon afterwards, encouraged by certain disaffected
Mongol nobles, he openly revolted against Gaykhátú, who,
betrayed by his general Tugháchár, was taken prisoner and
put to death at Múqán, on Thursday, 6 Jumáda II, 694
(April 23, 1295).

Baydú (April—October, 1295).

Baydú was crowned soon after this at Hamadán, and
after celebrating his accession in the usual drunken fashion
of the Mongols, proceeded to appoint Tughá-
chár commander-in-chief, dismiss the late premier
Sadr-i-Jahán, and replace him by Jamálu’d-Dín
Dastajirdání. He did not, however, long enjoy the high
position which he had gained, for six months after his

1 “Victorious” is the meaning of Muṣaffar.
2 Habíbú’s-Siyar (Bombay lithographed ed. of 1857), vol. iii, pt. 1,
p. 81.
acquisition he was overcome by Gházán, the son of his cousin Arghún, and, in the words of Khwándamir\(^1\), “quaffed a full cup of that draught which he had caused Gaykhátú to taste.”

**Gházán (A.D. 1295–1304).**

The accession of Gházán, the great-grandson of Húláglú, marks the definite triumph of Islám over Mongol heathenism, and the beginning of the reconstruction of Persian independence. He was born on December 4, 1271, and was therefore not twenty-four years of age when he assumed the reins of government. At the youthful age of seven he accompanied his grandfather Abáqá on his hunting expeditions, and at the age of ten his father Arghún made him governor of Khurásán, under the tutelage of the Amír Nawrúz, the son of Arghún Ághá, who for thirty-nine years had governed various Persian provinces for Chingíz Khán and his successors. The Amír Nawrúz had embraced Islám, and it was through him that Gházán was converted to that faith, for at the beginning of his struggle with his rival Baydí he had been persuaded by Nawrúz to promise that, if God should grant him the victory, he would accept the religion of the Arabian Prophet. This promise he faithfully fulfilled; on Sha’bán 4, 694 (June 19, 1295), he and ten thousand Mongols made their profession of faith in the presence of Shaykh Ṣadru’d-Dín Ibráhím\(^2\), the son of the eminent doctor Sa’du’d-Dín al-Ḥamawí. Nor did Gházán lack zeal for his new convictions, for four months after his conversion he permitted Nawrúz to destroy the churches, synagogues and idol-temples at Tabríz. He also caused a new coinage bearing Muhammadan inscriptions to be struck, and by an edict issued in May, 1299, prohibited usury, as contrary to the Muhammadan religion. In November, 1297, the Mon-

---

\(^1\) *Habíbu’s-Siyar* (Bombay lithographed ed. of 1857), vol. iii, pt. 1, p. 81.

\(^2\) So the *Habíbu’s-Siyar* and *Dawlatshák*; but, according to the *Mujmal* of Fāsīhī, Shaykh Ibráhím al-Juwayní.
gol amīrs adopted the turban in place of their national head-dress.

There was still, however, a considerable section of Mongols, princes, nobles and others, which regarded Gházán's conversion with active dislike. This led to sundry rebellions and intrigues, which, however, were sternly repressed; and in the course of one month, according to the Habīb'u-Siyar (loc. cit., p. 85), no fewer than five Princes and thirty-seven amīrs of the Mongols were put to death by Gházán and Nawrúz. Nawrúz himself, however, in spite of all that Gházán owed him, was suspected by his master of secretly intriguing with the Sultan of Egypt, and, though he fled to Herāt and sought refuge with Malik Fakhru'd-Dīn Kurt, he was taken and put to death. Shortly afterwards Jamālu'd-Dīn Dastajirdānī, the Šadr-i-Jahān1 and his brother Qutb-i-Jahān, were also put to death, and the great historian and physician Rashidu'd-Dīn Faḍlullāh was made prime minister. Gházán was a stern ruler; "his reign," as Sir Henry Howorth observes2, "was marked by a terrible roll of executions, and, as d'Ohsson says, there is hardly a page of Rashidu'd-Dīn at this time without a notice of the execution of some public functionary."

During a considerable portion of his reign, Gházán was at war with Egypt. His first campaign, which was in the winter of 1299-1300, culminated in the Mongol victory at Majma'u-l-Murūj near Ḥimṣ (Emessa), where the Egyptians, outnumbered by three or four to one, were completely routed. The Mongols occupied Damascus and other portions of Syria for a hundred days, during which Gházán's name was inserted in the khutba. In spite of Gházán's reassuring proclamation of December 30, 1299, Syria suffered heavily from the cruelties and depredations of the Mongols3. In

2 Howorth, loc. cit., p. 421.
3 Ibid., pp. 444-5.
the following winter (1300-1301) Ghazán again prepared to invade Syria, but was forced to retreat owing to floods and bad weather. In the following May he despatched a letter to the Sultan of Egypt, the answer to which, written in October, was delivered to him by his envoys in December, 1301. Rather more than a year later, at the end of January, 1303, Ghazán again marched against the Egyptians. Having crossed the Euphrates at the date above mentioned, he visited Karbalá, a spot sanctified to him by his strong Shi'ite proclivities, and bestowed on the shrine and its inmates many princely favours. At 'Ána, whither he next proceeded, Wassaf, the court-historian, presented him with the first three volumes (out of five) of the history on which he was engaged, and which has been so often quoted or mentioned in these pages. Ghazán accompanied his army for some distance further towards the West, and then recrossed the Euphrates to await the result of the campaign at Kashf, two days' journey westwards from Ardabíl. This campaign proved as disastrous to the Mongols as the previous one had been fortunate, for they were utterly defeated by the Egyptians in March, 1303, at Marju's-Šuffar near Damascus. The Egyptian victory was celebrated by general rejoicings in Syria and Egypt, especially, of course, at Cairo, where every house was decorated and every point of vantage crowded to see the entry of the Sultan with his victorious troops, preceded by 1600 Mongol prisoners, each bearing, slung round his neck, the head of one of his dead comrades, while a thousand more Mongol heads were borne aloft on lances, accompanied by the great Mongol war-drums with their parchment rent. Ghazán's vexation was commensurate with the Egyptian Sultan's exultation, and was increased by a scornful and railing letter addressed to him by the victor. Condign punishment was inflicted

1 For the contents of these letters, see Howorth, loc. cit., pp. 458-461.
2 Ibid., p. 467.
3 Ibid., p. 474.
by him on the Mongol generals and captains who were supposed to have been responsible for this disaster. Gházán’s health seems to have been undermined by the distress resulting from this reverse to his arms, which was perhaps still further increased by the abortive conspiracy to depose him and place his cousin Álafrank the son of Gaykhátú on the throne, and he died at the early age of thirty-two on May 17, 1304.

The mourning for his death throughout Persia was universal, and appears to have been sincere, for he had restored Islám to the position it occupied before the invasion of Chingíz Khán, repressed paganism, and reduced chaos to order. In spite of his severity, he was merciful compared to his predecessors, and had the reputation of disliking to shed blood save when he deemed it expedient or necessary. He was, moreover, a generous patron of science and literature and a liberal benefactor of the pious and the poor. Though ill-favoured and of mean and insignificant appearance, he was brave, assiduous in all things, and gifted with unusually wide interests and keen intelligence. He was devoted alike to arts and crafts and to the natural sciences, especially to architecture on the one hand, and to astronomy, chemistry, mineralogy, metallurgy and botany on the other. He was extraordinarily well versed in the history and genealogy of the Mongols, and, besides Mongolian, his native tongue, was more or less conversant with Persian, Arabic, Chinese, Tibetan, Kashmirí, and, it is said, Latin. Something also he knew more than his predecessors of the lands and peoples of the West, a knowledge chiefly derived from the numerous envoys of different nations who sought his capital in Ádharbayján, and reflected, as Howorth remarks (p. 487), in the work of the great historian Rashídú’d-Dín, who acted as his prime minister during the latter portion of his reign, and who was aware, for instance, that the Scotch paid tribute to the English and
that there were no snakes in Ireland. Amongst the envoys who visited Gházán’s court were represented the Chinese, the Indians, the Egyptians, the Spaniards (by Solivero of Barcelona), the English (by Geoffrey de Langley), and many other nations.

Gházán was also well grounded in Islám, the faith of his adoption, and showed a marked predilection for the Shi‘ite form of that religion. How he enriched Karbalá we have already seen, and the shrine of the eighth Imám ‘Alí ar-Riḍá at Mash-had also benefited by his charity. How far he was influenced in his conversion by sincere conviction and how much by political expediency is a matter open to discussion, but his conversion was in any case a blessing for Persia. A harsh government is always an evil thing for those subject to its sway; more evil if it be administered by a foreign, dominant caste; most evil if the administrators be also of an alien religion hostile to, or unsympathetic towards, the faith of their subjects. The Mongol dominion had hitherto been of this last and cruellest type; by Gházán’s conversion it was ameliorated at once to the second, which again prepared the way for a return to the first. “When Gházán became a Muhammadan,” says Howorth (p. 486), “he definitely broke off his allegiance to the Supreme Khan in the furthest East. Hitherto the Íl-kháns had been mere feudatories of the Kháqán of Mongolia and China. They were now to become independent, and it is natural that the formulae on the coins should accordingly be changed.” Henceforth Shamans and Buddhist monks could no longer domineer over the Muslim ‘ulamá; their monasteries and temples gave place to colleges and mosques. Muslim

1 See f. 312a of the India Office MS. of the Jâmi‘u’t-Tawdrikh (Persian, 3524=2828 of Ethé’s Catalogue).
2 Sayyid Núru’lláh of Shúshtar includes him in the list of Shi‘ite rulers given in the sixth Majlis of his Majálisu’l-Múminín. The pages of the lithographed Tihrán edition of this work published in 1268/1851–2 are unfortunately not numbered, so that no more exact reference can be given.
learning, enriched in some directions though impoverished in others, was once more honoured and encouraged. Nor were material improvements, tending greatly to benefit the hitherto oppressed subjects of the Il-kháns, wanting. Gházan was at all times stern and often cruel, but he had far higher ideals of his duties towards his subjects than any of his predecessors, and he adopted practical means to give effect to these ideals. "Be sure," he says, "that God has elevated me to be a ruler, and has confided his people to me in order that I may rule them with equity. He has imposed on me the duty of doing justice, of punishing the guilty according to their crimes. He would have me most severe with those who hold the highest rank. A ruler ought especially to punish the faults of those most highly placed, in order to strike the multitude by example." An account of the reforms which he effected in the collection of taxes, the prevention of extortion, the repression of the idle and baneful extravagances of the dominant Mongols, the restoration of confidence and security where the lack of these had previously reduced prosperous towns to ruined and deserted hamlets, and withal the restoration of the finances of the country to a sound and healthy condition would be out of place here, especially as the matter is fully discussed by Howorth in his great history (loc. cit., pp. 487-530). The institution of the new Era, called Íl-khání or Gházaní, which began on Rajab 13, 701 (March 14, 1302), was also dictated, at any rate in part, by a desire to put an end to sundry irregularities which had crept into the finance. To Gházan's credit must also be set his efforts to suppress or at least minimize prostitution, and the example he himself gave of a morality far higher than that generally prevalent amongst his countrymen at that time.

Previous Mongol sovereigns had, in accordance with the custom of their nation, always taken measures to have the place of their burial concealed. Gházan, on the other hand, specified the place

1 Howorth, loc. cit., p. 491.
where he should be buried, and spent large sums in erecting and endowing round about his mausoleum a monastery for dervishes, colleges for the Sháfi‘í and Ḥanafi sects, a hospital, a library, an observatory, a philosophical academy, a residence for ṣayyids, a fountain, and other public buildings. Annual endowments amounting to over a hundred tumáns, or a million pieces of money, were provided for the maintenance of these establishments, and every possible precaution was taken to secure these revenues to their original use. Round about the mausoleum and its dependent buildings grew up the suburb of Gházániyya, which soon rivalled Tabrız itself in size and surpassed it in beauty.

ÚLJÁYTÚ KHUDÁ-BANDA (A.D. 1305-1316).

Gházán was succeeded by his brother Úljáytú the son of Arghún, who was crowned on July 21, 1305, under the name of Úljáytú Muḥammad Khudá-banda, being at the time twenty-four years of age. As a child he had, at the desire of his mother Urúk Khátún, been baptised into the Christian church under the name of Nicolas, but later he was converted to Isláám by his wife, to whom he was married at a very early age. In his youth he had received the curious name of Khar-bandá (“ass-servant,” i.e. ass-herd or muleteer), which was afterwards changed to Khudá-banda (“servant of God”). On the former name Rashídú’d-Dín has the following verses in the preface to vol. i of his great history:

دوش در نامِ شاه خرینده، فکر می گرد ساوتی بنده؛
كه مکر معنی در این اسمست، كه از آن غافل است خوانده;
اندرون حروف بکوش آمد، كه هوا خوادا شاه فرخنده;
معنی در حروف این لفظ است، كه بشاه است سخت زینده;
عقد كن از ره حساب جمل، بیک بیک حرف شاه خرینده;
The point of these verses, which are hardly worth translating in their entirety, is that the sum of the numerical values of the nine letters constituting the words Shāh Khar-banda (شاه خرنده) is equivalent to that of the fifteen letters in the words Sāya-i-Khās-i-Āfarinanda (سایه خاص آفرینناده), for the first gives 300 + 1 + 5 + 600 + 200 + 2 + 50 + 4 + 5 = 1167, and the second 60 + 1 + 10 + 5 + 600 + 1 + 90 + 1 + 80 + 200 + 10 + 50 + 50 + 4 + 5 = 1167. Since in the Muhammadan, as in the Jewish view, words giving the same numerical equivalent are in some sense identical, the King's name, Khar-banda, is shown to be equivalent to Sāya-i-Khās-i-Āfarinanda, the "Special Shadow (i.e. Protection) of the Creator." According to Dawlatshāh¹ (an author on whose uncritical statements no reliance whatever can be placed), "when, on the death of Arghun Khán, Gházán Khán became king, Uljáytú Khán fled from him, and for some years wandered with the ass-herds in the district of Kirmán and Hurmuz, on which account he was called Khar-banda, 'the Ass-herd.' But others say that this is not so, but that the parents of a very beautiful child give him an ugly name, so that the evil eye may not affect him, and that on this account he was called Khar-banda."²

¹ P. 217 of my edition.
² For another explanation see the Travels of Ibn Batūta (ed. Defrémercy and Sanguinetti), vol. ii, p. 115.
Even before Úljáytú was crowned, it was deemed expedient to get rid of his cousin Álafrank as a possible claimant to the throne, and he, as well as the general Harqadáq, was accordingly assassinated by three Mongol officers. Úljáytú's first act was to confirm the laws of his predecessor Gházán, and to ordain the strict observance of the Shari'at, or Canon Law of Islám; and he appointed Rashídú’d-Dín the historian and physician, and Sa’du’d-Dín of Sáwa as joint Chancellors of the Exchequer, with absolute authority over his Persian as opposed to his Mongolian subjects. He visited the celebrated observatory of Marágha, and installed Ašlú’u’d-Dín, the son of the eminent Naširu’d-Dín of Tús (who, as already mentioned, had died in 1272–3), as Astronomer-royal. Abú Sa’íd, the son and successor of Úljáytú, was born in the year of the latter's accession, and in the same year was deposed Sháh Jahán, the last sovereign of the Qará-Khitá’í dynasty of Kirmán. In the same year was founded the royal city of Sultániyya, near Zanján, which soon assumed the most majestic proportions. Now it is an almost uninhabited ruin, conspicuous only for its magnificent though dilapidated mosque; but the name of the royal founder is still remembered in the following doggerel, which I heard from an old man who accompanied me round the mosque when I visited it in November, 1887:

"O Sháh Khudá-banda, worker of injustice, two fowls for one village!"

The last line is Turkish, but I have never been able to ascertain to what it alludes.

1 The death of Ašlú’u’d-Dín is recorded in the Mujmal of Fašíhí under the year A.H. 714 (A.D. 1314–15). Abúl-Faraj Bar-Hebraeus gives the date of Naširu’d-Dín's death as 675/1276–7 (Beyrout ed. of 1890, pp. 500–501).

2 Ta’rikh-i-Wassúf, pp. 477–8. The author gives a long poem by himself on this event, at the end of which he mentions "the day of Anírán in the month of Farwardín in the year A.H. 710" as the date when his poem was completed (March–April, A.D. 1311).
Two months after Úljáytú's succession he received embassies from three of the Mongol rulers (of whom Timúr Qá'án, Emperor of China, was the most important) to announce the truce which had just been concluded between them. Three months later arrived an embassy from Túqtáy, and shortly afterwards Úljáytú despatched ambassadors to Egypt, to assure Sultán Nášir of his friendly disposition. He was also in correspondence with Philip le Bel, Edward the Second, and Pope Clement V. The bearer of the Ílkhán's letters to and from these potentates was Thomas Ildouchi, who, as d'Ohsson observes (vol. iv, pp. 590–8), evidently concealed from the European courts to which he was accredited the fact that his master Úljáytú had embraced Islám; for the letters on both sides are extant, and both Edward II (in a letter dated Nov. 30, 1307) and Pope Clement V (in a letter dated March 1, 1308) assume explicitly that Úljáytú would help them in extirpating what they describe as "the abominable sect of Mahomet." Úljáytú, meanwhile, was preoccupied with devising some test whereby he might prove the sincerity of the numerous Jews who at this time desired to profess Islám. This was finally effected by the learning of Rashídú'd-Dín, who, as his history shows, was thoroughly conversant with Jewish tradition and doctrine, and was even accused by his enemies of being a Jew, or of regarding Judaism with undue favour. The intending proselyte was bidden to partake of camel's flesh seethed in milk, and the sincerity of his conversion was judged by his readiness to eat this doubly-unlawful food. It was about this time also (April 14, 1306) that the aforesaid Rashídú'd-Dín presented the finished portion of his great historical work, the Jámí'ut-Tawárikh to Úljáytú.

The chief wars of Úljáytú's reign were the conquest of Gilán in the early summer of 1307 and the capture of Herát in the latter part of the same

---

1 Cf. p. 11 supra, and n. 2 ad calc.
year. In both campaigns a gallant resistance was made, and success was not achieved by the Mongols without serious losses. In the defence of Herat especially the most conspicuous courage and resource were shown by the Ghurí captain, Muhammad Sám, to whose charge the city had been entrusted by Fakhr u'd-Dín Kurt. He was, however, ultimately taken by treachery and put to death. Amongst other notable persons who suffered death in Uljaytu's reign were Músá the Kurd, who claimed to be the Mahdí or appointed Saviour of Islám; Sa'du'd-Dín, the associate and later the rival of Rashídu'd-Dín, who was executed on a charge of peculation from the treasury; and Táju'd-Dín Áwají, an extreme Shi'ite, who had tried to convert Uljaytu to his doctrines. But what the unfortunate Táju'd-Dín failed to accomplish nevertheless was brought about by other means. Uljaytu belonged to the Hanafi sect, the doctors of which, relying on the royal favour, waxed arrogant, until the King was induced by his minister Rashídu'd-Dín to incline to the Shafi'i doctrine. Thereupon violent disputes took place in Uljaytu's presence between the representatives of these two Sunní schools, who, in the heat of controversy, brought against each other such abominable accusations that Uljaytu was greatly annoyed with both, and even the Mongol nobles, who were by no means squeamish, professed disgust, and began to ask whether it was for this that they had abandoned the faith of their ancestors, to which they now called on Uljaytu to return. The Íl-khán was further alarmed by a violent thunder-storm by which he was overtaken about this time, and which, according to the Mongols and their bakshíṣ or priests (who, expelled by Gházán, would appear to have returned to Persia under his successor, unless, as d'Ohsson implies, they were brought back ad hoc) was a signal of the Divine displeasure. For some time he was distracted with doubt, until at length he was persuaded by the Amír Taramtáž to follow Gházán's

1 D'Ohsson, vol. iv, pp. 536-541.
example and adopt the Shī‘ite creed. This he ultimately did, after he had visited ‘Ali’s tomb and there seen a vision which convinced him that the homage of the faithful was due, after the Prophet, to ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and his descendants.

Uljaytū conducted one campaign against Syria, of which the chief event was the siege of Raḥbat, which, however, the Mongols were obliged to raise when the town was reduced to the last extremity on account of the heat and the scarcity of provisions. As the result of dissensions between the brothers of the house of Qatāda who ruled Mecca alternately according to the fortune of war, Uljaytū’s name was for a while substituted in public prayer in the Holy City for that of the Egyptian Sultan Nasir.

Uljaytū died at Sulṭāniyya from the sequelae of an attack of gout on December 16, 1316, at the comparatively early age of thirty-five. He is described as “virtuous, liberal, not readily influenced by calumny; but, like all Mongol princes, addicted to spirituous drinks, and chiefly occupied with his pleasures.” His funeral obsequies were celebrated with great pomp, and he was mourned by his subjects for eight days. He had twelve wives, who bore him six sons and three daughters, but five of the former and one of the latter died in childhood. His surviving son, Abū Sa‘īd, succeeded him; his two surviving daughters were married to the Amīr Chūbān, and one of them, Sātī Beg, subsequently held for a short time the position of queen in the year 1339.

Abū Sa‘īd (A.D. 1317–1334).

Abū Sa‘īd, who was in Māzandarān at the time of his father’s death, was crowned in April, 1317, being then under thirteen years of age. The Amīr Chūbān was made Amīru’l-Umarā, while ‘Alī-shāh was associated with Rashīdu’d-Dīn Faḍlullāh in the

1 The inscription on one of his coins affords proof of this. See d’Ohsson, vol. iv, p. 541 ad calc.
wazírate. Between these two ministers there existed a great rivalry, and it soon became evident that one or other must succumb. The victim was Rashídú'd-Dín, whose greater scrupulousness and honour placed him at a disadvantage. By the intrigues of his rival he was deposed in October, 1317, and the death of the powerful Amír Sávinj in January, 1318, deprived him of his chief protector. The Amír Chúbán was anxious to reinstate him in office, but though he pleaded his advanced age and desired only to be allowed to live out the remainder of his life in peace and retirement, his rival ‘Alí-sháh took alarm, renewed his intrigues, and succeeded in persuading Abú Sá’íd that Rashídú’d-Dín and his youthful and comely son Khwája Ibráhím were guilty of poisoning the late ruler Úljáyútú. Both were condemned to death and executed on July 18, 1318, Rashídú’d-Dín being then over seventy years of age. His body was outraged, his houses and possessions plundered, and his relatives and connections subjected to all sorts of persecution. More will presently be said of his character, learning, charity and literary achievements.

About a month after this sad event (August, 1318) began the rebellion of Yasáwur, whose ambition led him to covet the province of Khurásán. He succeeded in compassing the death of Yasá’úl, and, having made himself master of Khurásán, invaded and ravaged Mázandarán, but retired before Abú Sá’íd’s general, Amír Húsayn into the Garm-sír, or hot region bordering on the Persian Gulf. About the same time a formidable conspiracy of Mongol captains, such as Iranchín¹, Túqmáq and Isen-búqá was formed against Chúbán, but the latter, supported by Abú Sá’íd, utterly defeated them near Úján in June, 1319, and those of the rebel leaders who did not perish in the battle were put to death with every circumstance of

¹ Or Irinjin, the nephew of Doquz Khátún. See Chabot’s Hist. de Mar Jabalaha III, p. 141 ad calc.
ignominy and cruelty at Sulţāniyya. Amongst the victims was Kinjik (or Kikhshik, or Kichik), the grand-daughter of Abáqá and wife of Iranchin, who had fought with conspicuous bravery in the battle to avenge the death of her son Shaykh ‘Alí, and was now, according to Nuwayrī’s account, trampled to death by horses at the command of Abū Saʿíd. Two months later Chúbán was rewarded by being given in marriage Sátí Beg, the king’s sister, while the king, to commemorate his valour in this battle, took the title of Bahādur Khān.

The years 1318–1319 were remarkable for grievous famines in Asia Minor and elsewhere, followed in 1320 by terrific hail-storms. Abū Saʿíd, much alarmed, consulted the theologians as to the cause of these calamities. They ascribed them to the laxity which prevailed about wine-drinking and prostitution, taverns and brothels being in many cases situated close to mosques and colleges. Abū Saʿíd thereupon closed all disorderly houses, and caused an enormous quantity of wine to be destroyed, but he allowed one wine-shop to remain for the use of travellers in each district. These measures produced a very good impression in Egypt, and facilitated the conclusion of a treaty between Abū Saʿíd and Sulţán Nāṣīr, the Egyptian ruler, who had recently carried his hostility against the Mongols so far as to send thirty assassins of the Ismaʿili sect from Syria to attempt the life of Qará Sunqur. Although this attempt miscarried, it greatly alarmed the Mongols, and both sides were thus prepared to come to terms and to set aside their ancient feuds. A treaty was ultimately concluded in 1323 between the two states, after a Mongol princess (a grand-
daughter of Bátú) had been given in marriage to Sultán Násir in 1320.

In 1322 Timúr-Tásh the son of Chúbán revolted in Asia Minor and declared himself to be the expected Mahdí or Messiah, but he was overcome by his father, pardoned, and ultimately reinstated in his government by Abú Sa‘íd. About the same time Armenia was devastated by the Egyptians, and Pope John XXII endeavoured to stir up the European powers on their behalf; to which end he wrote a letter (dated July 12, 1322)¹ to Abú Sa‘íd asking him to aid them, and exhorting him at the same time to embrace the Christian faith. He also appointed² a Dominican named François de Peruse archbishop of Sultáníyya.

Early in 1324 died the prime minister ‘Alí-sháh, who was chiefly remarkable as the first Mongol wazír to die a natural death. He was succeeded by Ruknu’d-Dín Šá’in, who enjoyed the support of the great Amír Chúbán. The power of this Amír, however, began to arouse the jealousy of Abú Sa‘íd, now about twenty-one years of age, and an open rupture was precipitated by Abú Sa‘íd’s passion for Bagh dád Khátún, the daughter of Chúbán and wife of Shaykh Hasan Jalá’ír, and by the intrigues of the ungrateful Ruknu’d-Dín against his benefactor. A threatened invasion of Khuráśán by the Mongols of Transoxiana obliged Chúbán and his son Husayn to be present in the eastern portion of the empire, while another son named Dimashq Khwája, against whom Abú Sa‘íd was already incensed, remained at the court, which returned from its winter quarters at Bagh dád to Sultáníyya in the spring of 1327. Abú Sa‘íd, growing daily more impatient of Dimashq Khwája’s arrogance and immorality, only awaited a reasonable excuse to destroy him.

¹ A translation of this letter is given by d’Ohsson, vol. iv, pp. 662–3.
² D’Ohsson, vol. iv, p. 664. This appointment was made on May 1, 1318. The first archbishop resigned in 1323, and was succeeded by Guillaume d’Ada.
Nor had he to wait long, for about this time it was discovered that Dimashq was engaged in an intrigue with one of Úljáytú's former concubines. Finding himself detected, he endeavoured to escape, but was overtaken and put to death, and his head was exhibited over one of the gates of Sultáníyya. This took place on August 25, 1327. He left four daughters, of whom the most notable was Dilshad Khátún. She was married first to Abú Sa‘íd, to whom she bore a posthumous daughter who died in infancy, and afterwards to Shaykh Hasan Íl-khání, to whom she bore Sultán Úways and another son. This Sultán Úways reigned at Baghdad from 1356–1374, and was, as we shall see, a notable patron of poets and men of letters and learning.

Abú Sa‘íd, having taken this decisive step, resolved to exterminate Chúbán and his whole family. Chúbán, warned of the king's intention, first put to death the wazír, Ruknu'd-Dín Sá'in, and then collected his troops, to the number of seventy thousand, and marched westwards, first to Mashhad and then to Simnán, whence he sent the venerable Shaykh 'Alá’d-Dín to intercede for him with Abú Sa‘íd. The Il-khán was not to be moved, and Chúbán continued his advance westwards until he arrived within a day's march of Abú Sa‘íd. All seemed to be in Chúbán's favour, until some of his most important amírs deserted to the king, taking with them some thirty thousand men. Thereupon Chúbán retreated, first to Sáwa, where he left his wives Kardúchín and Sátí Beg, and then to Ṭabas. His followers continued to desert him until he was finally left with only seventeen persons. He then decided to take refuge at Herát with Ghiyáthu'd-Dín Kurt, who, however, betrayed him, and caused him and his chief officers to be strangled. His body was, by the Íl-khán's order, conveyed to al-Madína with great pomp,

---

and there buried in the tomb which he had prepared for himself

Abú Saʿíd was now free to marry Baghdaḍ Khátún, but, though she soon acquired a great influence over him, he did not cease persecuting her family. Another of Chúbán's sons, Tímūr-Tásh, who was governor of Asia Minor, took refuge at the Egyptian court, where he arrived on January 21, 1328. He was at first well received, sumptuously entertained, and given an allowance of 1500 dinárs a day; but the urgent demands of Abú Saʿíd for his extradition, combined with the intrigues of the Egyptian Sultan's courtiers, soon decided the latter to get rid of him. For a while he hesitated between the extradition and the execution of his once powerful guest, but finally he decided to kill him, fearing lest, if he were sent to Abú Saʿíd, the intercession of his sister Baghdaḍ Khátún and his old friend Ghiyáthu'd-Dín, the son of the great Rashídú'd-Dín, now himself prime minister, might induce the Íl-khán to forgive him, and that, should this happen, he would certainly seek to revenge himself on the Egyptians. Tímūr-Tásh was therefore put to death in prison on the night of Thursday, August 22, 1328, and his head, embalmed and placed in a casket, was sent to Abú Saʿíd.

Of the waźtr Ghiyáthu'd-Dín b. Rashídú'd-Dín the contemporary historian Hamdu'lláh Mustawfí of Qazwín speaks in enthusiastic terms in his Ta'rtkh-i-Guzída, or "Select History," which is dedicated to him. "That minister of good repute," he says, "like his illustrious father, made the most admirable efforts to secure the order of the world; and inasmuch as to pardon when one has power to injure is the extreme of human perfection, and all the greatest of former ages have followed this path, and thus obtained, by their virtuous conduct, the highest honour and an enduring name, so this minister of angelic temperament, inspired by the certainty of his convictions, did even more than this, for, instead of punishing

1 See Ibn Baṭútá, vol. ii, pp. 119-121.
those who had wrought towards his noble family ill deeds whereof the recapitulation would disgust the hearts of my hearers, he drew the pen of forgiveness through the record of their crimes, recompensed their evil actions with good, and made each one of them an exemplar of the prosperity of this Empire, raising them to the highest ranks, and entrusting to them the most important functions, so that each now beholds with his own eyes that which he did most ardently desire.

This complaisance of Ghiyáthu’d-Dín nearly caused his destruction when the rebellious Amír Nárín Búqá sought his intercession with Abú Sa’íd at the very moment when he was plotting the minister’s assassination. On this occasion, however, the king, prompted by his wife Baghdadá Khátún, who hated Nárín Búqá as the destroyer of her father and brothers, intervened, and caused the rebel and his confederate Tásh-Tímúr to be executed on October 5, 1327.

The last years of Abú Sa’íd’s reign saw numerous changes in the Kurt kings of Herát. Ghiyáthu’d-Dín died in October, 1329, and was succeeded by his eldest son Shamsu’d-Dín, who was so much addicted to drink that it was said that during a reign of ten months he was only sober for ten days. He was succeeded by his younger brother Háfíz, a gentle scholar, who was assassinated in 1332, and replaced by his infant brother Mu’izzu’d-Dín, whose election was approved by Abú Sa’íd. He enjoyed a long reign of forty years, and was followed by his son, Ghiyáthu’d-Dín Pír ‘Alí, in whose time the dynasty, which had endured since 1245, was extinguished by Tamerlane.

In August, 1335, Abú Sa’íd, having learned that Úzbek, the Khán of the Golden Horde, intended an invasion of his dominions, was preparing to take the field against him when he fell ill, and died at Qará-bágh near Arrán on Nov. 30 of that year. He

---

1 See p. 611 of the fac-simile edition of the Ta’rikh-i-Guzída published in the “E. J. W. Gibb Memorial” Series, vol. xiv, i.
is described by Ibn Taghribardî as "a brave and brilliant prince of majestic appearance, generous and witty." He was a good calligraphist, composer and musician, and is praised by this historian not only for his good moral character and for his suppression of the drink traffic, but also for his destruction of the Christian churches. It is suggested by Mîrkhwând and positively asserted by Ibn Baṭīṭa¹ that Abū Saʿīd was poisoned by Baghdad Khâtūn, who was jealous of the ascendancy obtained by her younger rival Dilshâd Khâtūn over the Íl-khân². At any rate, whether guilty or not, Baghdad Khâtūn was put to death³.

With Abū Saʿīd's death the dynasty of the Íl-khâns of Persia, founded by Hûlâgû Khân, practically came to an end, and a period of anarchy ensued which lasted until another great wave of conquest from the land of Tûrân swept over Persia and Asia Minor thirty-five years later, led by the ruthless and irresistible conqueror Tîmûr-i-Lang ("Limping Timûr"), or, as he is commonly called in Europe, Tamerlane. By a strange coincidence, noticed in the Matlâʿu's-Sâ'dayn⁴, the year of Tîmûr's birth was the same as that of Abū Saʿīd's death, and the chronogram lawdh (ذو = "refuge!")⁵ has been devised for it, since this word gives the date (A.H. 736) according to the Muhammadan computation, and men might well seek refuge with God from this double calamity—the death of Abū Saʿīd and the birth of Tîmûr—which this year brought.

On the death of Abū Saʿīd, who left no sons, Arpa, or Arpagâʿûn, a descendant of Arik-bûqâ, the brother of Hûlâgû, was, at the instance of the minister Ghiyâthu'd-Dîn b. Rashîdu'd-Dîn,

² See Howorth's History of the Mongols, pt. 3, p. 624. In the first line of this page, Nov. 30, 1334, is given as the date of Abū Saʿīd's death. This error is apparently due to a careless perusal of the last paragraph in d'Olisson's Hist. des Mongols, vol. iv, p. 716.
³ The manner of her death is related by Ibn Baṭīṭa, vol. ii, p. 123.
⁴ See Rieu's Persian Catalogue, p. 182.
⁵ See Howorth's History of the Mongols, pt. 3, p. 634.
chosen as his successor. To strengthen his position, he married Sáti Beg, the widow of Chúbán and sister of Abú Sa‘íd. He then marched against Úzbek and defeated him. But meanwhile Amir ‘Ali Pádisháh and other amírs, disapproving of Arpa’s election, set up a rival Íl-khán in the person of Músá, a descendant of Húlágú. A battle took place between the two rivals near Marágha on April 29, 1336. Arpa was defeated, and both he and the wasír Ghiyáthu’d-Dín were put to death shortly afterwards. Músá, however, was not suffered to enjoy the fruits of victory for long: another rival, Muhammad Sháh, also descended from Húlágú, was set up against him by Shaykh Hasan the Jalá’ír (called Buzurg, “the Great”). Another battle was fought at Ala-Tágh near the town of Naw-Shahr, in which, by the treachery of Shaykh Hasan Buzurg, Músá was routed and ‘Ali Pádisháh killed. Yet another claimant was set up in the person of Túgháy-Tímúr, who joined forces with Músá, and fought another battle with Shaykh Hasan Buzurg near Marágha in June, 1337, in which Músá was taken prisoner and put to death (July, 1337), while Túgháy-Tímúr fled to Bištám. Shaykh Hasan, the son of Tímúr-Tásh, the son of Chúbán, now added to the confusion by producing a pretender whom he asserted to be his father Tímúr-Tásh, whose execution by the Sultan of Egypt has been already mentioned. A battle finally took place at Nakhjuwán on July 10, 1338, between the two Ísans, in which Hasan “the Greater” was defeated, while his protégé Muhammad Sháh was taken prisoner and put to death. Shaykh Hasan “the Less” (the grandson of Chúbán) now quarrelled with the pretended Tímúr-Tásh, and espoused the cause of the princess Sáti Beg, the sister of the late king Abú Sa‘íd and widow of his grandfather Chúbán. She was proclaimed queen in 739 (1338–9), and a reconciliation was effected between the two Ísans.

It is hardly worth following these intrigues further. Those who desire fuller information about them, and about the tortuous policy of Shaykh Hasan “the Less,” will find
it in the pages of d’Ohsson and Howorth. Suffice it to say that Tughāy-Tīmūr was betrayed by the astute Shaykh Ḩasan “the Less,” who then set up another puppet, Sulaymān Khān, a descendant of Hūlāgū, and gave him Sātī Beg in marriage, while Ḩasan “the Greater” set up as a rival a descendant of Ābāqā named Shāh Jahān Tīmūr. A battle took place between the two factions near Marágha in 1340. Ḩasan “the Greater” was defeated, retired to Baghdād, deposed his puppet Shāh Jahān Tīmūr, and, proclaiming himself king, founded the dynasty—more important in literary than in political history—of the Jalā’īrs, who reigned until 1411 over Western Persia and Mesopotamia, with Baghdād as their capital. As for Ḩasan “the Less,” the grandson of Chūbān, he was murdered in 1343, while marching to attack his rival, by his wife ʻIzzat Malik, who expiated her crime by a most cruel and ignominious death. On this event the contemporary poet Salmán of Sāwa (who, being a protégé of the rival Shaykh Ḩasan, was delighted at the death of Chūbān’s grandson) has the following verses1, which hardly bear translation:

ز هجرتِ نّبّويّ رفته هفصّد و چل و چار؛
در آخَر رجب أَفتَاد أَفقاتِ حسنَ؛
زنی چَگونه زنی خّبر خیراتِ جهان،
بوزر بازوی خود خصیّتیّن شیخ حسنَ؛
گرفت محکم و میداشت تا بیترد و برفت،
زهی خجسته زنی خایه دار مرد افگان؛

The Mongol ascendancy in Persia was now at an end, and, until Tīmūr’s hordes swept over the country (1384–1393), it was divided into at least four kingdoms, those of the Jalā’īrs, the Mużaffarīs, the Kurts and the Sar-ba-dārs, whose history will be considered in another chapter.

1 Ḥabibu’s-Siyar, vol. iii, p. 131 (Bombay lithographed ed. of A.D. 1857). I cannot find these lines in the Bombay lithographed edition of Salmán’s poems, but they are given in the Maṭla’u’s-Sa’dayn.
Besides the travels of Ibn Batuţa, repeatedly cited in the notes, much light is thrown on this period by the travels in Persia of Friar Odoric of Pordenone about A.D. 1318; the particulars given about "Bousaet" or "Boussay" (i.e. Abú Sa'id) and his kingdom by the Archbishop of Sulţáníyya in a tract written about A.D. 1330; and the narratives of the consuls who represented Venetian interests in Tabrīz and other Persian towns between the years A.D. 1305 and 1332.

1 A fine edition of this work, edited by M. Henri Cordier, was published by Leroux of Paris in 1891.

CHAPTER II.

THE HISTORIANS OF THE ÍL-KHÁNÍ PERIOD.

The period of about seventy years which we are now considering is chiefly remarkable, from the literary point of view, for the large number of eminent Persian historians which it produced. At least eight of these deserve somewhat detailed notices, besides a rather larger number of notable poets, whose number might easily be increased if those of the second rank were included. Before considering these Persian writers, however, a few words must be said about the Arabic literature of this period of which it behoves even students whose primary interest is in Persian letters to have at least some general idea.

So long as the Caliphate endured and Baghdád remained, in theory at least, the metropolis of all orthodox Muslims, the Arabic language held throughout those wide domains a position analogous to that of Latin in Europe during the Middle Ages; that is to say it was not only (what it still remains) the language of theology, philosophy and science, but also to a large extent of diplomacy, polite society and belles lettres. The overthrow of the Caliphate by the Mongols greatly impaired its position and diminished its prestige, but this decline did not become very conspicuous so long as those survived whose education had been completed before Islám suffered this great disaster, that is to say for some fifty or sixty years after the fall of Baghdád. In the later periods which we have to consider a knowledge of contemporary Arabic literature, though always important, becomes less essential to the student of Persian history and letters, but at this
period it is still vital, especially in the domains of history, biography and travel, not to mention theology, philosophy and science, where it continues to be indispensable.

The Arabic literature with which we are here concerned falls into three classes. First, the Arabic works of bilingual Persians whose Persian writings entitle them to mention in the literary history of their country. Of this class the Qāḍī'l-Quḍāt (Chief Justice) Nāširu'd-Dīn al-Bayḍawī may be taken as an example. Al-Bayḍā ("the White"), from which he derived his cognomen, is the Arabic name of a place in Fārs so called on account of a white tomb (turbat-i-safīd) which renders it conspicuous. Al-Bayḍawī is best known as the author of the famous commentary on the Qur`ān entitled Asrārī't-Tanzil, which is written in Arabic; but he also wrote in Persian a history of Persia entitled Nizāmu'i-Tawārīkh, whereof mention will be made in the course of this chapter. To speak of him merely as a historian of the second rank and to ignore his far more important work as a commentator would be to do him a great injustice. Secondly, Arabic works by non-Persians which have profoundly influenced Persian thought, such as the Fūsūṣu'l-Hikam and other writings of Shaykh Muḥiyyu'd-Dīn ibnu'l-'Arabī, and the writings of Shaykh Šadru'd-Dīn of Qōnya (Iconium), which were the sources whence such mystical poets as Fakhru'd-Dīn 'Irāqī derived their inspiration. Thirdly, and most important, Arabic historical, geographical and biographical works which throw light on the persons, places, circumstances and ideas which we shall meet with in the course of our investigations. Amongst these special mention must be made of the lives of physicians (Tabaqāṭu'l-Āṭibbā)
by Ibn Abī Usaybi'ā (d. 668/1270); the great biographical work of Ibn Khallikān (d. 681/1282) entitled Wafayātul-Ayān; the Āthārūl-Bilād ("Monuments of the Lands") of Zakariyyā b. Muhammad al-Qazwīnī (d. 682/1283); the general history, especially important for the Mongol period, entitled Mukhtasarār d-Duwal of Abu'l-Faraj Bar-Hebraeus (d. July 30, 1289); the well-known history of Abu'l-Fīdā, Prince of Hamāt (d. 732/1331), entitled Al-Mukhtasar ǧī Taʾrīkhīl-Bashar; and the illuminating travels of Ibn Baṭūṭā (d. 779/1377), which extended over a period of 24 years (1325-1349) and included not only Persia but the greater part of Asia from Constantinople to India and China, and from Arabia to Afghanistán and Transoxiana.

The student of Persian history and literature who ignores these books is cut off from some of the richest sources of trustworthy information, yet they are constantly neglected even by experts who write authoritatively on the Persian poets and other kindred topics. Take only the "Monuments of the Lands" of al-Qazwīnī above mentioned, consider the following list of eminent Persian poets to whom reference is made under the towns wherein they were born or where they spent their lives, and see how much information about them is given which is vainly sought in the Persian tadhkiras or "Memoirs" commonly consulted on such matters:

Value of the Āthārūl-Bilād

1 Brockelmann's Gesch. d. Arab. Litt., vol. i, pp. 325-6. The text was printed at Cairo in 2 vols., 1299/1882.
2 Ibid., vol. i, pp. 326-8. This work is accessible to the English reader in the excellent translation of the Baron McGuckin de Slane, 4 vols., London and Paris, 1843-1871.
3 Ibid., vol. i, pp. 481-2; published by Wüstenfeld together with the better known but less valuable 'Ajāʾibūl-Makhluqāt, or "Wonders of Creation" of the same author at Göttingen in 1818.
5 Ibid., vol. ii, pp. 44-46.
7 The references are to the pages of Wüstenfeld's edition, which is
'Asjadī (p. 278), Awhādu'd-Dīn Kirmānī (p. 164), Fakhri of Jurjān (p. 351), Farrukhī (p. 278), Firdawsī (pp. 278-9 and a verse from the Shāhnāma quoted on p. 135), Jalāl-i-Ṭabīb (p. 257), Jalāl-i-Khwārī (p. 243), Khāqānī (pp. 272-3, where 3 bayts of his poetry are cited, and p. 404), Abū Ṭāhir al-Khātūnī (p. 259), Mujīr of Baylaqān (p. 345), Nizāmī (pp. 351-2), Nāṣir-i-Khusraw (pp. 328-9), Abū Sa‘īd ibn Abī'l-Khayr (pp. 241-2), Sanā‘ī (p. 287), Shams-i-Ṭabasī (pp. 272-3), ‘Umar-i-Khayyām (p. 318), ‘Unṣūrī (p. 278) and Rashīdu’d-Dīn Watwat (pp. 223-4). Here, then, we have notices, some fairly full and containing matter not to be found elsewhere, of 19 important Persian poets who flourished before or during the thirteenth century, these being in many cases the oldest notices extant1, since the Lubābu’l-Albāb of ‘Awfī and the Chahār Maqāla, “Four Discourses,” of Nizāmī-i-‘Arūḍī of Samarqand are almost the only Persian works of greater antiquity which treat more or less systematically of the lives of Persian poets. And this is only one subject out of many interesting to the student of Persian dealt with in this most entertaining work.

We must now pass to the historians, who, as I have already said, are by far the most important writers of this period, for, while other periods, both earlier and later, have produced poets alike more numerous and more celebrated, none have produced historians comparable in merit to these.

Of ‘Aṭā Malik-i-Juwaynī’s Ta’rīkh-i-Jahān-gushā or “History of the World-Conqueror” (i.e. Chingiz Khān), repeated mention was made in a preceding volume2, but something more must be added here. It was completed in 658/1260, but con-

---

1 On p. 334 of the Athārul-Bilād the author tells us that he met Shaykh Muḥiyyu’d-Dīn ibn Muḥārī in 630/1232-3, while the author’s autograph copy of the book is dated 674/1275-6, so that its composition lies between these limits.

2 Lit. Hist. of Persia, vol. ii, where the chief references are pp. 434, 435; 443 and 473.
cludes with the events of the year 655/1257, notably the destruction of the Assassins by the author's master and patron Húlagú Khán. Some few MSS. contain an Appendix describing the sack of Baghdád, which took place in the following year, but this is probably an addition by a later hand. The work comprises three parts, of which the first deals with the history of Chingiz Khán and his ancestors, and his successors down to Chaghatáy; the second relates the history of the Khwárazm-sháhs, especially of the two last rulers of this dynasty, Qutbu’d-Dín Muḥammad and his son Jalálu’d-Dín; while the third treats of the Isma'íl sect and especially of Ḥaṣan-i-Ṣabbáḥ and his successors, the Assassins of Alamút. The work is therefore not a general history, but a historical monograph on Chingiz Khán and his predecessors and successors, to which are added accounts of the two chief dynasties with which he came in conflict in Persia and Mesopotamia. Further particulars about this most valuable and original history are given in an article which I contributed to the J.R.A.S. for January, 1904, pp. 1–17, and the first and second of the three volumes which it comprises have already appeared (in 1912 and 1916 respectively) in the “E. J. W. Gibb Memorial” Series (xvi, 1 and xvi, 2), edited by my learned friend Mírzá Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdu’l-Wahháb of Qazwín, who has prefixed to the first volume a full and critical account of the work and its author, and of the family of statesmen to which he belonged. He died in March 1283. His brother Shamsu’d-Dín the Šáhib-Díwán wrote this verse on his death:

"He and I, thou wouldst say, were two lamps which in unison shone; One lamp burneth still, but alas! for the other is gone!"

1 English Introduction, pp. xv–xcii; Persian ditto.
Colophon of the oldest ms. of the Tārīkh-i-Jahān-gushā in the Bibliothèque Nationale, dated a.H. 689 (A.D. 1290)
The following chronogram on his death was composed by Ṣadru'd-Dín 'Alí, the son of Naṣíru'd-Dín of Tús:

آصف عبد علاء حق و دين زبده خُون
کرر بدرود جیان را جو سر آمدش زمان
در شب شبه چهارم ز مه ذه حجه
سال بر ششصد و هشتاد و یکی در اروان

The Ta'rikh-i-Wassaf was intended, as its author informs us, to be a continuation of the above-mentioned history, and may therefore most conveniently be mentioned next, although it is of slightly later date than the Jámi'u't-Tawārikh, of which we shall next speak. Its proper title is Tajziyatul-Amsār wa Tajziyatul-A'ṣār (the "Allotment of Lands and Propulsion of Ages"), and its author, though commonly known simply as Wassaf (the "Panegyrist") or Wassaf-i-Heārat (the "Court Panegyrist"), was properly named 'Abdu'lláh ibn Faḍlulláh of Shiráz. He was employed in the collection of revenue for the Mongol Government, and was a protégé of the great minister Rashidu'd-Dín, who presented him and his book to Uljaytū, as he himself relates, at Sulṭāniyya on June 1, A.D. 1312. His history, as Rieu well says, "contains an authentic contemporary record of an important period, but its undoubted value is in some degree diminished by the want of method in its arrangement, and still more by the highly artificial character and tedious redundance of its style. It was unfortunately set up as a model, and has exercised a baneful influence on the later historical compositions in Persia." That these criticisms are fully justified will be denied by no one who has occasion to use the work, and indeed the author himself

1 Both these verses are taken from the Mujmal of Faṣīḥī, f. 466 of the Raverty ms., sub anno 681.
2 Pp. 544 et seqq. of the fine Bombay lithograph of 1269/1852-3.
3 Cat. of Pers. MSS. in Brit. Mus., p. 162.
declares that to write in the grand style was his primary object, and that the historical events which he records served merely as the material on which he might embroider the fine flowers of his exuberant rhetoric. Uljaytu, we are told, was unable to understand the passages read aloud to him by the author on the occasion of his audience; and the reader who is not a Persian scholar may form some idea of his pompous, florid and inflated style from the German translation of the first volume published with the text by Hammer in 1856. We could forgive the author more readily if his work were less valuable as an original authority on the period (1257–1328) of which it treats, but in fact it is as important as it is unreadable. It comprises five volumes, of which the contents are summarily stated by Rieu (op. cit., pp. 162–3), and there is, besides the partial edition of Hammer mentioned above, an excellent lithographed edition of the whole, published at Bombay in Rajab, 1269 (April, 1853).

Here, perhaps, mention should be made of a quasi-historical work similar in style but far inferior in value to that just mentioned, I mean the Mu'jam Mu'jam fi Āthāri Mu‘ūlūkīl-‘Ajam, a highly rhetorical account of the ancient Kings of Persia down to Sasanian times, written by Fadlu'llah al-Ḥusaynī and dedicated to Nuṣratu‘d-Dīn Ahmad b. Yūsuf-shāh, Atābek of Lur-i-Buzurg, who reigned from 1296 to about 1330. This book, which is vastly inferior to the other histories mentioned in this chapter, has been lithographed at Tihrán, and manuscripts of it are to be found in most large Oriental libraries.¹

We now come to the great Jami‘u‘t-Tawārīkh, or “Compendium of Histories,” of which incidental mention has been made in the last chapter in connection with its illustrious author Rashidu‘d-Dīn Faḍlu’llah, equally eminent as a physician, a

¹ See Rieu's Pers. Cat., p. 811; Ethē's Bodleian Cat., No. 285; Ethē's India Office Cat., Nos. 534–5.
statesman, a historian, and a public benefactor. Of his public career and tragic fate we have already spoken, but something more must be said not only of the scope and contents of his history, but of his private life and literary activity. His history, unfortunately, has never yet been published in its entirety, and manuscripts of it are comparatively rare, but amongst the published portions is his life of Húlágú Khán, edited by Quatremère at Paris in 1836, with a French translation and many valuable notes, under the title of Histoire des Mongols de la Perse, écrite en persan par Raschid-eldin, publiée, traduite en français, accompagnée de notes et d'un mémoire sur la vie et les ouvrages de l'auteur. From this excellent memoir, to which those who desire fuller and more detailed information are referred, the following salient facts of Rashíd-u'd-Dín's life and works are chiefly taken. He was born at Hamadán about A.D. 1247, and was asserted by his enemies to have been of Jewish origin. His grandfather Muwaffaqu'd-Dawla ‘Alí was, with the astronomer Naṣíru'd-Dín Țúsí and Ra’ísu’d-Dawla, an unwilling guest of the Assassins of Alamút when that place was taken by Húlágú in the very year of our author's birth, and was at once received into Húlágú's service. As court-physician Rashíd-u'd-Dín enjoyed considerable influence and honour during the reign of Abáqá, but it was in the reign of Gházán, whose accession took place in A.D. 1295, that his many merits were first fully recognized, and three years later, on the dismissal and execution of the prime minister Șadr-u'd-Dín Zanjání, called Șadr-i-Jahán, he was chosen by Gházán, conjointly with Sa'du'd-Dín, to succeed him. In A.D. 1303 Rashíd-u'd-Dín accompanied Gházán as Arabic secretary in the campaign against the Syrians, and it was during this period, while the Mongol court was established at Šáhruh-i-Wassáf, as has been already mentioned (p. 42), on March 3, 1303.
During the reign of Úljäytú (or Khudá-banda) Rashídū'd-Dín enjoyed the same high position as under his predecessor, and received from the new king several singular marks of favour and confidence. He also built in Sultániyya, the new capital, a fine suburb, named after him Rashidiyya, containing a magnificent mosque, a college, a hospital and other public buildings, and some thousand houses. In December, 1307, he was instrumental in establishing the innocence of two Sháfi'ite doctors of Baghdad, Shihábú'd-Dín Suhrawardí and Jamálú'd-Dín, who had been accused of carrying on a treasonable correspondence with Egypt. Some two years later he built another beautiful little suburb, near Gházániyya, the town which had grown up round Gházán's mausoleum, to the East of Tabríz, and, at great expense, brought thither the river Saráw-rúd through channels hewn in the solid rock. Immense sums of money were required for these and other admirable works of piety and public utility, but Rashídū'd-Dín, as he himself declares, had received from the generous Úljäytú such sums as no previous sovereign had ever bestowed on minister or courtier. On the transcription, binding, maps and illustrations of his numerous literary works he had, according to the Ta'rikh-i-Wassáf, expended no less a sum than 60,000 dinárs (£36,000).

Early in the year 1312 Rashídū'd-Dín's colleague Sa'dū'd-Dín of Sáwa fell from power and was put to death, the prime mover in the intrigue of which he was the victim being the clever and unscrupulous 'Ali-sháh, who at once succeeded the dead minister in his office. Soon after this a dangerous intrigue was directed against Rashídū'd-Dín, but happily it recoiled on its authors and left him unscathed. Whether he, on the other hand, was responsible for the barbarous execution of Sayyid Táju'd-

1 Quatremère, Hist. des Mongols, pp. xvi-xvii. The Shihábú'd-Dín here mentioned is not, of course, Sa'di's teacher, who died 632/1234-5.
Din, the Naqīṭu’-Ashrāf, or “Dean of the Sharifs” (i.e., the descendants of ‘Ali) is a doubtful question, which Quatremère answers in the negative.

In 1315 such acrimonious disputes broke out between Rashídū’-Dīn and ‘Alī-shāh, as to who was responsible for the lack of money to pay the troops, that Uljáytū assigned to the management of each one different provinces of Persia and Asia Minor. Nevertheless ‘Alī-shāh continued his campaign of calumny against his colleague, who succeeded only with the greatest difficulty in saving himself from disaster. The same rivalry and intrigue continued after the death of Uljáytū and the accession of Abú Sa‘īd, until finally Rashídū’-Dīn, having succumbed to the attacks of his traducers, was deprived of his office in October, 1317, and ultimately, on July 18, 1318, at the age of over seventy years, was put to death with his son Ibráhīm, a lad of sixteen years of age, on a charge of having poisoned the late king. His property was confiscated, his relatives were persecuted and despoiled, his pious foundations were robbed of their endowments, and the Rab‘-i-Rashídī, the suburb which he had founded, was given over to rapine. He was buried in the mausoleum which he had prepared for his last resting-place, but his body was not suffered to rest there in peace, for about a century later Mírānsháh the son of Tímúr-ı-Lang, in one of his fits of insane brutality, caused it to be exhumed and buried in the Jews’ cemetery. ‘Alī-shāh, in order to testify his joy at his rival’s fall, presented magnificent presents to the Sanctuary at Mecca, and, escaping the retribution which overtook most of his accomplices, died peaceably in his bed six years later (in 1324), being, as already remarked, the first minister of the Mongol Īl-kháns who had the good fortune to die a natural death. Of Rashídū’-Dīn’s son Ghiyáthu’-Dīn, who resembled him in virtue and learning, as well as in his public career and his sad end (for he too was ultimately put to death in the spring of 1336) mention has been already made in the preceding chapter.
For the conception of the Jāmiʿuʿt-Tawārīkh the credit, in Quatremère's opinion\(^1\), belongs to Ghāzān Khān, who, foreseeing that the Mongols in Persia, in spite of their actual supremacy, would in course of time inevitably be absorbed by the Persians, desired to leave to posterity a monument of their achievements, in the shape of a faithful record of their history and conquests, in the Persian language. For the accomplishment of this great task he chose (and no better choice could have been made) Rashīdūd-Dīn, at whose disposal were placed all the state archives, and the services of all those who were most learned in the history and antiquities of the Mongols. The minister, though engrossed by the state affairs of a vast empire, yet succeeded in finding time to prosecute his researches and commit them to writing, though, according to Dawlat-shāh\(^2\), the only time at his disposal for this purpose was that which intervened between the morning prayer and sunrise.

Before Rashīdūd-Dīn’s history of the Mongols was completed, Ghāzān died (May 17, 1304), but his successor Uljāyṭū ordered it to be finished and dedicated, as originally intended, to Ghāzān; whence this portion of the work, generally called the first volume, is sometimes entitled Taʾrīkh-i-Ghāzānī, the “Ghāzānian History.” Uljāyṭū also ordered the author to write a companion volume containing a general history of the world and especially of the lands of Islām, and a third volume dealing with geography. This last has either perished, or was never actually written, but only projected, so that the work as we now know it comprises only two volumes, the first on the history of the Mongols, written for Ghāzān, the second on general history. The whole work was completed in 710/1310-11, though two years later the author was still engaged on his supplementary account of Uljāyṭū’s reign.

\(^1\) Hist. des Mongols, p. lxviii.
\(^2\) P. 217 of my edition.
The contents of this great history are briefly as follows:

Vol. I, ch. i. History of the different Turkish and Mongol tribes, their divisions, genealogies, pedigrees, legends, etc., in a Preface and four sections.

ch. ii. History of Chingiz Khán, his ancestors and successors, down to Gházán Khán.


Part 2. History of the Prophet Muhammad and of the Caliphate, down to its extinction by the Mongols in 1258; of the post-Muhammadan Persian dynasties of Persia, viz. the Sultans of Ghazna, the Seljúqs, the Khwárazmsháhs, the Salgharid Atábeks of Fárs, and the Isma'ílís of the West and of the East; of Oghuz and his descendants, the Turks; of the Chinese; of the Jews; of the Franks and their Emperors and Popes; and of the Indians, with a long and full account of Sakyamuni (Buddha) and of the religion which he founded.

The above is the arrangement actually adopted in the manuscripts of the India Office and the British Museum, but the divisions proposed by the author in his Introduction are slightly different, for he intended to begin the second volume with the history of the reigning king Úljáytú from his birth until 706/1306-7, and to add a supplement at the end of the same volume continuing the history of this monarch year by year. This confusing arrangement is not actually observed in most manuscripts, which, if they contain Úljáytú's reign at all, put it in its natural place, at the end of vol. i, after Gházán.

Few if any of the extant manuscripts are, however, complete, though every part of the history is contained in one or other of them. In the J.R.A.S. for January, 1908 (pp. 17-37) I have given a fuller analysis of the contents, together with a scheme for the complete edition which is so much needed.
Ignoring the complicated and confusing divisions made by the author, I proposed to publish the whole book in seven volumes, of which the first three, containing the history of the Turks and Mongols, would correspond to vol. i of the original, and the last four to vol. ii, as follows:

**Series I. Special history of the Mongols and Turks.**

**Vol. I.** from the beginning to the death of Chingiz Khan.
**Vol. II.** from the accession of Ogotay to the death of Timur (Uljaytu), the grandson of Qubilay Khan.
**Vol. III.** from the accession of Hulagú to the death of Ghazan, including the continuation of the history of the later Il-khans down to Abu Sa'id compiled as a supplement to this portion of Rashidu'd-Din's work in the reign of Sháh Rukh and by his command.

**Series II. General history.**

**Vol. IV.** The Introduction, the history of the ancient kings of Persia down to the fall of the Sásánian dynasty, and the biography of the Prophet Muhammad.
**Vol. V.** The entire history of the Caliphate, from Abu Bakr to al-Musta'sim.
**Vol. VI.** The history of the post-Muhammadan dynasties of Persia (Ghaznawis, Seljuqs, Khwárazmsháhs, Salgharís and Isma'ílís).
**Vol. VII.** The remainder of the work, comprising the history (from their own traditions and statements) of the Turks, Chinese, Israelites, Franks and Indians.

The *Jámi'ú't-Tawáríkh* is remarkable not only for the extensive field which it covers and the care with which it has been compiled from all available sources, both written

---

1 This is the portion which M. Blochet has published in the "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial" Series, vol. xviii.

2 The portion of this volume dealing with Hulagú was, as already stated, published by Quatremère under the title of *Histoire des Mongols de la Perse*, vol. i (Paris, 1836).
Enthronement of Ogotáy, the son and successor of Chingiz, from an old ms. of the *Jami‘ut-Tawarikh* in the Bibliothèque Nationale
and oral, but for its originality. It is doubtful whether any Persian prose work can be compared to it in value, at any rate in the domain of history, and it is the more to be regretted that it remains unpublished and almost inaccessible. "I will dwell no longer," says Quatremère, "on the proofs of the extreme importance of Rashidu’d-Din’s compilation; this excellent work, undertaken in the most favourable circumstances, and with means of performing it never before possessed by any single writer, offered for the first time to the peoples of Asia a complete course of universal history and geography." The same writer illustrates the thoroughness of Rashidu’d-Din’s work by indicating the extent to which he drew on Chinese sources, written and oral, in writing that portion of his history which bore reference to Khata (Cathay), and expresses a regret, which all must share, that the geographical portion of his work is lost, or at least still undiscovered. Perhaps, as Quatremère conjectures, it perished in the destruction and looting of the Rab’i-Rashidi which immediately followed Rashidu’d-Din’s death.

Rashidu’d-Din composed numerous other works besides the Jāmī’u’t-Tawārikh, and of these and their contents a detailed account is given by Quatremère. Amongst them is the Kitābu’l-Aḥyā wa’l-Āthār (the “Book of Animals and Monuments”), which comprised twenty-four chapters treating of a variety of matters connected with meteorology, agriculture, arboriculture, apiculture, the destruction of noxious insects and reptiles, farming and stock-breeding, architecture, fortification, ship-building, mining and metallurgy. This work is unhappily lost.

Another of Rashidu’d-Din’s works was the Tawḍīḥāt, or “Explanations,” a theological and mystical work, of which the contents are arranged under a preface and nineteen letters. It was written at the

1 Op. laud., p. lxxiv.
2 Ibid., p. lxxviii.
3 Ibid., p. lxxxii.
4 Ibid., pp. cxii–cxlvi.
request of Úljáytú, and is described by Quatremère from a manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale.

This was followed by another theological work entitled *Miftáhu't-Tafástr*, the "Key of Commentaries," treating of the divine eloquence of the Qur'án, its commentators and their methods, Good and Evil, rewards and punishments, length of life, Providence, Predestination and the Resurrection of the Body. To these topics are added a refutation of the doctrine of Metempsychosis, and a definition of sundry technical terms.

"The Royal Treatise" (*ar-Risálatu's-Sul tániyya*) is another similar work, undertaken on Ramadán 9, 706 (March 14, 1307), as the result of a discussion on theological matters which had taken place in the presence of Úljáytú.

The *Lätá'iful-Haqáiq*, or "Subtle Truths," comprises fourteen letters, and begins with an account of a vision in which the author, on the night preceding Ramadán 26, 705 (April 11, 1306), dreamed that he was presented to the Prophet. Its contents also are theological. This and the three preceding works are all written in Arabic, and together form what is known as the *Majmú'a-i-Rashidiyya*, or "Collection of the works of Rashídú'd-Dín," of which a beautiful manuscript, dated 710/1310-11, exists at Paris. Another manuscript of the same library\(^1\) contains a Persian translation of the *Lätá'iful-Haqáiq*, and there are also preserved there two copies of an attestation of the orthodoxy of Rashídú'd-Dín's theological views, signed by seventy leading doctors of Muslim theology. This attestation was drawn up in consequence of accusations of heterodoxy made against Rashíd by a malicious fellow whose enmity had been aroused by the frustration of his endeavours to appropriate an emolument from a benefaction for scholars and men of learning made by Gházán Khán on his death.

Another of Rashíd's works, of which, unhappily, only

\(^1\) Ancien Fonds Persan, No. 107, ff. 1-70.
the general nature of the contents is known, is the Bayānu'l-
Ḥaqāʾiq, or "Explanation of Verities," comprising seventeen letters, dealing mostly with theological topics, though other subjects, such as the small-pox and the nature and varieties of heat, are discussed.

The elaborate precautions (precautions which, alas! in the event proved inadequate) taken by Rashīdū'd-Dīn to preserve and transmit to posterity the fruits of his literary labours are very fully detailed by Quatremère, and can only be briefly recapitulated in this place. First, he caused several copies of each of his works to be made for lending to his friends and to men of letters, who were freely permitted to transcribe them for their own use. Then he caused Arabic translations of all his Persian, and Persian translations of all his Arabic works to be prepared, and of both versions he caused numerous copies to be deposited, for the use of anyone who might desire to read or copy them, in the mosque-library of the quarter called after him Rabʿ-ī-Rashidī. He also caused one large volume, containing all of his treatises with the necessary maps and illustrations, to be prepared and deposited in the above-mentioned public library, giving it the title of Jāmiʿu't-taṣāntiʾ-Rashîdī, or "Complete collection of the works of Rashīdū'd-Dīn." Of four more works treating of Medicine and the Mongol system of government he caused trilingual versions, in Chinese, Arabic and Persian, to be prepared. He further accorded the fullest liberty to anyone who desired to copy any or all of these books, and, not content with this, assigned a certain yearly sum from the revenues with which he had endowed his mosque in order to have two complete transcripts of his

1 That this is the correct title appears from the text of this document, published by Quatremère together with the translation. See his Hist. des Mongols, p. cxlix, l. 3. The Majmuʿa contained four treatises only (see the preceding page), while the Jāmiʿ contained everything Rashīd had written.
works, one in Arabic and one in Persian, made every year, and presented to one of the chief towns of the Muhammadan world. These copies were to be made on the best Baghdad paper and in the finest and most legible writing, and to be carefully collated with the originals. The copyists were to be carefully chosen, having regard both to the excellence and the speed of their work, and were to be lodged in the precincts of the mosque, as the administrators of the bequest might direct. Each copy, when finished, bound and ornamented, was to be carried into the mosque and placed on a book-rest between the pulpit and the mihrab, and over it was to be repeated a prayer for the author, composed by himself, and conceived in the following terms¹:

"O God, who revealest the most hidden secrets, and givest knowledge of history and traditions! As Thou hast graciously guided thy servant Rashid the Physician, who standeth in need of Thine Abundant Mercy, in the composition of these works, which comprise investigations supporting the fundamental dogmas of Islam, and minute researches tending to elucidate philosophical truths and natural laws, profitable to those who meditate on the inventions of Art, and advantageous to such as reflect on the wonders of Creation, even so hast Thou enabled him to consecrate a portion of his estates to pious foundations, on condition that from these revenues should be provided sundry copies of these books, so that the Muslims of all lands and of all times may derive profit therefrom. Accept, O God, all this from him with a favourable acceptance, and cause his efforts to be remembered with thanks, and grant forgiveness for all sins, and pardon all those who shall help to accomplish this good work, and those who shall read or consult these works and put in practice the lessons which they contain. And bestow

¹ The original of this prayer is given by Quatremère on p. clxx of his Hist. des Mongols, and the translation, which is more elegant than literal, on pp. cxl-cxli. The translation here given is from the Arabic original.
Colophon of Qur'an transcribed for Uljayti, Rashidu'd-Din
and Sa'du'd-Din in A.H. 710 (A.D. 1310-11)

Or. 4945 (Brit. Mus.), f. 1a
on him a good recompense, both in this world and the next! Verily Thou art worthy of fear, yet swift to forgive!"

This prayer was also to be inscribed at the end of each copy so completed, and was to be followed by a brief doxology, also formulated by Rashidu’d-Dín, and a colophon penned by the administrator of the bequest, stating at what epoch and for what town each copy had been made, and giving his own name and genealogy, so that he also might be remembered in the prayers of the faithful. Finally the completed copy was to be submitted to the qādīs, or judges, of Tabrīz, who should certify that all the formalities prescribed by the author had been duly carried out; and it was then to be sent to the town for which it was destined, and deposited in a public library where it could be freely used by all students, and even borrowed against a bond for such sum as the librarian might deem suitable. A copy of the Arabic version of the Majmū‘a-i-Rashzdiyya, together with the Bayándul-Haqḍ’iq and the Kitábu‘l-Aḥyá wa‘l-Āthár, was also to be made for one of the Professors on the foundation, who was daily to read and expound to the students some portion of the contents. Besides this, each lecturer on the foundation was obliged to make a copy of one of these works, either in Arabic or Persian, during the period occupied by his course of lectures, failing which he was to be dismissed and replaced by one more diligent than himself. The copy, when made, was to be his own, to sell, give away, or keep as he pleased. All facilities were to be accorded to persons desirous of copying any of these works in the library, but they were not allowed to be removed from its walls. In conclusion the successive administrators of the funds were exhorted to carry out zealously and literally the wishes of the benefactor, and curses were invoked on any administrator who should fail to do so.

Yet, as Quatremère observes, in spite of all these elaborate precautions, “we have lost the greater part of the works of this learned historian, and all the measures which he took

have not had a more fortunate success than the precautions devised by the Emperor Tacitus to secure the preservation of his illustrious relative's writings. The action of time and the vandalism of man, those two scourges which have robbed us of so many masterpieces of antiquity, have also destroyed numerous other productions, less brilliant without doubt, but not less useful; and while worthless compilations are spread abroad in all directions and load the shelves of our libraries, we are left to lament bitterly a number of important works, of which the loss is irreparable."

Of one such work, however, not apparently known to Quatremère, I am the fortunate possessor. This is a collection of Rashídú'd-Dín's letters, mostly on political and financial matters, addressed to his sons and others who held various offices under the Mongol government, and collected, arranged and edited by his secretary Muḥammad of Abarquh. For two manuscripts of this work, one old, the other a modern copy of the first, made, apparently, for Prince Bahman Mīrzá Bahdū'd-Dawla, I am indebted to the generosity of my friend Mr G. le Strange, who obtained them from the late Sir Albert Houtum-Schindler. A third manuscript volume, in English, is entitled in Mr le Strange's hand: *Summary of the Contents of the Persian MS. Despatches of Rashídú'd-Dín: copied from notes supplied by Sir A. H. Schindler, and afterwards corrected by him*: Dec. 1913. In view of the extreme rarity of this work and the interest of its contents, a list of the 53 despatches and letters which it contains and the persons to whom they are addressed is here appended.

1. Preface of the editor Muḥammad of Abarquh, defective at beginning.

2. Letter from Rashídú'd-Dín to Majdu'd-Dín Isma'il Fálí.

3. Answer to the above.

4. From Rashídú'd-Dín to his son Amīr 'Alí, Governor

of ‘Irāq-i-‘Arab, ordering him to punish the people of Baṣra for rebellious conduct.

5. From the same to his son Amīr Maḥmūd, Governor of Kirmān, reprimanding him for oppressing the people of Bam.

6. From the same to his servant Sunqur Bāwarchī, Governor of Baṣra, instructing him as to the policy he should pursue.

7. From the same to his sister’s son Khwāja Maʿrūf, Governor of Ḍānīḥ, Ḍār, Ḍabāra, Nā’ūsa, ‘Ashāra (?), Raḥba, Shafāthā (?) and Baladu’l-‘Ayn, appointing him Governor of Rūm. Written from Sultāniyya in 690/1291 (or possibly 696/1296-7).

8. From the same to the Nāʿibs of Kāshān concerning the pension of 2000 dīnārs assigned to Sayyid Afdal-ud-Dīn Masʿūd out of the revenues of Kāshān.

9. From the same to his son Amīr Maḥmūd (see No. 5 supra) ordering the distribution of food to the poor of Bam, Khabīṣ, etc.

10. From the same to his son Khwāja Saʿdu’d-Dīn, Governor of Antioch, Tarsus, Sūs, Qinnasrin, the ‘Awāṣim and the shores of the Euphrates, giving him fatherly advice as to the methods of administration he should adopt, and warning him against sloth, wine-drinking, and over-fondness for music and dissipation.

11. From the same to his son ‘Abdu’l-Muʿmin, Governor of Simnān, Dāmghān and Khwār, ordering him to appoint the Qāḍī Shamsu’d-Dīn Muḥammad b. Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abdu’l-Karīm of Simnān Chief Judge of that district.

12. From the same to Shaykh Ṣadru’d-Dīn b. Shaykh Bahāʿu’d-Dīn Zakariyyā condoling with him on the death of a son.

13. From the same to Mawlānā Ṣadru’d-Dīn Muḥammad Turkaʿī concerning a revised and emended scale of taxation to be applied to the people of Isfahān and other places.

B. P.
14. Proclamation from the same to his son Amír 'Alí, Governor of Baghdad, and to the people of that city, small and great, concerning the appointment of Shaykh Majdu'd-Dín as Shaykhu'l-Islám and the provision to be made for the professors, officers and students of the khángáh of the late Gházán Khán.

15. From the same to Amír Nuşratu'd-Dín Sitáy, Governor of Mawšil, and Sinjář, concerning Sharafu'd-Dín Hasan Mustawfí.

16. Answers from the same to philosophical and religious questions propounded by Mawláná Ṣadr-i-Jahan of Bukhárá.

17. Letter from the same to his son Khvája Jalál, asking for 40 young men and maidens of Rúm to be sent to him at Tabríz to form the nucleus of a population for one of the five villages he has included in his park in the Rab'i-Rashídí.

18. From the same to Khvája 'Alá'u'd-Dín Hindú requesting him to obtain and send various medicinal oils for the hospital in the Rab'i-Rashídí.

19. From the same to his son Amír 'Alí, Governor of Baghdad, concerning allowances and presents to various theologians.

20. From the same to his son Khvája 'Abdu'l-Latíf, Governor of Išfahán, giving him good advice.

21. From the same to his son Khvája Jalálu'd-Dín, Governor of Rúm, also giving good advice, and ordering various quantities of different herbs and drugs for his hospital at Tabríz.

22. From the same to his son Amír Shihábu'd-Dín, then Governor of Baghdad, giving him good advice, and summarizing the revenues of Khúzistán.

23. From the same to Mawláná Majdu'd-Dín Isma'íl Fálí, inviting him to be present at the marriages which he has arranged for nine of his sons with various noble ladies.

24. From the same to Qará-Búqá, Governor of Kayfí and Pálú.
25. From the same to Mawláná ‘Affú’d-Dín Baghdádí.
26. From the same in answer to a letter from the Mawlás of Qayşariyya (Caesarea) in Rúm.
27. From the same to his son Amír Ghiyáthu’d-Dín Muhammad on his appointment as Inspector of Khurásán by Khudá-banda Úljáytú.
28. From the same to the people of Síwás concerning the Alms-house for Sayyids founded there by Gházán (Dárús-Siyádat-i-Ghásánt) and the necessity of its proper maintenance.
29. From the same from Multán in Sind to Mawláná Quţbu’d-Dín Mas’úd of Shíráz, giving an account of the journey to India which he undertook at the Íl-khán’s command to greet the Indian kings and bring back various drugs and spices not obtainable in Persia.
30. From the same to Takhtákh Ínjú as to complaints of his tyranny made by the people of Fárs, concerning which he is sending his son Ibráhím to report.
31. From the same concerning Mawláná Muhammad Rúmí, and the teaching in the college at Arzanján, of which he has been appointed Master.
32. From the same to Shirwán Sháh, ruler of Shábarán and Shamákhí, inviting him to visit the Garden of Fatḥábád which he has made.
33. From the same to the revenue officers of Khúzistán, concerning various financial and administrative matters, and the sending of Khwája Siráju’d-Dín of Dízful to audit the accounts, make investigations, and report.
34. From the same to his son Khwája Majdu’d-Dín, ordering him to collect stores for the army destined for the occupation of India.
35. From the Seljúq ruler of Arzanján, Malik Jalálu’d-Dín Kay-Qubád b. ‘Alá’u’d-Dín Kay-Qubád, asking advice on sundry matters; with Rashídú’d-Dín’s replies.
36. Rashídú’d-Dín’s reply to a letter from Mawláná Sa’dru’d-Dín Muhammad Turka’í, written during a dangerous illness and containing his last will and testament as to the division

37. Rashídú’d-Dín to the same, concerning a book which he had written and dedicated to him, and sending him a present of money, choice garments, a horse and various food-stuffs.

38. From the same to the people of Diyár Bakr concerning the digging of a new canal to be called after himself, and the establishment and population of 14 villages on both sides of it, with names and plan of the new villages, which are for the most part named after his 14 sons.

39. From the same to his son Jalálu’d-Dín, Governor of Rúm, concerning the digging of a new canal from the Euphrates to be called after his late lord Gházán Khán, and the foundation of 10 villages, of which the plan and names are again given.

40. From the same to his agent Khwája Kamálú’d-Dín Síwási, Mustawfi of Rúm, ordering him to send, by means of a merchant named Khwája Aḥmad, certain presents in cash and in kind to ten learned men in Tunis and the Maghrib (names given) in return for ten books (titles given) in 36 volumes which they had sent to the Minister, of whose generosity they had heard.

41. From the same to the authorities at Shíráz ordering them to make certain specified presents in cash and in kind to Mawláná Mahmúd b. Ilyás who had written a
book entitled *Laṭā'if-i-Rashdīyya* and dedicated it to Rashīdu’d-Dīn.

42. From the same to the authorities at Hamadān concerning the maintenance of the Pharmacy (*Dārū-khānā*) and Hospital (*Dārūsh-Shi‘fā*) which he had founded there, and which he is sending a physician named Ibn Mahdī to inspect and report on. Written from Caesarea (*Qayṣariyya*) in 690/1291.

43. From the same to his son Amīr Mahmūd, Governor of Kirman, recommending to his care and assistance Khwāja Mahmūd of Sāwa, whom he is sending on a mission to India, to Sulṭān ‘Alā’u’d-Dīn, and also to collect money due to Rashīdu’d-Dīn from his estates there.

44. From the same to his son Pīr Sultān, Governor of Georgia, concerning the King’s projected expedition to Syria and Egypt, and an intended punitive expedition of 120,000 men under ten Mongol *amīrs* (names given) which is to pass through Georgia to chastise the rebellious people of Abkhāz and Trebizond, and which Pīr Sultān is to accompany, leaving the government of Georgia in the hands of his deputy Khwāja Mu‘īnu’d-Dīn.

45. From the same to Shaykh Ṣafīyyu’d-Dīn of Ardabil giving, after many compliments, a list of the supplies of meat, fowls, rice, wheat, butter, honey, *māst*, perfumes and money which he proposes to supply to the aforesaid Shaykh’s monastery (*khanqāh*) for the festival to be held there in commemoration of the Prophet’s birthday.

46. Letter from Malik Mu‘īnu’d-Dīn, Parwānā of Rūm, to Rashīdu’d-Dīn, complaining of Turkmān depredations in his province.

47. Letter from Malik ‘Alā’u’d-Dīn accompanying the presents of precious stuffs, aromatic drugs, animals, conserves, spices, dried fruits, carpets, oils, plate, rare timber, ivory, *etc.*, which he is sending from India by way of Bāṣra to Rashīdu’d-Dīn.

48. Letter from Rashīdu’d-Dīn to his son Amīr Mahmūd, then engaged in studying Ṣūfīsīm in Kirkmān.
49. Letter from the same to his son Amír Aḥmad, at that time Governor of Ardabil, containing seven recommendations (wasıyyat), and expressing regret that he is occupying himself with Astrology.

50. Letter of condolence from the same to Mawláná Sharafu'd-Dín Ṭabasí on the death of his son, and ordering Shamsu'd-Dín Muḥammad of Abarqūh to supply him yearly with certain specified provisions.

51. Letter from the same to his son Sa'du'd-Dín, Governor of Qinnasrin, describing the completion of the Rab'-i-Rashidí at Tabríz, with its 24 caravansarays, 1500 shops and 30,000 houses; its gardens, baths, stores, mills, workshops, paper-mills and mint; its workmen and artisans, brought from every town and country, its Qur'án-readers, mu'ādh-dhins and doctors of theology, domiciled in the Kūcha-i-'Ulamá ("Rue des Savants"); its 6000 or 7000 students; its 50 physicians from India, China, Egypt and Syria, each of whom is bound to give instruction to ten pupils; the hospital (Dáru'sh-Shifá) with its oculists, surgeons and bone-setters, to each of whom are assigned as pupils five of the writer's servants; and the allowances in kind and in money made to all of them.

52. Letter from the same to his son Khwája Ibráhím, Governor of Shíráz, describing the campaign against Kábul and Sístán, and demanding various arms and munitions of war in specified quantities.

53. Letter from the same to several of his sons concerning the attributes of learning, clemency, reason and generosity. The ms. breaks off abruptly in the middle of this letter.

These letters, which ought to be published, are of extraordinary interest on account of the light they throw on the character and manifold activities of this most remarkable man, at once statesman, physician, historian and patron of art, letters and science. We have already noticed the tragic fate which overtook him and to a large extent brought to naught his careful and elaborate plans for the preserva-
tion of his books and the beneficent institutions which he founded for the promotion of learning and charity; and the least we can do in pious memory of a truly great scholar is to perpetuate what is left of his writings.

But if Rashíd-u'd-Dîn failed to secure the immortality of all his works, he set a fruitful example to other historians, so that it is largely due to him that this period is so conspicuous for merit in this field of knowledge. We have seen how he helped Waṣṣāf and brought him to the Īl-khán's notice. We shall now consider the work of his most illustrious follower, Ḥamdū'lláh Mustawfî of Qazwîn. Of his life little is known save what he tells us incidentally in his works. He professed to be of Arab origin, tracing his pedigree to Ḥurr b. Yazîd ar-Ri'yâhi, but his family had long been settled in Qazwîn. His great-grandfather, Amin'u'd-Dîn Naṣr, was Mustawfî of I'ráq, but later adopted the ascetic life, and was finally slain by the Mongols. His brother, Zaynu'd-Dîn Muḥammad, held office under Rashíd-u'd-Dîn, and he himself was appointed by the same minister, about 1311, superintendent of the finances of Qazwîn, Abhar, Zanján and Ţârûmâyân. For the rest, he tells us that he had from his youth upwards eagerly cultivated the society of men of learning, especially that of Rashíd-u'd-Dîn himself, and had frequented many learned discussions, especially on history; so that, though not by training a historian, he resolved to employ his leisure in compiling a compendious universal history. Three of his works, the Ta'rîkh-i-Guzîda, or "Select History," the Zafar-nâma, or "Book of Victory," and the Nuz-hatu'Qulîb, or "Heart's Delight," have come down to us. Of these, the first two are historical, the third geographical.

The Ta'rîkh-i-Guzîda was composed in 730/1330, and is dedicated to Rashíd-u'd-Dîn's son Ghiyâthu'd-Dîn Muḥammad, who was made Prime Minister in May, 1328, and, as we have seen, was put to death in May, 1336. The author enumerates about two dozen of his sources, which include (1) the
Stratu'n-Nabi, or Biography of the Prophet (probably Ibn Hisham's); (2) the Qisåšu'l-Anbiyá (probably ath-Tha'labi's); (3) the Risála-i-Qushayriyya; (4) the Tadhkiratu'l-Awliyá (probably Faridu'd-Dín 'Atţárs); (5) the Tâdvin of Imámú'd-Dín al-Yáfi'; (6) the Tajáribul-Ummam (probably of Ibn Miskawayhi); (7) the Masháribu't-Tajárib; (8) the Divvání'n-Nasab; (9) the Chronicle of Muhammad Jarir at-Tabari; (10) the history of Hamza of Isfahan; (11) the Tarikhul-Kâmil of Ibnu'l-Athír; (12) the Zitbatut-Tawdrikh of Jamalu'd-Dín Abu'l-Qasim of Kashan; (13) the Nizámü't-Tawárikh of the Qádí Nášíru'd-Dín al-Báydáví; (14) the 'Uyúnü't-Tawárikh of Abú Tálib 'Alí al-Kházin al-Baghdádí; (15) the Kitábü'l-Má'dris of Ibn Qutayba; (16) the Ta'ríkh-i-Jahán-gushá of 'Aţá Malik-i-Juwaynì; (17) Abú Sharaf Jarbáhání's Persian translation of al-'Utbi's Ya7nini; (18) the Siyásat-1

1 Edited by Wüstefeld, Göttingen, 1858–1860; German translation by Weil, Stuttgart, 1864.
2 Printed at Cairo in 1312/1894–5, with the Abridgement of al-Yáfi's Rawdatu'r-Rayáhín in the margins.
3 Printed at Bulqáq, 1284/1867–8.
5 See Hajji Khalifa (ed. Flügel), vol. ii, p. 254, No. 2773, where 623/1226 is given as the date of the author's death.
6 Vols. 1, 5 and 6 have been published in fac-simile in the "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial" Series, (vii, 1; vii, 5; vii, 6).
7 Probably one of the works on Genealogy entitled Kitábü'l-Ansáb.
8 Published at Leyden in 15 vols. (1879–1901) by an international group of eminent Arabic scholars presided over by the late Professor de Goeje.
10 Ed. Tornberg, 14 vols., Leyden, 1851–1876; Cairo, 12 vols., 1290–1303/1873–1886.
11 This work and its author will be discussed further on in this chapter.
12 Ed. Wüstefeld, Göttingen, 1850.
13 The first two of the three vols. constituting this work, edited by Mírzá Muhammad of Qazwín, have appeared in the "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial" Series, xvi, 1 and xvi, 2.
14 The Arabic original was lithographed at Dihlí in 1847, and printed
náma (here called Siyarul-Muluk1; (19) the Sháhnáma of Firdawsí2; (20) the Sáljúq-náma of Záhiri of Nishápúr; (21) the Majma‘u ‘Arbá’l-Maslak of Qádí Ruknú’d-Dín Juwayní; (22) the Istíshárá‘l-Akhbár of Qádí Ahmad Dámghání; and lastly (23) the Jám‘u‘t-Tawárikh3 of the author’s late martyred master and patron Rashídú’d-Dín Faḍlu’lláh.

After the enumeration of his sources, most of which, as will appear from the foot-notes, are directly accessible to us, the author describes the different eras used by different peoples, some of whom date from Adam, others from the Deluge, others from Abraham or Moses, others from the destruction of Pharaoh, others from the building of the Ka‘ba or the Abyssinian invasion of Yaman, while the Greeks date from Alexander, the Copts from Nebuchadnezzar, and the pre-Islamic Quraysh from the year of the Elephant. He then discusses the confusion in chronology arising from these differences as to the terminus a quo, which is increased by the fact that the philosophers deny that the world had a beginning, while the theologians assert that it had a beginning and will have an end, but decline to define or specify either. The learned men of India, China and Europe assert that Adam lived about a million years ago, and that there were several Adams, each of whom, with his descendants, spoke a special language, but that the posterity of all save one (viz. the Adam of the Hebrews) died out. Most of the Muslim doctors of Persia, on the other hand, reckon the period between Adam and Muḥammad as six thousand years, though some say more and some less. Astronomers reckon from the Deluge, since which, at the time of writing (viz. in the year 698 of

in Cairo with al-Manífí’s commentary in 1286/1869-70. Jarbádhaqání’s Persian translation was lithographed in Tihrán in 1272/1855-6.

1 Edited and translated by Schefer (Paris, 1891, 1893).

2 The three printed editions are Turner Macan’s (Calcutta, 1829), Jules Mohl’s (Paris, 1838-1878) and Villers and Landauer’s (Strassburg, 1877-1884, 3 vols., ending with Alexander the Great).

3 See above, pp. 68-9, 72-5.
the Era of Yazdigird, i.e. about A.D. 1330) 4432 years are considered to have elapsed.

The Tarikh-i-Guzda comprises an Introduction (Fatihah), six chapters (Bab), each of which is divided into numerous sections (Fasl), and a conclusion (Khátima), as follows:

Introduction. On the Creation of the Universe and of Man.

Chapter I. in two sections. (1) Major Prophets, and
(2) Minor Prophets, and Sages, who, not being Prophets, yet worked for the cause of true religion.

Chapter II. The Pre-Islamic Kings of Persia, in four sections, viz.:
(1) Pîshdádiyán, eleven Kings, who ruled 2450 years.
(2) Kayáníyán, ten Kings, who ruled 734 years.
(3) Mulikü’t-‘Tawdíf (Parthians), twenty-two Kings, who ruled 318 years.
(4) Sásániyán, thirty-one Kings, who reigned 527 years.

Chapter III. The Prophet Muhammad and his Companions and Descendants, in an introduction and six sections, viz.:

Introduction, on the pedigree, genealogy and kin of the Prophet.
(1) Life of the Prophet, his wars, his wives, secretaries, relations and descendants.
(2) The Orthodox Caliphs, who are reckoned as five, al-‘Hasan being included. Duration, from 10 Rabi‘ I, A.H. 11 to 13 Rabi‘ I, A.H. 41 (June 6, 632–July 17, 661), when al-‘Hasan resigned the supreme power to Mu‘áwiya the Umayyad.

1 The period between Alexander the Great and the fall of the Parthians (really about 550 years) is always under-estimated by Muhammadan writers, with the one exception (so far as I know) of Mas‘údî, who, in his Kitábü’t-Tanbih wa’il-Ishrdf (pp. 97–9), explains the political and religious motives which led the founder of the Sasánian Dynasty, Ardashîr-i-Bábakân, to reduce it deliberately by about one half.

2 This period is over-estimated by more than a century. The duration of the dynasty was from A.D. 226 to 652.
(3) The remainder of the twelve Imáms, excluding 'Alí and his son al-Ḥasan, who was poisoned in 49/669-70. Duration, 215 years and 7 months, from 4 Şafar, A.H. 49 to Ramaḍán, A.H. 264 (March 14, 669–May, 878).

(4) Notices of some of the chief “Companions” (Aṣ-ḥáb) and “Followers” (Tábūn) of the Prophet.


Chapter IV. Post-Islamic Kings of Persia, in twelve sections, viz.:

(1) Ṣaffárids, three Kings, who reigned 35 years, from 253/867 to 287/900, after which date their posterity continued for some time to rule over Sístán.

(2) Sámáñids, nine Kings, who reigned 102 years and 6 months, from Rabi‘ II, A.H. 287 to Dhu‘l-Qa‘da, A.H. 389 (April, 900 to Oct.–Nov. 999).

(3) Ghaznawí, fourteen Kings, who reigned 155 years (30 years over most of Persia, and the remaining years in Ghazna), from 390/1000 to 545/1150-1.

(4) Ghúrí, five Kings, who reigned for 64 years, from 545/1150–1 to 609/1212–13.

(5) Dáyłamí (or House of Buwayh), seventeen Kings, who reigned for 127 years, from 321/933 to 448/1056–7.

(6) Seljúqs, in three groups, viz.:

(a) Of Persia, fourteen Kings, who reigned for 161 years, from 429/1037–8 to 590/1194.

(b) Of Kirmán, eleven Kings, who reigned for 150 years, from 433/1041–2 to 583/1187–8.
HISTORIANS OF THE ÍL-KHÁNÍ PERIOD

(c) Of Asia Minor, eleven Kings, who reigned for 220 years, from 480/1087-8 to 700/1300-1.

(7) Khwárazmsháhs, nine Kings, who reigned for 137 years, from 491/1098 to 628/1230-1.

(8) Atábeks, in two groups, viz.:
   (a) Of Diyár Bakr and Syria, nine Kings, who reigned for 120 years, from 481/1088-9 to 601/1204-5.
   (b) Of Fárs (also called Salgharids), eleven Kings, who reigned for 120 years, from 543/1148-9 to 663/1264-5.

(9) Isma‘ílís, in two groups, viz.:
   (a) Of North Africa and Egypt (the Fátimid Caliphs), fourteen anti-Caliphs, who reigned for 260 years, from 296/908-9 to 556/1160.
   (b) Of Persia (the Assassins of Alamút), eight pontiffs, who ruled for 171 years, from 483/1090-1 to 654/1256.

(10) Qará-Khitá’ís of Kirmán, ten Kings, who reigned for 85 years, from 621/1224 to 706/1306-7.

(11) Atábeks of Luristán, in two groups, viz.:
   (a) Of Lur-i-Buzurg, seven rulers, who reigned for 180 years, from 550/1155-6 to 730/1329-30.
   (b) Of Lur-i-Kúchak, eleven rulers, who reigned 150 years, from 580/1184-5 to 730/1329-30.

(12) Mongol Íl-kháns of Persia, thirteen Kings, who had reigned at the time of writing 131 years, from 599/1202-3 to 730/1329-30. “Hereafter,” adds the author, “let him who will write the continuation of their history.”

Chapter V. Account of men notable for their piety or learning, in six sections, viz.:

(1) Imáms and Mujtahids (12 are mentioned).
(2) “Readers” of the Qur’án (9 are mentioned).
(3) Traditionists (7 are mentioned).
(4) Shaykhs and Şúfís (about 300 are mentioned).
(5) Doctors of Divinity, Law and Medicine (about 70 are mentioned).

(6) Poets, of whom about 5 Arabic and 87 Persian poets are mentioned. The biographies of the latter have been translated and published by me in the J.R.A.S. for October 1900 and January 1901, and as a separate reprint.

Chapter VI. Account of Qazwín, the author’s native town, in seven sections, *viz.*:

(1) Traditions concerning Qazwín. Some 40 are given, of which 36 are said to be from an autograph copy of the *Tadwín* of ar-Rafi’î. Nearly all these agree in describing Qazwín as one of the “Gates of Paradise.”

(2) Etymology of the name of Qazwín.

(3) Notable buildings of Qazwín; its nine quarters and architectural history from the time of Shápúr I, who was its original founder; its conquest by the Arabs, and conversion to Islám.

(4) Its environs, rivers, aqueducts (*qanâts*), mosques, and tombs. Some of its inhabitants are said still to profess secretly the religion of Mazdak.

(5) Notable men who have visited Qazwín, including “Companions” and “Followers” of the Prophet, Imáms and Caliphs, Shaykhs and ‘ulamá, Kings and *wazîrs*, khâqáns and *amîrs*.

(6) Governors of Qazwín.

(7) Tribes and leading families of Qazwín, including Sayyids; ‘ulamá; Iftikhâris (of whom the actual representative, Malik Sa’îd Iftikhâру’d-Dîn Muḥammad b. Abú Naṣr, had learned the Mongol and Turkí languages and writing, and had translated

1 See G. le Strange’s ed. and translation of our author’s *Nuzhatu’l-Qudūb* (“E. J. W. Gibb Memorial” Series, vols. xxiii, 1, pp. 56–8 and xxiii, 2, pp. 62–3), where many of these traditions are given on the same authority. See also p. 88 *supra*, n. 5 *ad calc.*
Kalila and Dimna into the first, and the Sindibad-nama into the second); Bázdáris or Muẓaffarís; Bisháris; Burhánís; Ḥanafís; Ḥulwánís; Khálidís; Khalifís; Dabírán; Ráfíís; Zákánís; Zubayırís; Zádánís; Shírzáds; Ṭa’úsís; ‘Abbásís; Ghaffárís; Fílwágúshán; Qadawís; Qaráwuls; Tamímís; Karajís or Dulaflís (one of whom was the cosmographer and geographer Zakariyyá b. Muḥammad b. Ṣazmúd); Kiyás or Kaysís; Mákánís; Mustawfís (the author's own family, said to be descended from Hurr b. Yazíd ar-Riyáhi); Mú’mínán; Mukhtárán; Mu’áfiyán or Mu’áfaniyán; Marzubánán; Níshápúriyán; and Búlá-Tímúríís or Ṭábábakán.

Conclusion. A tree of dynasties, or genealogical tree, based on that devised by Rashíd u’d-Dín, but improved. This tree is, however, omitted in all the manuscripts which I have seen. Having regard to the extent of the field covered by the Ta’rikh-i-Guzida, and its comparatively modest size (some 170,000 words), it is evident that it is of the nature of a compendium, and that no great detail can be expected from it. It is, however, a useful manual, and contains many interesting particulars not to be found elsewhere, while for contemporary history it is of first-rate importance, so that the need for a complete edition of the text had long been felt. Until the year 1910 the only portions accessible in print were:


(2) The whole of chapter vi, except the first section on the Traditions, containing the account of Qazwín, translated into French by M. Barbier de Meynard, and published in the Journal Asiaticque for 1857 (Sér. v, vol. 10, pp. 257 et seqq.).
(3) Section 6 of chapter v, the account of the Persian poets, translated by myself in the *J.R.A.S.* for October 1900 and January 1901.

In 1910, however, a *fac-simile* of a fairly accurate and ancient MS. (transcribed in 857/1453) was published in the "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial" Series (vol. xiv, 1), and this was followed in 1913 by an abridged English translation, with full Indices, by myself and Dr R. A. Nicholson (vol. xiv, 2), so that the whole work is now accessible to scholars, who can form their own opinion of its value.

In the preface of the *Ta'rikh-i-Guzída*, Hamdu'lláh Mustawfi speaks of a great historical poem on which he was then engaged, and of which he had at that time (730/1330) completed fifty and odd thousand couplets out of a total of 75,000. This poem, entitled *Zafar-náma*, the "Book of Victory," was actually completed five years later. It is essentially a continuation of Firdawsi's *Sháh-náma*, and the only known manuscript (Or. 2833 of the British Museum, a huge volume of 779 folios, transcribed in Shíráz in 807/1405, and bought in Persia by Mr Sidney Churchill for the Museum about 1885) contains besides the *Zafar-náma* the revised text of the *Sháh-náma* on which the author had spent six years. The *Zafar-náma* begins with the life of the Prophet Muhámmad, and comes down to the author's own time, *viz.* to the year 732/1331–2, when Abú Sa'id was still reigning. It comprises, as already said, 75,000 couplets, 10,000 couplets being assigned by the author to each of the seven and a half centuries of which he treats, or, according to the main chronological divisions of the work, 25,000 couplets to the Arabs, 20,000 to the Persians, and 30,000 to the Mongols. The author was forty years of age when he began it, and spent fifteen years on its composition, so that he must have been born about 680/1281–2. From

---

1 For full description of this precious MS. see Rieu's *Persian Supplement*, No. 263, pp. 172–174, and also the *Athenaeum* for 1885, p. 314.
Dr Rieu's description, it is evident that the historical value of this work is by no means to be neglected: "the author," he says (loc. cit., p. 173), "is very precise as to facts and dates, and his third book will be found valuable for the history of the Mongol period. He gives, for instance, on f. 512a, a very vivid description of the wholesale slaughter wrought by the Mongols in his native place, Qazwin. His information was partly derived from his great-grandsire, Amin Nasr Mustawfi, who was ninety-three years old at the time." The following extract from this portion may serve as a specimen:

وزین رو بقوزین سَتَاتِی بجَنَک، در آمَد بکاردِ غَرِان پُلَنک،
بدانَگه که شِهر دربای خون، هَد وهفت بودی زِشنِد فوزن،
ز شعبان گذر کرده به هفت روز؛
کُن پیدا شد آن محسنت و درد و سوز;
در آن وقت ب‌ن‌د حاکم‌های دیار، ظَفَر لقب مَبَّری نامدار;
واقعه‌ی شهر قزوین

بِحکم خُلفِه دَرِین شِهر شیر، گو لشکر دَرِین مَرْز آمَد بجَنک، بیستند دروازه‌ها هَم‌چَو سَتک;
بر آمَد بیارو بسی جَنگو، بسَوی مُغَل کرده در چَنگ رَو;
سَه روز اندَرین کس ندیدن دَرَا؛ چهارم بِشر اندَر آمَد سَهاء;
سر هَم‌کنان اَوردِنَد زَیر، سَر آمَد سِرانا سَراَر زَمان;
نِدادنَد کسرا بقوزین اَمان؛ هِمه کشته‌های انده بُد در مَغاک،
هر آن‌کس که بود اندَرآن شِهر پِاک، نِیاندند کسرا بِنَتِن در رَوَان;
ز خُرد و بَرَک و ز پیر و جَوان، هِمه شیرا بخت بر کشته‌شْد;
بَسی خوب رویان ز بی‌پَه سَهاء، بِکرَنَد حَوَردِا بِخیره تِباه;
ز تخم نَبُی بِه خرَان دَختران، فروزنده چون بر فَلک اَختران;
Mongol siege of a Chinese town, from an old ms. of the *Jāmiʿuʿt-Tawārikh* in the Bibliothèque Nationale
Thence to the town of Qazwín, Subutáy
Like raging tiger came right speedily.
The tale of years at six, one, seven stood
When that fair town became a lake of blood,
And Sha'ban's month had counted seven days
When it was filled with woe and sore amaze.
The governor who held the ill-starred town
Mu'áffar named, a ruler of renown,
Was, by the Caliph's most august command,
Set to control the fortunes of the land.

When came the hosts of war and direful fate
Firm as a rock they closed the city gate.
Upon the wall the warriors took their place,
And each towards the Mongols set his face.
Three days they kept the ruthless foe at bay,
But on the fourth they forced a blood-stained way.

1 *I.e.* from Zanján.
2 The *ms.* has ستای (n for d), but see the *Tá'uíkh-i-Jahán-gushá* (*E. J. W. Gibb Memorial* "Series, xvi, 1), p. 115, l. 17.
3 Sha'ban 7, A.H. 617 = October 7, A.D. 1220.

B. P.
Fiercely the Mongols entered Qazvin Town
And heads held high before were now brought down.
No quarter in that place the Mongols gave:
The days were ended of each chieftain brave.
Nothing could save the townsman from their doom,
And all were gathered in one common tomb.
Alike of great and small, of old and young,
The lifeless bodies in the dust they flung:
Both men and women shared a common fate:
The luck-forsaken land lay desolate.
Many a fair one in that fearful hour
Sought death to save her from th' invaders' power:
Chaste maidens of the Prophet's progeny
Who shone like asteroids in Virtue's sky,
Fearing the lust of that ferocious host
Did cast them down, and so gave up the ghost.
Much in that land prevails the Shafi'ite;
One in a thousand is a Hanafite;
And yet they counted on that gory plain
Twelve thousand Hanafites amongst the slain!
In heaps on every side the corpses lay,
Alike on lonely path and broad high-way.
Uncounted bodies cumbered every street:
Scarce might one find a place to set one's feet.

In terror of the Mongol soldiery
Hither and thither did the people fly,
Some seeking refuge to the Mosque did go,
Hearts filled with anguish, souls surcharged with woe.
From that fierce foe so sore their straits and plight
That climbing forms the arches hid from sight.
The ruthless Mongols burning brands did ply
Till tongues of flame leapt upwards to the sky.
Roof, vault and arch in burning ruin fell,
A heathen holocaust of Death and Hell!"
at Bombay in 1311/1893-4. In 1915, however, a critical edition of the text was brought out by Mr G. le Strange in the "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial" Series (vol. xxiii, 1), and the English translation (vol. xxiii, 2), which is now in the Press, will shortly follow.

The Nuz-hatul-Qulub was composed five years later than the Zafar-náma, during the period of anarchy which succeeded Abú Sa'íd's death, to which the author alludes with feeling. He was persuaded, he says, to undertake the work at the request of certain friends, who felt the want of a Persian work on geography, most of the works on that subject being in Arabic. He enumerates amongst his sources the following works, which he has supplemented from his own observations during his travels through Persia: the Šuwarul-Aqázlim of Abú Zayd Aḥmad b. Sahl al-Balkhi; the Tibyán of Aḥmad b. Abí 'Abdi'llah; the Road-book (Masdlik wa'1-Mamálik) of Abú'l-Qasim 'Abdu'lláh ibn Khurádhdhih; and a work entitled the Jahán-náma; besides nineteen other works, of which the enumeration will be found in Rieu's Persian Catalogue, pp. 418-419. The work is primarily divided into an Introduction (Fátiha), three Discourses (Maqála), and an Appendix (Khútima). The third Maqála is the important part of the work: all that precedes this deals with cosmography, the heavens, the earth, the three kingdoms, and man. This third Maqála, which contains the geographical portion of the work, deals first with the geography of the two holy cities of Arabia and of Jerusalem; then with the geography of Persia, Mesopotamia and Asia Minor, with an appendix on the physical geography of Persia; then with the countries bordering on Persia, and some other lands never included in the Persian Empire.

1 This author is perhaps identical with the "Ibnu'l-Balkhí" whose Fárs-námá Mr G. le Strange intends to publish in the Gibb Series.

The Conclusion treats of the wonders of the world, especially of Persia. The book is of considerable value for a knowledge of the geography and condition of mediaeval Persia, and was largely used by Mr G. le Strange in the compilation of his *Lands of the Eastern Caliphate* before he published the edition mentioned on the preceding page.

Mention has been already made at the beginning of this chapter (p. 63 supra) of a small historical manual entitled *Nizámü't-Tawárikh* (the "Order of Histories" or "Dates") by the well-known judge and *Qur'áni*-commentator Náširu'd-Dín al-Baydáwí, whose father held the same office under the Atábek Abú Bakr b. Sa'd-i-Zangí, the patron of the great poet Sa'dí. This dull and jejune little book, compiled in the year 674/1275, with a continuation, apparently added by the author, down to 683/1284-5, and a further continuation, probably by another hand, to 694/1294-5, contains an outline of general history from the time of Adam to the date last mentioned. It has not been published, and is probably not worth publishing, since it is doubtful whether it contains anything new or valuable, and whether it is calculated to add to the fame which its author enjoys as a jurisconsult, theologian and commentator

Another still unpublished historical manual of this period is that properly entitled *Rawdátu Úlil-Albáb fi tawárikhi'l-Akábir wa'l-Ansáb* (the "Garden of the Intelligent, on the histories of the great, and on genealogies") compiled in 717/1317 by Abú Sulaymán Dá'úd of Banákat (or Fanákat) in Transoxiana. It is better known as the *Tá'rikh-i-Banákatí*, is obviously and indeed admittedly inspired by Rashidu'd-Dín's great work,

---

1 For further particulars see Rieu's *Persian Cat.*, pp. 832-4.
2 *Ibid.*, pp. 79-80. The only copy to which I have access is a MS. (unfortunately defective at beginning and end) from the Library of the late Sir A. Houtum-Schindler. It formerly belonged to that great bibliophile Prince Bahman Mirzá Bahá'u'd-Dawla.
and comprises nine sections, called qism, as follows: (1) Prophets and Patriarchs; (2) ancient Kings of Persia; (3) the Prophet Muḥammad and the Caliphs; (4) Persian dynasties contemporary with the ‘Abbásid Caliphs; (5) the Jews; (6) the Christians and Franks; (7) the Indians; (8) the Chinese; (9) the Mongols. In one respect it shows very clearly the influence of Rashídū’d-Dīn’s wider conception of history, for more than half the book is devoted to the non-Muslim peoples mentioned in the headings of the last five qismās, to wit the Jews, the European nations, including the Roman Emperors and the Popes, the Indians, the Chinese and the Mongols. The accounts given of these nations, though for the most part brief and dry, show some real knowledge of the chief facts, while the statements of non-Muslim religious doctrines are fair and devoid of acrimony or fanaticism. Bayḍáwī, on the other hand, like most Persian historians not directly inspired by Rashídū’d-Dīn, practically ignores all history except that which is connected with Islam and the Muhammadan peoples, the ancient Kings of Persia, and the Hebrew Prophets and Patriarchs. This contrast between these two historical manuals is probably in large measure due to the fact that Bayḍáwī lived in Fārs, which, as we have seen, lay outside the great stream of communication between East and West set in motion by the Mongol dominion, while the author of the Taʾrīkh-i-Banākātī was from Transoxiana, and, as poet-laureate of Gházán Khán (701/1301–2), was doubtless familiar with the Mongol court and the many foreigners from distant lands who frequented it. His information about the Jews, Christians, Indians, Chinese and Mongols, though largely directly borrowed, often in the same words, from the pages of Rashídū’d-Dīn, was nevertheless undoubtedly supplemented by what the author learned orally from representatives of the peoples in question. In no Persian history before the Mongol period and in few after it do we find so many
references to places, people, and historical events beyond the ken of most Muslim writers; places like Portugal, Poland, Bohemia, England, Scotland, Ireland, Catalonia, Lombardy, Paris and Cologne; people like the Roman Emperors from Romulus downwards, and the Popes from St Peter to the Pope contemporary with the author, who is said to be the two hundred and second in succession; and events like the different Church Councils, the Conversion of Britain to Christianity in the time of Pope Eleutherius, the Nestorian heresy, and the like. As a specimen of one of the more interesting passages the following account of printing from wood blocks in China is worthy of attention. Having described the care with which the Chinese transcribe historical and other passages from their ancient books, he says:

"Then, according to a custom which they have, they were wont and still continue to make copies from that book in such wise that no change or alteration can find its way into the text. And therefore when they desire that any book containing matter of value to them should be well written and should remain correct, authentic and unaltered, they order a skilful calligraphist to copy a page of that book on a tablet in a fair hand. Then all the men of learning carefully correct it, and inscribe their names on the back of the tablet. Then skilled and expert engravers are ordered to cut out the letters. And when they have thus taken a copy of all the pages of the book, numbering all [the blocks] consecutively, they place these tablets in sealed bags, like the dies in a mint, and entrust them to reliable persons appointed for this purpose, keeping them securely in offices specially set apart to this end on which they set a particular and definite seal. Then when anyone wants a copy of this book he goes before this committee and pays the dues and charges fixed by the Government. Then they bring out these tablets, impose them on leaves of paper like the dies used in minting gold, and deliver the sheets to him. Thus it is
impossible that there should be any addition or omission in any of their books, on which, therefore, they place complete reliance; and thus is the transmission of their histories effected.

A third minor history of this period is the Majma’u’l-Ansâb (“Collection of Genealogies”) of Muhammad ibn ‘Alî of Shabánkâra, who, like Fakhr-i-Banákatî, was a poet as well as a historian. Of this book there seem to have been two editions, the first issued in 733/1332-3, the second three years later and one year after the death of Abû Sa’îd. This work contains a summary of general history from the Creation to the time of writing, but I have unfortunately been unable to obtain or read a copy, and am indebted for these meagre particulars to Rieu’s admirable Persian Catalogue, pp. 83-4. According to Ethé the original edition perished when the house of Rashídû’d-Dîn’s son Ghiyâthu’d-Dîn Muḥammad was pillaged, and the author rewrote the book from memory, completing this second edition, according to Ethé, in 743/1342-3.

Two rhymed chronicles of this period also deserve notice, the Shâhinshâh-nâma (“Book of the King of Kings”), or Chingiz-nâma (“Book of Chingîz”), of Aḥmad of Tabrîz, containing the history of the Mongols down to 738/1337-8 in about 18,000 verses, and dedicated to Abû Sa’îd; and the Ghâzân-nâma of Nûrû’d-Dîn ibn Shamsu’d-Dîn Muḥammad, composed in 763/1361-2. Both works are very rare. Rieu has described a MS. of the first, copied in 800/1397-8, acquired by the British Museum at the sale of the Comte de Gobineau’s library in 1885; and I possess a fine MS. of the latter, copied at Tabrîz in 873/1468-9 for the Royal Library of Abu’n-Naṣr Ḥasan Beg Bahâdur Khán, and given to me in August, 1909, by Dr Riḍá Tawfîq, then

1 India Office Pers. Cat., cols. 10—11, Nos. 21 and 22.
2 Persian Suppl. Cat., No. 201, p. 135.
Deputy for Adrianople in the Turkish Parliament. Both works are written in the same metre (the mukâqârib) as the Sháh-náma of Firdawsí, of which they are imitations, but the second is only about half the length of the first (something between 9000 and 10,000 couplets). Neither of these two works appears to be of any exceptional merit either as history or poetry, though useful information about the period of which they treat could no doubt be extracted from them by patient examination.

1 In the short prose preface describing how the poem came to be written for Sultán Uways, who had restored the pension enjoyed by the author, then fifty years of age, under Gházán Khán, the number of verses is stated as 10,000.
CHAPTER III.

THE POETS AND MYSTICS OF THE ÍL-KHÁNÍ PERIOD.

From the literary point of view the period which we are now considering is, as we have seen, chiefly remarkable for the quality and quantity of historical writers which it produced. That it was also rich in poetical talent cannot be disputed, but this is less remarkable, since at hardly any period was there a dearth of poets in Persia. Almost every well-educated Persian can produce moderately good verses on occasion, and it would be a hopeless and useless task even to mention all of those who, transcending the rank of mere versifiers, can fairly claim to be poets. Severe selection is necessary but not easy, for on the one hand due regard must be paid to the judgement of the poet's own countrymen, even when it does not entirely accord with our own; and on the other hand care must be taken not to overlook any poet of originality and talent merely because he has not found favour with the Persian biographers, who, especially in their treatment of contemporaries, are apt to be swayed by personal, political, and even religious prejudices and predilections.

In the period with which we are now dealing there lived at least a score of poets whose claims to consideration cannot be denied. The two greatest by far were Jalálu'd-Dín Rúmí and Sa'dí of Shíráz, of whom the former died in 672/1273 at the age of 66, and the latter about 690/1291 at the very advanced age, as is generally asserted, of 110 lunar years. Both these poets, therefore, belong rather to the period preceding this, and have accordingly
been already discussed in a previous volume, to which the reader is referred. They might with equal justice have been included in this volume, which is the poorer for their omission, since their literary activity extended into the period which it covers, and both poets came into relations with some of its leading personages, Sa’dí with the Sáhib-Díwán and his brother ‘Alá’u’d-Dín of the great Juwayní family, and even with Abáqá Khán himself, and Jalálu’d-Dín Rúmí with the unfortunate Parwána of Rúm, Mu’ínu’d-Dín, who was put to death by Abáqá for suspected complicity with the Egyptians in 675/1276–7. It would be easy to devote many pages to each of them in this place without repeating anything that has been said before, but the difficulty is to limit rather than to extend the scope of this chapter, and, in spite of all temptations to the contrary, they must therefore be omitted here.

For similar reasons I shall content myself with a very brief mention of three other poets of this time whom many Persian students, especially such as have pursued their studies in India, would place next to the two great poets mentioned above; I mean Amír Khusraw and Hasan of Dihlí and Badrí-Chách, all of whom are highly esteemed in India, but none of whom, so far as is known, ever visited, much less resided in Persia. To reduce the subject-matter of this book within any reasonable limits, it becomes more and more necessary to exclude the great and increasing number of Indian writers of Persian. Two considerations besides that of space seems to me to justify this procedure. The first is that, owing to the greater interest in India which naturally prevails in

---

2 See the English Introduction to vol. xvi, 1, of the “E. J. W. Gibb Memorial” Series (the *Jahán-gushá* of Juwayní, edited by Mirzá Muḥammad), pp. lii–liv.
England, far more has been written about these Indian-Persian authors, whether poets or historians, than about the purely Persian men of letters. The second is that, so far as a foreign student may be permitted to express an opinion on matters of literary taste, this Persian literature produced in India, has not, as a rule, the real Persian flavour, the \( \text{vájár} \) as the Irish call it, which belongs to the indigenous product. Without making any invidious comparisons, it will hardly be contested that there is just as good reason for treating the abundant Persian literature produced in India from the middle of the thirteenth to the middle of the nineteenth century as a separate subject as for a similar procedure in the case of the English literature produced in England and that produced in America; and that therefore the omission of Amír Khusráw from this chapter is as justifiable as the omission of Walt Whitman from a modern English literary history, especially as a very long notice of the former is given in Elliot's *History of India*. The same observation applies in lesser degree to the Persian writings produced in Afghánistán and Turkey respectively, though Persian still remains the natural speech of a large number of Afghans, and Turkish Sultans (notably the great Salím “the Grim") have not disdained, even when at war with the Persians, to make use of their language for literary purposes. Exceptions will be made, however, especially in the period succeeding that included in this volume, in the case of native-born Persians who, attracted by the munificence of the Moghul Emperor of Dihlí, emigrated to India in the hopes of disposing of their intellectual wares more profitably than was possible in their own country.

The attention of those who read Urdú should be called

---

1 Vol. iii, pp. 524-566.
2 A most sumptuous edition of this Persian *Díván of Sulţán Salím*, edited by the late Dr Paul Horn of Strassburg, was printed by command of the German Emperor for presentation to the late Sulţán ‘Abdu’l-Ḥamíd in 1904. Of this rare and beautiful work I am fortunate enough to possess a copy.
to a very excellent modern book entitled Shi'ru'l-'Ajam ("Poetry of the Persians") by the late Shiblí Nu-máni, lithographed at 'Ali-garh in two volumes in or about 1325/1907, and containing critical studies of about a score of the classical poets of Persia from Firdawsí and his predecessors to Ḥáfíz. Amongst these a long notice¹ is devoted to Amír Khusraw of Dihlí, which contains incidentally a good deal of information about his friend, contemporary and fellow-poet Hasan of Dihlí. Those who do not read Urdú may be referred to another excellent and scholarly work produced by Indian scholarship under the auspices of my friend Sir Edward Denison Ross, the Catalogue of the Arabic and Persian Manuscripts in the Oriental Public Library at Bankipore, of which the first volume, containing the Persian poets from Firdawsí to Ḥáfíz, was published at Calcutta in 1908. Twenty pages of this volume (pp. 176-195) are devoted to Amír Khusraw and his various works, and the four following pages to his friend Amír Ḥasan. Both were disciples of the great Saint Niẓámú'd-Dín Awliyá, who died in 725/1324, only seven months before Amír Khusraw, who was buried beside him. Amír Ḥasan only survived them a few (probably two) years.

Amír Khusraw, not less notable as a musician than as a poet, was of Turkish race, his father Amír Sayfu'd-Dín Maḫmúd having fled before the Mongols from the region of Balkh to India, where he finally settled at Patyálí. There the poet was born in 651/1253. He was therefore seventy-one years old when he died, and "lived to enjoy the favour of five successive kings of Dihlí." He was enormously productive; Dawlat-sháh credits him with nearly half a million verses. Of these "Mírzá Báysunqur, after ceaseless efforts, succeeded in collecting 120,000," but having subsequently discovered 2000 more from his ghazals, he "concluded that it would be

very difficult for him to collect the complete work of the poet, and gave up the idea for ever."

Although, for the reasons given above, I do not propose to speak at length of Amîr Khusraw, yet, in accordance with the well-known Arabic saying of which the gist is that what cannot be fully included need not therefore be wholly omitted, I shall give here "for good luck and a blessing" (tayammun wa tabarruk) one short extract from his Laylā wa Majnūn in which he mourns, with a remarkable touch of feeling, the death of his mother and younger brother, both of whom died in 698/1298-9. The poet's love for his mother, which is in strong contrast with his lack of appreciation of his daughter, is one of the most attractive features of his character.

1 See the Bankipore Catalogue mentioned above, vol. i, pp. 176-7, and my edition of Dawlat-shāh, p. 240.

2 ما لا يُدرك علمه لا يترك علمه;

3 The five verses addressed to his daughter, who appears to have been called 'Affa, will be found on p. 125 of vol. ii of the Shi'ru'll-'Ajam, and the verses to his mother on pp. 126-7.
Amir Khusraw’s lament on his mother’s death

“A double radiance left my star this year:
  Gone are my brother and my mother dear.
My two full moons have set and ceased to shine
  In one short week through this ill luck of mine.
By double torture I am racked of Fate,
  By double blow doth Heaven me prostrate.
Double my mourning, double my despair;
  Alas that I this double grief must bear!
Two brands for one like me is’t not a shame?
  One fire’s enough to set the stack aflame.
One breast a double burden should not bear,
  One head of headaches cannot hold a pair.
Beneath the dust my mother lieth dead;
  Is’t strange if I cast dust upon my head?
Where art thou mother mine, in what strange place?
  Canst thou not, mother, show me thy dear face?
From heart of earth come smiling forth once more,
  And take compassion on my weeping sore!
That place to me doth Paradise recall.
  Thy being was the guardian of my soul,
The strong support which kept me safe and whole.
Where'er those lips of thine to speech were stirred
  Ever to my advantage was thy word.
To-day thy silence makes its dumb appeal,
  And lo, my lips are closed as with a seal!”

Badr-i-Chách, another poet of Transoxiana, has a considerable reputation in India but is practically unknown in Persia. The town of Chách or Shásh of which he claimed to be the “Full Moon” (Badr) is the modern Táshkand. His poetry, which I have never read, but of which Sir H. Elliot has translated specimens in his History of India¹, is reputed very difficult, a common characteristic of the Persian poetry produced by men of Turkish race or writing under Turkish influence and patronage, but not in itself, from our point of view, a reason for including him in this survey.

¹ Vol. iii, pp. 567-573.
Mention may here be made of a little-known poet called Qâni‘î, who fled from his native town of Tûs in Khurásán before the terrible Mongol invasion, escaped to India, and thence made his way westwards by Aden, Mecca, Medina and Baghhdád to Asia Minor, where he attached himself to the court of the Seljúq rulers of Qonya (Iconium), for whom he composed an immense versified history of the dynasty on the model of the Sháh-náma, and a metrical rendering of the celebrated Book of Kalila and Dimna, of which a manuscript (Add. 7766) belonging to the British Museum is described by Rieu, from whom these particulars are taken. In virtue of these and other poetical productions, of which he boasted that they filled thirty volumes and amounted to 300,000 bayts, he received the title of Maliku‘sh-Shu‘árá (“King of Poets” or Poet Laureate), and he lived long enough to compose an elegy on the death of the great Jalálu‘d-Dín Rúmí, who died, as already mentioned, in 672/1273.

Another early but little-known poet of this period is Púr-i-Bahá-yi-Jámi, to whom Dawlat-sháh devotes an article containing but few facts about his life, to which other biographical works, such as the Haft Iqlím, Atash-kada, Majma‘ul-Fuṣáhá, etc. add but little. His original patron was Khwája Wajhi‘u‘Dín Zangi (Dawlat-sháh) or Táhir-i-Fáryúmádí (Haft Iqlím), but he afterwards enjoyed the patronage of the great Sáhib Díván. He seems to have been fond of quaint conceits and tours de force, and Dawlat-sháh cites an ingenious poem of his, containing 28 bayts, in which he made use of as many Mongol and Turkish words and technical terms as possible, as when he says:

Qâli: تِو چُو چَوْنِ شَکَلِ بِخُشْیان
Kordānḏ मश्ख़ ब्र र प ख़ ० त स एियुरी

3 Loc. cit., p. 182, lines 22-3.
"The wizards of thy tresses, like the pens or the bakhshíts,
Have practised on thy cheek the Uyghúr writing."

The following quatrains are rather neat.
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"If a pearl is missing from thy sweet casket
Thy dignity is in no wise diminished in the matter of beauty.
A hundred moons shine from the corners of thy cheek
What matter if one star be missing from thy Pleiades?"

The two following poems by Púr-i-Bahá, written in the grand style cultivated by court poets, and filled with elaborate word-plays and far-fetched metaphors, are chiefly interesting because they can be exactly dated. The first refers to the destruction of Níshápúr by an earthquake in 666/1267-8, and the second to its restoration in 669/1270-1 by order of Abáqá. Both are taken from that rare work the Mujmal of Fašíhí of Khwáf.

1 See d'Ohsson, vol. i, p. 17, who defines "les Cames" (Qamán) as "ministres de leur culte grossier, qui étaient à la fois magiciens, interprètes des songes, augures, aruspices, astrologues et médecins." The bakhshíts were the scribes who wrote the old Uyghúr character, which continued to be used in Turkestán until the fifteenth century of our era.

2 Only four MSS. of this work are known to exist, two in Petrograd and two in Cambridge. See my article on this rare book in the number of the Museion published at the Cambridge University Press for the exiled Belgian professors in 1915, pp. 48-78.
Through the shakes and knocks of the earthquake shocks it is upside down and awry,
So that 'neath the Fish is Arcturus\(^1\) sunk, while the Fish is raised to the sky.
That fury and force have run their course, and its buildings are overthrown,
And riven and ruined are whole and part, and the parts asunder strown.
Not in worship, I ween, are its chapels seen with spires on the ground low lying,
While the minarets stoop or bend in a loop, but not at the bedesmen's crying.
The libraries all are upside down, and the colleges all forsaken,
And the Friday Mosque in ruins is laid, and the pulpits are shattered and shaken.
Yet do not suppose that this ruin arose from the town's ill destiny,
But ask of me if thou fain wouldst see the wherefore of this and the why.

\(^1\) Arcturus (\textit{Simáq}) is accounted one of the highest stars in heaven. In the popular cosmogony of the less educated Muslims, the earth is supposed to be supported by a great fish (\textit{Samák} in Arabic, \textit{Máht} in Persian) which swims in a vast ocean contained by banks of cloud. Hence the Arabic expression \textit{miyá-s-Samák ila's-Simáq} ("from the Fish to Arcturus"), corresponding to the Persian \textit{az máh tá bi-máh} ("from the Moon to the Fish"), meaning from the highest to the lowest.

B. P.
'Twas because the Lord had such high regard for this old and famous place
That He turned His gaze on its fashions and ways with the eyes of favour and grace,
And such was the awe which His glance inspired, and His Light's effulgent rays
That with shaking feet to earth it fell for fear of that awful blaze.
For did not the Mountain of Sinai once fall down and crumble away
Where Moses stood, and the Face of God to behold with his eyes did pray?

The buildings of Nishápúr Time had striven to displace
And Ruin wide from every side had thither turned its face.
God willed that men should once again its buildings strive to raise
In the reign of just Abáqá, the Núshírván of our days.
Of all the world the lord is he, of all the earth the king,
Foe-binder, world-subduer he, all kingdoms conquering.
It happened in the year six-hundred and three-score and nine
That from its ruins rose again this city fanied and fine.
Venus and Sol in Taurus, Ramadán was ending soon;
In Gemini stood Mercury, in Pisces stood the Moon.
May this new town's foundation to thee a blessing bring,
And every desert in thy reign bear towns as flourishing!
By thy good luck Nishápûr old is now grown young again,
Like to some aged dotard who his boyhood doth regain.
Three things, I pray, may last for aye, while earth doth roll along:
The Khwája's\(^1\) life, the city's luck, and Pûr-i-Bahá's song!

Not very much need be said, or indeed, is known, about
Imámí of Herát, whose full name, according to the author
of the Ta'rikh-i-Guzída, was Abú 'Abdî'lláh Muḥammad b. Abú Bakr b. 'Uthmán. He was
the panegyrist of the rulers and ministers of Kirman, and
died, according to the Majma'ul-Fusahá\(^2\) in 667/1268-9.
An extraordinarily complicated acrostic on his own name,
composed by him according to the terminology of the state
accountants, will be found in the Guzída\(^3\). The highest
compliment which he ever received was probably that paid
him by his contemporary Majdu'd-Dín Hamgar, in reply to
a versified question addressed to the latter poet by Mu'ínu'd-
Dín the Parwána, Malik Iftikháru'd-Dín, Núru'd-Dín Raşadí,
and the Şâhib-Dîwán Shamsu'd-Dín, enquiring his opinion
as to the respective merits of himself, Sa'dí and Imámí\(^4\).
His reply was as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ما گرچه بنطق طوطیه خوش نفسیم؛} \\
\text{بر شکر گفتاهای سعدی مکسيم؛} \\
\text{در شیوه، شاعری باجماع آمیز؛} \\
\text{هژتیز من و سعدی بامامی نرسیم.}
\end{align*}
\]

"Though I in song am like the tuneful birds,
Fly-like I sip the sweets of Sa'dí's words;
Yet all agree that in the arts of speech
Sa'dí and I can ne'er Imámí reach."

\(^1\) Probably the Şâhib-Dîwán is meant.  \(^2\) Vol. i, p. 98.
\(^3\) See my translation of this section of the work (ch. v, § 6) in the
\(^4\) These verses are given by Dawlatsháh, p. 166, l. 24—p. 167,
ll. 1–9 of my edition.
To this Imámí replied in the following complimentary quatrain¹:

"Though throned in power in eloquence's fane,
And, Christ-like, raising song to life again,
Ne'er to the dust of Majd-i-Hamgar's door,
That Saḥbán of the Age², can I attain."

Sa'dí, on the other hand, vented his spleen in the following verse:

"Whoe'er attaineth not position high
His hopes are foiled by evil destiny.
Since Hamgar flees from all who pray or preach,
No wonder he 'can ne'er Imámí reach.'³"

The poems of Imámí, so far as I am aware, have never been published, nor are manuscripts of them common. In my necessarily limited investigations I have made use of the British Museum manuscript Or. 2847. One of the prettiest of his poems which I have met with occurs on f. 98a of that manuscript, and runs as follows:

¹ *British Museum* MS. Or. 3713, f. 179b.
² Saḥbán ibn Wál'il, an ancient Arab, whose eloquence is proverbial.
³ There is an untranslateable pun here, for Imámí means the position of an Imám, or leader in prayer, as well as being the poet's *nom de guerre*.
⁴ *Chine*, which I have emended on account of the metre.
We celebrate the New Year's Feast but once in all the year;
A Feast perpetual to me affords thy presence dear.
One day the roses hang in clusters thick upon the tree;
A never-failing crop of roses yield thy cheeks to me.
One day I gather violets by the bunch in gardens fair,
But violets by the sheaf are yielded by thy fragrant hair.
The wild narcissus for a single week the field adorns;
The bright narcissus of thine eye outlasts three hundred morns.
The wild narcissus must its freshness lose or vigil keep;
To thy narcissus-eyes no difference waking makes or sleep.
Fragrant and fair the garden jasmine is in days of Spring,
But round thy hyacinths the jasmine-scent doth ever cling.
Nay, surely from thy curls the hyacinths their perfume stole,
These are the druggist's stock-in-trade and those food for the soul.
Those from a ground of silver spring, and these from heaps of stone;
Those crown a cypress-form, while these adorn some upland lone.
There is a garden-cypress which remains for ever green,
Yet by thy cypress-stature it appears uncouth and mean.”

Imámí was for some time patronized by Fakhru'l-Mulk

1 A flower “keeps vigil” when it is fully open.
2 “Hyacinth” (sunbul) is a common poetical metaphor for hair.
3 Meaning the fair, silver-like skin.
of Khurásán, who on one occasion submitted to him the following versified enquiry:

“What says that master of the Law, chief scholar of our land, Our guide in doctrine and belief, to this which we demand: Suppose a cat at dead of night feloniously should steal A cage of pigeons or of doves, and make therefrom a meal, Would Retribution's Law revealed the owner justify If he in vengeance for the birds should doom the cat to die?”

To this enquiry, Imámí answered as follows:

“A subtle question this indeed! The palate of the mind Therein thy nature's fragrance fair and reason rare doth find! No vengeance falls upon the cat, for nowhere hath implied Our Prophet in his Holy Law that such is justified. Have cats which hunt for birds less right than catkins on the tree? Their claws upon the branch they spread whene'er a bird they see. So, if his own white arm he seeks to keep secure from pain, Let him avoid with Pussy's blood his hand and arm to stain. If he the pigeon seeks to save, the dove to keep alive, To hang their cages out of reach he surely could contrive!”

Poetical interrogations of this sort seem to have been the fashion at this time, for certain people of Káshán addressed a similar versified question as to the respective merits of the poets Anwari and Zahir of Fáryáb to Majdu'd-Dín Hamgar, and to this same question Imámí also thought good to reply in verse. The text and translation of this correspondence, including the question and the answers, all in verse, are given in the Ta'rikh-i-Guztadá, to which the curious reader is referred. Majdu'd-Dín Hamgar’s reply contains the date when it was written, viz. the end of Rajab, 674 (Jan. 19, 1276), and both he and Imámí agree in preferring Anwari to Zahir, a judgement in which nearly all competent critics will concur.

1 Apparently that same minister Fakhru'l-Mulk Shamsu’d-Dawla, to whom several of Imámí’s poems are dedicated.
2 For the original verses, which it would be superfluous to reprint here, see my edition of Dawlatsháh, p. 169.
3 Catkins are called gurbo-i-bid, “willow-cats,” in Persian.
4 See pp. 60–64 of the separate reprint of my translation of this portion (ch. v, § 6) published in the J. R. A. S. for Oct. 1900 and Jan. 1901.
Majdu’d-Dín’s claim to prefer Imámí’s poetry not only to his own but to Sa’dí’s, on the other hand, cannot be taken seriously, and must have been prompted by some personal motive, such as a desire to please Imámí or to annoy Sa’dí. All Persian writers who have noticed this matter at all have expressed amazement at the view which Majdu’d-Dín Hamgar saw fit to advance; for in truth Imámí’s poetry, so far as we can judge from the specimens given by Dawlatsháh¹ and in the Átash-Kadá² and the Majma’ul-Fuṣahá³, has no special distinction or originality, while Sa’dí’s claim to be reckoned among the half-dozen greatest poets of his country has never been disputed.

Majdu’d-Dín Hamgar was, according to the Ta’rikh-i-Guzista, a native of Yazd, and a protégé of Bahá’u’d-Dín Juwayní, the high-handed governor of Fárs, who died in 678/1279⁴. When the poet came from Yazd to Isfahán, he left his elderly wife behind him, but she soon followed him. News of her arrival was brought to the poet by one of his pupils, who said, “Good news! Your lady has alighted in the house.” “Good news,” replied Majdu’d-Dín, “would rather be that the house had alighted on her!” The lady, to whom this speech was reported, reproached her husband for his unkind words, quoting the quatrain of ‘Umar Khayyám beginning:

پیش از من و تو لیل و نباری بودست
“Days changed to nights ere thou wert born, or I.”

“Before me, perhaps,” replied Majdu’d-Dín, “but Heaven forbid that day and night should have existed before thee!”

According to Dawlatsháh⁶, Majdu’d-Dín Hamgar boasted descent from Núshírwán the Sásání, and was on this

⁵ See E. H. Whinfield’s text and translation in Triibner’s Oriental Series (1883), No. 33 (pp. 24–5).
account a somewhat privileged person at the courts which he frequented. To this alleged genealogy the poet alludes in the following verses:

"بر من زمانه كرد هنرا همه وبال
وز غير بریخت خون جوانیم چرخ زال
کلکم ز دست بسته تپر حسود شکل
پر من خیابان طلشید سهپر خیام مثال
چرخا چه خواهی از من عور پرهنه پای
دهرا چه خواهی از من زاز شکسته بال
از چشی باز توخته کن لقمهای بوم
وز ران شیر ساخته کن طعمه شغل"

"از زخم او چون طبل ننامه بپچ روی
ور خود زیشت مین بیشک بر تصد دوگ
ای پای پیل فنته مرا نرمتر بگوب
ای دست چرخ سفله مرا سختتر بیال"

"از مالشی که یافت دلر روشنی گزفت
روشن شود هر آینه آگیه از صقال
وقتی چنین شاک شل از خاک بردمید"

"طالع نگر چه بخت مرا خشک شد نهال
عبیر همین که نیستم از نطفه حرام
چرخ یمین ایران زاده از نسبت حلال"

"هستر ز نسل ساسان نز تخم تکین
هستر ز صلب کُسری نز دوده ینال"

"شعری بخوش مذاقی چون چاشنی وصل
شکلی بنقشندی چون صورت خیال"

"زفیتی ندیده چشیر کس از من بوقت جود
لا نا شنوده گوش کس از من که سوال"

"دلوا نشاط لب نباغد پس از شباب
خوشیدرا فروغ نباغد پس از زوال"

"My virtues all a cruel age hath made for me a bane;
My youthful blood the aged Sphere hath shed in grief and pain.
The envious Mercury\(^1\) hath plucked the pen from out my hand,
The arching Heaven hath drawn a bow to smite me where I stand.
O Sphere, what would'st thou of me, a poor, bare-footed thing?
O Time, what seek'st thou from me, a bird with broken wing?
Make of the falcon's eyes a dish to satisfy the owl:
Make of the lion's thighs the food for which the jackals prowl.
In no wise like the noisy drum will I his blows bewail,
Although his lashes on my back descend as falls the flail.
O foot of trouble's elephant, prithee more gently press!
O hand of this ignoble Sphere, increase my dire distress!
Through tribulations bravely borne my heart hath grown more bright,
As mirrors gain by polishing in radiancy and light.
What time the rose-bush from the dust doth raise its flowering head,
The sapling of my luck (what luck!) hath withered and is dead.
My fault is this, that I am not from some base seed upgrown:
My crime is this, that noble is the pedigree I own.
The sons of Sásán, not Tigín, my ancestors I call;
I'm of the race of Kisrá, not the household of Inál\(^2\).
My verse is sweet and exquisite as union with the fair:
My pen in picture-painting hath the gifts of fancy rare.
No eye hath seen an impulse mean impede my bounty's flow:
The ear of no petitioner hath heard the answer 'No!'
When youth is gone, from out the heart all love of play is cast:
And lustre fadeth from the sun which hath the zenith passed."

Majdu'd-Dín Hamgar wrote poems in praise of Shamsu'd-Dín Muḥammad the Ṣáhib-Dīwān as well as of the Atábek Sa'd b. Abú Bakr. Manuscripts of his poems are rare, but a fine old manuscript (Or. 3713) in the British Museum, transcribed in the years A.D. 1293–8 by the poet's grandson, contains a number of his quatrains. Unlike the quatrains of 'Umar Khayyám, Abú Sa'id b. Abīl-Khayr, and other masters of this style of verse, Majdu'd-Dín's quatrains deal less with

\(^1\) Mercury is the planet which presides over the destinies of authors, scribes and poets.

\(^2\) Tigín or Tagín is a suffix of Turkish names (e.g. Subuk-tigín, Alp-tigín, etc.) and Inál is another common Turkish name or title. Kisrá is the Arabic form of Khusrav ("Chosroes"), the proper name of Nūshārān and Parviz, and the generic name for all the kings of the Royal House of Sásán.
mystical and philosophical ideas than with concrete things and persons. Some are merely abusive epigrams, such as the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{آن مادر شوم فرح چون زاد ترا،} \\
\text{از گنجه بابخاز فرستاد ترا،} \\
\text{و آن دایه خوک خوار سگبان بغا،} \\
\text{شیر سگ و خون خوک می داد ترا،} \\
\end{align*}
\]

"Born of a mother of accursed womb
From Ganja's town to Abkház thou didst come,
Where that dog-training swineherd nurse of thine
Fed thee on dog's milk and the blood of swine."

The following, expressing the poet's love of travel, is too ingenious in its word-plays to admit of adequate translation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ای چرخ عنانیز از سفر هیچ متاب،} \\
\text{نامی ز سرندپ ده آبیر ز سراب،} \\
\text{هدر شام ز بامیان ده قرصی نان،} \\
\text{هبر بامز شام ده مرا شربتی آب،} \\
\end{align*}
\]

"O heaven, never turn aside my reins from wandering:
Give me my bread from Sarandib (Ceylon), my water from Saráb:
Grant me each evening (shám) a loaf of bread from Bámiyán,
And every morning (bám) give me a draught of water from Shám (Damascus)."

In the two following quatrains he laments his advancing age:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{آن شد که دلم ز طبع چون آتش و آب،} \\
\text{می ریخت بدهه ده چون دو خوشاب،} \\
\text{عشقی و جوانشی و سکار دل بود،} \\
\text{وین هر سه دُر باره نینیم به خواب،} \\
\end{align*}
\]

1 *Sarandib*, from the Sanskrit *Swarna-dīpa*, is the name given by the Arab geographers to Ceylon, and *Saráb* is a town in Ádharbáýján. There is a kind of word-play between these two names, but a much more complete one in the second half of the quatrain between *bám* (morning) and *Bámiyán* (north-west of Afghanistán) on the one hand, and *shám* (evening) and *Shám* (Damascus) on the other. The last is an example of the "complete word-play."
"Fiery and fluent, once my heart did hurl
Spontaneous verses forth, each verse a pearl:
Then Love, Desire and Youth were mine. These three
Not e'en in dreams I now can hope to see!"

اي ن پای مرا حضی نیست پرواى رکاب
نه روي رگوب ماند و نه رای رکاب
زين سان حضى بتنگ آمدم از پيرى و ضعف
نه دست عنان دارم و نه پای رکاب

"This foot of mine no more the stirrup suits;
For me no more are spurs and riding-boots.
Oppressed by aches and age, there now remains
No foot for stirrup and no hand for reins."

Here is another very insulting quatrain, but again no record remains of the person to whom it was addressed:

اي ديدن خوک پيش ديدار تو خوب
با چهره تو بوزنه معشوق قلوب
از روی تو خویي تو بسي زشت راست
با زشتی خویي تو زيي روی تو خوب

"Compared to thee a pig’s a pretty sight:
Beside thy face an ape’s the heart’s delight.
Thy temper’s uglier than e’en thy face,
Compared to it thy face is fair and bright."

Some of the quatrains are acrostics on names, as, for example, the following:

اعداد حروف نام آن دلبر چست
چون بخش فلك سيصد و ستست درست
حرف سومش نه یپک چارم حرفست
وز ثاني حرف شش يکي حرف نخست

"The [sum of the] numbers of the letters in that graceful charmer’s name
Is exactly three hundred and sixty, like the divisions of the heavens.
The third letter is one-ninth of the fourth letter,
While the first letter is one-sixth of the second letter."
The name appears to be *Nasháṭ* (ٛشاطٛ), for \[\text{ن} = 50, \text{ش} = 300, \text{l} = 1, \text{ب} = 9\], which yields a total of \(360\) and fulfils the two other conditions.

The following is addressed to his sweetheart:

\[
\text{نَهُ بَرَكَ حَكِيمه} \text{َ زَنِيرُ بِلَوْيَتَ',}
\]
\[
\text{نِه سَيِرَكَ حَكِيمه} \text{َ خَرَمَ در كَوْيَتَ',}
\]
\[
\text{مِن دِيده وَغَوْشَرُ بِدَان مَيْخَوْهَمَ',}
\]
\[
\text{تا بِشَنَوَم آوِاز وَ بِبيَنَرُ رَوِيَتَ',}
\]

"No means have I by thee to pitch my tent,
Nor money in thy street a house to rent:
My ears and eyes serve only to this end,
To hear thy voice and on thee gaze intent."

That Majdu'd-Dín Hamgar reached an advanced age is suggested by some of the quatrains just cited, while in another he describes himself as over eighty, but I have not been able to ascertain the precise dates of his birth and death.

Mention must now be made of a poet of far greater talent and originality than those of whom we have spoken above, namely Fakhru'd-Dín Ibráhim of Hama-dán, better known by his poetical *nom de guerre*, or *takhallus*, of 'Iráqi. Notices of his life are found in most of the later biographies of mystics and poets, notably in the *Nafahátul-'Uns* of Jámil\(^1\) and in the *Majálisu'l-'Ushsháq* of Husayn Mírzá Bayqará; but in the absence of contemporary testimony the particulars there given must be received with a certain reserve, while from his writings, almost entirely of a mystical and erotic character, little or nothing is to be gleaned as to his personal adventures. He is the typical *qalandar*, heedless of his reputation, and seeing in every beautiful face or object a reflection, as in a mirror, of the Eternal Beauty. "Love," as one of his biographers says, "was predominant in his nature," and hence his *ghazals* have an erotic character which has exposed him to very harsh strictures on the part of some European critics, notably

---

Sprenger\(^1\), who find scandalous in a Persian sentiments which in Plato they either admire or ignore.

According to Jámí, ‘Iráqi was born at Hamadán, and in childhood learned the Qur'án by heart and could recite it melodiously and accurately. When he was about seventeen years of age, a party of qalandars, amongst whom was a very beautiful youth, came to Hamadán, and, when they left, ‘Iráqi, attracted by the beauty of the young dervish, followed them to India. At Multán he became the disciple of Shaykh Bahá'u'd-Dín Zakariyyá, of whom he says in one of his poems:

\[\text{پرسي اکر از جهان کیست امام الانامی} \]

\[\text{نشنوی از آسان جز زکریا جواب} \]

“If thou shouldst ask of the world ‘Who is the guide of men?’
Thou wilt hear from heaven no other answer than ‘Zakariyyá’.”

Soon after his arrival there the discipline of a chilla, or forty days’ retirement and meditation, was imposed upon him, but on the tenth day the other dervishes came to the Shaykh and complained that instead of meditating in silence he was singing a ghazal or ode which he had composed, and which in the course of a few days was in the mouths of all the revellers in the city, who were singing it in the taverns to the accompaniment of the harp and zither. This ghazal, which is one of ‘Iráqi’s best-known poems, is as follows:

\[\text{خستین باده کاندر جام کردند} \]
\[\text{ز چشم مست ساقی وام کردند} \]
\[\text{چو با خود یافتند اهل طرباً} \]
\[\text{شراب بیخودی در جام کردند} \]
\[\text{لب میکوئ جانان جام در داد} \]
\[\text{شراب عاشقانش نام کردند} \]
\[\text{سر زلف بتن آرام نگرفت} \]
\[\text{ز بس دلبا که بی آرام کردند} \]

\(^1\) Catalogue of the Library of the King of Oude, pp. 440–1.
The wine wherewith the cup they first filled high
Was borrowed from the Sáqí's languorous eye.
Since self-possessed the revellers they found
The draught of selflessness they handed round.
The loved one's wine-red lips supplied the cup:
They named it 'Lover's wine,' and drank it up.
No rest the hair of those fair idols knows,
So many a heart it robs of its repose.
For good and bad a place within our hall
They found, and with one cup confounded all.
They cast the ball of Beauty on the field,
And at one charge compelled both worlds to yield.
The drunken revellers from eye and lip
The almond gather, and the sugar sip.
But that sweet lip, desired of all, most fair,
Maketh harsh words the helpless lover's share.
They loosen and set free their locks of jet
That they therewith for hearts a snare may set.
A hundred messages their glances dart;
Their eyebrows signal secrets to the heart.
They speak in confidence and silence claim,
And then their secrets to the world proclaim.
Where'er in all the world is grief and gall
They mix them up, the mixture 'Love' they call.
Why should they seek to hurt 'Iráqí's fame,
Since they themselves their secrets thus proclaim?"

When Shaykh Bahá'u'd-Dín heard the last couplet, he said, "This finishes his business!" He then called to 'Iráqí in his cell, "Do you make your supplications in wine-taverns? Come forth!" So 'Iráqí came forth, and the Shaykh clothed him in his own khirqa or dervish-cloak, raised him from the ground to which he had cast himself, and subsequently gave him in marriage his daughter, who afterwards bore him a son named Kabíru'd-Dín.

Twenty-five years passed, and Shaykh Bahá'u'd-Dín died, naming 'Iráqí as his successor. The other dervishes, however, disapproved of this nomination, and complained to the King of 'Iráqí's antinomianism. He thereupon left India and visited Mecca and al-Madína, whence he proceeded to Asia Minor. At Qonya (Iconium) he attended the lectures of the celebrated Shaykh Șadru'd-Dín of that city on the Fúsúš of Shaykh Muḥiyyu'd-Dín ibnu'l-'Arabí, and composed his most celebrated prose work, the Láma'dát ("Flashes" or "Effulgences"), which was submitted to the Shaykh and won his approval. The powerful nobleman Mu'ínu'd-Dín the Parwána was 'Iráqí's admirer and disciple, and built for him, it is said, a khángáh or monastery at Túqát, besides showing him other favours. On his death, 'Iráqí left Asia Minor for Egypt, where also he is said to have been well received by the reigning Sultan, whose favour he retained, notwithstanding the efforts of his enemies to traduce him. In Syria, whither he subsequently proceeded, he met with an equally good reception, and there, after six

months' sojourn, he was joined by his son Kabíru'd-Dín from India. There also he died, on the 8th of Dhu'l-Qa'da, 688 (Nov. 23, 1289) and was buried in the Sálihiyya Cemetery at Damascus, beside the great mystic Shaykh Muḥiyyu'd-Dín ibnu'l-'Arabi, who had predeceased him by 50 years, and whose influence in Persia, still prevalent even in our days, was largely due to 'Iráqi, Awhadu'd-Dín of Marágha, and others of the same school.

The following poems from 'Iráqi's Díván may serve besides that already given, as typical of his style:

سر بسر لطفي و جانی ای پسر
خوشتار از جان چیست آنی ای پسر
میل دلبا جمله سوی روی تست
وه چه شیرین دلستانی ای پسر
ز آن بچشری مرن در آنی هر زمان
کن صفا آپ روانی ای پسر
از می حسن ارچه سر مسی منک
با حریفان سر گرانی ای پسر
وعده امید انرچه کچ بود
از بانه در نمانی ای پسر
بر لب خود بوسه ده و آنگه بیبن
ذوق آپ زندگانی ای پسر
ز آن شدم خاک درت گزجام می
جرعه بر من فشانی ای پسر
گوش جانیا پر گهر شد بسکه تو
از سخن در می فشانی ای پسر
از لطیفی می نباند بسی تو
در دل و چشم زحسن و لطف تو
آتشگارا و نباني ای پسر

ئیست در عالم عراقی را دمی
بر لپ تو کامرانی ای پسر
"From head to feet thou art gracious, pleasant and sweet, O Love!
Thee to prefer to life 'twere right and meet, O Love!
A hunter of hearts art thou to hold us in thrall, O Love!
To mine eyes appear thy features fair and dear, O Love!
Awake or asleep like a crystal stream so clear, O Love!
Though Beauty's wine doth incarnadine thy cheek, O Love!
Bear with thy comrades, nor causeless quarrels seek, O Love!
They melt in air, hope's promises false and fair, O Love!
Excuses, I ween, you'll find enough and to spare, O Love!
Kisses sip from thine own fair lip, and behold, O Love!
The Water of Life with its savour so sweet and so cold, O Love!
In the dust hard by thy path I die at thy door, O Love!
That a draught of wine on this dust of mine thou mayst pour, O Love!
Jewels of speech on all and each thou dost hurl, O Love!
So that every soul in its ear may wear a pearl, O Love!
None do I see in grace like thee, and I'm sure, O Love!
Thou art soul incarnate and spirit essential and pure, O Love!
In mine eyes and heart thou hast thy part and share, O Love!
Thou dost hide or appear, now dark and dim, now clear, O Love!
Never a moment on earth from North to South, O Love!
May 'Iraqi aspire to have his desire of thy mouth, O Love!"

The following is the first strophe of a very fine Tarji-band:

أُكِوْسُ تَلَلٌّاتُ بِمَداَمٍ، أَمْ شَمْسٌ تِـهَّلَتْ بُـغْمَاءِ;
اِزْ صَفَاءِ مِي وَ لِطَافَتِ جَامٍ؛ دِرْ هُرَّآمِیمِّیحَت رَنِکُ جَامَ وَ مَداَمٍ;
هِـیَ جَامِسَت وَ نِیسَت گُوَّی مَيی؛ یَا مُدَادَمَـسْت وَ نَیسَت گُوَّی جَامَ;
تَا هَوَآ رَنِکِ آَقْتَاب گُرْفَت، هَرِوَ یِکِسَان شَدَدْ نُورُ وَ ظَلَامُ;
رَوْز وَ شِب۷ بَا هِمَ آَشْتُی کُرَّدَنَّ، کَارِ عَالِم اَز آَن گَرَفَت نَـظَـامُ;
کُرَ نَدَانِی چَه اَیَنِ چَه رُوَز وَ شِبَّـت;
یَا مُدَادَمَ اَـسِت جَام وَ بَادَه کُسَّمَ;
سَرَّآپِ حَیَاتَاتِ دِرَ عَالِمِ، چُون مَی وَ جَامَ فَیهرَکـِن توْ مَداَمَ;
انکِشَافِ حَمَاب عَالِم رَقِیْقِن، چُونَ شِب وَ رُوَز فَرَضُ چَن وَ سَلَامُ;
وَر نَشَدَ زِین بِیان تُرَا رُوْشَن، جَمِلَه آَغْاَز کَارَ تَا اَنَـجَامُ;

B. P.
Cups are those a-flashing with wine,
Or suns through the clouds a-gleaming?
So clear is the wine and the glass so fine
That the two are one in seeming.
The glass is all and the wine is naught,
Or the glass is naught and the wine is all:
Since the air the rays of the sun hath caught
The light combines with night's dark pall,
   For the night hath made a truce with the day,
   And thereby is ordered the world's array.
If thou know'st not which is day, which night,
   Or which is goblet and which is wine,
By wine and cup divine aright
The Water of Life and its secret sign:
   Like night and day thou mayst e'en assume
   Certain knowledge and doubt's dark gloom.
If these comparisons clear not up
All these problems low and high,
Seek for the world-reflecting cup
That thou mayst see with reason's eye
That all that is, is He indeed,
Soul and loved one and heart and creed.”

Here is a fragment of another ode:

از پرده برون آمد ساقی قدحی در دست،
هر پرده، مای بدرید هر توبه، ما بشکست،
بنمود نخ زیبا گشتیم همه شیدا،
چون هیچ نیاند از ما آمد برم ما بنشست،
زلفش گریهی بکشاد بند از دل ما ببِرُخاست،
جان دل ز جهان بر داشت و اندر سر زلفش بست،
در دامِ سر زلفش ماندیدر همه حیران،
وز جامِ مِی لعلش گشتیم همه سرمست،
از دست بشد چون دل در طرّه، او زد چنگ،
غرقه زند از حیرت در هرچه ببابد دست.
Forth from the Veil came that fair Cup-bearer, in hand the cup;  
He tore our veils asunder, and our vows forthwith broke up;  
Showed us His visage fair, and straightway us of sense bereft,  
Then sat Him down beside us, when of us no trace was left.  
His locks the knots unloosed; our spirits' bonds were cast aside;  
Our souls abjured the world, and to His curls their fortunes tied.  
There in His fragrant tresses we remained in frenzy fine,  
Intoxicated with the proffered cup of ruby wine.  
Lost at His hands, our hearts for refuge clung unto His hair,  
E'en as the drowning man will catch at straws in his despair.  
And when His tresses' chains became the bonds of hearts that raved,  
From their own being they escaped and from the world were saved."

Of the following ode a spirited translation was made,  
but not published, by my friend Sir E. Denison Ross. The translation here given resembles and is suggested by his,  
but is not identical with it, for I cannot lay my hands on  
the copy which I received, nor can I remember it in detail.

مرا جز عشقِ تو جانی نمی بینم نمی بینم  
دلبرا جز تو جانانی نمی بینم نمی بینم  
بخود صبرِ و آرامی نمی یابم نمی یابم  
زتو لطفِ و احسناتِ نمی بینم نمی بینم  
ز روی لطف بنم را رو که دردی را که من دارم  
بجز روی تو درمانتی نمی بینم نمی بینم  
بیا گر خواهشِ دیدن که دور از روی خوب تو  
بقای خویشِ چندانی نمی بینم نمی بینم  
بگیر ای یار دست من که در گردابی افتادم  
که آنرا هیچ پایانی نمی بینم نمی بینم  
ز روی لطف و دلداری بیا سامان سپرد کن  
که خودرا بی تو سامانی نمی بینم نمی بینم  
عراقی را بدرگاهت رهی بنما که در عالم  
چو او سرگشت و خبرانی نمی بینم نمی بینم
"Save love of thee a soul in me I cannot see, I cannot see;
An object for my love save thee I cannot see, I cannot see.
Repose or patience in my mind I cannot find, I cannot find,
While gracious glance or friendship free I cannot see, I cannot see.
Show in thy face some sign of grace, since for the pain wherewith I'm slain
Except thy face a remedy I cannot see, I cannot see.
If thou wouldst see me, speed thy feet, for parted from thy presence sweet,
Continued life on earth for me I cannot see, I cannot see.
O friend, stretch out a hand to save, for I am fallen in a wave
Of which the crest, if crest there be, I cannot see, I cannot see.
With gracious care and kindly air come hither and my state repair;
A better state, apart from thee, I cannot see, I cannot see.
Some pathway to 'Iráqi teach whereby thy gateway he may reach,
For vagrant so bemused as he I cannot see, I cannot see."

Besides his lyric poetry 'Iráqi composed a mathnawi poem entitled the 'Uskhshág-náma, or "Book of Lovers," but this I have not read, nor is a copy of it at present accessible to me. I therefore pass to his most notable prose work, the Lama'át ("Flashes," or "Effulgences"), a mystical treatise inspired, as already mentioned, by the teachings of "the most great doctor" (ash-Shaykhul-akbar) Muhiyyu'd-Dín ibnu'l-'Arabi, by origin of the famous Arabian tribe of Ṭayy, and by birth a Moor of Andalusia.

The Lama'át is a comparatively small book, containing, perhaps, between 7000 and 8000 words, and, though written in prose, includes numerous pieces of verse. The many-sided and talented Jámi, of whom we shall speak in a later chapter, wrote a commentary on it, entitled Ashi‘atu'l-Lama'át¹ ("Rays of the Flashes"), in the preface to which he says that he began by being prejudiced against the work and its author, but, being requested by one of his spiritual guides to study and collate the text, he found it to consist of "graceful phrases and charming suggestions, verse and prose combined together and subtleties in Arabic and Persian intermingled, wherein the signs of [human] know-

¹ Lithographed, with other Šúfi tracts, at Tihrán in 1303/1885-6.
ledge and [superhuman] gnosis were apparent, and the lights of rapture and ecstasy manifest, so that it would awaken the sleeper, cause him who was awakened to apprehend secret mysteries, kindle the fire of Love, and put in motion the chain of Longing.” The book is divided into 28 “Flashes” (Lam’a), probably in correspondence with the number of letters in the Arabic alphabet. As a specimen I give the opening pages, down to the end of the first Lam’a, the prose portion in translation only, the verses both in translation and in the original.

“In the Name of God, the Merciful, the Forgiving.

“In the Name of God, the Merciful, the Forgiving.

“Praise be to God who illuminated the countenance of His Friend with the Effulgence of Beauty, so that it gleamed with Light; and made visible therein the limits of Perfection, and rejoiced therein with joy; and raised him up by His hand and chose him out while Adam was not yet a thing mentioned, nor had the Pen written, nor the Tablet been inscribed. [His friend, who was] the Treasure-house of the treasures of Being, the Key of the Store-houses of Bounty, the Qibla of Desire and the Desired One, the Possessor of the Standard of Praise and the Laudable Station, the tongue of whose high degree declares:

و إن كنت ابن آدم صورة فلي فيه معنى شاهد بايتو

‘Though in outward form I seem one of Adam’s progeny,
Yet the underlying truth claims for me paternity.'

کفتا بصورة ارچه ز اولاد آدمی,

از روى مرتبه بیمه حال بترم,

چون بنگرم در آینه عکس جمال خوشی,

گردد همه جهان بحقيقت مصوّر

1 This verse, as Jâmi tells us, is from the Tâ’Iyya, or qasida rhyming in 4, of Ibnu’l-Fârid. Though outwardly the Prophet is descended from Adam, he is in reality the Object and Cause of Creation, so that Adam exists through and because of him, not he through Adam. The Muslims represent God as saying to the Prophet, “But for thee, I had not created the Heavens.”
Although in form of Adam's race,' said he,
'Higher by far than his is my degree.
My beauty mirrored in a glass I see,
And all the world a picture seems of me.
Creation's Sun am I: doth it amaze
If each created atom me displays?
The holy Spirits make my Essence plain,
And human forms my Attributes retain.
The boundless Sea's a sprinkling of my grace;
The radiant light's a reflex of my face.
From Throne to Footstool all is but a mote
Which in the radiance of my Sun doth float.
The Veil of Attributes aside is hurled,
And my bright Essence brightens all the world.
The stream which Khîdr's ebb of life did stop
Was of my Kawthar-stream a single drop.
That breath wherewith Christ loosed the thralls of Death
Was but a blast of my soul-saving breath.
My Essence all the Names doth manifest;
I am of Names the greatest and the best!
(May God bless and hail Him!)

But to proceed. A few words on the degrees of Love, dictated by the mood of the moment, are here set down in the manner of the Sawdaniyah, that they may be for every lover a mirror to display the Beloved; though the rank of Love is too high for anyone to approach the pavilion of its glory by dint of understanding or explanation, or to gaze on the perfection of its true nature with the eyes of discovery and observation.

但不限于 العشق عن همب الْبِلَادِ و عن وصف التفرَق و الوصالِ
متي ما جَلَّ شَيْع عن خيالِ يَجْلِ ع ن الإحاطة و المثالِ;

Exalted high is Love o'er men's ambition,
And o'er ideas of union or partition;
For when a thing transcends all thought and mention
'Tis freed from likeness and from comprehension.

It is veiled by the Veil of Glory and isolated in its Perfection. Its Attributes are the Veils of its Essence and implicit in that Essence. Its Splendour is the Lover of its Beauty, which is involved in that Splendour. For ever it makes love to itself, and concerns itself not with aught else. Every moment it casts aside the Veil from the face of some loved one, and every instant it raises a new song in the way of loverhood.

عشق در بردِه می نوازد سازِ
هر نفس نغمه گذر سازدِ
همه عالیصدای نغمه اوستِ
راز او از جهان برون افتادِ
سر از زبان هر ذرهِ

Within the Veil Love sings its air:
Where is the lover to hear it, where?

1 This is the title of a treatise by Shaykh Ḥamd Ghazzalī on Love, the Lover, and the Beloved.
Each moment it chants a different lay,
And ever some melody fresh doth play.
All the Universe echoes its song:
Who hath heard such an anthem long?
Its secret out from the world doth leap:
How can an Echo its secret keep?
I tell no tales, but loud and clear
From the tongue of each atom its secret hear.

Every moment with every tongue it tells its secret to
its own ear; every instant with all its ears it hears its
speech from its own tongue; every minute with all its
eyes it flashes its beauty on its own vision; every second
in every aspect it presents its being to its own notice. Hear
from me its description as it really is:

\[
\text{یُحَدْثُنِی فِی صَائِبَتْ ثُمَّ نَارِقَ، وَ غَمَرَ عِیونَ ثُمَّ کَسَرُ الحَواجَب.}
\]

It speaks with me through speaking and through speechless\(^1\);
Through lowered eyelashes and glancing eyes.

Knowest thou what it whispers in my ears?

\[
\text{عشَقُم کِه در دو کُون مَکَانَم بَدید نیست،}
\]
\[
\text{غنیاً مُعَیّرِم کِه ناشُنُم بَدید نیست،}
\]
\[
\text{ز ابُرو و غِمُرِه هَر دو جَهان صید کُرده اَم،}
\]
\[
\text{مُکَرِدَان کِه تیرو جَهان بَدید نیست،}
\]
\[
\text{چَوْن آفتَاب در رَخ هَر ذَهَ ذو ذَهَرُم؛}
\]
\[
\text{از غَایتِ ظُهور عیانَم بَدید نیست،}
\]
\[
\text{گَویم بِهر زبَان و بِهر گُوش بشُنوُم؛}
\]
\[
\text{وَین طَرفه تَرکِو جَوْش و زبَان بَدید نیست،}
\]
\[
\text{چَوْن هَر چَه هَسَت در هَمِی عَالِم هَمِی منیَّر؛}
\]
\[
\text{مَانِد در دو عَالِم اَم آَنِر بَدید نیست،}
\]

I am Love, for which in these worlds there is found not a place:
The 'Anqā am I of the West\(^2\), who hath never a trace.

\(^{1}\) *I.e.* through articulate and inarticulate creatures, through the
organic and the inorganic.

\(^{2}\) The true explanation of 'Anqā-yi-Mughrib is doubtful. See Lane's
*Arabic-English Lexicon*, s.v.
By my glance and my eyebrow the world I have captured, I trow,
Heed not that I do not possess either arrow or bow.
Revealed in the face of each atom am I, like the sun;
So apparent am I that my form is apparent to none.
I speak with all tongues, and with every ear do I hear
Though, strange as it seems, I have neither a tongue nor an ear.
I am all that exists in all worlds, so 'tis patent and clear
That neither in this world nor that have I rival or peer.

FOREWORD.

Know that in each 'Flash' of these 'Flashes' some hint
is given of that Reality which transcends differentiation,
whether you call it Love or Attraction, since there is no
dearth of words; and some suggestion is made as to the
manner of its progress in diverse conditions and cycles,
of its journey through the degrees of dissociation and estab-
ishment, of its manifestation in the form of ideas and
realities, of its emergence in the garb of Beloved and Lover,
and finally of the absorption of the Lover in the Beloved
formally, of the inclusion of the Beloved in the Lover
ideally, and of the comprehension of both together in the
Majesty of its Unity. There divergences are reconciled,
ruptures are made whole, the Light is concealed within the
Light, and the Manifestation lies latent within the Mani-
festation, while from behind the pavilions of Glory is cried:

ألا خلّ شئٌ ما خلّ الله باتل

O, is not all save God hollow and vain?
The identity [of each] disappears [in the other], leaving
neither sign nor trace, and they merge in God, the One, the
All-compelling.

FIRST FLASH,

Setting forth the pre-existence of Love to both Beloved and
Lover, and the manner of their production by it,
which takes place in the First Differentiation;
and setting forth that wherein each stands
in need of the other.

The derivation of both Lover and Beloved is from Love,
which, in its Abode of Glory, is exempt from differentiation,
and, in the Sanctuary of its own Identity, is sanctified from inwardness and outwardness. Yea, in order to display its perfection, in such way as is identical with its Essence and [equally] identical with its Attributes, it shows itself to itself in the Mirror of Loverhood and Belovedness, and reveals its Beauty to its own Contemplation by means of the Seer and the Vision. Thus the names of Loverhood and Belovedness appeared, and the description of the Seeker and the Quest became manifest. It showed the Outward to the Inmost, and the Voice of Loverhood arose: it showed the Inmost to the Outward, and the name of Belovedness was made plain.

No atom doth exist apart from It, that Essence single:
'Tis when Itself it doth reveal that first those 'others' mingle.
O Thou whose outward seeming Lover is, Beloved thine Essence,
Who hitherto e'er saw the Object Sought seek its own presence?

Love, by way of Belovedness, became the Mirror of the Beauty of Loverhood, so that therein it might behold its own Essence, and by way of Loverhood the Mirror of Belovedness, so that therein it might contemplate its own Names and Attributes. Although but one object is beheld by the Eye of Contemplation, yet when one face appears in two mirrors, assuredly in each mirror a different face appears.

The Face is only one, yet multiple
When thou in many mirrors see'st it.

No atom doth exist apart from It, that Essence single:
'Tis when Itself it doth reveal that first those 'others' mingle.
O Thou whose outward seeming Lover is, Beloved thine Essence,
Who hitherto e'er saw the Object Sought seek its own presence?

Love, by way of Belovedness, became the Mirror of the Beauty of Loverhood, so that therein it might behold its own Essence, and by way of Loverhood the Mirror of Belovedness, so that therein it might contemplate its own Names and Attributes. Although but one object is beheld by the Eye of Contemplation, yet when one face appears in two mirrors, assuredly in each mirror a different face appears.
O how can 'Otherness' appear when whatsoever existeth here
In essence is that Other One becoming to our vision clear?"

Shaykh Abú Ḥámid Awḥadu'd-Dín of Kirmán was
like 'Iráqí, a follower, and, indeed, as it would appear from
the Majma'ul-Fusahá', a personal friend or dis-
ciple of the great Shaykh Muhíyyu'd-Dín ibnu'l-
'Arabí, and had met (according to the same
authority) that wild mystic Shams-i-Tabríz, the inspirer of
Jalálu'd-Dín's Mathnawi and Diván. He was also ac-
quainted, as some assert, with Awhádi of Marágha and with
'Iráqí himself, whom, in his heedlessness of appearances and
passionate admiration of beauty, he somewhat resembles.
Shaykh Shihábu'd-Dín, who, for chronological reasons,
cannot be the famous Suhrawardí, strongly disapproved of
him, called him a "heretical innovator," and refused to
admit him to his presence, on hearing which Awḥadu'd-
Dín recited the following Arabic verse:

ما سأئني دْزْكُوْرًا لِي بِمَسْبِبَةٍ، بَلّ سَرْتُ مِنّي حَطْرَةٌ بَيَّالِكَةٍ،

"I mind not that bad names thou dost me call:
I'm glad that thou shouldst mention me at all."

Jámi apologizes for him for "contemplating the Truth
through the medium of its Manifestations in Phenomena,
and beholding Absolute Beauty in finite forms," and adds
that, being asked by Shams-i-Tabríz what he was doing, he
replied, "I am contemplating the Moon in a bowl of water,"
meaning the Beauty of the Creator in the beauty of the
creature; to which Shams-i-Tabríz replied, "Unless you
are afflicted with a carbuncle on the back of your neck,

1 See the Tihrán lithographed edition, vol. i, pp. 89-94, and Jámi's
Nafahát, p. 685.
2 See Jámi, Nafahátul-Uns, ed. Nassau Lees, pp. 684-689. This
verse is ascribed by Badi'uz-Zamán al-Hamadhání to a poet named
Dumayna (Rasd'il, ed. Beyrout, 1890, p. 96 and n. 8 ad calc.). In its
original form it was addressed to a woman and runs:—

لَدَن سَأَئِني أَنْ يُنَى بِمَسْبِبَةٍ، لَكُدَ سَرْتُ مِنّى حَطْرَةٌ بَيَّالِكَ،
why do you not look at the Moon in the sky?" Similarly Mawláná Jalálu’d-Dín Rúmí, being told that Awhadu’d-Dín sought the society of the beautiful, but with purity of purpose, exclaimed, "Would rather that his desires had been carnal, and that he had outgrown them!" Awhadu’d-Dín expresses his own point of view in the following quatrain:

زآن می نگرم بچشیر سر در صورت
زیرا که ز معنیست اثر در صورت
این عالم صورت است و ما در صورت
معنی نتوان دید مکر در صورت

"Therefore mine eyes insistent gaze on forms
Because the Idea itself displays in forms:
We live in forms; this World's the formal World:
The Idea we thus must needs appraise in forms."

Apart from a few quatrains cited in the Nafahát’l-Uns of Jámí, the Majma’u’l-Fuṣahá of Riḍá-qulí Khán, and other biographical works, Awhadu’d-Dín seems to have left little save a mathnawi poem entitled “The Lamp of Spirits” (Miṣbáḥu’l-Arwáh), from which long extracts are given in the Majma’u’l-Fuṣahá and the following eight couplets in the Nafaḥát (pp. 688-9):
While the hand moves, the shadow moveth too:
What else, indeed, can the poor shadow do?
'Tis but the hand which makes the shadow fall,
The shadow, then, no substance hath at all.
To call 'existent' what no Being hath,
Save through another, is not Wisdom's Path.
Absolute Being only wise men call
Being, and naught save God exists at all.
That which existent but through God became
IS NOT in truth, but only IS in name.
And yet the Artist loves His work, 'tis clear;
There's none but He, so be thou of good cheer.
Himself at once the Truth doth hear and tell
The Face He shows He doth perceive as well,
Know, then, by Allah, for a certainty
That nothing else existence hath save He."

Mention should also be made of Awhadu'd-Dín's disciple, Awhadí of Marágha, also called of Iṣfahán, because, though a native of the former place, he passed a considerable portion of his life and died at the latter. Little seems to be known to the biographers of his circumstances, but the prevalent opinion is that he died in 738/1337–8. His chief poem is an imitation of the Ḥadīqa of Saná'i entitled Jám-i-Jam (the "Cup of Jamshíd," also known as the "World-displaying Glass"), of which copious extracts are given by the biographers, and of which I possess a good manuscript. Dawlatsháh, followed by the Haft Iqlím, states that this poem was so popular that within a month of its production four hundred copies of it were made and sold at a good price, but adds that in his time (892/1487) it was seldom met with and little read. This seems to have been the only mathnawi poem he wrote, but he also left a díwán, estimated by Ridá-qlí Khán, the author of the Majma'ul-Fúsahá, to contain six or seven thousand

1 See my edition of Dawlatsháh, pp. 210–215; Majma'ul-Fúsahá, vol. ii, pp. 94–98; Haft Iqlím, under Iṣfahán, etc. Jámfí, however, (Nafahat, p. 707) reverses the rôles of these two cities.
2 Dated 916/1510–11. The text comprises about 4500 couplets.
verses¹, including qasidas and quatrains, of which a selection is given by the biographers. The following may serve as examples of his style:

(Part of a qasida taken from the Haft Iqlim).

"How long wilt pride in beard and turban take?
That Friend adopt as friend: all else forsake.
With stir and movement fill thy heart with pain:

1 Dawlatsháh (p. 210 of my edition) says 10,000."
The soul in rest and quiet strength doth gain.
All scent and hue of self do thou efface,
That He may clasp thee tight in His embrace.
Till thou art contrite vainly shalt thou seek
In truth the beauty of that lovely cheek.
If thou canst do what He enjoins on thee
He'll do what thou dost ask assuredly.
He's kin enough: all else forsake forthwith:
When wilt thou free thyself from kin and kith?
Ask of thyself, when from thyself set free,
God-vexer, where and who thy God may be?
Who is't in thee who speaks of 'us' and 'me'?
Who fixed the evil and the good for thee?
If there are 'others,' prithee point them out:
Art thou alone? Then wherefore 'others' flout?
To be united is not as to see:
In this my speech is no hypocrisy.
Were sight and union one in fact and deed
The eye on looking at the thorn would bleed.
A cup he gives thee: spill not, drink it up!
Hold fast when I bestow another cup!
One is the Master's Face: pluralities
From Mirror and from Mirror-holder rise.
One the King's portrait and the coining-die:
Numbers in gold and silver coinage lie.
One sap supplies the flower which doth adorn
The rose-bush, and the sharp and cruel thorn.
Orange and fire alike\(^1\) their hue derive
From that life-giving sun whereon they thrive.
A thousand circles issue from the point
What time the compass doth enlarge its joint.
The world entire reveals His Vision bright:
Seek it, O ye who are endowed with sight:
All things His praises hymn in voices still,
Sand in the plain and rocks upon the hill."

The following fragment is possessed of some beauty, but is imitated from one of Sa'di's\(^2\).

\[\text{ای رنگ ناکشیده گه میراث میخوری،}
\text{بنگر گه کیستی تو و مال گه میبری،}
\]

\(^1\) Or "Orange and pomegranate," for \text{nār} has both meanings.
\(^2\) See the Calcutta edition of 1795, vol. ii, ff. 238\(^a\)–239\(^b\).
Think O thou who dost inherit, yet didst labour ne'er,
Who was he whose wealth was thine, and who art thou, the heir?
He amassed but did not spend it, so 'twas left behind:
Use it well, that when thou fittest, others good may find.
Gold a goblin is, and woman for the neck a chain:
Chained and goblin-haunted's he who greatly loves the twain.
Over-anxious for thy offspring be not, for the Lord
Knoweth better than the servant how to guard his ward.
Dally not with lust and passion, which do curses bring,
Curses which thou shalt not 'scape with Flying Ja'far's wing.
This thy lust and this thy craving are a sea of strife:

1 *I.e.* Ja'far ibn Abi Talib, the Prophet's cousin, who was killed by the Romans in the Battle of Mútta (September, A.D. 629), and of whom the Prophet said, "I saw Ja'far yesterday in a group of the angels, having two wings whereof the pinions were stained with blood." (Ibnu'l-Athîr, ed. Tornberg, vol. ii, p. 181). Hence he was called the "Winged (or "Flying") Martyr." (Muir's *Life of Mahomet*, new and abridged edition of 1828, p. 410 *ad calc.*)
Canst thou swim not? Wherefore venture in the waves thy life?
Washing of the coat and turban naught can profit you:
Wash thy hands of worldly longings: this is washing true!
On the evil wrought by others never wilt thou dwell
If upon the deeds thou doest thou shouldst ponder well.
Truth there lacks not in the sayings Awhadí doth say:
He who hearkens to his counsel wins to Fortune's way!"

The following ode is another favourable specimen of Awhadí's work:

"Many a Spring shall Autumn follow when thou'rt passed away;
Many an evening, many a morning, many a night and day.
To the World thy heart incline not, though it seemeth fair;
Deem it not a faithful friend who for its friends doth care.
Thou to-day who like a scorpion everyone dost sting,
Snakes shall be thy tomb's companions, shame to thee shall bring.
Comfort some afflicted spirit; that is worth thy while;
Else to vex thy fellows' spirits easy is and vile.
Look not on earth's humble dwellers with a glance so proud:
Knowing not what Knight is hidden midst the dusty cloud."

The following fragment must conclude our citations from Awhadí:

"Zehar Xawar gan ra Zehar Xawar dar,
Zehar Xawar gan ra Zehar Xawar dar,"

B. P. 10
These suppliant suitors hold in slight esteem;
Hold thou their vows as frailer than a dream.
Honours which meanness winneth for thy name
Regard, if honour toucheth thee, as shame.
When Fortune’s cup into your hands doth pass
Think of the headache as you raise the glass.
Like ill-bred camel seems thy restive soul;
Put on the leading-rein or lose control!

The village of Shabistar (or Chabistar) near Tabriz, in Adharbayjân, gave birth about the middle of the thirteenth century of the Christian era (seventh of the Hijra) to another notable mystic, Sa’du’dd-Dîn Mahmûd, generally called, after his native place, Shabistari. Little is known of his life, which seems to have been passed quietly, and, so far as those stirring times allowed, uneventfully, at or near Tabriz, where he died about 720/1320. He was by no means a voluminous writer, but his Gûlshan-i-Râz, or “Rose-Garden of Mystery,” a mathnawi containing about one thousand couplets, is one of the best and most compendious manuals of the mystical doctrine of the Sûfis, and enjoys even at the present day a high reputation. It has been edited with a translation, Introduction, and valuable notes, by Mr E. Whinfield, who gives in his Introduction the few particulars known about the author and the history of the poem. This attracted the attention of European travellers as early as A.D. 1700, reached certain Western libraries during the succeeding

1 Published by Trübner, London, 1880.
century, was utilized by Dr Tholuck in his *Sufismus* in 1821 and was partly translated into German by the same writer in his *Blühtensammlung aus der Morgenländischen Mystik* in 1825, and was edited with a complete versified translation in German by Hammer-Purgstall in 1838. The poem was composed, as the poet himself informs us, in the month of Shawwál, 710 (Feb.–March, 1311) in reply to a series of fifteen questions on mystical doctrine propounded by an enquirer from Khurasán named Amír Ḥusaynî. These questions, which are included in the poem, are briefly as follows:

(1) As to the nature of thought.
(2) Why is thought sometimes a sin, sometimes a duty, and what sort of thought is incumbent on the mystic?
(3) What am “I”? What is meant by “travelling into one’s self”?
(4) What is meant by “the Pilgrim,” and what by “the Perfect Man”?
(5) Who is the Gnostic (‘Arif) who attains to the Secret of Unity?
(6) “If Knower and Known are one pure Essence, What are the inspirations in this handful of dust?”
(7) “To what Point belongs the expression, ‘I am the Truth’?”
(8) “Why call they a creature ‘united’? How can he achieve ‘travelling’ and ‘journey’?”
(9) “What is the union of ‘Necessary’ and ‘Contingent’? What are ‘near’ and ‘far’, ‘more’ and ‘less’?”
(10) “What is that Sea whose shore is speech? What is that pearl which is found in its depths?”
(11) “What is that Part which is greater than its Whole? What is the way to find that Part?”
(12) “How are Eternal and Temporal separate? Is this one the World and the other God?”
(13) “What means the mystic by those [allegorical] expressions of his?
What does he indicate by 'eye' and 'lip'?
What does he intend by 'cheek,' 'curl,' 'down' and 'mole'?
(He, to wit, who is in 'Stations' and 'States.')"

(14) "What meaning attaches to 'Wine,' 'Torch' and 'Beauty'?
What is assumed in being a haunter of Taverns?"

(15) "Idols, girdles and Christianity in this discourse
Are all infidelity; if not, say what are they?"

The book contains not only the answers to these questions, but a number of incidental illustrations, parables and digressions, and is on the whole one of the best manuals of Súfî Theosophy which exist, especially when taken in conjunction with the excellent commentary of 'Abdu'r-Razzáq al-Láhijí.

Since the whole of this work is accessible to the English reader in Whinfield's excellent translation, the following short specimen may suffice here:

**Question X.**

*From the Gulshan-i-Ráz*  
"What Sea is that whereof the shore is speech? What pearl from out its depths our hands can reach?"

**Answer X.**

"The Sea is Being; speech its shore; the shell
Words, and its pearls Heart's Wisdom, wot thee well.
Each wave a thousand royal pearls doth pour
Of text, tradition and prophetic lore.
Each moment thence a thousand waves are tossed,
Yet ne'er a drop therefrom is ever lost.
Knowledge is gathered from that Sea profound;
Its pearls enveloped are in words and sound.
Ideas and mysteries descending here
Need some similitude to make them clear."

**Illustration.**

"In April's month, thus was it told to me,
The oysters upwards float in 'Ummán's sea.
Up from the depths unto the Ocean's brim
Ascending open-mouthed they shorewards swim."
Mists from the sea arise and veil the land,
And then in rain dissolve by God's command.
Into each oyster-mouth a rain-drop creeps:
The shell doth close, and sinketh to the deeps.
With heart fulfilled it sinketh down again;
A pearl is formed from every drop of rain.
Into the depths himself the Diver hurls,
And to the shore brings back the lustrous pearls.
Being's the sea: the shore our human frames:
God's Grace the mist: the rain God's Holy Names:
Wisdom's the diver in this mighty deep,
Who 'neath his cloak a hundred pearls doth keep.
The Heart's the vase wherein is Wisdom found:
Heart's wisdom's shell the letters, words and sound.
The moving breath like lightning doth appear,
And thence words fall upon the hearer's ear.
Break, then, the shell: bring forth the royal pearl:
The kernel keep: the husk on ash-heap hurl.
Lexicon, grammar and philology
All these mere accidents of letters be.
Who'e'er on things like these his life doth spend
Doth waste his life without an aim or end.”

Shaykh Mahmúd Shabistári cannot, like so many Persian poets, be charged with writing too much, for the Gulshan-i-Ráz is, so far as I know, his only poem, while his only other works are the Haqqu'l-Yaqín (“Certain Truth”), and the Risála-i-Sháhid (“Tract of the Witness”). The former is fairly common, and has been lithographed at Tihrán with other Súfi tracts: the latter I have never met with. The full title of the better-known treatise is “Certain truth on the Knowledge of the Lord of the Worlds,” and it contains eight chapters, corresponding with the eight Gates of Paradise, and dealing with the following topics:

(2) The Manifestation of the Divine Attributes, and the Station of Knowledge.
(5) On Contingent Being and Plurality.
(6) On Differentiation of movement, and the continual renovation of Differentiations.

(7) On the Philosophy of obligation, compulsion, pre-destination and conduct.

(8) Explaining the Return and the Resurrection, and Annihilation and Permanence.

The poet Rabi'i of Būshanj, the panegyrist of Fakhru'd-Dīn Kurt of Herāt, is little known, but a long notice of him is given in that rare and valuable work the *Mujmal* ("Compendium") of Faṣḥī of Khwāfī, under the year 702/1399-1400 in which he was put to death. He was a great drinker of wine, while Fakhru'd-Dīn was addicted to *bang*; a fact to which reference is made in these two quatrains:

 הרפה חפ מין אSeriously Trivandramショム 'מ
 שאיפטש חפ חפטיק אפלאショ'un

 Porto خطאות פס חורמה בר defaultMessageショム' גזן פייש חפ חפו שוזה דרخאךショム

"When I wax cheerful with the green-hued seed 2
I'm ready to bestride the heaven's green steed;
With verdant youths on lawns the green I eat
Ere like the grass the earth on me shall feed."

מיסוחארה אגרגי בוד עור שוד ווצעיבד אש ג bör az בורשוד' גזן פיש חפ חפו גוזמה דרخאךショム' גזן פיש חפ חפו גוזמה דרخאךショ'un

"The toper, e'en if rich, is harshly blamed,
While by his rioting the world's inflamed.

1 The MS. which I have used formerly belonged to Colonel Raverty, and was bought by the trustees of the "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Fund" on his death. A second MS., now in my possession, is from the Library of the late Sir Albert Houtum-Schindler. There is a third MS. at St Petersburg. There is, unfortunately, a large lacuna comprising the years A.H. 718-840 (A.D. 1318-1436) in the Raverty MS.

2 *I.e.* Indian hemp (*Cannabis Indica*) or *bang*, the green colour of which is also alluded to in its nicknames * Ağâ-yi-Sayyid* ("Master Sayyid") and *Tûti-yi-Sabz* (the "Green Parrot").
While in prison Rabīʿ composed a poem called the *Kārnāma* ("Book of Deeds") and other poems, wherein he sought but failed to move the King's pity. Of these some seventy couplets are cited in the *Mujnāl* of Faṣḥīḥī, of which the following may serve as specimens:

(From the *Kārnāma*.)

شاه جبناخسرو روی رمین، وارث جمشید ملك فخیر دین،
واشت یکی بندر گران ساخته، ز آن و فولاد به‌پرداخته،
کردن مرا بسته بدان بند یای، سرمکش از خواهش بیبان خدای،
آن دگران را همه آزاد کرد، چرخ فلک بین مثلچه بیداد کرد،
من شهر پس بسته بندر گران، راست چوک اکوس بی‌پردازان،
بارغمی بر دل و بر یای بنده، با همه غرم هنفسرت تا بچند،
جان من از صجشتان در گریو، بلعجبی چند نه مرومن نه دیو،
یک دل از ایوان بیبان شاد نه، چون دلشان آهن و پولاد نه،
خسر یکی لیت خوره شاگردشان، دیو یکی مسخره در گریشان،
خشتستان چشتی و خون ریختی، عادتشان بستن و آویختنی،
کاره همه عمر برون کوب و زور، روی همه سالبخسار و غور،
کوه روانند نبید آرمای، کوه روانند بصنع خدای،
ده تن ازین قوم نگهبان من، واي برين حال پريشان من.

"The Empire's Lord, King of these realms so fair,
Prince Fakhrū'd-Dīn the Kurt, great Jamshīd's heir,
Had fetters fashioned for the culprit's heel
Most strongly wrought of iron and of steel.
Therewith my feet they bound by his command:
Bow to the will of him who rules the land!
The other captives all he did set free:
Of Heaven's wheel behold the tyranny!

1 This seems to point to the smoking of hemp, the hemp being compared to the emerald and the fiery pipe-bowl to the ruby casket.
Thus I myself in grievous fetters found,
As Ká'ús in Mázandarán was bound.
With feet in fetters, heart weighed down with care,
How long shall I in every sorrow share?
Nor men nor demons are my comrades here:
My soul cries out at such companions drear.
No heart on earth through them doth gladness feel:
Hard as their hearts no iron is, nor steel.
The Devil's but a joke when they are there;
Their pupil, only fit for blows, the bear.
Their custom is to hang, torment and bind;
Bloodshed and slaughter occupy their mind.
Their life-long work is outrage, curse and blow:
To Khaysár¹ and to Ghúr each year they go.
They're highland robbers all, in battle proved,
Themselves like mountains which God's power hath moved.
Ten of these wretches now control my fate:
Alas for my condition desolate!"

In another qaṣīda, composed during his imprisonment,
the poet says that he was thirty-one years of age at the
time of writing, and that of this period he had spent seventeen
years in the King's service and fourteen in the Holy San-
ctuaries (Mecca and Medina):

\[
\text{سُيُوُنََيْدُ ذَرْتُ زُعْمَرَ غَرَضَ اَلْحُرْمَٰثَانَ}\\
\text{هَفَّهُدَاءِ ذِرْخَمَتِ تَوْنَحَارَدَهِ ذِرْ بِتِّ حَرَمَ}.
\]

A third poem in the same strain and composed under
the same conditions (a mathnawī in this case) is also recorded
in the Mujmal, but all appeals were unavailing, and the
unfortunate poet died in prison, none knows in what manner.

Humámu'd-Dín of Tabrız is another poet of this period
who merits a brief mention. According to the
Mujmal he died in 714/1314, at the age of 116,
while a well-known anecdote² brings him into

¹ Khaysár is a fortress in Khurasán, not far from Herát (Yáqút, vol. ii, p. 507); and Ghúr a mountainous district in Afghánistán.
Perhaps, like Kalát-i-Nádírī at the present day, they were formerly used as penal settlements.
contact with the great Sa'dí (died 690/1291), with whom he engaged in a wordy duel, not conspicuous for refinement, in which he was signally worsted. No other particulars of his life are known to me, except that he also was one of the panegyrists of the Šāhīb Dīwān. The following specimens of his verse (which is said to have been greatly influenced by that of Sa'dí) are taken from the Haft Iqlīm.

"On the day of life’s surrender I shall die desiring Thee:
I shall yield my Spirit craving of thy street the dust to be.
On the Resurrection Morning, when I raise my head from sleep,
I shall rise desiring Thee, and forth to seek for Thee shall creep.
I will smell not blooms of Eden, nor of Heavenly Gardens speak,
Nor, desiring Thee alone, shall I Celestial Houris seek."

"When the parting from country and friends to my vision appears
The stages I tread are fulfilled with the flood of my tears.
In parting one moment, one breath like ten centuries seems:
How weary the days and the weeks and the months and the years!"

"On the day of life’s surrender I shall die desiring Thee:
I shall yield my Spirit craving of thy street the dust to be.
No other particulars of his life are known to me, except that he also was one of the panegyrists of the Šāhīb Dīwān. The following specimens of his verse (which is said to have been greatly influenced by that of Sa'dí) are taken from the Haft Iqlīm.

"On the day of life’s surrender I shall die desiring Thee:
I shall yield my Spirit craving of thy street the dust to be.
On the Resurrection Morning, when I raise my head from sleep,
I shall rise desiring Thee, and forth to seek for Thee shall creep.
I will smell not blooms of Eden, nor of Heavenly Gardens speak,
Nor, desiring Thee alone, shall I Celestial Houris seek."

"That day of parting seemed the Day of Doom:
How were it if our friendship had been less?
Make much, then, of your friends while they are here,
For this false sphere is fraught with faithlessness."

"Last night to tell my tale I did prepare
Unto my Friend, and forth from every hair
Flowed speech. Night passed, unended was my song;
Blame not the night; the tale was over-long!"

A good many other poets of this period, such as Afdal-i-Káshi, Athír-i-Awmáni, Sayfu’d-Dín-i-Isfarangi, Rafi’u’d-Dín-i-Abhari, Faríd-i-Āhwal ("the squint-eyed") and Nizári of Quhistán might be mentioned, did space allow, but as in most cases their works are inaccessible to me save in the brief extracts given by the biographers, it has seemed better to pass them over for the present. Of the last-named, however, a few words must be said, for a MS. of his poems (Or. 7909) has been acquired by the British Museum since the publication of the Supplement to the Persian Catalogue, and of this MS. a transcript was made for me in the autumn of 1913 by an Indian copyist, Mawlawí Isma’il ‘Alí. This transcript I desired because of the strong probability that Nizári belonged to the sect of the Isma’ílís, Maláhida, or Assassins, and I hoped that his poems might afford proof of this fact, and perhaps reveal a genius comparable to that of the one great Isma’ílí poet hitherto known, Násir-i-Khusraw¹. That Nizári of Quhistán belonged to the Isma’ílí sect is not merely suggested by his pen-name and place of origin, but is asserted or hinted at by most of the biographers. On the death of al-Mustansír, the eighth Fáṭímid or Isma’ílí Caliph (A.D. 1035–1094), there ensued a struggle for the succession between his two sons al-Musta’lí and Nizár², in which the latter lost his life and

² Ibid., pp. 199, 201, 203, 204, 206, etc.
his throne, but continued to be regarded by the Eastern or Persian Isma'îlîs (including the derived Syrian branch) as the legitimate Imâm. It was from him, no doubt, that the poet took his nom de guerre, for the other suggestion, that it was derived from the Persian adjective nizâr ("thin," "weak") is quite untenable. Quhistan, moreover, was a stronghold of the Assassins\(^1\), especially the towns of Qâyín and Birjand to which he particularly alludes in one of his poems, where he says:

"I am seated over my treasure, whether I be in Birjand or Qâyín; O Nizârî, henceforth, free and untroubled, thou hast the treasure of poverty and a safe corner.\(^2\)"

The MS. of Nizârî's poems alluded to above contains only ghazals or odes, and these, though spirited enough, appear for the most part to be of the usual Bacchanalian type, and to give little or no indication of the poet's religious views or general circumstances. It is in qaṣidas and mathnawîs that such indications are generally to be found, and, unfortunately, neither of these classes of poems are represented in the MS. in question. According to Sprenger\(^2\), Nizârî died in 720/1320, and left two mathnawîs, one of which, entitled Dastûr-nâma, he describes as "very witty and amusing," but I have never seen it. Nizârî's writings would probably repay further study.

In conclusion a few words must be said about Sultân Walad (or Veled, according to the Turkish pronunciation), the son and ultimately the spiritual successor of the great Mawláná Jalâlu’d-Dín Rûmî. He was born in Asia Minor at Lâranda (the modern Qaramán) in 623/1226 when his father was only nineteen years of age, and his proper name was Bahá’u’d-Dín Aḥmad.

\(^1\) See G. le Strange's *Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, pp. 354-5.

\(^2\) *Catalogue of the Library of the King of Oude*, vol. i, p. 524.
His best-known work is a *mathnawi* poem, entitled *Rababnáma* (the "Book of the Rebeck"), which, though mostly written in Persian, contains 156 verses in Turkish, which Gibb describes as "the earliest important specimen of West-Turkish poetry that we possess." These archaic verses have attracted the attention of Von Hammer, Wickerhauser, Bernhauer, Fleischer, Salemann and Radloff, and Gibb has very fully discussed them and their author in the first volume of his great *History of Ottoman Poetry*, pp. 149-163. "To Sultán Veled," he says (loc. cit., pp. 156-7), "belongs not only the honour due to the pioneer in every good work, but the credit which is justly his who successfully accomplishes an arduous enterprise. To have inaugurated the poetry of a nation is an achievement of which any man might be proud." Thus even so great an admirer of Turkish poetry as Gibb is constrained to admit that it chiefly owes its inception to a Persian, and is in fact, in a sense, a branch of Persian poetry, to which for five centuries and a half (A.D. 1300-1850) it owed its inspiration. At all events the rise of both the Ottoman State and Turkish literature belong to the period which we have discussed in this and the preceding chapters, and henceforth it will be necessary to allude to both with increasing frequency.

1 For references see Gibb's *Hist. of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. i, p. 157 ad calc. Radloff's article, which he does not mention, is entitled *Über Alt-Türkische Dialekte*. i. *Die Seldschukischen Verse im Rebabnáme*. It was published in 1890 in vol. x, Livraison 1, of the *Mélanges Asiatiques* at St Petersburg.
BOOK II.

FROM THE BIRTH TO THE DEATH OF TIMÚR-I-LANG, COMMONLY CALLED TAMERLANE.

(A.H. 736-807 = A.D. 1335-1405.)
CHAPTER IV.

THE PERIOD OF TÍMÚR.

The power of the Mongols in Persia practically came to an end on the death of Abú Sa‘íd (13 Rabí‘ II, A.H. 736 = Nov. 30, 1335), and some eight months later in the same year of the hijra (Shá‘bán 25 = April 8, 1336) was born Tímúr, called Lang (“the limping”), and generally known in the West as “Tamerlane,” who was destined to become in his turn almost as great a scourge to the Muslims of Western and Central Asia as Chíngíz Khán. The approximate coincidence of the death of the last great Mongol ruler of Persia with the birth of this new organizer of Tartar depredations has been remarked by the author of the Matla‘u’s-Sa‘dâyn, and makes this date a convenient starting-point for the period of seventy years which we are now about to consider; a period which, in spite of the anarchy wherewith it began and the bloodshed wherewith it ended, is remarkable alike for the quantity and the quality of the poets and writers which it produced. Of the former were Salmán of Sáwa, Khwájú of Kirmán, ‘Ubayd-i-Zákání, ‘Imád of Kirmán, ‘Aṣṣár of Tabríz, the two Jaláls, known respectively as ‘Aḍudí and Ṭábíb (“the physician”), Kamál of Khujand, Maghribí, Bushaq, Ibn-i-Yámín, and last but not least the incomparable Háfíz of Shíráz; of the latter were the historians of Tímúr, Nízám-i-Shámí and Sharafu’d-Dín ‘Alí Yazdí, and Muʿínu’d-Dín Yazdí, the historian of the House of Muẓaffar which perished at Tímúr’s hands, not to mention others who, though Persians, wrote chiefly in Arabic, such as the Sayyid-i-Sharíf of Jurján, Sa‘du’d-Dín Taftázání, and ‘Aḍudú’d-Dín al-Íjí.

1 See Rieu’s Persian Catalogue, p. 182.
Timur's first invasion of Persia took place in A.D. 1380, when he subdued Khurasan, Sistan and Mazandaran; his second in A.D. 1384-5, when he again invaded Mazandaran and extended his operations into Adharbayjan, 'Iraq-i-'Ajam and Georgia, finishing up with the subjugation of Shahriz and a massacre of 70,000 persons at Ispahan; and his third and last in A.D. 1392, when he again subdued Fars and extirpated the Muzaferi dynasty, having already destroyed the Sarbadars of Sabzawar (in 1381) and the Kurts of Herat (in 1389). During the 45 years succeeding Timur's birth and Abu Sa'id's death (A.D. 1335-1380) Persia was, however, left to its own devices, and was divided between four or five petty dynasties, of which the Muzaferis, ruling over Fars, 'Iraq-i-'Ajam and Kirkman, were the most important; then the Jalaiirs (or Il-khanis) of Baghdad and Adharbayjan; and lastly the Sarbadars of Sabzawar and the Kurts of Herat, both in the North-East. The history of these dynasties is very intricate, and, perhaps, hardly worth a detailed study; while the territories over which each held control were indeterminate, and their frontiers (if such existed) constantly shifting, and often—indeed generally—civil war prevailed between members of the same dynasty, and their heritage was divided among rival brothers or cousins. What is remarkable, however, is that it is precisely during such periods of anarchy and division of power that Persian literature has flourished most; so that, for example, while a dozen first-class poets lived in the brief period of 45 years now under discussion, the whole Safawi period, which in all lasted 234 years (A.D. 1502-1736), and in which Persia reached a degree of power, splendour and consolidation unequalled in modern times, hardly produced half that number of poets of more than local fame, though arts flourished and theology reached its zenith. The cause of this curious phenomenon will be further discussed when we come to speak of the Safawi period; but it would seem that the
existence of numerous small courts, rivals to one another, and each striving to outshine the others, was singularly favourable to the encouragement of poets and other men of letters, who, if disappointed or slighted in one city, could generally find in another a more favourable reception.

Before speaking of Tímůr, then, it is necessary to give some account of the petty dynasties which flourished in Persia during this half-century’s interregnum. Of these the Muẓaffarí were the most important, both on account of the position and extent of their realms, and by reason of the eminent poets—notably Háfiẓ of Shíráz—who frequented their courts. Next to them we may place the Jalá’irs or Íl-khání princes who ruled over Baghdád and Tabríz as the direct heirs of the shrunken Mongol power, and under whose ægis likewise many eminent poets flourished. The Sarbadárí (or Sarbadál) of Sabzawár seem to have held sway over a very restricted territory, and were in fact (as their name, “Head-on-the-gallows,” implies) little better than successful outlaws and highway-robbers; while the Kurts of Herát, though more civilized, greater patrons of letters, and more stable in character (they ruled for 144 years, from A.D. 1245 to 1389), were established in a domain which is no longer included in Persia, but now forms part of Afghánistán, and were themselves, perhaps, of Afgán or semi-Afghán descent. Of each of these dynasties some brief account must now be given.

**The Muẓaffarí.**

Apart from the general histories, such as the Rawḍatu’ís-Ṣafá, with which every student of Persian is familiar, there exists a monograph on the House of Muẓaffar by a contemporary scholar of some repute, Mu’īnu’d-Dín of Yazd, who was made professor at one of the colleges of Kirmán in 755/1354. This history exists only in manuscript, and I have been able to consult

---

1 See Rieu’s Persian Cat., p. 168, and Persian Suppl., p. 33.
it in an old copy belonging to the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge\(^1\), dated 778/1376-7, and, since January, 1917, in two MSS., one written in the author's life-time, from the library of the late Sir A. Houtum-Schindler. It comes down only to the year 767/1365-6, and so omits the last thirty years of the dynasty; and it is, moreover, written in a very stilted and artificial style. So difficult, indeed, was it that a certain Maḥmūd Kutbī, while engaged in transcribing the *Ta'rikh-i-Guzīda* in 823/1420, thought good to add to that history an independent account of the Muẓaffarī dynasty from his own pen. This account is contained in the *fac-simile* of an old MS. of the *Guzīda* published in the Gibb Memorial Series (vol. xiv, i, pp. 613-755)\(^2\), and carries the history of the dynasty down to its extinction in Rajab, 795 (May, 1393). This, and the account contained in the modern *Fārs-nāma-i-Nāsīrī* of Ḥājjī Mīrzā Ḥasan (pp. 49-66), have been chiefly used in compiling the following brief account of the dynasty, but I should like also to acknowledge my indebtedness to an excellent and most readable sketch of its history contained in the Introduction to Miss Gertrude Lowthian Bell's *Poems from the Divan of Hafiz*\(^4\) (pp. 8-28).

The ancestors of the House of Muẓaffar are said to have come to Persia from Arabia in the early days of the Muḥammadan conquest, and to have settled near Khwāf in Khurāsān, whence Amīr Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Ḥājjī Khurāsānī, the grandfather of Muḥarrīzū'd-Dīn Muḥammad, the first king of the dynasty, migrated to Yazd during the period of the Mongol invasion. One of his three sons, Abū Bakr, with 300 horsemen, accompanied Hūlāgū's expedition against Baghdād, and was subsequently killed in Egypt by Arabs of the Banū Khaḍāja tribe. His brother Muḥammad succeeded him as deputy to the Governor of Yazd, but died without issue. The third son,

---

1 Frank McClean Collection, No. 198.
2 See also Rieu's *Persian Cat.*, p. 82.
3 Lithographed at Tihrán in A.H. 1315/1895-6.
4 London: Heinemann, 1897.
Jalālu’-d-Dīn Manṣūr, lived at Maybud, near Yazd, and likewise left three sons, Sharafu’-d-Dīn Muẓaffar, Zaynu’-d-Dīn ‘Alī, and Mubārizu’-d-Dīn Muḥammad. The first is said to have been notified in a dream of the distinction to which his family was destined, and while still young distinguished himself by destroying a band of robbers from Fārs who were committing depredations in his province. In 685/1286 he went to Kirmān and entered the service of Sūrghatmish Qarā-Khitā’ī. Later he served the four Mongol sovereigns Arghūn, Gaykhatū, Ghazān and Uljāytū Khudā-banda, to the last-named of whom he was presented at Khānīqīn in 711/1311, and who conferred on him a more extensive government. He died in 713/1313, leaving to succeed him his son Mubārizu’-d-Dīn Muḥammad, then only thirteen years of age, who was confirmed in his father’s offices by Uljāytū (died Dec. 16, 1316). At the age of 29 he married as his second wife Bānū Jahān, the grand-daughter of Sūrghatmish. He had five sons, Sharafu’-d-Dīn Muẓaffar (born 725/1325, died of a wound in 754/1353); Shāh Shujā’ (born 733/1333); Qutbu’-d-Dīn Maḥmūd (born 737/1336); and two others named Aḥmad and Bāyazīd.

Mubārizu’-d-Dīn Muḥammad is generally reckoned the first of the Muẓaffarī dynasty, the duration of which, from his accession in A.D. 1313 to the extirpation of the dynasty by Tīmūr in A.D. 1393, covered a period of 80 years. His original government, as we have seen, was the little town of Maybud near Yazd, but in A.D. 1319 the latter town was added to his jurisdiction. In A.D. 1340 Kirmān also fell to his share, though the previous ruler, Qutbu’-d-Dīn, invoked and received help from the Kurt kings of Herāt, and offered a stubborn resistance. In A.D. 1353, after a still more prolonged struggle, he succeeded in wresting the province of Fārs with its capital Shīrāz from Abū Ishāq Injū, whose little son, ‘Alī Sahl, aged ten, was taken prisoner and cruelly put to death by Shāh Shujā’ at Rafsinjān. One of Mubārizu’-d-Dīn’s first measures was to enact severe laws against wine-drinking and other forms of
dissipation prevalent amongst the pleasure-loving Shirázís, concerning which his son Sháh Shujá‘ composed the following quatrain:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{در مجلس دهر ساز مستی بستت،} & \\
\text{نه چنانه قانون و نه دف بر مستی بستت،} & \\
\text{زنده تن هم ترک می پرستی کردن،} & \\
\text{جز محسوب شیر که بی می مستی بست.} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

"Closed are the taverns now throughout the land;
Zither and harp and tambourine are banned;
Banned is wine-worship to the libertine;
Only the proctor's\(^1\) drunk, though not with wine!"

In the following year, A.D. 1354, whether in consequence of this unpopular measure or not, Shíráz was seized by rebels against the Mużaffarís, but was soon retaken. About this time Mubárizu’d-Dín declared his allegiance to the titular Caliph al-Mu’taḍid\(^2\), whose name he caused to be inserted in the khutba. In A.D. 1357 Isfahán was attacked and ultimately taken, and its ruler Shaykh Abú Isháq Injú was captured, brought to Shíráz, and there put to death at Mubárizu’d-Dín’s command by Amír Quṭbu’d-Dín, the son of Sayyid Amír Hájji Ḥájjí Ḍárráb, who had suffered death by order of Abú Isháq. It is said that just before his death Abú Isháq recited the two following quatrains:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{افسس که مرغ عمرا دانه نبندد،} & \\
\text{و امید بیچ خوش و بیگانه نبندد.} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

\(^1\) The Muḥtaṣib, here rendered “proctor,” was an officer whose function it was to maintain public order and morality and ensure that the goods sold by tradesmen should both in quantity and quality maintain a proper standard.

After capturing Isfahán, Mubárizu’d-Dín marched on Tabrız, which also he occupied, after two engagements with the troops of Akhí Júq, whom his sons pursued as far as Nakhjuwán. Finally, however, his fortune turned against him, for his sons Mahmúd and Shuja', apprehensive of his intentions towards them, seized and blinded him when they reached Isfahán on the homeward march, and imprisoned him first in the castle of Tabarak and then in the Qal’a-i-Safid in Fárs, where he succeeded in winning over the warden to his interests. Some sort of reconciliation was eventually effected between him and his rebellious sons, but it did not long endure, and Mubárizu’d-Dín finally died in prison at Bam in Rabí’ 1 (December, 1363), at the age of sixty-five. 

1 His severity was such that, according to one of his intimates, Luṭfu'lláh b. Šadrú’d-Dín Iráqí (cited in the Fárs-náma-i-Náširi), he would often lay aside the Qur’án which he was reading to decapitate some criminal brought before him for judgement, and then calmly resume the perusal of the Sacred Book.

"No hope in kin or stranger doth remain,  
Nor to the bird of Life one single grain;  
Of all we said throughout our life, alas!  
Naught will survive us save an echo vain!"

"Depart and quarrel not with Fortune's spite;  
Depart, nor strive with circling Heaven's might:  
Drain with a smile the poison-cup of Death  
And pour libations ere you take your flight."
Shāh Shujā' (759–786 = 1357–1384).

Mubārizu’d-Dīn was succeeded by his son Shāh Shujā’, whose chief claim to fame is that he was the patron of the immortal Ḥāfīz. He himself was not devoid of poetic talent, and wrote verses both in Arabic and Persian, specimens of which are given by Maḥmūd Kutbī. Nor did his intellectual attainments end here: he knew the Qur’an by heart when he was nine years of age; could remember eight verses of Arabic poetry after hearing them read once; was famous for his epistolary style, wrote a fine hand, and was skilled in all martial exercises. He was also a great patron of men of learning, and at one time used to attend the lectures of Mawlānā Qiwāmu’d-Dīn, while he appointed the eminent Sayyid-i-Sharīf-i-Jurjānī professor in the Dārūsh-Shīfā College which he had founded at Shīrāz. Nor did his reign lack military glory of the somewhat barren kind prevalent at that time, for he retook Shīrāz from his brother Maḥmūd, who had ousted him from it by a trick, and Kirmān, which had been seized by Dawlatshāh; and, on the death of Sulṭān Uways Jalā’īr at Tabrīz in March, 1375, occupied not only that city, but also Nakhrjuwān, Qārabāgh, Awjān, Sulṭāniiyya, Shūshtar and even Baghdād, so that he became for a while the master of the greater part of Persia.

In his family relations he was not happier than the rest of his House. His brother Maḥmūd, who had strangled his wife, the daughter of Shaykh Abū Ishaq, about A.D. 1368, died in 1375 at the age of 38. On hearing of his death Shāh Shujā’ wrote the following quatrain:

محمود برادرم شد شیر مکین،
میکرد خصومت از پی تاج و نگین،
کردهم دو بخش تا بر آساید خلق،
او ور زمین گرفت و من روی زمین.

1 See pp. 683–4 of the fac-simile of an old MS. of the Tahrīkh-i-Guzīda published in the Gibb Series (vol. xiv, 1).
"My brother Mahmúd, lion-like crouched low,  
For crown and ring was my relentless foe.  
At length we shared the earth that men might rest:  
I took the surface, he the realm below."

He was also troubled by the real disloyalty of one son, Sulțán Uways, and the fancied disloyalty of another, Sulțán Shibli, whom in a fit of anger, intensified by drink, he caused to be blinded, and only repented of his rash act when it was too late. This happened in A.D. 1383, a year before his death, which took place on October 9, 1384, he being then 53 years of age and having reigned 27 years. On his death-bed he wrote a letter to the great Tímúr1, setting forth his devotion and loyalty, and commending to his care his sons and brothers, especially his successor Zaynu'l-Ábidín. How much effect this letter, with its admonitions that "loyalty to promises is a part of Faith," produced on Tímúr was shown nine years later when he made a massacre of the whole family. The body of Sháh Shujá was conveyed to Medína for burial, or, according to another account, buried in a place called Kúh-i-Chahil Magám (the "Mountain of Forty Stations") a little to the North-east of Shíráz. The date of his death is given by the chronogram: حيف ازه شجاع ("Alas for Sháh Shujá!") , the numerical equivalents of the component letters of which add up to (A.H.) 786 (= A.D. 1384).

Zaynu'l-Ábidín (786–789 = 1384–1387).

Zaynu'l-Ábidín's reign was both short and troubled, for not only was it marred by those family feuds and fratricidal strifes which were characteristic of this dynasty, but the menace of Tímúr and his Tartars hung ever more threateningly over the land. Soon after his accession Zaynu'l-Ábidín was attacked by his cousin Sháh Yahyá, and shortly after this arrived Tímúr's envoy Qutbú'd-Dín and required the insertion in the khutba

1 The text of this letter will be found on pp. 730–733 of the facsimile of the Ta'rikh-i-Guzida (Gibb Series, vol. xiv, i)
of his master's name, which was tantamount to recognizing him as over-lord. In 789/1387 Tímirú himself made his first entry into 'Iráq and Fárs. From Iṣfahán, which was governed by Majdu’d-Dín Muẓaffar, the uncle of Zaynu’d-Dín, he demanded a large sum of money, in collecting which his agents showed so harsh and arrogant a disposition that the inhabitants rose against them and killed them. Tímirú took a terrible revenge on them, for he ordered a general massacre, in which 70,000 persons⁴ are said to have perished. He then advanced on Shíráz, but Zaynu’l-‘Abidín did not await his arrival, and fled to Shúshtar, where he was treacherously seized by his cousin Sháh Maṉṣúr, who thereupon marched to Shíráz and drove out his brother Yahyá, who fell back on Yazd. The next six years (A.D. 1387–1393) passed in continual strife between the three Muẓaffarí princes Sháh Maṉṣúr (who reigned over Fárs and Iṣfahán), his brother Sháh Yahyá (who ruled at Yazd), and his cousin Sháh Ahmád (who held Kírmán), until in 795/1393 Tímirú for the second time descended on these distracted provinces. He first took the Qal’a-i-Safíd (“White Castle”), killed the garrison, and released and restored to the throne Zaynu’l-‘Abidín, and then continued his march on Shíráz, whence Sháh Maṉṣúr fled to Pul-i-Fásá. Of some of the Shírází who had followed him thither he enquired what the people of Shíráz were saying of him. “Some say,” they replied, “that those who wielded maces weighing ten maunds and carried quivers weighing seventeen maunds have fled like goats before a pack of wolves and have left their families as an easy prey to the foe.” On hearing this Sháh Maṉṣúr, moved alike by shame and compassion, resolved to go back to Shíráz and face the inevitable death which a conflict with Tímirú’s hosts involved. He had with him only 3000 men, of whom 2000 fled soon after the battle began, while the Tartar army “were

¹ This is the number given in the Fárs-náma-i-Náṣirí, but the Ta’rikh-i-Guzida (p. 739 of fac-simile) raises the number to 200,000.
more numerous than ants and locusts,” yet with such valour and desperation did he engage the enemy that more than once he forced his way almost to within striking distance of Timur, until at last, wounded in the neck and shoulder, he turned in flight towards Shíráz. He was overtaken by some of Sháh Rukh’s soldiers, who dragged him from his horse and severed his head from his body. The year of his death (795/1393) is given by the chronogram "he relinquished the kingdom”\(^1\). The other Mužaffarí princes (Ahmad ‘Imádu’d-Dín and Sulțán Mahdí, son of Sháh Shujá’, from Kirmán; Nuşratu’d-Dín Sháh Yahyá and his sons Mu'izzu’d-Dín Jahángír and Sulțán Muḥammad from Yazd; and Sulțán Abú Isháq, son of Sulțán Uways, son of Sháh Shujá’, from Sírján) surrendered themselves to Timur and were at first treated honourably, but were finally put to death at Qumishah, a little to the south of Isfahán, on Rajab 10, 795 (May 22, 1393), a date commemorated in the following verses:

```
bebāralt nūzūr ḵān bālā mūstaqf
Shāh-náy ká ḵow̄ āz slāṭīn robdan;
ḵeh e ḥīstād w pānah w tawṣīhīn zehjart;
Deh māw zap māw rāmā pūn̄ gūndan;
Ḵo ḵomā baˈnā dar zūmāna bīrshand;
Ḵo tā́r̄e bāndak zūmānī gūndan;
```

Only two were spared, Zaynu’l-‘Abídín and Shiblí, both of whom had been blinded, the one by his cousin Mansúr, the other by his father Sháh Shujá’. These were taken by Timur to Samarqand, his capital, where they spent the remainder of their days in tranquillity. So ended the Mužaffarí dynasty, which for eighty years had held sway over the greater part of southern and central Persia. Several of their princes

\(^1\) This works out at \(40 + 30 + 20 + 5 + 300 + 400 = 795\).
were distinguished alike by their taste and their talents, and their patronage of learning and letters drew to their court not only numerous poets of distinction, including the incomparable Háfiz, but savants such as ‘Aḍūdu’d-Dīn al-Ījī and Mu‘īnū’d-Dīn Yazdī. Materiaily they did little to benefit their subjects, save for the building of a few colleges; while even in Eastern history it would be difficult to find a household so divided against itself and so disposed to those fratricidal wars and savage mutilations or destruction of their kinsmen which constitute the greater part of their history.

**The Jalá’irs, Íl-khánís, or Ílkánís.**

During the period of the disruption of the Mongol Empire two Shaykh Ḥasans play a prominent part, the one known as “the Great” (Buṣurg), the other as “the Little” (Kūchak). The latter was the grandson of the great Amír Chúbán, whose power and influence were still further increased by his marriage in 719/1319 with Sáṭí Beg, the daughter of Úljáytú and sister of Abú Sa‘íd, who bore him three sons, besides the six sons and one daughter (Baghdád Khátún) born to him by another wife. Of these ten children the most celebrated were Amír Ḥasan, Timúr-Tásh, Dimashq Khwája, and Baghdád Khátún. Amír Ḥasan and his three sons, Tálish, Hájji Beg and Ghúch Husayn, all died violent deaths about 727–8/1327–8. Timúr-Tásh rebelled and fled to Egypt, where he was at first well received by al-Malik an-Násir, who, however, becoming alarmed at his increasing influence and evident ambition, put him to death in 728/1328. He was the father of the above-mentioned Shaykh Ḥasan-i-Kūchak (“the Little”), also called after his grandfather “Chúbání,” and of Malik-i-Ashraf. Dimashq Khwája, the third of Amír Chúbán’s sons, was put to death by Abú Sa‘íd in 727/1327 (a year very fatal to this family)

---

1 Concerning the Jalá’irs, a tribe cognate to the Mongols, see the *History of the Moghuls of Central Asia* by N. Elias and E. Denison Ross (London, 1898), p. 88*. 

---

*The Jalá’ir or Ílkání Dynasty*
on a charge of carrying on an intrigue with one of the widows of the late king Úljáytú. His daughter Dilshád Khátún and her aunt Baghdád Khátún were both ladies of considerable note, and, extraordinary as it appears, both were married at one time in their lives to the Sul táñ Abú Sa'íd and at another to the rival Shaykh Hasan, called “the Great” (Buzurg). Baghdád Khátún is said to have been remarkable for her beauty, and was married in 723/1323 to Shaykh Hasan-i-Buzurg; but unfortunately Abú Sa'íd saw her, was smitten by her charms, and conceived so violent a passion for her that in 727/1325 he compelled her husband to divorce her so that he might marry her himself. On Abú Sa'íd's death in 736/1335-6 and the elevation to the throne of Arpa, she was put to death privily by the new Sultan on suspicion of having poisoned her late husband, and Shaykh Hasan-i-Buzurg compensated himself by appropriating the late monarch's other widow Dilshád Khátún. She bore him Sul táñ Uways, whose power she subsequently shared, and, like him, was the subject of many panegyrics on the part of the poet Salmán of Sáwa.

Shaykh Hasan “the Great” was the son of Husayn, the son of Áq-Búghá, the son of Aydakán, and claimed descent from Húlágu, whence, I suppose, the title of Ílkání (ایلخانی, Íl-khání, though probably a mere variant of it) by which, as well as Jalá'ír (the tribal name) the dynasty was known. For about eight years (736-744/1335-1343) after the death of Abú Sa'íd the history of Persia consists largely in the struggles and intrigues of these two houses (of Chúbán and Jalá'ír) for the supreme power, their ambitions being thinly masked by the puppet-princes of the race of Húlágu whom they successively raised to a nominal and generally very

The author of the Habibu’s-Siyar, Khwándamír, endeavours to explain the illegality of Abú Sa'íd's marriage with Baghdád Khátún and her niece Dilshád Khátún by assuming that he divorced the former before marrying the latter. He also asserts that Baghdád Khátún avenged this slight by poisoning Abú Sa'íd.
brief sovereignty. By 737/1337 Shaykh Hasan-i-Buzurg was in possession of Baghdád and Tabríz, the two capitals of the Mongol Íl-kháns and afterwards of the Jalá'írs, who would therefore appear to have represented most directly the older dynasty; but his tenure only became relatively secure on Rajab 27, 744 (Dec. 15, 1343), when his rival Shaykh Hasan-i-Kúchak was murdered by his unfaithful wife in a very horrible manner, which nevertheless called forth a savage and untranslatable epigram from Salmán of Sáwa, the panegyrist of the Jalá'írs, of which the text has been already given on p. 60, supra.

The Jalá'ír or Íl-khání dynasty founded by Shaykh Hasan-i-Buzurg endured for some 75 years, and, though much harassed by Tímúr during the last fifteen or twenty years of its existence, was never entirely crushed by him like the Mużaffarí. Shaykh Hasan and his son Shaykh Uways, whose mother was Dilshád Khátún, each reigned about twenty years (A.H. 736 or 737 to 757 and A.H. 757 to 776 respectively); and all three seem to owe much of their fame and good repute to their indefatigable panegyrist Salmán of Sáwa, most of whose poems are consecrated to their praise. The portrait of them presented by most historians and biographers is therefore a very flattering one, and, though their virtues may have been exaggerated, there seems no reason to believe that it is altogether unfounded. After the death of Sultán Uways, however, on the 2nd of Jumáda I, 776 (Oct. 9, 1374), the fortunes of the dynasty began to decline. On that same day the late ruler's eldest son Hasan was put to death by the nobles, and the younger son Husayn was placed on the vacant throne at Tabríz, whence he was driven out, after a successful war with the Turkmáns, for a space of four months by Sháh Shujá' the Mużaffarí. Shortly after this his authority was resisted by his brother 'Alí, and finally in Safar, 784 (April-May, 1382), he was killed by another brother, Aḥmad, who in turn was proclaimed king, and became involved almost immediately in a fratricidal conflict with yet another
brother named Bayazid. A partition of the kingdom was finally effected, Adharbáyján being assigned to Ahmad and ‘Iráq to Bayazid, but soon fresh conflicts occurred between the two brothers in which the aid of Sháh Mansúr the Mu’áffarí was invoked first by one and then by the other. These undiying squabbles were brought to an end by the approach of Tímúr’s army, which, after a protracted resistance on the part of Ahmad, finally compelled him and Qará-Yúsuf the Turkmán to seek refuge with the Turkish Sultán Bayazid, known as Yıldırím, “the Thunder-bolt.” Thence they passed to Egypt, the ruler of which country was preparing to make his peace with Tímúr by surrendering them to him when, fortunately for them, news arrived that that sanguinary conqueror was dead. Shortly afterwards Ahmad’s bad faith led to a rupture between him and Qará-Yúsuf, who defeated him near Tabríz on the 25th of Rabí‘ II, 812 (Sept. 6, 1409). The same night he was captured and put to death, after a troubled and turbulent reign of twenty-seven years, by his conqueror, and with him practically ended the İl-khání or Jalá’ír dynasty, though its final extinction at the hands of the Qará-qoyúnlu or “Black Sheep” Turkmáns did not take place until a year or two later.

The Kurts¹.

We pass now to the Kurt dynasty which ruled over extensive territories in the N.E. of Persia and the adjacent countries with their capital at Herát. The most detailed account of them which I have met with is contained in a still unpublished history of Herát entitled Rawdátu‘l-Jannát fi ta‘rikhi madinat Herát (“Gardens of Paradise: on the history of the city of Herát”), composed by Mawláná Mu‘ín of Isfízár. This history, which comes down to the year 875/...
1473–4 or thereabouts, is based on the older works of Abū Ishaq Ahmad b. Yā-Sīn; Shaykh ‘Abdu’r-Raḥmān Fāmī; Sayfī of Herāt; and the Kurt-nāma of Rabī’i of Būshanj; and is divided into 26 Rawdās (“Gardens”), each containing two or more Chimans (“Parterres”). Of these, Rawdās vii–x deal with the period and dynasty now under review. I am indebted to Mr A. G. Ellis, Assistant Librarian of the India Office, for the loan of an excellent ms. of this work, transcribed in 1073/1662–3 and superior in accuracy and legibility to either of the British Museum codices. Another work which supplies some useful information about this dynasty is the very rare Mujmal of Faṣīḥi of Khwāf, from which the poems of Rabī’i cited in the last chapter are taken. Some account of the dynasty is, of course, also contained in all general histories of Persia of a later date, such as the Rawdatu’s-Safā, Ḥabibu’s-Siyar, Maṭla’u’s-Sa’dayn, etc.

The ancestor of the Kurts was a certain Ţāju’d-Dīn ‘Uthmān-i-Marghini, whose brother, ‘Īzzu’d-Dīn ‘Umar-i-Marghini, was the powerful Wazīr of Sultān Ghiyāṭu’d-Dīn Muḥammad-i-Ghūrī (d. 599/1202–3). Ţāju’d-Dīn was made Warden of the Castle of Khaysār, and on his death his son, Malik Ruknu’d-Dīn Abū Bakr, married the daughter of the above-mentioned Sultān. Their son Shamsu’d-Dīn succeeded his father in 643/1245–6, joined Sālī Noyan in an invasion of India in the following year, and met the great Shaykh Bahā’u’d-Dīn Zakariyyā (the spiritual director of the poet ‘Īrāqī) at Multān in 645/1247–8. Later he visited the Mongol ruler Mangū Qā’ān (646–655/1248–1257) who placed under

---

1 Rabī’i, called Khaṭīb, of Būshanj, was killed, according to the Mujmal of Faṣīḥi, in 702/1302–3. He was court-poet to Fakhrū’l-Dīn Kurt.

2 Add. 22380 and Or. 4106.

3 See p. 150 supra, ad calc., where the MSS. are enumerated. The St Petersburg MS. is No. 271 of the Institut des Langues Orientales du Ministère des Affaires Etrangères. See Baron Victor Rosen’s Manuscrits Persans, pp. 111–113.
his sway Herát, Jám, Búshanj, Ghúr, Khaysár, Fírúz-Kúh, Gharjistán, Murgháb, Merv, Fáryáb (up to the Oxus), Isfízár, Faráh, Sístán, Kábúl, Tíráh, and Afghánistán up to the Indus. In 662/1263–4, after having subdued Sístán, he visited Húlágu, and three years later his successor Abáqá, whom he accompanied in his campaign against Darband and Bákú. He again visited Abáqá, accompanied by Shamsu’d-Dín the Șáhib Diwán, in 675/1276–7, and this time the former good opinion of the Mongol sovereign in respect to him seems to have been changed to suspicion, which led to his death, for he was poisoned in Sha’bán, 676 (January, 1278), by means of a water-melon given to him while he was in the bath at Tabríz. Abáqá even caused his body to be buried in chains at Jám in Khurásán. Mawláná Wajíhu’d-Dín Nasafí commemorated the date of his death in the following verses:

بِسْالِ شَشْدَ وَ هُفتادُ وَ شَش مِهْ شَعْبَانُ
قضاً ز مُصْحَفِ دُوران قِوُ بِناَکْریسَتُ بِفَالُ
بنامِ صَفِدرِ اِیرانیان مُحمَّدُ حُدَّرُتُ
بر آمَد آیتَ وَ آَلِشَهْشَسُ حُوْرُتُ” در حَالٍ

The allusion is to the verse in the Qur’án (sūra lxxxı, 1) “When the sun is rolled up,” for the title of the deceased ruler, Shamsu’d-Dín, signifies the Sun of the Faith.

The title of Malik (which means King in Arabic, but in Persia at this period meant no more than Prince or Amír) seems to have been first taken by Ruknu’d-Dín, but already the Shaykh Thiqatu’d-Dín Fámi had given the higher title of Sháh to his uncle ‘Izzu’d-Dín ‘Umar in the following verse:

اِیَام شِد مِسَاعد وَ امیدْ شِد غَنیٌ
در عَدَد عَرَی دِن عَسْر آن شَاهْ مَرغُنیٌ
فرخنده خَسَوَی کَه زَکَحَل سَخگُای اوٌ
دارد هَمِیشَه دیدهُ حَاجَات رَوشْنیٌ

Shamsu’d-Dín poisoned
The title of Malik was, however, that borne by all the succeeding members of this house.

Shamsu'd-Dīn was succeeded in 677/1278–9 by his son Ruknu'd-Dīn, who thereupon assumed his father's title with the adjective Kihīn ("the Younger"). He died at Khaysār on Safar 12, 705 (Sept. 3, 1305), but seems at a much earlier date to have been practically set aside by his son Fakhru'd-Dīn, who, having been imprisoned by his father for seven years, was released at the intercession of the Mongol general Nawrūz, whom he ill requited by betraying him in 696/1296–7 to Ghāzān Khān, against whom Nawrūz had revolted. Three years later Fakhru'd-Dīn himself fought against Ghāzān's brother Khudā-banda, who succeeded Ghāzān in 705/1305–6, and in the following year sent an army of 10,000 men under Dānīshmand Bahādur against Herāt, of which the fortifications had been greatly strengthened by Fakhru'd-Dīn. Dānīshmand was, however, killed by a treacherous stratagem after he had been allowed to occupy Herāt, together with many of his men, and Fakhru'd-Dīn then returned from Amān-Kūh, whither he had fled, and reoccupied the city. Soon afterwards he died on Sha'ban 22, 706 (Feb. 26, 1307). He was a great patron of literature. Sayfī says that forty poets of note were his panegyrists, and that he himself had composed eighty qaṣīdas and one hundred and fifty muqaddaṭtāt in his praise. On the other hand his rule was austere: he forbade women to walk abroad, and sternly repressed wine-drinking and public mourning.

Fakhru'd-Dīn was succeeded by his brother Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn, who soon afterwards had a quarrel with his brother 'Alā'ū'd-Dīn, and went to lay his case before the Mongol sovereign Khudā-banda, who accorded him a gracious reception. On his return to Herāt in 708/1308–9 he extended his power over Ghūr, Khaysār and Isfīzār. 'Alā'ū'd-Dīn Hindū's intrigues against him compelled him again to visit Shāh Khudā-banda in
714/1314–15, and it took him some time, aided by the intercession of Shaykh Núru'd-Dín 'Abdu'r-Rahmán of Isfará'in, to regain that monarch’s confidence. On his return he was confronted first, in 718/1318–19, with an invasion of Khurásán by Prince Yasúr1 the Nikúdarí and, in the following year, with the hostility of Qutbu'd-Dín of Isfízár and the people of Sístán, on which latter war Púr-i-Bahá of Isfízár has the following verses:

شاهَا دَخْرُ بهُ يُشِمِّي سِيِّدِان سِیِّدان

آهَنَكِ جَنَّكِ لِشْكَرِ ایْرَانِیاً مَکِنَّ

رِيش و بِروت بِش بَیت اهْل سِیِّدان

زنَار تَکِیه بَر نَبِد و رَیْسِان مَکِنَّ

"O King, do not again, supported [only] by the weak Sístánís,
Venture to give battle to the army of the Persians.
The people of Sístán are nothing more than beards and moustaches;
Beware lest thou relyance on felt and cords!"

In 720/1320 Prince Yasúr was killed and the Nikúdarí dispersed, and in Rajab of that year (August, 1320) Ghiyáthu'd-Dín set out to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca, leaving his son Malik Shamsu'd-Dín Muhammad to act as Viceroy. In 729/1329 Ghiyáthu'd-Dín died, leaving four sons, the above Shamsu'd-Dín who succeeded him; Ḥáfíz and Mu'izzu'd-Dín who successively ascended the throne; and Báqír.

On the date of Shamsu'd-Dín's accession the following Arabic chronogram was composed by Jamálu'd-Dín Muḥammad ibn Ḥusám:

أَضَاءَتْ بُشْمُضِ الْدِّینِ كُرْتُ رَمَّانًا وَ أُجِرَى فِي بَحْرِ الرُّجَادَاتِ فِلْهُ

وَ مِنْ عَجَابِ تَأْرِخٍ مِّنَّا مَلَکَهُ يَوَاَفِقُ قُوَّةَ الْنَّاسِ خَلْدِ مَلِکَهُ

The words Khullída mulkühú ("May his rule be eternalized!") give, according to the abjad reckoning, the date 729; but unhappily so slight was their appropriateness that

1 See Howorth's Hist. of the Mongols, Part iii, pp. 590–1.

B. P.
Shamsu'd-Dīn died two months after his accession, and was succeeded by his brother Ḥāfiz, who in turn, after a brief and troubled reign of about two years, was succeeded by the third brother Abu'l-Ḥusayn Malik Mu'izzu'd-Dīn.

The accession of Mu'izzu'd-Dīn in 732/1331 almost synchronized with three important events, the death of Abú Sa'īd (which practically marked the end of the Mongol dominion over Persia); the birth of Tīmūr; and the rise of the Sarbadār Dynasty.

**The Sarbadārs.**

The history of this dynasty, so far as it need be discussed here, may well be considered in connection with that of the Kurts. It is well summarized by Stanley Lane-Poole, who says that they held Sabzawār and the neighbouring district for nearly half a century, "during which period twelve successive chiefs assumed the command, nine of whom suffered violent deaths." It may be added that no one of them reigned more than six or seven years, and that they were enthusiastic adherents of the Shi'a doctrine, while in Nīshāpūr and Herát the Sunnī doctrine predominated. Nevertheless Khwája 'Alí Mu'ayyad, the last of the line, succeeded in taking Bīstām and Farhādjird and winning over Nīshāpūr, which, however, was recaptured by the Kurts in 777/1375-6. The revolt which gave rise to this dynasty—if such it can be called—took place on Sha'bān 12, 737 (March 16, 1337), when Amīr 'Abdu'r-Razzāq of Bayhaq, a disciple of Shaykh Ḥusayn Jūrī (whose murids or disciples formed an important element in the forces of this little kingdom) first raised the standard of rebellion, saying, "A gang of evil-doers dominates and oppresses the people. By God's grace we will do away with the oppression of these tyrants, failing which we will see our heads on the gibbet (sar-ba-dār), since we can no longer endure these tyrannical aggressions," and it

1 *Mohammadan Dynasties*, p. 251.
was to this expression that the dynasty owed its name. One notable poet, Ibn-i-Yamín, is associated with the Sarbadárs, but after the battle of Záwa, in which Shaykh Husayn Júrí was killed and the Sarbadár forces routed, he fell into the hands of Malik Mu'izzu'd-Dín Kurt, by whom he was well received and treated with honour.

Mu'izzu'd-Dín Kurt reigned for forty years, not ingloriously, though not without occasional acts of barbarity which were, unhappily, characteristic of that time, as when, after the capture of Bádghís, he erected, in the style later made familiar by Tímúr, two towers or minarets of the heads of his enemies. Finally he sickened and died in 771/1369-70, a date expressed in the following chronogram:

\[
\text{آنرا كه جبال َي دا َعا َچو َبِر َزني َيِك َنقطه،}
\]

He was buried at Herát by the side of the Ghúrí monarch Súltán Ghiyáthu'd-Dín Muḥammad Sám and of his own father Ghiyáthu'd-Dín Muḥammad-i-Kurt, and was succeeded by his son Ghiyáthu'd-Dín Pír 'Alí.

It was about this time that the shadow of Tímúr (Tamerlane) began to fall over the land, but as usual his first advances were of a friendly character, and he gave his niece Sevinj Qutluq Ághá in marriage to Ghiyáthu'd-Dín Pír 'Alí's son Pír Muḥammad in or about the year 778/1376. Five years

---

1 The original words (Rawdátu'l-Jannât, Mr Ellis's MS., f. 147) are as follows:

\[
\text{جمِعِى مفسَدان مستِيلا يائِته بِر خَلاَيق سَتیر ميْكنَد،} \\
\text{اَکْرِ توقيَّت} \\
\text{ياْبيَر} \\
\text{دَفع ظالمٍ نتائِىَل مَانَيمٍ و آلَ سر خودَ بِر دار بنيَمَر كه} \\
\text{ديُم} \\
\text{تحَمل تعدَّى ظالمٍ نداريِم، بدين سيب ايشاَنارا سردار لقب شد.}
\]
later, in the spring of A.D. 1381, early in his first Persian campaign, Tímúr occupied Herát, placed it and the adjacent territories under the control of his son Mirán-sháh, and carried off the Kurt ruler Ghiyáthu’d-Dín Pír ‘Alí and his eldest son Pír Muhammad to Samarqand, where he imprisoned them, while two other members of the family, Amír Ghúrí and Malik Muhammad, were similarly imprisoned at Andakán. Soon afterwards, however, an abortive rebellion at Herát in A.D. 1389 furnished their captor with an excuse for putting them to death, and so ended the Kurt dynasty, a year after the extinction of their rivals the Sarbadárs.

Amongst the four dynasties whose history has been briefly sketched above was Persia for the most part divided when, in the last quarter of the eighth century of the hijra and the fourteenth of the Christian era, Tímúr burst upon the land and ravaged it as Chingíz Khán had done some hundred and fifty years before. Between the two Central Asian conquerors there are many points of resemblance; both had to begin by consolidating their power and destroying rivals amongst their own people; both had passed the age of forty when they embarked on their invasions of Persia; and both were responsible for incalculable bloodshed and suffering. Two circumstances chiefly differentiate them, the fact that Chingíz Khán was a heathen while Tímúr was, in name at least, a Muhammadan; and the fact that, while Chingíz Khán was confronted with the great empire of the Khwárazmsháhs, Tímúr found Persia, as we have seen, parcelled out amongst a number of petty rulers whose dominions had no fixed frontiers, and who were constantly at war with one another and even with ambitious members of their own families. That Tímúr was a Muhammadan certainly tended to mitigate in some measure, so far as Persia and other Muslim lands were concerned, a natural savagery not inferior to that of Chingíz, for he at least showed more respect for
TÍMÚR
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shrines and sacred edifices, and for men reputed holy or learned. Yet we must not be misled by panegyrist like Sharafu’d-Dín ‘Alí Yazdí, author of the Zafar-náma ("Book of Victory")¹, who wrote under the patronage and for the pleasure of the conqueror; though we need not, on the other hand, endorse all the abusive language employed by the Arabic writer Aḥmad ibn ‘Arabsháh in his ‘Ajá’ibu’l-Maqdúr fl’ akhdbári Timúr ("Marvels of Destiny in the History of Timúr")², where the conqueror is habitually described as "this traitor," "this criminal," "this mad dog," and the like. But Sharafu’d-Dín’s fulsome flattery is less tolerable than Ibn ‘Arabsháh’s abuse, for though he is unable to omit all mention of Timúr’s massacres and pyramids of skulls, he does not scruple to declare³ that "his generous personality manifested the boundless grace of God, while the purest virtue and philanthropy were concealed in his light-seeking mind; and such acts of wrath and retribution as were ostensibly committed in the initial stages [of his conquests] by some of his world-endowed followers and partisans, as will be presently set forth, were prompted only by the exigencies of conquest and the necessities of world-empire." As specimens of those acts mention may be made of his massacre of the people of Sístán in 785/1383–4, when he caused some two thousand prisoners to be built up in a wall; his cold-blooded slaughter of a hundred thousand captive Indians near Dihlí in 801 (December, 1398); his burying alive of four thousand Armenians in 803/1400–1, and the twenty towers of skulls erected by him at Aleppo and Damascus in the same year; and his massacre of 70,000 of the inhabitants of Isfahán in 789 (November, 1387), to quote only a few out of many similar instances of his callous indifference to bloodshed and human suffering. Sir John

¹ Published in two volumes at Calcutta in the Bibliotheca Indica Series in 1887–8. This history, which comprises in this edition some 1560 pages, is prolix, tedious, florid and fulsome.
² Published at Leyden, 1636; Calcutta, 1818; Cairo, A.H. 1285, etc.
Malcolm's judgements of Tīmūr will command the assent of all fair-minded students not blinded by a misplaced hero-worship of great conquerors, such as Alexander, Chingíz, Tīmūr or Napoleon, who deemed no price of human suffering too great for the gratification of their ambitions. "Such a leader as Timour," says Malcolm, in his excellent History of Persia, "must have been idolized by his soldiers; and, with an army of six or seven hundred thousand men attached to his person, he was careless of the opinion of other classes in the community. The object of this monarch was fame as a conqueror; and a noble city was laid in ashes, or the inhabitants of a province massacred, on a cold calculation that a dreadful impression would be made which would facilitate the purposes of his ambition. He pretended to be very religious, was rigid in performing his sacred duties, and paid attention to pious men; who, in return for his favour, used to assure him that God had given the countries of other monarchs to his victorious sword. The parade which he made of these prophecies proves that he either believed in them, or that he thought they might produce an effect favourable to his designs."

"From what has been said," observes this judicious historian a little further on, "we may pronounce that Timour, though one of the greatest of warriors, was one of the worst of monarchs. He was able, brave and generous; but ambitious, cruel and oppressive. He considered the happiness of every human being as a feather in the scale, when weighed against the advancement of what he deemed his personal glory; and that appears to have been measured by the number of kingdoms which he laid waste, and the people that he destroyed. The vast fabric of his power had no foundation, it was upheld by his individual fame; and the moment that he died, his empire dissolved. Some fragments of it were seized by his children: but it was in India alone that they retained dominion for any length of time. In that country we yet perceive a faint and expiring

1 London, 1815, pp. 482-3.  
2 Op. laud., p. 484.
trace of the former splendour of the Moghul dynasty; a
pageant, supported by the British nation, still sits upon a
throne at Delhi; and we view in him the gradual decline
of human greatness, and wonder at the state to which a few
centuries have reduced the lineal descendants of the great
Timur.”

Besides the two histories of Timur already mentioned,
the Persian Zafar-náma of Sharafu’Din ʿAlí Yazdí and
the Arabic ‘Ajá’ibu’l-Maqdúr of Ibn ʿArabsháh,
there exists a third contemporary history, un-
published, and, so far as is known, represented
only by the unique MS. Add. 23,980 of the British Museum.
This history, also written in Persian, and also entitled
Zafar-náma, was undertaken at Timúr’s command in 804/
1401–2 by Nizám-i-Shámi, and was concluded and presented
to Timúr in 806/1403–4, just a year before his death.
The author was living in Baghdád when it was taken by
Timúr in 795/1393, and was the first person who came out
to greet him. “God have mercy on thee,” said Timúr, “for
thou wert the first person to come forth from this city before
me!”

This history, conciser and less florid than the
homonymous work of Sharafu’Dín, appears to deserve
publication, and seems to have formed the basis of the later
work. In writing this chapter I have had at my disposal
not only my own brief notes on its contents, taken during
spare hours in the British Museum, but also a complete
transcript made for me by my friend Dr Aḥmad Khán.

Reference must also be made to the so-called “Memoirs”
and “Institutes” of Timúr (Mafṣúzát and Tuzúkát-i-Tímúr),
which, though translated into English from the
Persian and widely quoted and used by Euro-
pean writers, are now generally, and I think
properly, regarded by the best judges as apocry-

1 Sir John Malcolm’s History was published in 1815, long before
the Indian Mutiny, which led, among other results, to the final ex-
tinction of the dynasty of Timúr, commonly known as the “Great
Moghuls.”

2 MS., f. 99.
The Persian version of this book was first produced in the seventeenth century of our era, in the reign of Sháh Jahán (1628–1659), by a certain Abú Tálib al-Ḥusaynî, who professed to have translated it from a Turkí original discovered by him in the library of a certain Jaʿfar Páshá, governor of Yaman (Arabia Felix). Of the existence of this Turkí original no evidence whatever exists save this statement of Abú Tálib’s, and it appears much more likely that he himself compiled the Persian work, in imitation of Bábur’s² authentic autobiography, with the aid of the Záfar-náma and other histories of Tímúr. A manuscript of this work was brought to England by Major Davy in 1779, and on his death in 1784 passed into the possession of his son. In 1779 he wrote to Dr White, then Laudian Professor of Arabic in the University of Oxford, a high appreciation of this book and a vehement defence of its authenticity³, and in 1783 both the text and translation of the “Institutes” were published in collaboration by these two. In 1787 Professor Langlès produced a French translation with the following cumbersome title: *Instituts politiques et militaires de Tamerlan, proprement appelé Timour, écrits par lui-même en Mongol, et traduits en Français, sur la version Persane d’Abou-Taleb Al-Hosseini, avec la Vie de ce Conquérant, d’après les meilleurs Auteurs Orientaux, des Notes, et des Tables Historique, Géographique, &c.* In 1830 Major Charles Stewart published an English translation of the *Malfúzát* or [pseudo] autobiographical Memoirs.

Not only as one of the greatest conquerors the world has ever seen, but as the ancestor of the so-called Moghul dynasty in India, Tímúr has attracted the attention of many

¹ See Rieu’s *Pers. Cat.*, pp. 177–180, where several very cogent reasons against the authenticity of the book are given.

² That this, not Bábár, is the correct form has been shown by Sir E. Denison Ross, in his interesting article on *A Collection of Poems by the Emperor Bábür* published on Oct. 26, 1910, as an extra number to vol. vi of the *J. A. S. of Bengal*, pp. iv–vi of the *Introduction*.

European (especially English) as well as Asiatic historians, and has furnished a subject for many writers. For the purposes of this book, in which the historical portion of the subject is necessarily subordinated to the literary, it will be sufficient to give a brief sketch of his career, based chiefly on the Zafar-náma and Ibn 'Arabsháh, especially that portion of it which is connected with Persia.

Timúr (a name which in Turkish signifies "Iron") was born at Kash in Transoxiana on Sha'bán 28, 736 (April 11, 1336). As usual in the case of men who afterwards became famous, attempts are made by his panegyrists on the one hand to affiliate him (through Qaráchár Noyán) to the Mongol Royal House of Chingíz Khán, and on the other to surround his birth with all manner of portents indicative of his future greatness. Ibn 'Arabsháh, on the other hand, merely gives the names of his father (Taragháy) and his grandfather (Abgháy), says that "he and his father were herdsmen, belonging to a gang of rascals devoid alike of intelligence and religion," and ascribes the limp to which he owed his sobriquet of "the Lame" (Lang) to a wound received while engaged in stealing sheep. His early adventures and the steps by which he gradually attained the leading position amongst his people need not here detain us, and it is sufficient to say that he first became prominent at the age of 24 in 761/1360; received the title of Šáhib-Qirán ("Lord of the Auspicious Conjunction") ten years later when he succeeded in killing his rival Sultán Husayn in Sha'bán, 771 (March, 1370); spent six or seven years after this in consolidating his power in Transoxiana, and did not seriously turn his attention to Persia until the spring of A.D. 1381, when he was 45 years of age. In this first campaign, which lasted only for the inside of a year, his attention was confined to Khurásán. At Andakhúd he paid his respects to a more or less crazy dervish known as Bábá Sangú, and, with that superstition which was so strangely blended with his

1 Zafar-náma, i, p. 310.
ferocious energy, interpreted as a presage of victory the piece of meat which that holy but demented personage threw at his head. Sarakhs surrendered to him, and, after visiting another holy man, Zaynu'd-Dín Abú Bakr, at Táyabád, he captured and destroyed Búshanj. The reduction of Herát and submission of Ghiyáthu’d-Dín Pír ‘Alí, the Kurt ruler, followed; and thereafter came the turn of Tús, Isfará’in (which was levelled with the ground and many of its inhabitants slain), and Kalát. He then returned to Samarqand and Bukhárá for the winter.

In the spring of the following year (A.D. 1382) he continued his operations against Persia. At Kalát, where he encamped, he was joined by his son Mirán-sháh from Sarakhs and by the now submissive Ghiyáthu’d-Dín Kurt from Herá’t; and, having established a blockade of this strong place, he passed on to Turshíz, which also surrendered to him. Here he received an ambassador from Sháh Shujá‘, the Muţazzárí ruler of Fárs, whose daughter he demanded in marriage for his grandson Pír Muḥammad. Having received the submission of Amír Walí, the ruler of Mázandarán, Tímrú returned for the winter to Samarqand, his capital, where he was for a while plunged in sorrow by the death of his wife Dilshád Ághá and her elder sister Qutlugh Turkán Ághá.

In the autumn of A.D. 1383, after despatching an expedition against the heathen Mongols to pursue Qamaru’d-Dín, Tímrú again set out on a campaign against Mázandarán and Sístán. Towards the end of October he attacked Sabzawár, undermined and destroyed the citadel, and took captive some two thousand persons, whom “he piled alive one upon another, compacted them with bricks and clay, and erected minarets, so that men, being apprised of the majesty of his wrath, might not be seduced by the demon of arrogance, and so cast themselves into the pit of wailing and destruction.” Having received the submission of Faráh, he attacked Ziríh, which was fiercely

---

1 Zafár-náma, i, p. 360.
defended by some five thousand men, most of whom were slain, and their heads built up into minarets. In December Sístán fell before his onslaught, and "whatever was in that country, from potsherds to royal pearls, and from the finest fabrics to the very nails in the doors and walls, was swept away by the winds of spoliation, while the lightning of rapine, comprehending alike the greater and the less of that land, consumed moist and dry together." After reducing two or three other fortresses, and constructing more pyramids of the skulls of his enemies, Tímúr captured Qandaháhár, hanged the commander of the garrison, and returned to his capital Samarqand, where he allowed himself a period of repose lasting three months.

It would be tedious, and, in a work of this character, out of place to describe in detail the almost annual campaigns which occupied the remaining twenty years of Tímúr’s life, but in brief they were as follows:

In 786/1384-5 Tímúr invaded Mázandarán and Ádharbáyján, wintered at Ray, continued his campaign in the spring of 1385, and, having reduced the Caspian provinces and the North of Persia as far as Sulţániyya, returned to his capital Samarqand for the winter.

In 788/1386-7 Tímúr, seeing the distracted state of Persia, determined to effect its total subjugation, and set out on a three years’ campaign against that country. He first marched against Malik ‘Izzu’d-Dín, the ruler of Luristán, sacked Burújírd and Khurramábád, and caused many of his opponents to be cast alive over precipices. He next marched on Tabríz, where Sulţán Aḥmad Jalá’ír had collected an army to oppose him, but on his approach the latter, deeming discretion the better part of valour, retreated to Nakhjuwán, and, after a fierce battle, succeeded in making good his escape. Tímúr spent the summer at Tabríz, and despatched thence to Samarqand a selection of the most skilful artificers and craftsmen whom he could find in the conquered city. In the autumn he crossed the Araxes,

pushed forward towards Nakhuwan, and, having subdued the strong fortress of Qârs, proceeded to devastate Gurjistân (Georgia). Having captured Tiflis, and, indulged in a great hunting-expedition, in which the game slain was so abundant that most of it was left to rot on the ground, he returned to winter quarters in Qara-Bagh.

In the spring of A.D. 1387 (A.H. 789) Tîmûr renewed his campaign in Asia Minor, subdued the cities of Bâyazîd, Erzeroum, Erzinjân, Mûsh, Akhlât and Ván, and received the submission of Salmâs and Urmia, and in the autumn, in consequence of the refusal of the Mu'azzâfârî prince Zaynu'îl-'Abidîn to appear before him, he marched against Fârs. On the way thither he entered Isfahân, and levied a heavy contribution on the people of that city. This provoked a riot, in which a good many of Tîmûr's tax-collectors and agents were killed, and Tîmûr took a terrible revenge, making a general massacre of the people, in which it is computed that 70,000 perished, whose heads were counted and afterwards built up into minarets. This happened on Monday, Nov. 18, 1387. Tîmûr then continued his march to Shîrâz, which submitted to him in the following month (Dec. 1387), and it is on this occasion that the legendary interview between the great conqueror and the poet Hâfîz is supposed to have taken place. Dawlatshâh, who relates the anecdote, with characteristic inaccuracy assigns this meeting to the year 795/1392-3, when Hâfîz had been dead for four years. The story, which is probably entirely apocryphal, is that Tîmûr summoned Hâfîz to his presence and upbraided him for the well-known verse in which he says:

"If that unkindly Shîrâz Turk would take my heart within her hand, I'd give Bukhârâ for the mole upon her cheek, or Samarqand."

"With the blows of my lustrous sword," exclaimed Tîmûr, "have I subjugated most of the habitable globe, and laid

1 Zafar-nâma, i, p. 404.
2 Ibid., p. 435.
3 See pp. 305-6 of my edition.
waste thousands of towns and countries to embellish Samarqand and Bukhara, my native towns and the seats of my government; and you, miserable wretch that you are, would sell them both for the black mole of a Turk of Shíráz!"

"Sire," replied Ḥāfiz, with a deep obeisance, "it is through such prodigality that I have fallen on such evil days!" Tímur is said to have been so much delighted by this quick rejoinder that he not only refrained from punishing the poet but gave him a handsome present. There is a variant of the story, which I have heard in Persia but not met with in any book, according to which Ḥāfiz replied, "They have misquoted me: what I really wrote was not

_Bi-khāl-i-hinduwash bakhsham Samarqand u Bukhārā-rā_

but—

_Bi-khāl-i-hinduwash bakhsham du ṭan qand u si khurmā-rā_

I would give for the mole on her cheek two maunds of sugar and three dates."

No mention of any such meeting occurs in contemporary biographers of Tímur, such as Sharafu'd-Dīn 'All of Yazd, nor have I met with any trustworthy evidence in support of it.

To return to Tímur's invasion of Fārs. Zaynu'l-ʿAbidīn, the Muẓaffarī prince, had fled to his cousin Sháh Manaṣūr, governor of Shūshtar in the S.W. of Persia, who, violating alike the bonds of kinship and claims of hospitality, cast him into prison. Most of the other princes of the House of Muẓaffar, as well as the Atābeks of Luristān and other petty rulers, waited on Tímur at Shírāz and tendered their submission. But, even in the moment of his triumph, news was brought to the conqueror by a messenger, who had accomplished the long journey from Samarqand to Shírāz in the incredibly short space of seventeen days, that a fresh revolt of the stiff-necked Tūqātmishi required the presence of Tímur to defend his own realms. Thereupon, in February, 1388, he at once set out for Samarqand, bearing with him, as part of his spoils, the learned Sayyid-i-Sharīf-i-
Jurjání, and appointing the Mużaffarí princes Sháh Yahya, Sultán Muhammad, Sultán Ahmad and Sultán Abú Isháq governors of Shíráz, Iṣfahán, Kirmán and Sírján respectively.

For the next four years and a half Timúr was engaged in warfare against Túqátmish, the Mongols, the realm of Khwárazm or Khiva, and other northern peoples, and Persia enjoyed a brief rest from his attentions, though a rebellion which broke out in the summer of 1389 in Khurásán (apparently prompted by reports of his defeat at the hands of Túqátmish) was put down in the usual bloody and barbarous fashion by Míránsháh, especially at Tús, where some ten thousand persons were massacred, and their heads built up into pyramids or minarets.

On the last day of July, 1392, Timúr, after some delay occasioned by a serious illness, once again crossed the Oxus on another of his devastating campaigns in the South. This, known as the “Five Years’ Campaign” (Yūrish-i-panj-sála\(^1\)) included the Caspian provinces, Fárs (where he exterminated the princes of the Mużaffarí dynasty, as already described at p. 169 supra), Armenia, Georgia, Mesopotamia, and South Russia. In Gurgán and Mázandarán he came in contact with certain heretical Sayyids, many of whom he slew, “delivering those regions from the mischievous influence of those misguided communists\(^2\).” Sharafu’d-Dín’s account of their tenets is neither clear nor detailed, but it appears highly probable that they belonged to the heretical Ḥurúfí sect, whose founder, Faḍlu’l-láh, appeared, preached his doctrines, and suffered death in Timúr’s reign, and was a native of Astarábád. We shall have more to say about him and his doctrine presently.

In the latter part of December, 1392, Timúr, having received a visit from his wives and family, set out for South Persia, travelling by way of Dámghán, Samnán, Ray, Qazwín, Sultáníyya, Kurdistán, and Burújird (which he reached on February 14, 1393\(^3\)), and putting to death on

---

\(^1\) Žafar-náma; i. pp. 561 et seqq.

\(^2\) Ibid., pp. 576-7.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 587.
his way many of the Lurs. He reached Dizful on March 2 and Shúshtar a day or two later, and thence set out for Shíráz. On his way thither he captured the strong fortress of Qal'a-i-Safíd and released the blinded captive prince Zaynu’l-‘Ábidín, whom he treated with honour and promised vengeance on Sháh Manšúr. Nor was this vengeance long delayed, for, as already narrated, Sháh Manšúr was slain in battle a few days later, while most of the remaining princes of the House of Muẓaffar were put to death by Tímúr’s order on May 22, 1393. “All the most skilful of the craftsmen and artisans of the provinces of Fárs and ‘Iráq” were, according to Sharafu’d-Dín ‘Álíf of Yazd, transferred by Tímúr to Samarqand1.

On August 10 Tímúr, who was approaching Baghdád was visited by Shaykh Núru’d-Dín ‘Abdu’r-Rahmán of Isfará’in, who came as an ambassador from Sultán Aḥmad Jalá’ir to make his excuses for not waiting on Tímúr in person. His excuses were ill received by Tímúr, who nevertheless treated the Shaykh with the respect which, according to the Zafar-náma (p.629), he habitually accorded to learned and pious men. Shortly afterwards he entered Baghdád and occupied the palace of Sultán Aḥmad, who fled before him. Some of Tímúr’s amírs went in pursuit, overtook the fugitives near Karbalá, and captured much spoil and some of the wives and sons of Sultán Aḥmad, who, however, succeeded in making his escape. His son ‘Alá’u’d-Dawla, together with his wives, a selection of the most skilful artisans of Baghdád, and the celebrated musician Khwája ‘Abdu’l-Qádir, were sent to Samarqand by Tímúr, who also despatched an ambassador to Barqúq al-Maliku’z-Záhir, the ruler of Egypt, with a view to concluding a treaty of friendship and commercial intercourse with him.

Tímúr’s next exploit was the reduction of the strong fortress of Takrít, which was gallantly defended. Finally, however, the defenders were overcome and put to death, and their heads built up into minarets. Continuing his march

northwards he passed by Karkúk, Arbil, Mawṣil (Mosul) and Rawḥá, where, in March, 1394, he was overtaken by stormy and rainy weather, and compelled by this and the disobedience of Malik ʿIzzuʿd-Dīn to return to Mesopotamia. Having in a brief space of time dealt with this rebellious chieftain, Tímúr again turned northwards and reduced the fortress of Márdín. Luckily for the garrison, news had just reached Tímúr of the birth, at Sultāniyya, on March 22, 1394, of a grandson, the afterwards celebrated Ulugh Bey, son of Sháhrúkh, and this put Tímúr in such good humour that he spared their lives, which would otherwise have certainly been forfeited. Ṭám (Diyār Bakr) next succumbed to his victorious arms in April, but he had to abandon his attempt to raze the fortifications on account of their extraordinary strength and solidity. He then passed on to Síwás, Músh, Bitlís, Akhlát and Aydín, halting for a while in the Plain of Ála-dágh to receive his wives and younger children, who came to visit him from Sultāniyya, and despatching an army in pursuit of his enemy Qará Yúsuf and his Turkmán followers. At the end of July, 1394, he captured the fortress of Avník, on the upper waters of the Araxes, and sent its defender, Miṣr the son of Qará Yúsuf, to Samarqand, together with Sultán ʿÍsá, the ex-governor of Márdín. He next invaded Georgia and occupied Tiflis.

Fortunately for Persia, a fresh menace on the part of his old enemy Túqaṭmish compelled Tímúr at this juncture, towards the end of February, 1395, to march northwards to defend his own territories, and this, with the ensuing campaign in Southern Russia, in the course of which he penetrated as far as Moscow, kept him occupied for more than a year. During and in consequence of his absence several revolts broke out in Persia, such as that of Qará Yúsuf the Turkmán in Ádharbáyján; of Gúdarz (probably a Zoroastrian) at Sírján; of Sultán Muḥammad, son of

---

1 Zafar-náma, i. p. 680.
2 Ibid., p. 684.
3 Ibid., p. 735.
4 Ibid., p. 761.
5 Ibid., p. 757.
6 Ibid., pp. 784-5.
Abú Saʻíd of Tabas, and some Khurásáni soldiers who had formerly been in the service of the Mužaffarí dynasty at Yazd; and of Buhlúl at Niháwand. All these revolts were quickly and sternly repressed, and the ringleader of that last mentioned, Buhlúl, was burned alive. The ensuing month of Ramaḍán was passed by Tímúr at Hamadán "in obedience and devotion to the Divine Benefactor, and in the observance of the obligations of fasting and vigils and of every kind of religious rite and ceremony." He then, having ordered his generals to subdue the whole Persian shore of the gulf from Khúzístán to Hurmuz, set out on July 18, 1396, for Samargand.

On this occasion Tímúr remained quiet at his capital for a longer period than usual, and devoted a good deal of attention to beautifying it and its environs by the labours of "the expert engineers and skilful architects who had been gathered to the Royal Metropolis from every clime and country from East to West." He also gave a series of gorgeous banquets, of which one of the chief was to celebrate the conferring of the kingdom of Khurásán, including Sístán and Mázandarán, from Fíruzkúh to Ray, on his son Sháh-rukh, which happened in May, 1397. Less than a year later, in the spring of 1398, he set out on his Indian campaign, instigated thereto, as asserted in the Zafar-náma, by his desire to promote Islám and crush idolatry, and by the accounts which reached him of the toleration shown by the Muslim rulers towards their Hindú subjects and neighbours. After some preliminary operations against the Afgáns (or Awgháns) of the Sulaymán Kúh and the Siyáh-púsh ("Black-robed") heathen of Káfirístán, he crossed the Indus on Muḥarram 12, 801 (Sept. 24, 1398) and proceeded to carry fire and sword into India. It is unnecessary for our purpose to follow these operations in detail. They were characterized by the usual bloodshed and barbarities, amongst the worst of which was the massacre

1 Ibid., i, p. 788.  
2 Ibid., ii, p. 6.  
3 Ibid., i, pp. 803-4.  
4 Ibid., ii, p. 15.
in cold blood of 100,000 Indian prisoners near Dilih on December 12, 1398\(^1\). Compared to this monstrous crime the horrors enacted a few days later at Dilih, and the massacre of 10,000 persons a month earlier at Batnûr sink into insignificance.

Reports of troubles in Persia (especially in Ádharbáýján, where his son, Míránsháh, to whom the government of this important province had been entrusted, was courting disaster by his insane vagaries, generally ascribed to an injury to his head caused by a fall from his horse) impelled Tímûr to cut short his Indian campaign early in the year A.D. 1399, and to hasten homewards. He crossed the Indus on his return journey on March 8 of that year, five months and seventeen days after he had crossed it at the beginning of his campaign, and the Oxus three weeks later. On April 7 he reached his native town of Kash or Shahr-i-Sabz (the “Green City”), and entered Samarqand, his capital, on April 27. A fortnight later (May 9, 1399) he laid the foundation-stone of the magnificent mosque (\(\textit{Masjid-i-Jámî}') which he had long intended to erect for the embellishment of his metropolis.

On September 9, 1399, Tímûr again quitted Samarqand for Ádharbáýján, where the erratic conduct of his son Míránsháh, of which fresh accounts continued to reach him, urgently demanded his attention. At Ayvának, near Ray, he was joined by his son Sháh-rukh and by another army which he had despatched by way of Mázandarán. Míránsháh was induced to come to his father's camp to render account of his misconduct, which included the waste or embezzlement of a large proportion of the revenues, the putting to death on mere suspicion of certain men of consequence against whom he had conceived a spite, the wanton destruction of certain historic buildings, and the exhumation of the eminent Minister and historian Rashídú’d-Dín Faḍlulláh, whose body he caused to be re-interred in the Jews' cemetery. Míránsháh was punished by his father’s displeasure and the virtual transference of the authority he

\(^1\) \textit{Zafar-námá}, ii, p. 92.
had misused to his son Abú Bakr, but Tímúr's fiercest wrath fell upon certain minstrels and poets who had been Míránsháh's boon-companions, and who were alleged to have corrupted his principles and encouraged his extravagances. Several of these, namely Mawlání Mūḥammad of Quhistán, "who, together with a complete mastery of the technicalities of the various sciences, was unique in his age and the marvel of his time in verse and prose composition, both serious and frivolous," Quṭbu'd-Dín Ná'í, Ḥabíb-i-'Údí and 'Abdu'l-Mu'mín the rhapsodist, were condemned to death on this charge and hanged at or near Qazwín. According to Dawlatsháh, Mūḥammad of Quhistán must needs indulge his propensity for jesting even on the scaffold. Turning to Quṭbu'd-Dín, one of his fellow-victims, he said, "You had precedence in the King's company: precede me, therefore, here also." "O unlucky heretic," replied the other, "do you bring matters to this pass, and cannot you cease jesting yet?" When it came to Mūḥammad's turn to die, he recited the following punning verse:

"'Tis the end of the matter and the last round, O heretic!
Whether thou goest or not, the choice is no longer in thy hand!
If they lead thee, like Manṣūr, to the foot of the gibbet (pá-yi-dár),
Stand firm (páy-dár) like a man, for the world is not enduring (páy-dár)!
"

1 Zafar-náma ii, pp. 213–214.
2 Pp. 330–1 of my edition. In the very rare Mujmal of Fašíhí, under the year A.H. 802, two other victims are enumerated, viz. Ardashir-i-Changi ("the harper"), and Khwája Yahyá-yi-Narrád ("the backgammon-player").
3 The celebrated mystic who was hanged or crucified in the tenth century of our era at Baghdád for exclaiming Ana'l-Haqq! ("I am the Truth!" i.e. God). His real name was Ḥusayn ibn Manṣūr al-Ḥalláj ("the wool-carder"). See my Lit. Hist. of Persia, vol. i, pp. 428–437.
The campaign on which Tímúr was now embarked, and which included some of his most remarkable achievements, is called by Sharafu'd-Dín ‘Alí Yazdí (ii, 206) the "Seven Years' Campaign." As it began about Muḥarram 8, 802 (Sept. 10, 1399), and as Tímúr returned to his capital, Samarqand, in Muharram, 807 (July, 1404), this appellation must be regarded as a misnomer. Even the abridged account of the many bloody battles and brilliant victories included in this period which is given in Price's Chronological Retrospect\(^1\) fills 166 quarto pages, and in this place it must suffice to indicate only its chief events.

The winter of A.D. 1399-1400 was spent by Tímúr in Qarábágh near the Araxes, and ere spring had melted the snows he once more invaded Georgia, devastated the country, destroyed the churches and monasteries, and slew great numbers of the inhabitants. In August, 1400, he began his march into Asia Minor by way of Avník, Erzeroum, Erzinján and Sívás. The latter place offered a stubborn resistance, and when it finally capitulated Tímúr caused all the Armenian and Christian soldiers to the number of four thousand to be buried alive; but the Muhammadans he spared.\(^2\) Meanwhile an animated correspondence was taking place between him and the Ottoman Sultán Báyazíd, called Yildirim (the "Thunder-bolt"), from whom Tímúr demanded the surrender of Sultán Aḥmad of Baghdád and Qará Yúsuf the Turkmán. This Báyazíd refused, as, until a very recent occasion, the Turks have ever been wont to refuse such betrayal of guests; and, moreover, as must be admitted, and as will presently be seen, he couched his refusal in language little calculated to appease his great rival. With the Sultán of Egypt also (al-Maliku'n-Nāṣir Faraj) Tímúr became embroiled by reason of the unlawful detention of his ambassador at Cairo, and thus the campaign became diverted not only against the territories over which the two

---

\(^1\) Published in London in 4 vols., 1811-1821. The portion to which reference is here made is vol. iii, Part i, pp. 297-463.

\(^2\) Zafar-náma, ii, p. 269.
fugitive kings had reigned respectively, but against the Ottoman and Egyptian, and incidentally the Syrian lands.

After taking ‘Ayntab, Tímúr besieged and reduced Aleppo in October, 1400, and there captured and sent with other spoils of war to Samarkand his future historian Mawláná Nižāmu’d-Dín called Shámít (the “Syrian”). Having next subdued in turn Ḥama, Ḥims (Emessa) and Ba‘labakk (Baalbek) he proceeded to invest Damascus. Here an assassin, instigated by al-Maliku’n-Nāsir, Sultan of Egypt, attempted his life, but failed and was put to death. Damascus surrendered, but again revolted, and was again subdued in March, 1401, when it finally submitted, and suffered Tímúr’s name to be inserted in the khutba, after it had suffered the horrors of Tartar incendiarism and looting. Another portion of Tímúr’s army ravaged the Syrian coast as far south as ‘Akká.

Tímúr next turned his attention to Bagh dád, the capital of the recalcitrant Sulţán Ahmad Jalá’ír, and, having taken it, made, on June 20, 1401, a great massacre, in revenge for the many notable officers of his army who had perished in the siege. Each soldier was ordered to bring a head1, and in the words of Sharafu’d-Dín ‘Alí Yazdí, “the market of retribution became so brisk that the broker of death sold at one price the old man of eighty and the child of eight, while the oven of wrath was so enkindled that it consumed in like manner the corporeal vestiture of the wealthy plutocrat and the wretched pauper2.”

Having left Bagh dád a smoking charnel-house, Tímúr again turned his attention to the unfortunate Georgians, until the approach of winter drove him in November, 1401, into his winter quarters at Qarábágh. About the middle of February,

1 According to Ibn ‘Arabsháh the number of Tímúr’s soldiers on this occasion was 20,000, and each was ordered to bring two heads.

2 Zafar-náma, ii, p. 367.
1402, he prepared to attack the Ottoman Sultan Bāyazīd, from whom he had received another defiant letter which goaded him to fury. On July 20, 1402, was fought the memorable battle of Angora, in which the Ottoman Turks were utterly defeated and their Sultan, Bāyazīd, “the Thunderbolt,” taken prisoner. The well-known story that Tīmūr confined him in a cage and carried him about with him wherever he went is now generally discredited. No mention of this is made, I think, by Sharafu’d-Dīn ‘Alī of Yazd and other Persian historians of Tīmūr, and the story may have arisen from an expression used by Ibn ‘Arabshāh, who, as already mentioned, hated Tīmūr, and sought always to represent his actions in the worst light. The expression in question is:

\[ \text{"The son of 'Osmān fell into a hunter's snare, and became confined like a bird in a cage"—} \]

a phrase which it is not necessary to take literally, and which may well have been employed metaphorically and to fulfil the exigencies of the rhymed prose in which Ibn ‘Arabshāh’s work is composed. Sharafu’d-Dīn explicitly says that when Bāyazīd, with hands bound, was brought before Tīmūr, the latter, after reproaching him for his previous contumacy, expressing his regret at having been compelled to make war on a fellow-believer who had rendered such signal services to Islam, and reminding him how he would have probably behaved to the conquered had their respective positions been reversed, concluded by saying that “in gratitude for the victory and help vouchsafed to him by the mercy of God” he would do naught but good to his captive and the other Turkish prisoners.

1 It is, however, accepted by Professor H. A. Gibbons in his very interesting work on the *Foundation of the Ottoman Empire* (Oxford, 1916). See his long foot-note on p. 255, where the matter is very fully discussed.

Be this as it may, the campaign against the Ottoman Turks continued; royal Broussa and “infidel” Smyrna were attacked and made desolate, the latter in December, 1402; and a little later, on February 26, 1403, the unfortunate Bāyazīd died in captivity.

Seeing what had befallen the Turks, the Egyptian Sultan, al-Maliku‘n-Nāṣir Faraj, abandoned his former attitude of defiance, released Tīmūr’s ambassador, and sent his submission to the victor of Angora by an embassy which was graciously received. In August and September, 1403, Tīmūr again raided Georgia, and, having wintered once more at Qarābāgh, reached Ray on May 10 and Samarqand about the end of July, 1404. Here a month later arrived the Spanish Mission headed by Ruy González de Clavijó, who has left us an entertaining account of his journey from Spain to Samarqand and back, and of his impressions of Tīmūr, of which account an English translation, edited by Sir Clements R. Markham, was published by the Hakluyt Society in 1859. Clavijo sailed from Seville in company with an envoy, Muḥammad al-Qāḍī, whom Tīmūr had sent to Spain, accompanied by Gomez de Salazar and an ecclesiastic named Fray Alonzo Paez de Santa Maria. Travelling by way of Constantinople, Trebizond, Erzeroum, Khūy, Tabrīz, Tīhrān and Mashhad, the Spanish envoys reached Samarqand on August 31, 1404, in company with the ambassador of “the Sultan of Babylon,” and were received by Tīmūr on Monday, September 8. He “was seated in a portal, in front of the entrance of a beautiful palace; and he was sitting on the ground. Before him there was a fountain, which threw up the water very high, and in it there were some red apples. The lord was seated cross-legged, on silken embroidered carpets, amongst round pillows. He was dressed in a robe of silk, with a high white hat on his head, on the top of which there was a special ruby, with pearls and precious stones round it.” The ambassadors were
brought close before him that he might see them better; for his eyesight was bad, he being so old that the eyelids had fallen down entirely. He received them graciously, enquiring, “How is my son the king? Is he in good health?” and then turned to the nobles who stood round him, saying, “Behold! here are the ambassadors sent by my son the King of Spain, who is the greatest King of the Franks, and lives at the end of the world. The Franks are truly a great people, and I will give my benediction to the King of Spain, my son. It would have sufficed if he had sent you to me with the letter, and without the presents, so well satisfied am I to hear of his health and prosperous state.”

The Spanish envoys were subsequently entertained at several banquets, of which Clavijo gives detailed descriptions, and saw Tímúr several times. They seem to have been much struck by the quantities of meat and wine consumed, and the frequent drunkenness. “The drinking,” says Clavijo (p. 148), “was such that some of the men fell down drunk before her” (Caño, wife of Tímúr); “and this was considered very jovial, for they think there can be no pleasure without drunken men.” On another occasion (Oct. 9, 1404), besides the banquet, they were treated to an exhibition of Tímúr’s “justice,” for “in the place where the traders had pitched their tents, he ordered a great number of gallows to be set up; and declared that, in this festival, he knew how to be merciful and kind to some, and how to be severe to others.” On these gallows he forthwith hanged several persons of quality, besides “certain traders who had sold meat for more than it was worth,” and some shoemakers. “The custom is,” adds Clavijo, “that, when a great man is put to death, he is hanged; but the meaner sort are beheaded”—a curious inversion of the mediaeval practice in England.

The ambassadors do not seem to have seen Tímúr after November 1, 1404, on the morrow of which day “he did not come out of his tent, because he felt ill.” They were bidden
by the Mírzás, or Secretaries of the Court, to depart, but this they at first declined to do until they should receive their dismissal from Tímúr and his messages and compliments to their own King. Finally, however, they were compelled to leave without another audience (Tímúr being then, as they were led to believe, sick unto death) and quitted the city on November 18 with the "ambassadors from Turkey," and "the ambassador from the Sultan of Babylon." After remaining for three days in a garden outside the town, they started on their homeward journey on November 21, 1404. They reached Tabríz on February 28, 1405, and were delayed there and at the camp of 'Umar Shaykh Mírzá in Qarábágh for six months, not leaving Tabríz on their homeward march until August 22. After passing through Armenia, of whose inhabitants Clavijo says that "the Christian Armenians are an evil race, who would not let the ambassadors pass until they had given up some of their property," they reached Trebizond on September 17, Constantinople on October 22, 1405, Genoa on January 3, 1406, and San Lucar in Spain on March 1 of the same year, after an absence of nearly three years.

But few notices of this Embassy occur in the Persian historians, though mention is made of it by Sharafu'd-Dín 'Alí of Yazd, who says¹: "At this juncture there arrived an ambassador from the ruler (farmán-dih) of the Frankish realms, who presented many fine gifts and presents, and a variety of offerings and oblations," amongst which "certain tissues adorned with designs and pictures which would have filled Manes with despair" specially aroused the author's admiration. He also mentions on the next page the presence of the Spaniards at one of the banquets given by Tímúr, adding that "even chaff finds its way into the sea," and, a few pages lower², chronicles their departure.

By this time Tímúr was apparently recovered from his indisposition, tired of the settled life, and eager for fresh

¹ Zafar-náma, ii, p. 598.
² Ibid., p. 633.
adventures, and he resolved to undertake a campaign against China in order to destroy the temples of the heathen, spread the true faith, and incidentally enrich himself and his army with the spoils of that spacious, ancient and wealthy land. After making all necessary arrangements for the campaign and for the administration of his vast territories during his absence, he set out from Samarqand on his eastward march on November 27, 1404. The winter was exceptionally severe, and the army, after suffering much from the cold, crossed the Jaxartes (Sihun) on the ice, and reached Utrár on January 14, 1405. A month later Timúr fell ill, and, though treated by Mawláná Faḍlu’lláh of Tabríz, who was accounted one of the most skillful physicians of his age, his sickness increased and complications set in until he finally succumbed, a week after the first attack, on February 18, 1405, being then seventy-one [lunar] years of age, and having reigned thirty-six years. His mind remained clear to the last, and having nominated his grandson Pir Muhammad-i-Jahángír to succeed him as ruler of his vast empire, he embodied his last wishes in a discourse which is fully reported by Sharafu’d-Dín1, and died with the profession of the faith of Islám on his lips.

The character of Tímúr has been differently appraised by those who are dazzled by his military achievements on the one hand, and those who are disgusted by his cruelty and utter disregard of human life on the other. One factor in such judgement is the acceptance or rejection of the much discussed and quoted Tuzúkát, or “Institutes,” which profess to contain Tímúr’s own philosophy of Empire. Thus Gibbon says, in a foot-note in ch. lxv, that though he “did not expect to hear of Tímour’s amiable moderation”...he “can excuse a generous enthusiasm in the reader, and still more in the editor, of the Institutions,” though in the corresponding portion of the text, he criticizes him pretty severely, and

admits that "perhaps we shall conclude that the Mogul Emperor was rather the scourge than the benefactor of mankind." Sir John Malcolm's very judicious observations have been already cited. Sir Clements R. Markham says that, although Tímir's conquests were the cause of much suffering to the human race, yet "he certainly was not the remorseless tyrant he is represented by [Ibn] ‘Arabsháh and his other enemies," and that "there is evidence that he had loftier aims than the mere gratification of his lust for conquest." He adds that though "the name of Tímir is frequently coupled with that of Chingíz Khán, yet the latter was a rude uncultivated barbarian, while there is evidence that the former was versed in all the knowledge of his age and country." As regards the facts of Tímir's life, there is little difference of opinion: his massacres and pyramids of skulls are equally chronicled by his panegyrist, Sharafu'd-Dín ‘Alí of Yazd and Nizám-i-Shámí, and his detractor Ibn ‘Arabsháh, though the former affect to regard them as "manifestations of the Divine Attributes of Wrath" (Sifát-i-Jaláliyya or Qahriyya), and the latter as the outcome of diabolic malignity. The latter view appears to me the more reasonable and natural; and as for the "Institutes," which supply a quasi-philosophic basis for this policy of "frightfulness," I incline to the reasoned opinion expressed by Rieu that they are spurious.

Before closing this brief account of Tímir, some reference should be made to certain despatches which passed between him and the Ottoman Sultan Báyazíd and others, of which the texts are preserved in an important collection of State Papers known as the Munshá'át-i-Firídún Bey, of which a good edition was printed at Constantinople in Jumáda II, A.H. 1274 (February, 1858). The compiler of this work, Aḥmad Firídún, known as Tawqí (Tevqí), flourished in the middle of the tenth

---

1 See pp. 182–3 supra.
2 History of Persia, p. 219.
century of the Muhammadan (sixteenth of the Christian) era, and composed, besides the *Munsha'āt* (compiled in 982/1574–5), a history entitled *Nuz-hat-ul-Akhbār*. The first volume of the *Munsha'āt* comprises State Papers ranging in date from the time of the Prophet (seventh century of the Christian era) to the middle of the sixteenth century. It contains 626 large pages, of which pp. 118–142 contain letters to, from, or about Tīmūr, as follows:

1. Letter from Qarā Yūsuf to Sulṭān Bāyazīd, written in Persian and undated, complaining of the aggressions of Tīmūr, whom the writer describes as “that quickener of the fire of evil and trouble and agitator of the chain of mischief and insolence, Tīmūr the object of Divine Wrath (may God destroy and crush him!),” and demanding help from Bāyazīd (pp. 118–119).

2. Bāyazīd’s answer to the above, also written in Persian and undated (p. 119).

3. Letter from Tīmūr to Bāyazīd, written in Arabic and undated, requiring in peremptory language that no shelter shall be afforded to Qarā Yūsuf and Sultān Aḥmad, and warning the Ottoman Sultan against disobedience to this command (pp. 120–1).

4. Bāyazīd’s answer to the above, also written in Arabic and undated. This begins (after the doxology), “Know, O ravening dog named Tīmūr,” and hurls defiance at the invader, daring him to advance (p. 121).

5. Letter from Sultān Aḥmad Jalā’īr of Baghdād to Sultān Bāyazīd, written in Persian and undated. The writer describes how, after the capture of Baghdād and the two ‘Irāqs by Tīmūr, he withdrew to Malatya and Sīwās to await the arrival of Qarā Yūsuf, according to Bāyazīd’s instructions, and how in conjunction they attacked, routed and annihilated the Uzbekks who formed the vanguard of Tīmūr’s army, but were awaiting with certainty an attack from his main army so soon as news of this disaster should reach him (pp. 124–5).
(6) Báyazíd’s answer to the above, announcing that, in consequence of the news received from Sultan Aḥmad, he has concluded peace with the “Tekfur,” or Byzantine Emperor, and has advanced to Tóqát to aid in checking the invasion of Tímúr (p. 125). Dated Sha’bán, 798 (May, 1396).

(7) Second letter from Tímúr to Báyazíd, written in Persian and undated. It begins with a “salutation tempered with reproach” (saládm-i-‘itáb-ámiž), describes the writer’s forty years’ career of conquest, and how he has now advanced to Síwáṣ, and taunts his adversaries with their failure to capture Malatya and Sinope. He is still, however, ready to come to terms, since he is unwilling that the dissensions of Muslims should afford fresh opportunity to the “Frankish infidels” to pursue their schemes of aggression. In conclusion he describes himself as of the family of the Íl-khánís, and demands a speedy and conciliatory answer to his overtures (pp. 126-7).

(8) Báyazíd’s answer to the above, also in Persian and undated. The writer boasts of the martial prowess of the Turks, reminds Tímúr how his ancestor Er-Toghríl with 300 horsemen routed 10,000 “Tartar and Mongol heathens,” and rehearses other like glorious deeds of his predecessors. He claims to be the protector of the Muslims, and declares that “hitherto not one of the House of Oṭhman has sought by flattery to turn aside an enemy, or has had recourse to deceit or guile” (pp. 127-8).

(9) Tímúr’s third letter to Báyazíd, written in Persian and undated, acknowledging a letter sent by means of the Qáḍí Farídu’d-Dín and a person named Najáší, and expressing a desire for friendship and alliance. Tímúr alludes to his Syrian campaign, objects to the Sultans of Egypt calling themselves “Kings of the two Holy Shrines” (Ṣultánu’l-Haramayn), and complains of the return of Sultan Aḥmad Jalá’ír to Baghdád (pp. 128–131).

(10) Báyazíd’s answer to the above, written in Persian. It is couched in much politer language than his previous
letters, but declines absolutely to surrender Sultan Ahmad Jalal’ir and Qarà Yûsuf, which, says the writer, would be entirely incompatible with the Ottoman traditions of hospitality. He alludes to the continuance in Egypt of the lawful descendants of the ‘Abbásid Caliphs, and calls on Tímar, if his intentions are really peaceful, to surrender Síwás (pp. 131–2).

(11) Tímar’s fourth letter to Bâyazid. In this letter he boasts his orthodoxy and adherence to the Sunnî creed, denounces the actions of Sultan Ahmad Jalal’ir and Qarà Yûsuf, and demands their banishment from Ottoman territory, and an apology from Bâyazid (pp. 132–4).

(12) Bâyazid’s answer to the above (pp. 134–5).

(13) Letters from Sháh Mana’ir, the nephew of Sháh Shujá’ the Muẓaffarí ruler of Shíráz, to Bâyazid, written in Persian after Dhu’l Qa’da, 802 (June—July, 1400), describing the mischief wrought by “the accursed ones of Chaghatáy,” and the deceitfulness and cunning of “that sinner and rebel” Tímar (pp. 135–9).

(14) Bâyazid’s answer to the above. He abuses Tímar, alludes to the depredations wrought by him in Fârs and at Shíráz, and states that, though actually engaged in an attempt to capture Constantinople, he is preparing to abandon this in order to attack Tímar (pp. 139–140).

(15) Tímar’s fifth letter to Bâyazid, written from Marâgha in Persian, but undated. He alludes to his capture of Baghdád, and, after quoting a verse to the effect that to win the whole world it is not worth vexing even an ant, indulges in veiled threats as to what he will do if Bâyazid still refuses to listen to his demands (pp. 140–2).

Here ends the correspondence between Tímar and Bâyazid preserved by Firídún Bey.

It only remains to be added that Tímar’s corpse was conveyed across the frozen Khujand River on the night of Feb. 19, 1405, and interred four days later at Samarqand, while the Chinese campaign—happily for that people—was finally abandoned.
CHAPTER V.

THE POETS AND WRITERS OF THE TIME OF TÍMÚR.

Attention has already been called to the curious but indisputable fact that in Persia, at any rate, periods of great turmoil and disorder have generally produced the finest poetry, while periods of relative prosperity, when the country was under a strong and stable government, have generally been singularly barren in this respect. In comparatively modern times Persia has never been more strong, united and prosperous than under the Šafawí dynasty (A.D. 1502–1736), more particularly during the sixteenth century; yet, though, not only in military strength, national unity and commerce, but also in the arts (especially architecture and painting) and the sciences (especially theology), this period was particularly brilliant, it hardly produced a single poet of commanding genius or wide-spread reputation; a phenomenon of which the causes will be discussed when we come to speak of the epoch in question. The period with the literary aspects of which we are now about to deal is, on the other hand, as will have been sufficiently apparent from the preceding chapter, one of anarchy, misery and bloodshed; yet it would be hard to indicate any period of seventy years (A.D. 1335–1405) which produced so many remarkable poets, a galaxy of talent in which the great Ḥáfiz is merely the brightest of many brilliant stars. Probably the existence of numerous little courts, each anxious to rival and excel the others, is favourable to the development of poetical talent, since the poet who fails to win appreciation from one royal patron can easily find another who may prove more susceptible to his song; while, when there is but one capital

1 Cf. pp. 160–1 supra.
and one court, he who fails there (not necessarily from lack of talent so much as from lack of opportunity, ill fortune, or the machinations of jealous rivals) is likely to be permanently discouraged, or at least to remain unknown outside his own immediate circle.

From this point of view, Persia, immediately after the collapse of the Mongol power, and before the irruption of Tímúr the Tartar, was an ideal field for the wandering poet. In the North-East, with their capital at Herát, were the Kurt princes; at Sabzawár and the neighbourhood the little Sarbadár dynasty (if such it can be called) held sway; the Íl-khanís, Shaykh Ḥasan-i-Buzurg, his son Sultán Ūways, and their descendants, ruled over a curious elliptical domain which had its northern capital at Tabrîz and its southern capital at Baghdád; while Southern Persia was divided amongst princes of the House of Muţaffar, often independent of, and even at war with, one another, with Shírâz, Īsfahán, Yazd and Kirmán as their seats of government. There were no hard and fast frontiers to these little states, and no map could be made showing the divisions of these fluid, ever-shifting kingdoms; rather, if we wish to reconstruct the political geography of Persia at that period, we must conceive of some seven or eight centres whence radiated, in ever-varying strength, the influence of as many petty warrior-princes, whose truculent activities were oftener than not combined with a fine literary taste.

Of the poets of this period some ten at least deserve mention, either on account of their evident originality and beauty, or because of the reputation which they enjoy in their own country. These two things do not necessarily go together, but either of them seems to me to entitle a poet at any rate to honourable mention; for a foreign critic must always entertain some mistrust of his judgements, and must remember that, strive as he may, he can hardly hope to
develop the fine and discriminating taste of the cultivated native critic, and that the mere fact that a poet has maintained his reputation amongst his own countrymen for several centuries entitles him at least to some respectful consideration. This applies to lyrical poets like Khwájú and ‘Imád of Kirmán and Kamál of Khujand, of whom one is apt to think as mere dim reflections of the incomparable Háfiz, devoid of any salient originality; but it must not be forgotten that the first died 37 and the second 18 years before him, and that they may therefore well have prepared the way for his greater achievements, while the eminence of the third, who was his contemporary, is to a certain extent certified by Háfiz himself in the verse—

"Wenn er erst Hafsens Lieder höret,
Die als zart und lieblich Jeder kennt,
Wird sich selbst Kemál nicht unterfahren
Dichtend aufzutreten in Chodschen."

On the other hand poets like ‘Ubayd-i-Zákání and Bushaq (Abú Isháq) are so original that, whether appreciated or not in their own country, they cannot be ignored by any student of Persian literature.

I propose, therefore, to discuss in this chapter the following poets, and, that priority may be duly considered in relation to actual merit, in chronological order. This, however, can only be regarded as approximate, since in most cases the date of death only is recorded (and that often uncertainly), and we often do not know whether the poet died young or at an advanced old age. Indeed, notwithstanding the numerous biographies of poets given by Dawlatsháh,
and in the Atash-kada, Haft Iqlim and other similar well-known works, the lack of authentic particulars as to the lives and characters of these poets is a very discouraging feature in our quest. Most of the anecdotes given in these books are trivial or fictitious, and, save for what can be gleaned from their verses (where again we are often hampered by the lack of anything approaching a critical edition), we are finally driven to admit that we know very little indeed about most of them. They were generally poor men, often socially obscure, and as such were completely ignored by contemporary historians, while all that later generations, who appreciated their merit, could do was, as a rule, to string together a few more or less trivial anecdotes, evidently constructed in many cases to explain or illustrate passages in their poems. An exception must be made in favour of one rare manuscript work, the Mujmal ("Compendium") of Faşīḥi of Khwáf, a Chronicle of some thousand pages compiled in 845/1441–2 and containing many valuable details not to be found elsewhere, especially in what concerns the province of Khurasán in general, and the city of Herát in particular.

The poets of this period whom I propose to discuss are the following:

(1) Ibn-i-Yamín (d. 745/1345 according to Dawlatsháh², or 769/1368 according to the more authoritative Mujmal) was associated with the Sarbadár dynasty.

1 So far as I know, only three MSS. of this work exist in Europe. One, in St Petersborg, is described by the late Baron Victor Rosen at pp. 111–113 of his Collections Scientifiques, vol. iii, Manuscrits Persans (No. 271) and by Dorn in vol. ii of the Bulletin de la classe historico-philologique de l'Académie Imperiale des Sciences de St Pétersbourg, pp. 1 et seqq. The second (marred by an extensive lacuna comprising the years A.H. 718–840) formerly belonged to the late Colonel Raverty, and is now the property of the "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Trust." The third, modern but complete, belonged to Sir Albert Houtum-Schindler and is now in my possession. See also p. 150 supra, n. 1 ad calc.

II. Ibn-i-Yamin

(Amîr Mahmûd ibn Amîr Yaminu'd-Dîn Tughrâ'î).

Although notices of this poet and his father Yaminu'd-Dîn (from whom he derives the name Ibn-i-Yamin—"son of Yamin"—by which he is commonly known) occur in Dawlatshâh, the Haft Iqlîm, Atash-kadâ, Majma'u'lu-Fusahâ and other biographical works, the few particulars about him which are known to us are chiefly derived from the rare Muqmal of Faşîhî. In this work Ibn-i-Yamin is thrice mentioned, under the years 743/1342-3, and 769/1367-8, the year of his death.

The first of these two notices, so far as it concerns Ibn-i-Yamin, runs as follows:

"War of Malik Mu'izzu'd-Dîn Abu'l-Hasayn Muhammad-i-Kurt with Khwájá Wajîhu'd-Dîn Mas'úd-i-Sarbadâr and Shaykh Hasân-i-Jûrî between Zâwa and Khwáf, and death of Shaykh..."

1 Pp. 272, 275-7 and 359 of my edition.
2 P. 7 of the Bombay lithographed ed. of A.H. 1277.
3 Vol. ii, pp. 2-5 of the Tihrân lithograph.
Hasan-i-Júrî at the hands of Khwájá Wajíhu'd-Dín Mas'úd's men on the 13th of Şafar [A.H. 743 = July 18, 1342], and flight of Khwájá Wajíhu'd-Dín.

"Loss of the Điwán (complete poetical works) of the late Amír Fakhru'l-Haqq wa'd-Dín Mahmúd ibn-i-Yamín the Mustawfi (government accountant) of Faryúmad, which was looted in the battle mentioned above. Here is the fragment [in which Ibn-i-Yamín refers to this event]:

'چنگالی گارتاوان اوفتاد 'وزان پس کسی زو نشاتی نداد '"

'It fell into the hands of the spoilers, and thereafter no trace of it was found.'

"The above-mentioned Amír Fakhru'd-Dín Mahmúd [Ibn-i-Yamín] sent the following fragment which he had composed from Sabzawár to Malik Mu'ízzu'd-Dín Abu'l-Ḥusayn-i-Kurt:

""
Seek as they might his Divān was not to be found, so he made a [fresh] compilation from the anthologies of the Masters [of this art], and from what each [amateur of verse] remembered by heart, and from what he himself subsequently composed:

"So that my verses, scattered like the Seven Thrones¹, Might be again co-ordinated like the Pleiades."¹

¹ I.e. the Great Bear, also called "the Seven Brothers" (Haft Bīrādārān), and by the Arabs Banātū'n-Na'sh, "the Daughters of the Bier," or "Pall-bearers."
This ends the first notice of Ibn-i-Yamín in the *Mujmal*, but, before passing on to the second, I should give a translation of the fourteen couplets quoted above, which, if not remarkable as poetry, are of interest on account of the data which they afford.

*(Translation)*

“If Heaven, by a trick, snatched my *Diwan* out of my hands,
Thanks be to God! He who made the *Diwan*¹ is still with me!
And if Fate plucked from me a string of pearls fit for a king,
Yet I grieve not at its loss, since the remedy is with me.
And if the wind tore a flower from a branch of the rose-bush of my talent,
A garden full of anemones, eglantine and basil is still with me.
And if one of my shells of brilliant pearls was emptied,
I still have a mind filled with pearls like the sea of ‘Ummán.
What matters it if a few drops of the sputterings of my pen are lost?
There still remains with me a talent bountiful as the April cloud!
If the sweet water of my verse has been cast to the winds like dust
It matters little, for with me is the Fountain of the Water of Life.
And though my heart is grieved at the loss of my *Diwan*,
Why should I grieve at this, since my pearl-producing genius remains?
And if the praise of the King of the World is, like the fame of his justice,
Spread abroad throughout the earth, the praise-producing talent is mine!
Although I could compile another *Diwan*, yet
My life’s work is wasted, and regret for this remains with me.
If this vile Age is unkind to me, what matter
If the favours of the King of the Age are mine?
That just Prince *Mu‘izzu’d-Dīn*, whose virtue cries,
‘Whatever of glory can enter the Phenomenal World is mine.’
The chief of the favours which in all circumstances
The King of the Age doth show me amongst all my peers
Is this, that by his favour one of noble rank says to me
‘Rejoice, O Ibn-i-Yamín, for the constituent parts of the *Diwan*
are in my possession!’
Life has passed: may he continue successful until Eternity,
And may the daily portion of me his servant be prayers for the King so long as life remains to me!”

¹ *I.e.* my genius, myself.
The second entry in the *Mujmal* is very brief, and merely records the death of Ibn-i-Yamin on the 8th of Jumáda ii, 769 (Jan. 30, 1368), this date being further commemorated in the following chronogram:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{بود از تاريخ هفت هفت صد با شئت و نه'} \\
\text{روز شنه هشت ماه جمادی الآخرین'} \\
\text{گفت رضوان حوررا بی حیر و استقبال كن'} \\
\text{خیمه بر صحراى جنت بر زند ابن یمین'}
\end{align*}
\]

This is followed by a quatrain\(^1\) said to have been uttered by the poet a little before his death:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{منکر که دل ابن یمین بر خون شد'} \\
\text{بنگر گه ازین جبان قانی چون شد'} \\
\text{مصحف بکف و چشم بر روى بدیست'} \\
\text{با پیک اجل خندن زنان بپرون شد'}
\end{align*}
\]

"Regard not Ibn-i-Yamin's heart of woe;  
See how from out this transient world I go.  
Qur'an in hand and smiling, forth I wend  
With Death's dread messenger to seek the Friend."

Dawlatsháh devotes an article to the poet's father as well as to himself (Nos. 6 and 7 of the fifth *Tabaqá*), but contributes few material or trustworthy facts, though he cites one fine poem of 14 couplets by the former, whose death he places in the year 724/1324. According to him Amír Yamínú'd-Dín, the father of our poet, was of Turkish origin; settled as a landowner at Faryümad, where his son was born, in the reign of the Mongol Sulţán Khudá-banda; and enjoyed the favour and patronage of Khwája 'Alá'ú'd-Dín Muḥammad, who was in the fiscal service of Sulţán Abú Sa'íd,

\(^1\) Given also with very slight variations by Dawlatsháh, p. 276, ll. 15-18 of my edition.
and who was killed near Astarábad by the Sarbadárs in 737/1336–7. Concerning the son, Ibn-i-Yamín, he tells us little, save that he was the panegyrist of the Sarbadárs, which is doubtful, and that he died in 745/1344–5, which is almost certainly incorrect; but he endeavours to make up for this dearth of information by a digression of ten pages on the history of the little Sarbaddr dynasty, which lasted about fifty years and was finally extinguished by Tímúr about 788/1386. The Haft Iqlim, Átash-kada and Majma‘u’l-Fuṣahá práctically yield no further information, except that the last-named work states that Ibn-i-Yamín was the panegyrist of Ṭughá-Tímúr. Owing to the loss of his Diván, as described above, it is impossible to determine with certainty who were his patrons and to whom his panegyrics were chiefly addressed.

Ibn-i-Yamín’s extant work consists of his Mugatta‘áát, or “Fragments,” most of which are of a philosophical, ethical or mystical character. An edition of them was printed at Calcutta in 1865, and I also possess a pretty and carefully-written manuscript dated Rajab 5, 881 (Oct. 24, 1476). A German rendering of many of these poems by Schlechta-Wssehrd has also been published¹. The following fine verses on the evolution of the soul are amongst the best and most celebrated of Ibn-i-Yamín’s poems:

زدء از کتیر علم خیمه بصحرای وجود 旅程
وز جمادی بناتی سفری کرده و رفت بعد از نیمار کشش طبع بهجوانی بود
بعد از نیمار کشش طبع بهجوانی بود
چون رسیدم بوی از وی گذری کرده و رفت
بعد از آن در صدف سیه، انسان بصفا
قطره، هستی خودرا گذری کرده و رفت

¹ Ibn Jemin’s Bruchstücke, Vienna, 1852, pp. 191. It contains translations of 164 “Fragments.”
The following is a rather free translation of the above:

"From the void of Non-Existence to this dwelling-house of clay
I came, and rose from stone to plant; but that hath passed away!
Thereafter, through the working of the Spirit's toil and strife,
I gained, but soon abandoned, some lowly form of life:
That too hath passed away!
In a human breast, no longer a mere unheeding brute,
This tiny drop of Being to a pearl I did transmute:
That too hath passed away!
At the Holy Temple next did I foregather with the throng
Of Angels, compassed it about, and gazed upon it long:
That too hath passed away!
Forsaking Ibn-i-Yamin, and from this too soaring free,
I abandoned all beside Him, so that naught was left but HE:
All else hath passed away!"

The same ideas have been equally well expressed, however, by the great mystical poet Jalálu’dd-Dín Rúmí, who lived a century earlier, in a very well-known passage of the Mathnawi which runs as follows:

"From the void of Non-Existence to this dwelling-house of clay
I came, and rose from stone to plant; but that hath passed away!
Thereafter, through the working of the Spirit's toil and strife,
I gained, but soon abandoned, some lowly form of life:
That too hath passed away!
In a human breast, no longer a mere unheeding brute,
This tiny drop of Being to a pearl I did transmute:
That too hath passed away!
At the Holy Temple next did I foregather with the throng
Of Angels, compassed it about, and gazed upon it long:
That too hath passed away!
Forsaking Ibn-i-Yamin, and from this too soaring free,
I abandoned all beside Him, so that naught was left but HE:
All else hath passed away!"
"I died from mineral and plant became;
Died from the plant, and took a sentient frame;
Died from the beast, and donned a human dress;
When by my dying did I e'er grow less?
Another time from manhood I must die
To soar with angel-pinions through the sky.
'Midst Angels also I must lose my place,
Since 'Everything shall perish save His Face,'
Let me be Naught! The harp-strings tell me plain
That 'unto Him do we return again!'"

(Another Fragment)

"Only for one of reasons twain the wise
Possession of this varied world do prize:
Either to benefit their friends thereby,
Or else to trample down some enemy.
But he who seeketh wealth upon this earth,
And knoweth not wherein consists its worth
Is as the gleaner, who with toil doth bind
His sheaf, then casts the harvest to the wind.
Naught but a weary soul and aching back
Accrue to those who understanding lack."

The following is typical in its Manichæan and Malthusian pessimism:

"Ibk^  
Obl;^  
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1 Compare Tennyson in Locksley Hall:
"Love took up the harp of Life, and smote on all the chords with might;
Smote the chord of Self, that, trembling, pass'd in music out of sight."
"Knowest thou wherefore the child no gratitude bears
E’en to the father who makes him the chief of his heirs?
‘Twas thou,’ he seems to say, ‘who my peace didst mar
By bringing me into a world where such miseries are!’"

The fragment next following also represents a line of thought common with Ibn-i-Yamin and others of his school:

خداوند قصد نکرده‌ای هستین داد،
بروز آن‌ست اندر افکنند خشت,
گل پیکرترا چهل با ماداد,
بدست خود از راه حکمت سرشت,
قلیرا فرمود تا بر سرت،
hمه بودنیبا یکایک نوشت,
نزیبد که گوید ترا روز حشر,
که این کار خوبست و آن کار زشت,
ندارد طمع رستن شاخ عود,
هر آنکس که بینم شترخار خشت,
چو از خط فرمانش بیرون نیند,
چه اصحاب مسجد چه اهل خشت,
خیردرا شکفت آید از عدل او,
که آنرا دهد دوزن اینرا پیشت.

"That God who on Creation’s Primal Day
The first foundations of thy soul did lay,
Who in His Wisdom did for forty morns
Fashion the house of clay thy soul adorns;"
Who bade the Pen\(^1\) inscribe upon thy brow
Whate'er betided thee from then till now,
It ill beseems Him on the Judgement-Day
'This was well done, and that done ill' to say!
For he who sows the camel-thorn can ne'er
Expect the aloe-tree to blossom there.
Since, then, the Muslim and the Christian stand
Subject alike to His supreme command,
'Why should He give,' in wonder ask the wise,
'To this one Hell, to that one Paradise?''

(Another Fragment)

مرد باید که هر کجا باشد، عَرَت خویشتن نَگه دارد;
خود پسندی و ابلی تندد؛ هرچه کبی و میست بگذارد;
بطریقی رود که مردم را، سر موثی ز خوود نیازارد;
همه کسرا ز خویش به داند، هیچ کسرا حقیر نشارد;
سر و زر در طلب نهاد آنگه؛

"Whoe'er he be, wherever he may dwell
A man should strive to guard his honour well;
Conceit and folly he should put aside,
And turn his back on arrogance and pride;
Should so behave that none through him should e'er
Endure vexation equal to a hair;
None should despise for lack of power or pelf,
And deem each neighbour better than himself;
Then all his energies and wealth should spend
That so perchance he thus may gain a friend."

(Another Fragment)

کُنْجَی یَکَه دَرَو تَنِیجِ اَغیار نباشد،
بر کس ز تو و بر تو ز کس بار نباشد،
رودی و سرودی و حرفی دو سه یاری;
باش باید که عدد بشتر از چار نباشد،

\(^1\) According to another tradition (Tabarī, I, 29) the Prophet said:
"The first thing which God created was the Pen, and He commanded it to write down everything" (i.e., as is explained in other traditions, everything predestined to happen).
The following fragment is practically a paraphrase of some very well-known Arabic verses ascribed to Qábús ibn Washmgír, Prince of Tabaristán (reigned A.D. 976–1012), which are quoted in the Story of the Merchant and the Jinní in the Arabian Nights:

"A corner which no stranger can explore,
Where no one bores you, and you no one bore,
A sweetheart, lute and song, a friend or two—
At most a party not exceeding four;
A harp, a zither, roasted meats and wine,
A cup-bearer who is a friend of thine,
Reason, which doth distinguish good and ill,
Regarding not thy ploy with eyes malign!

Whoever doth disparage such affair
Is in the spirit-world devoid of share;
To Ibn-i-Yamín should such luck accrue
For no one in this world or that he'd care!"

1 See W. H. MacNaghten's edition (Calcutta, 1839), vol. i, p. 11, ll. 1–8.
Not as I would, O friends, the world doth go:
Of men of genius 'tis the constant foe.
Though fickle Fortune trouble me, what then?
Trouble's the portion of all noble men.
The sky holds countless stars, of which not one
Suffers eclipse, except the moon and sun.
'Tis custom now that he who wants for wits
Ever above the man of talent sits,
As on the sea the dust and rubbish swim
While pearls lie sunk in its abysses dim.

2. Khwājū of Kirmān
(Kamālu'd-Dīn Abū'l-'Āţā Mahmūd ibn 'Ālī ibn Maḥmūd).

Although nearly all the well-known biographies, such as Dawlatshāh, the Haft Iqlīm, the Ātash-kada, the Majma'ūl-Fuṣahā, etc., contain notices of Khwājū of Kirmān, they are singularly jejune and lacking in precise information, while such precise information as is given is often demonstrably incorrect. Indeed the carelessness with which these works are compiled and copied is deplorable. To take one instance only, Ridā-quli Khán, in spite of his undeniable attainments as a poet, a lexicographer and a historian, states in the Majma'ūl-Fuṣahā that Khwājū was the panegyrist of Sulṭān Abū Sa'īd Khán, who

reigned from 716-736/1316-1335, and immediately afterwards gives the year of his death as 503/1109-1110, which is evidently a careless mistake for 753. Dawlatshah, who gives 742/1341-2 as the year of his decease, describes him as belonging to a good family in Kirman, where, however, he spent but a small part of his life, though in some verses quoted on the same page, and evidently composed at Baghdád, he speaks of his native town with longing and affection:

Verses showing his love of his native place Kirman

Verses showing his love of his native place Kirman

Verse showing his love of his native place Kirman

“Pleasant the fragrant and sweet-scented blast
Which o'er the earth of Kirman late hath passed!
Pleasant the days of that sweet Philomel
Which in its groves and gardens fair doth dwell!
What fault was mine that Heaven did decree
From that pure land I must an exile be?
Wherefore in Baghdád city must I dwell
That tears like Tigris from mine eyes may well?”

During his travels, according to the Haft Iqlim, Khwájú made the acquaintance of many of his contemporaries amongst the poets and men of letters, and became the disciple of the eminent and pious Shaykh Ruknu'd-Din 'Alá'u'd-Dawla of Simnán, with a sketch of whose life Dawlatsháh seeks to compensate us for the exiguity of his information about the proper subject of his biography. Rieu\(^3\) quotes some verses in which a little-known contemporary poet named Haydar of Shfáz fiercely attacks

---

\(^1\) Loc. cit., p. 249, ll. 18-21.

\(^2\) Literally, “Where naught but the Tigris comes into my eyes.” This may either mean “Where my eyes serve only to shed rivers of tears,” or, “Where I can see nothing but the Tigris.”

\(^3\) British Museum Pers. Cat., p. 623.
Khwájú, whom he calls “a Kábúlí thief from Kirmán town,” as a plagiarist. He says:

“Do not mention the name of Khwájú before a poet,
For he is a thief from the Dilwán of Sa’dí.
Since he cannot compete in verse even with me
How dares he talk about Sa’dí?”

I can find no mention of Khwájú in the Mujmal of Fašíhí, but Hamdu’lláh Mustawfi of Qazwín accords him a brief notice and cites one of his poems in the Ta’rikh-i-Guzída, which was completed in 730/1330\textsuperscript{1}, so that even during his lifetime he was evidently well-known throughout Persia. He is also mentioned in the Majálisu’l-Mú’minín, that late but extensive biographical work on the ornaments of the Shí’a sect of Islám, which, however, in this case does little more than copy Dawlatsháh.

It may be laid down as a general principle that the only satisfactory method of writing the lives of Persian poets, with the possible exception of some of the older ones, who lived before the Mongol Invasion had destroyed the scientific spirit of historical criticism in Persia, is to collect and collate such particulars as can be derived from their own works as preserved in old and correct manuscript copies, since little confidence can be placed in some of the modern lithographed editions. This method has been followed in the case of many of the older poets, such as Firdawsí, Nízámi, Anwarí, Khákání, etc., and in this respect Khwájú is more fortunate than many of his contemporaries, for so long ago as 1848 Dr Franz von Erdmann published\textsuperscript{2} a short account of him, in which, after quoting and translating Dawlatsháh’s article, he gives a brief description of a manu-

\textsuperscript{1} P. 818 of the fac-simile edition published in the “E. J. W. Gibb Memorial” Series, xiv, i. See also pp. 29–30 of the reprint of an article on the Biographies of Persian Poets contained in...the Ta’rikh-i-Guzída which I contributed to the J.R.A.S. for Oct. 1900 and Jan. 1910.

script of his Khamsa, or five longer mathnawi poems, adding some useful particulars derived from them and from his Dīwān. These particulars I shall here summarize, together with the additional details contributed by Rieu.¹

According to his own statement, in his poem Naw-rūz u Gul ("New Year's Day and the Rose"), he was born on Shawwāl 15, 679 (Feb. 7, 1281). He began his poetical career by attaching himself to the court of one of the Muzaffari princes, probably Mubārizu’d-Dīn Muḥammad, the founder of that dynasty, at Yazd. Later he frequented the court of Shaykh Abū Ishāq (reigned 742–754/1341–1353) at Shīráz, and, as may be gathered from the dedications of some of his qaṣīdas (panegyrics) given by von Erdmann, the courts of Shirwān-shāh and Qizil Arslān, Prince of ‘Irāq, while the poem already cited shows that he also spent some time at Baghhdād. In short he would seem to have wandered through the greater part of Persia, and cannot be regarded, like some of his contemporaries, as essentially the poet of one particular dynasty.

Khwāju’s poems comprise the five romantic mathnawīs which constitute the Khamṣa, or "Quintet" (of which no copy is accessible in Cambridge, though the British Museum possesses a fine copy² made in 798/1396), and a Dīwān containing qaṣīdas (some religious, but mostly panegyrics), ghāzals (odes), muqatta’āt (fragments), rubā’iyyāt (quatrain), etc. Of the Dīwān I possess two manuscripts, one quite modern, and the other, bought at the sale of the Fiott-Hughes library about twenty years ago, copied by “Darwish Ḥāfīẓ of Shīráz” (not, of course, the great Ḥāfīẓ, who died more than a century earlier) in 899/1493–4. A former owner of the last-mentioned manuscript has computed the number of verses which it contains at about four thousand.

² Add. 18,113, to which Rieu’s remarks, where cited, refer.

B. P.
The five poems which constitute the Khamsa are:

(1) *Naw-rúz u Gul* ("New Year’s Day and the Rose"), of which the contents are briefly stated by von Erdmann, who says that it comprises 2615 verses (*bayts*).

(2) *Humáy u Humáyun*, dedicated, apparently, either to Sultan Abú Sa‘íd (716-736/1316-1335) or to his minister Ghiyáthu’d-Dín Muḥammad, and containing 3203 verses. This poem, as Rieu has shown, was composed at Baghhdád in 732/1331-2.

(3) *Kamál-náma* (the “Book of Perfection”), composed in 744/1343-4, and dedicated to Shaykh Abú Isháq, Prince of Fárs, who had ascended the throne only two years previously.

(4) *The Rawḍatul-Anwár* ("Garden of Lights"), a mystical poem composed at the shrine of Shaykh Abú Isháq Ibráhím, the patron saint of Kázárún in Fárs, in 743/1342-3, a year before the poem last mentioned.

(5) Another mystical poem of the title of which I am uncertain. The whole Khamsa, or “Quintet,” is apparently an imitation of the celebrated Khamsa of Niżámi of Ganja, and was concluded in 744/1343-4.

In spite of the comparative celebrity which Khwájú enjoys, I have not been able to discover any striking beauty or conspicuous merit in his odes (*ghazals*), of which I have read some seventy-five. The following may serve as a fairly favourable specimen:

ماکذر زما که خاطری ما در وفای تست
دل بر امید وعده و جان در وفای تست

سبلست اگر رضای تو ترک رضای ماست
مقصود ما ز دنیی و عقیبی رضای تست

زین پس چو سر فداى قفای تو کردهایم

مارا مران ز پیش که دل در قفای تست
Translation

"Pass us not by, for our thought is set on thy constancy,
Our heart on the hope of thy promise, and our soul on thy faith!
If it be thy pleasure to thwart our pleasure, that matters little;
Our object in this world and the next is thy pleasure.
Hereafter, since we have staked our head in following thee,
Drive us not from thy presence, for our heart follows after thee.
I put my neck under the yoke and bow my head in service:
Forgive me, if thou wilt, or slay me: it is for thee to judge.
He who is thy slave becomes freed from all:
He who is thy friend becomes a stranger to his own kin.
O thou who art dearer to my heart than the soul which is in the body,
That soul which is in my body exists but for thee!
This sad-hearted victim who aspires to thy love,
His rightest oath is by thy heart-entrancing stature.
Khwájú, who is passing away through thy cruelty and harshness,
His heart is still set on thy love and loyalty!"

Besides odes (ghazals) and the above-mentioned mathnawís, Khwájú has several tarkíb-bands, one or two "fragments" (muqattáát), and a few quatrains, including one about the dove crying "Kú, kú?" ("Where, where?" are the great ones of yore departed?), generally ascribed to 'Umar Khayyám.
The following mustazdd is not without grace:

(Translation)

"Is there none to say from me to that Turk of Cathay (Khatā) if any fault (khatā) has been committed Come back, for we hope from thee for ourselves Fidelity to promises.

This is a very common word-play, e.g. in the well-known verse: The Turks of Cathay or Chinese Tartary are celebrated in Persia for their fair complexions and beauty.
Do not cast pepper in the name of me, the heart-consumed,
   On the fire of thy cheek,
For because of that musky grain of thine I have fallen, O friend,
   Into the snare of misfortune.
Today I am, like the curve of thine eyebrow, in the city
   Like unto the crescent moon,
Since I have seen that face of signal beauty
   The cynosure of every eye.
Come back, that I may lay down my head at thy feet, and my life
   At the feet of thy horse,
Since the hand of poor indigent me cannot provide
   Anything more than 'hoof-money,'
Is it a rule in your city not to enquire
   Into the condition of poor strangers?
After all, what hurt could befall the realm of thy beauty
   From one so helpless [as me]?
How long, O sweet-voiced minstrel, wilt thou play out of tune
   The 'Lover's Air'?
Soothe me, the poor and portionless, for once
   By a song of substance!
After all, how much longer can I keep hidden
   In my heart the grief of separation?
O Beloved, I am sure that this grief will spread
   One day somewhither.
Through regret for thy ruby lip I am in the Darkness of Alexander
   Like Khwájú,
But what can I do, since the Kingdom of Darius.
   Is not meet for a beggar?"

These few specimens of Khwájú's poems will perhaps suffice to show that his verse, while graceful and pleasing, lacks any conspicuous distinction or excellence.

1 Rue (sipand) and pepper (filfil) are burned in incantations against the Evil Eye. The black mole (khál) or beauty-spot on the red cheek of a beautiful person is often compared by the Persian poets to rue on the fire.
2 I.e. bent with grief and disappointment.
3 Na'l-bahá, or "hoof-money," is money paid to invading troops to induce them to abstain from looting.
4 This alludes to Alexander's quest for the Water of Life in the Land of Darkness.
3. 'Ubayd-i-Zákání
(Nizámü'd-Dín 'Ubaydu'lláh).

'Ubayd-i-Zákání is, perhaps, the most remarkable parodist and satirical writer produced by Persia, and though, like most Persian, Arabian and Turkish satirists, his language is frequently so coarse as to render a large part of his writings unfit for translation, his Akhláqu'l-Ashráf, or "Ethics of the Aristocracy," is, where not so marred, a fine piece of irony, while some of his serious poems (which have been too much ignored by most of his biographers) are of singular beauty. Of his life, as usual, little is known, save that he was originally from Qazwín (for which city he seems to have had little affection, since he is constantly gibing at the stupidity of its inhabitants), lived at Shíráz (to which, on the other hand, as several of his poems show, he was much attached) during the reign of Shaykh Abú Isháq İnjú (who was killed in 747/1346-7), abandoned serious writing for a ribaldry more in accord with the taste of the great men of that time, but none the less (as several of his poems and a well-known anecdote about his death indicate) suffered much from penury and debt, and finally died about 772/1371. Another well-known anecdote describes his quarrel and reconciliation with his contemporary Salmán of Sáwa¹, and he appears to have enjoyed the patronage of Sultán Uways at Baghdád or Tabríz, or both. Dawlatsháh² consecrates a long but not very informative article to him, most of which (with fuller quotations from his poems) is reproduced in the Haft İqlím. The notice in the Atashkāda is very meagre, and no mention of him is made in the Mujmal of Fásihí or in the modern Majma'ul-Fusahá. His satirical mathnawi of "the Mouse and the Cat" (Mushu Gurba) has been lithographed, with quaint woodcuts, at

¹ See Ouseley's Notices of Persian Poets, pp. 125-128.
Bombay, without date; and a selection of his *Facetiae*, to which is prefixed a Persian preface, probably by the late Mirzá Hábib of Isfahán, followed by another of M. Ferté, was printed at Constantinople, at the Press of Ebu’z-Ziyá Tevfíq Bey, in 1303/1885–6. As these two prefaces contain most that is to be said about ‘Ubayd-i-Zákání, I here append a translation, omitting only a few unsuitable passages.

"Preface.

"That most witty poet ‘Ubayd-i-Zákání was of the village of Zákán near Qazwín, and was one of the notabilities of the eighth century of the Flight. He was a man of talent and learning, one of the masters of style and sound taste. Although some reckon him as one of the ribald writers, it is only fair to state that, though jests, ribaldry and satire occur in his poems, he deserves to rank as something more than a mere satirist, being, indeed, conspicuous amongst the older poets for his grace and wit, and in these respects approached by few. He was particularly skilful in incorporating in his poems and investing with a ludicrous sense the serious verses of other poets, an achievement in which he left no ground unturned. His own serious poems, on the other hand, are incomparable in fluency of diction, sweetness and distinction, and are unrivalled in grace and subtlety.

"‘Ubayd-i-Zákání pursued his studies at Shfraz in the reign of Sháh Abú Isháq, and became one of the most accomplished men of letters and learning of his time, acquiring complete proficiency in every art, and compiling books and treatises thereon. He subsequently

1 There is also a cheap English rendering, with the same woodcuts, of which I once picked up a copy at the railway bookstall of Llandudno Junction.
2 It comprises 128 pp.
3 Ḥamdu’lláh Mustawff of Qazwín in his Ta’rikh-i-Guzida (Gibb Memorial Series, vol. xiv, 1, pp. 845–6) speaks of the Zákánis as one of the notable tribes or families of Qazwín, says that they were descended from the Arabian tribe of Khafája, and quotes in the original Arabic a rescript (manshár) addressed to them by the Prophet Muḥammad. At the end of this article he mentions our poet as follows: "Of them is that honoured gentleman Master [Khvája] Niẓámu’d-Dín ‘Ubaydu’lláh, who has some fine poems and incomparable writings." This book was written in 730/1330, and as ‘Ubayd-i-Zákání was then already a man of note in his own city of Qazwín, he cannot have been born much later than 700/1300.
4 Fourteenth of the Christian era.
returned to Qazwín, where he had the honour of being appointed to a
Judgeship, and was chosen as the tutor and teacher of sundry young
noblemen. At that time the Turks in Persia had left no prohibited or
vicious act undone, and the character of the Persian people, by reason
of association and intercourse with them, had become so changed and
corrupted that 'Ubayd-i-Zákání, disgusted at the contemplation thereof,
sought by every means to make known and bring home to them the
ture condition of affairs. Therefore, as an example of the corrupt
morals of the age and its people, he composed the treatise known as
the 'Ethics of the Aristocracy' (Akhláqül-Ashráf), which was not
intended as mere ribaldry, but as a satire containing serious reflections
and wise warnings. So likewise, in order to depict the level of intelli-
gence and degree of knowledge of the leading men of Qazwín, each
one of whom was a mass of stupidity and ignorance, he included in
his 'Joyous Treatise' (Risála-i-Dilgushá) many anecdotes of which
each contains a lesson for persons of discernment. As a measure of
his accomplishments, experience, learning and worldly wisdom, his
'Tract of a Hundred Counsels' (Risála-i-Sad Pandá) and his 'Defini-
tions' (Tá'rifát) are a sufficient proof. Moreover, even those who speak
of him as a mere ribald satirist admit that he composed a treatise on
Rhetoric ('Ilm-i-Ma'áání u Bayán) which he desired to present to the
King. The courtiers and favourites, however, told him that the King
had no need of such rubbish. Then he composed a fine panegyric,
which he desired to recite, but they informed him that His Majesty did
not like to be mocked with the lies, exaggerations and fulsome flattery
of poets. Thereupon 'Ubayd-i-Zákání said, 'In that case I too will
pursue the path of impudence, so that by this means I may obtain access
to the King's most intimate society, and may become one of his
courtiers and favourites,' which he accordingly did. Then he began
recklessly to utter the most shameless sayings and the most unseemly
and extravagant jests, whereby he obtained innumerable gifts and
presents, while none dared to oppose or contend with him.

"It is said that after 'Ubayd-i-Zákání had despaired of entering the
King's assembly, he extemporized the following quatrain:

در علم و هنر مسَّو چو مان صاحب فن،
تا نزد عزیزان نشوی خواه چو من،
خواهی که شوی بهبین ارباب زمین،
کُنکُن آور و خُنکُنی کن و خُنکُن رزن."

1 The Farhang-i-Násiri explains کُنکُن as کُنکُن، with a
reference to Sa'di's Khabíthát (Calcutta ed. of 1795, vol. ii, f. 470b, l. 4);
'In arts and learning be not skilled like me,
Or by the great like me despised thou'llt be.
Wouldst earn applause from this base age of thine?
Beg shamelessly, play lute and libertine!' 

"One of his acquaintances, hearing this, expressed astonishment that one so talented and accomplished could abandon learning and culture in favour of ribaldry and lewd utterances. To him ‘Ubayd-i-Zâkânî sent the following verse:

"Keep clear of learning, Sir, if so you may,
Lest you should lose your pittance for the day.
Play the buffoon and learn the fiddler's skill:
On great and small you then may work your will!"

"It is said that Salmân-i-Sáwâjî, a contemporary poet, wrote these verses satirizing ‘Ubayd-i-Zâkânî, whom he had never seen:

"The point of this verse is that Persian wits affect to regard the people of Qazwín as fools, just as they dub the Khurâns's asses,' the
people of Tús 'cows,' those of Bukhárā 'bears,' and those of Transoxiana 'Mashhadís,' that is, heretics (Ráfaélís), all of which attributions are of the nature of disparagement.

"As soon as 'Ubayd-i-Zákání heard this verse, he at once set out for Baghhdád. On his arrival there, he found Salmán, surrounded with great pomp and circumstance, on the banks of the Tigris, occupied with pleasure and diversion and the society of learned and accomplished men. When by some means he succeeded in entering the circle, Salmán had just composed this hemistich descriptive of the Tigris:

\[
\text{دیره‌ای ایماسل رفتاری عجب مستانه است}
\]

'With drunken frenzy and fury fierce this year the Tigris flows'—which he asked the bystanders to complete. Thereupon 'Ubayd-i-Zákání extemporized the following complementary hemistich:

\[
\text{باي در زنجير و كف بر لب مگر دیوانه است}
\]

'With its foaming lips and its feet in chains, 'twere mad, you might suppose.'

"Salmán was delighted, and enquired whence he came. He replied, 'From Qazwín.' In the course of the ensuing conversation Salmán asked him whether his name was known or any of his verse familiar in Qazwín, or not. 'Ubayd-i-Zákání replied, 'The following fragment of his poetry is very well known:

\[
\text{من خرابات‌های پاده پرست، در خرابات مغان عاشق و مست}
\]

\[
\text{می کشندم چو سبودوش بدوش،}
\]

\[
\text{می برندم چو قندح دست بدست}
\]

'A frequenter of taverns am I, and a lover of wine, Besotted with drink and desire at the Magians' shrine. Like a wine-jar from shoulder to shoulder amongst them I pass, And go from one hand to another like goblet or glass.'"

"'Now although Salmán is an accomplished man,' added 'Ubayd, 'and these verses may perhaps be truly ascribed to him, yet in my opinion they were most probably composed by his wife!'

"Salmán perceived from this witty speech that this was none other than 'Ubayd himself, whereupon he made much of him, apologized for his satire, and so long as 'Ubayd remained in Baghhdád, fell short in no service which he could render him. And 'Ubayd used often to say to

1 The implication is, of course, that his wife was a woman of loose morals and bad character.
him, 'O Salmán, fortune favoured you in that you so speedily made your peace with me, and so escaped from the malice of my tongue!'

Then follows as a postscript the short Introduction ascribed to M. Ferté, who describes therein his devotion to Oriental and especially Persian literature, his desire to contribute something to a fuller knowledge of it, and his appreciation of the works of 'Ubayd-i-Zákání, a manuscript of which happened to come under his notice. From this manuscript he made the selections (amounting to about three-quarters of the whole contents) contained in this volume. These include:

1. The Akhlāqul-Assrāf, or "Ethics of the Aristocracy" (prose), composed in 740/1340.
2. The "Book of the Beard" (Rīd-nāma), in mixed prose and verse, undated.
3. The "Book of a hundred Counsels" (Risāla-i-Sad ḫand), composed in 750/1350 (prose).
4. The "Definitions" (Ṭa‘rīfāt), or "Ten Sections" (Dāl Fāsl), undated (prose).
5. Poems of different kinds, mostly obscene, including parodies.
6. The "Joyous Treatise" (Risāla-i-Dilgushā), divided into two parts, the one containing Arabic, the other Persian anecdotes and facetta.

On the other hand, there are omitted from these selections all 'Ubayd's serious poems and panegyrics, as well as the "Book of Lovers" ('Ushshāq-nāma), "Book of Omens" (Fāl-nāma), etc. Of the three MSS. of this poet's works which I have examined in the British Museum (Or. 2947, Or. 5738, and Or. 6303) the last contains the largest selection of poetry, including panegyrics on Shaykh Abú Ishāq, Sultān Uways, Ruknu’d-Dīn 'Amīdu’l-Mulk, etc. Among these one of the prettiest is the following:

دل باز دارد میلی بجایی، افتتاح بازم در سر هوائی.
او پادشاهی من بی نوائی، از شریاری من خاکساری.
بلا بالندی گیسو کهندی، سلطان خسینی فرمان روانی.

"Once again a passion has entered my head; again my heart inclines in a certain direction.

He is of Royal birth, I am of the dust; he is a King, and I am portionless.

One tall of stature, with locks like lassoes, an autocrat descended from Sultán Husayn:

One with eyebrows like bows and slender waist, one unkind, fair and deceitful.

Such a charmer of hearts, such a graceful cypress-tree, such a shower of oats and seller of barley!

Without him the sun gives no light; without him the world has no lustre.

Wherever his ruby-lip smiles, there sugar is of no account.

Everywhere the heart holds with his vision pleasant speech and sweet discourse

Thou wouldst say that I come to the house of a physician, that perhaps I may procure a remedy for my heart.

Everyone else complains of a foe, but our complaint is of a friend. Should the eyes of 'Ubayd not look their fill upon him, then his eyes do not regard any other misfortune!"

Another fine manuscript of the works of 'Ubayd-i-Zákání, bearing the class-mark Suppl. persan 824, is in the possession

---

1 "To show oats and sell barley" means to make specious promises which one cannot fulfil, to let one's practice fall short of one's promises, etc.
of the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. It was transcribed in Muharram, 834 (Sept.—Oct., 1430), comprises 111 leaves, and contains besides the poems, serious and flippant, the "Book of Lovers" (‘Ushshāq-nāma), in verse and partly in dialect; the "Ethics of the Aristocracy" (Akhlaq-ul-Ashrāf), the "Book of the Beard" (Rish-nāma), and the "Ten Chapters" (Dah Fasl). The most striking feature of the serious poems is the constant references to Fārs and its capital Shīrāz, which evidently held the affection of the poet far more than his native city Qazwīn. Thus, to quote a few examples, he says (f. 13b):

بيمن معدلت بادشاو بنده نواز,'

"By the auspicious justice of that King who is so gracious to his servants the region of Shīrāz has become an earthly Paradise."

So again he says (f. 23a):

شَد ملك نار بامی پادی گردهار
خوشت ز صحن جنّت و خرّمتر از ببار

"By the favour of the Creator the Kingdom of Pārs hath become pleasanter than the Courts of Paradise and gayer than the Spring." And again (f. 28a) he says:

رسید راوت منصور شاه بنده نواز,'
بُخّرّمی و سعادت بخطّه شیرار,'
جبانشای جوانبخت شیخ ابو اسحق,'
خدایان مخالف خُش موافق ساز,'

"The victorious standard of the King who is so gracious to his servants hath reached with glee and happiness the region of Shīrāz:

Shaykh Abú Ishāq, that world-conqueror of youthful fortune, our liege-lord who slayeth opponents and maketh the fortune of his loyal supporters."

The following verse, again (f. 35b), is strongly reminiscent of, and was probably inspired by, a very well-known verse
of Sa'di's occurring in a poem quoted in vol. ii of my *Literary History of Persia*, p. 535, lines 13–15:

نسيب پاد مصلّی و آب رکن آباد
غريب را وطن خويش می برد از یاد

"The gentle breeze of Muşallá and the stream of Ruknábád cause the stranger to forget his own native land."

The following verse occurring in a poem in which ‘Ubayd bids farewell to Shíráz affords further testimony of his attachment to that place:

فتخی از خاطه شیراز و بجان در خطره
وه کنیب رقتین ناجار چه خونین چکرم

"I leave the region of Shíráz, being in peril of my life:
Alas, how full of anguish is my heart at this inevitable departure!"

As in the case of Ḥáfiz so also in ‘Ubayd’s *Diván* we find one disparaging allusion to Hurmuz (Ormuz) in the Persian Gulf which would seem to show that our poet had once visited that place:

در هرمز افتاده چنین با غرم و درد
از صحبت دوستان و مخدومان فرد

"I am thus cast away in Hurmuz in grief and sorrow, isolated from the companionship of friends and patrons."

Amongst the serious poems is one (f. 30b) in praise of the Ṣāhib-*Diván* ‘Amídu’l-Mulk, while amongst the satires are two (ff. 54b and 55a) directed against Ḵamál’u’Dín Ḥusayn and Shiháb’u’Dín Ḥaydar.

One of the religious poems at the beginning of the volume (f. 1b), containing the praise of God, the Prophet, and the Four Orthodox Caliphs, indicates that ‘Ubayd was a Sunni, but, apart from his disreputable *facetiae*, the following verse shows clearly enough that he neither claimed nor desired to lead a virtuous life:

خدایا دارم از لطف تو آمید گه ملک عیش من معبور داری
بسوردانی قضاء زهد از من بلاء توبه از من دور داری

1 I have not been able to identify these persons.
“God, of Thy grace one special hope I nourish,  
That Thou wilt cause my pleasure-realm to flourish,  
And turn from me the Doom of Abstinence,  
And save me from the Plague of Penitence!”

As regards 'Ubayd's *facetiae* (*hasaliyyat*), which are practically the only poems contained in the Constantinople edition of his works, they are, as already stated, almost without exception unfit for translation, and are regarded with disapproval or disgust by all respectable Persians at the present day. Their only point, moreover, lies in the skilful turning to base uses of the serious verses of earlier or contemporary poets, who are thus held up to ridicule and made to afford material for ribaldry by the unscrupulous 'Ubayd-i-Zakâni. Amongst the lighter poems which are unobjectionable, however, the following may be cited:

بيش ازین از مِلک هرسالی مرا  
در وثاقم نان خشک و تره،  
گه گهی هر باده حاضر شدی،  
گر ندیبی و نکاری آمدی  
نسبت در دستم کنون از خشک و تره  
ز آنچه وقتی در شماری آمدی  

غير من در خانه ام چیزی نیاند،  
و آن نباندی گر بکاری آمدی;

"Something at least from my small property  
Was wont to reach me in the days gone by,  
And when friends came to cheer my loneliness  
A crust of bread they found, a dish of cress,  
And sometimes wine withal, when some new flame  
Or some old crony me to visit came.  
But now, alas! all that I reckoned on,  
Solid or liquid, from my table's gone,  
And only I am left, nor would remain  
If my removal were another's gain!"

That poverty and debt were our poet's usual lot appears from other verses, such as the following:

مردم بعیش خوشدل و من مبتلا قرض  
هر کس بکار و باری و من در بلای قرض؛

Others rejoice in merriment, while I am afflicted with debt;  
Everyone has his affairs and business, while I am in the misfortune of debt.

My duty towards God and my debts to His creatures bow my neck;  
Shall I discharge my duty towards God, or my debts?

My expenses are more than usual, and my debts beyond bounds:  
Shall I take thought for my expenses or for my debts?

I complain of no documents save summonses for debt,  
And I fear no one save the witnesses to my indebtedness.

I have debts in the town and debts in the suburb,  
Debts in the street and debts in the store.

From morning until evening I continue in anxiety  
As to where I may incontinently beg a loan.

Other people flee from the hands of debt, while I,
After prayer and supplication, pray for a loan from God. My honour, like that of beggars, is cast to the winds, so often have I sought a loan from the door of every beggar. If the Master does not bespeak for me the King's favour, how can poor 'Ubayd finally discharge his debts?—Master 'Alâ'îd-Dunyâ wa'd-Dîn, except whose hand none other in the world hath given Debt its deserts!"

Other poems to the same purport will be found on pp. 58 (ll. 18–23) and 61 (ll. 16–20) of the Constantinople edition, and whether or no the well-known story about 'Ubayd-i-Zâkâni's death-bed practical joke on his children be true, it certainly accords alike with his character and his circumstances.

The following epigram on a physician is worth quoting:
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This cat, being in need of a meal, goes to a wine-tavern and conceals itself behind a wine-jar. Presently a mouse appears, leaps on to the edge of one of the jars, and begins to drink the wine, until, filled with the arrogance engendered by alcohol, and ignorant of the proximity of its formidable foe, it begins to boast its prowess, saying: "Where is the cat, that I may wring its neck and bear its head to the market-place? In the day of my munificence at the time of conferring benefits I would distribute the heads of a hundred cats! Cats are but as dogs in my sight, were I to meet them in the open field!"

Suddenly the cat leaps out upon it, seizes it, and cries, "O miserable mouse, how wilt thou save thy life?"

The mouse, effectively sobered now, adopts a tone of piteous entreaty, saying, "I am thy slave: pardon me these sins! If I ate dirt (i.e. talked nonsense) I was drunk, and drunkards eat much dirt! I am your slave, your devoted slave...":

The cat, however, pays no heed to the mouse's supplications, kills and eats it, and then goes to the mosque to pray and repent of its mouse-eating:
Another mouse which was hiding in the pulpit of the mosque hears these edifying utterances and hastens to bear the good news of the cat's repentance to the other mice, saying, in a verse which has become proverbial and is alluded to by Ḥáfiz:  

"Good tidings, for the cat has become devout, an ascetic, a true believer, a Musalman!"

The mice thereupon decide to express their satisfaction by sending to the cat a deputation of seven mice bearing suitable presents of wine, roasted meats, sweets, nuts, fruits and sherbets. The cat invites them to approach, and then seizes five of them, one in its mouth and one in each of its four paws, while the two survivors escape and carry the sad news of the cat's unchanged nature to the other mice. After a week's mourning for their lost comrades, the mice, 330,000 in number, under the command of their king, march out to do battle with the cats. After a fierce struggle, the cats are defeated, and the chief offender, taken captive, is brought before the king of the mice, who condemns it to die on the gibbet, but at the end the cat breaks away from its captors,

1 See my Literary History of Persia, vol. ii, p. 78, on the figure called *talmīḥ* or "allusion."
kills the king of the mice, and scatters or slays his followers. The poem ends:

"This strange and wonderful story is a memento of 'Ubayd-i-Zákání."

Passing now to 'Ubayd-i-Zákání's prose works, we shall first consider his "Ethics of the Aristocracy" (Akhláqu'l-Askráf), which is a very bitter satire on the morals of his time, composed in 740/1340, and comprising a Preface and seven chapters, each of which deals with one of the virtues in the following order: (1) Wisdom; (2) Courage; (3) Chastity; (4) Justice; (5) Generosity; (6) Clemency and Fidelity; (7) Modesty, Mercy, etc. In each chapter the author treats first of the old or "abrogated" conception of the virtue in question (madh-hab-i-mansúkh), and then of the new or "adopted" view (madh-hab-i-mukhtár) of the moderns, whom he ironically extols for their discovery, that, for instance, Courage is not really a virtue, as the ancients taught, but a very dangerous and harmful quality. Concerning the purpose of his book he thus speaks in the Preface:

"Just as the physicians have expended their energies on removing the ailments of the body and maintaining its health, so likewise the prophets have concentrated their attention on removing the maladies and misfortunes of the spirit, so that they may bring it out of the perilous guls and whirlpools of ignorance and imperfection to the shores of salvation and perfection. When the wise man regards with attentive gaze, it will become plain to him that the object of the mission of those on whom has devolved the Prophet's trust is the refining of the qualities and purification of the attributes of God's servants, a truth thus enunciated in the words of the poet:

'Whether or no a Prophet comes, be thou virtuous in conduct,
For he whose conduct is virtuous will not go to Hell.'

"His Holiness the Prophet himself has removed the veil from the virgin face of this idea, and has revealed the beauty implicit therein
on the bridal throne of this assurance—'I have been sent to complete virtuous qualities,' while learned men of former times have committed to writing, in lengthy treatises, most of which the defective intelligence of this humble writer fails to comprehend, the laws of this science, known as 'Ethics' or 'Practical Philosophy,' whereby, in the best and safest way, human nature may be perfected. From the auspicious time of the pure Adam until these days the noblest of mankind, with much trouble and extreme endeavour, have made the most strenuous efforts to acquire the four cardinal virtues of Wisdom, Courage, Chastity and Justice, which they account the chief means to happiness in this world and salvation in the world to come, and concerning which they say:

'Of whatever creed thou art, be a well-doer and a giver,
For Infidelity combined with good character is better than Islám combined with immorality.'

"But now in this age, which is the cream of all the ages and the crown of all times, the nature of the leaders of mankind has been sublimated, and great and powerful thinkers have appeared who have concentrated their luminous thoughts and salutary meditations on all matters appertaining to this life and the next, and in their clear vision the ancient laws and practices appeared contemptible and unsubstantial. Moreover, by the lapse of ages and passage of time, most of these rules had become obsolete, and the observance of these ethical principles and practices proved burdensome to the powerful minds and luminous intellects of these people. Therefore they manfully trampled under foot these principles and practices; adopted instead, for their guidance in this life and the next, the method now current amongst the great and noble (to the elucidation of some portion of which this epitome is devoted); and based on it their conduct of the affairs of this world and the next. The portals of thought being thus opened and the chain of speech extended, let us enter upon the matter in hand.

"It is now some time since this humble writer 'Ubayd-i-Zákání conceived the ambition of writing a compendious treatise dealing with certain ethical conceptions of the ancients, which the people of our time regard as 'obsolete,' and some portion of the principles and practices of the leaders of thought in this age, which they regard as 'adopted,' in order that this treatise might benefit students of this science and neophytes in this path. Now at last, in this year 740 of the Flight (A.D. 1339-1340) he hath hastily penned this epitome, entitled 'Ethics of the Aristocracy,' dividing it into seven chapters, each of which
contains two views, first the 'obsolete' view, in accordance with which our forefathers regulated their lives; and second the 'adopted' view, now discovered by our great thinkers, whereby they regulate their affairs here and hereafter. And although this treatise borders on ribaldry, yet—

آن کس که ز شر آشناشت ' داند که متاع ما صُجابِیست‌

'He who is familiar with the city will know whence our goods are obtained.'

"The humble author's hope in striving to complete this brief treatise is that—

مگر صاحبِدی روزی بجایی، گند در کار این مسکین دعائی،

'Perchance somewhere and somewhen some man of heart
May utter a prayer on behalf of this poor fellow.'"

After these preliminary remarks, the author proceeds to discuss in turn each of the seven virtues already enumerated, beginning in each case with the "obsolete view" (which is exactly modelled on what is set forth at greater length in such well-known treatises on Ethics as the earlier Akhlāq-i-Nāširī or the later Akhlāq-i-Jalā'ī or Akhlāq-i-Muhsīnī), and then passing on to the "adopted" view of his contemporaries. As a specimen we may take the first chapter, which is less ribald than most.

"First Chapter. On Wisdom.

"Philosophers in defining Wisdom say that this consists in 'seeking to perfect the human soul in its intellectual and practical aptitudes; whereof the former is effected by an apprehension of the true nature of things as they really are, and the latter by the acquisition of a psychical habit or faculty, whereby the soul is able to perform virtuous actions and to abstain from evil actions, which is called Character.' In other words¹, there are centred in the Rational Soul two faculties, on the perfecting of which its perfection depends; one, the speculative faculty, the other the practical faculty. The first is that which craves after the apprehension of knowledge and the acquisition of science, so that, impelled by its promptings, the soul acquires a power of knowing things as they truly are, whereby eventually it attains the felicity of knowing that true

¹ The preceding words in italics are in the original in Arabic. In what follows they are explained in Persian.
Object of all Search and Universal Goal Who (Exalted and Holy is He!) is the Consummation of all Existences. So, guided by this knowledge, the soul attains to the Realm of Unity, nay, even to the Precincts of Union, and becomes tranquil and composed (for ‘are not hearts composed by the remembrance of God? ’), while the dust of doubt and the rust of uncertainty are cleansed from the visage of its mind and the mirror of its heart, even as the poet says:

‘Wherever Certainty entered, Doubt departed.’

“Now as for the Practical Faculty, it is that which coordinates and arranges the powers and actions of the soul, so that they cooperate and agree with one another, by virtue of which equipoise and accord its qualities become pleasing in God's sight. And when such knowledge and practice are combined in this degree in any person, he may fitly be entitled the ‘Perfect Man’ and ‘Vicar of God,’ and his rank becomes the highest attainable by the human race, even as God Most High hath said: ‘He giveth Wisdom to whom He will, and whosoever is given Wisdom hath been given abundant good.’ Moreover his spirit, after its separation from the body, becomes fitted to dwell in Paradise, to enjoy everlasting happiness, and to become receptive of God’s grace...

“Thus far is the view of the ancient philosophers.”

The writer now passes immediately to the

“Adopted View.

“When the great and wise men of subtle understanding, with whose honoured persons the face of the earth is now adorned, reflected on the perfecting of the human soul and its future destiny, and examined the practices and opinions of the famous men of former times, they soon formulated a complete and categorical denial of all these beliefs. They say: ‘It has been revealed to us that the “Rational Soul” is a thing of no consideration; that its continuance absolutely depends on the continuance of the body, and that its destruction is involved in the destruction of the body.’ They further say: ‘What is asserted by the Prophets as to its having perfections and defects, and as to its subsisting and continuing in itself after its separation from the body is impossible, as is also the Resurrection. Life consists in the just

1 Qur’an, xiii, 28.
2 Khalifa (“Caliph”), or Representative, alluding to God’s saying, when He created man (Qur’an, ii, 28), “Verily I am placing a Representative (or Vice-Gerent) on Earth.”
3 Qur’an, ii, 272.
equipoise of the elements comprising the body, and when this is decomposed its owner becomes for ever extinct and null. What is intended by the joys of Paradise and the torments of Hell must be in this world, as the poet says:

آن را که داده اند همينجاش داده اند،
و آنرا که نیست و عده بفرداش داده اند،

'He to whom they give receives his gift even here,
And he who has nothing [here] is put off with promises for "tomorrow."'

"Consequently our leaders of thought are entirely unconcerned with such matters as the Resurrection, Future Punishment, Nearness to or Remoteness from God, the Divine Approval or Wrath, Perfection and Imperfection, and the like; and the result of this conviction is that they spend every day of their life in satisfying their lusts and pursuing their pleasures, saying:

ای آنکه نتیجه، چهار و هفتی،
وز فیضت و چهار دایر اندر تفتی،
می خور که هزار بار بیشت گفتی؛

باز آمدن نیست چو رفتی رفتی،

'O Final Outcome of the Seven and Four,
Who by the Four and Seven art vexed sore,
Drink wine! A thousand times I've told thee this—
When once thou'rt gone, thou shalt return no more!'

"While they commonly inscribe this quatrain on their fathers' tombstones:

زین صفوف روان و دهلیزی نیست،
جمه با من و تو عقلی و تبیینی نیست،

نامیز که وهم کرده کنن چیزی هست؛

خشش بلند ازین خیال کن چیزی نیست،

'No mansions lie beyond this earth and sea;
No reason dwells outside of me and thee:
That Nothing which is deemed by some men All,
O pass it by; 'tis but vain phantasy!'

1 I.e. promises of a future life.
2 I.e. the Seven Planets and the Four Elements called the "Seven Celestial Fathers" and the "Four Mundane Mothers."
"And it is for this reason that in their eyes attacks on men's lives, property and honour seem insignificant and of small account.

'To such one draught of wine in hue like fire
Outweighs the blood of brethren or of sire.'

"In truth our applause is the just meed of these our great and favoured guides to whom matters which, notwithstanding the cultivation of the reasoning powers, remained hidden for several thousand years have been made plain without trouble."

So in like manner 'Ubayd-i-Zákání deals with the other virtues. Thus in speaking of the "adopted" or current view about Courage, which is the subject of the second chapter, he says:

"Our teachers say that when one confronts a dangerous enterprise, or engages in combat and conflict with another, one of two things will happen: either his adversary will prevail and slay him, or the contrary. If he slays his adversary, he will have on his neck the burden of innocent blood, and as a consequence thereof will undoubtedly sooner or later be overtaken by punishment. If, on the other hand, his adversary prevails, that person will assuredly go the road to Hell. How, then, can a wise man undertake an action presenting such alternatives? What proof, indeed, is clearer than this, that whenever there is a wedding, or a dance, or any social function where delicate meats, sweets, robes of honour and money are in evidence, rakes, effeminate persons, minstrels and jesters are invited there, while when arrows and spears are the entertainment provided, some stupid fool is persuaded that he is a man, a hero, a defeater of armies, a captain courageous, and is thus induced to confront the swords, so that when the poor wretch is slain in battle the rakes and effeminates of the town wag their tails, saying:

'Tebar and tosooni neem ezm Khordar, lot o mii o matorim现如今
Scant attraction have arrow and axe and spear for me;
Minstrels, wine and delicate meats far better agree!'

The third chapter, dealing with Chastity, hardly lends itself to translation, but the "adopted view" concerning Justice in the fourth chapter is worth quoting.

"The view of our teachers is that this quality is the worst of all attributes, and that Justice involves much loss; a thesis which they have proved by the clearest arguments. For they say: 'The founda-
tion of sovereignty, lordship and mastery is punishment, since men
will not obey any one until they fear him; all will feel
themselves equal; the foundations of administration will
be undermined, and the order of public business dis-
organized. He who practices Justice (which God forbid!) refrains
from beating, killing and fining any one, and does not intoxicate him-
self and quarrel or be angry with his subordinates, him none will fear.
Then the people will not obey their kings, nor sons their sires, nor
servants their masters, while the affairs of the lands and the people
will lapse into chaos. Hence it is that they say:

پادشاهان از پی یک مصلحت صد خون کنند

'Kings to gain a single object oft will slay a hundred souls.'

"And they further say: 'Justice bequeaths disaster.'

What proof, indeed, can be more convincing than this, that so long
as the Kings of Persia played the tyrant, like Ḍaḥḥák the Arabian and
Yazdigird 'the Sinner' (who now confer distinction on the chief seats
of Hell, together with other later potentates who followed them), their
Empire increased and their realm flourished; but when the reign of
Khusraw Anúsharwán came, who, by reason of his weak judgement
and the policy of his feeble-minded ministers chose the attribute of
Justice, in a little while the pinnacles of his Palace fell to the ground, the
Fire Temples, which were their places of worship, were extinguished,
and all trace of them disappeared from the face of the earth1. The
Commander of the Faithful and Confirmer of the Laws of Religion
'Umar ibnul-Khattáb (may God be well pleased with him), who was
noted for his justice, made bricks and ate barley-bread, while his cloak,
as they relate, weighed seventeen maunds. Mu'táwiya, by the blessing
of Injustice, wrested the kingdom from the hands of the Imám 'Alí (may
God ennoble his countenance). Nebuchadnezzar did not establish his
authority, nor become eminent in both worlds, nor did his empire in-
crease, until he slew twelve thousand innocent prophets in the Holy
City and cast into bondage many thousand more. Chingiz Khán, who
to-day, in despite of his enemies, stands supreme in the lower depths
of Hell as the exemplar and guide of all the Mongols, ancient and
modern, did not attain to the sovereignty of the whole world until with
ruthless sword he had destroyed millions of innocent persons.

"Anecdote.

"It is recorded in the histories of the Mongols that when Baghdád
was conquered by Húlágú Khán he ordered the remnant of the in-

1 These were some of the portents said to have heralded the Arab
Invasion and the overthrow of the Sásánián Empire.
habitants who had escaped the sword to be brought before him. He then enquired into the circumstances of each class, and, when he was acquainted with them, he said: ‘Artisans are indispensable,’ and gave them permission to go about their business. To the merchants he commanded that some capital should be given, so that they might trade for him. From the Jews he was content to take a poll-tax, declaring them to be an oppressed people; while the effeminate he consigned to his gynæcia. He then set apart the judges, shaykhs, Súfís, Hájjís, preachers, persons of note, beggars, religious mendicants, wrestlers, poets and story-tellers, saying, ‘These are superfluous creatures who waste God’s blessings,’ and ordered all of them to be drowned in the Tigris, thus purifying the face of earth from their vile existence. As a natural consequence sovereignty continued in his family for nearly ninety years, during which time their Empire daily increased; until, when poor Abú Sa‘íd conceived in his mind a sentimental passion for Justice, and branded himself with the stigma of this quality, his Empire shortly came to an end, and the House of Húlágú Khán and all his endeavours were brought to naught through the aspirations of Abú Sa‘íd...

“Blessings rest on those great and well-directed persons who guided mankind out of the dark delusion of Justice into the light of right guidance!”

The “Book of the Beard” (Rísh-náma) is a fantastic dialogue between ‘Ubayd-i-Zákání and the beard considered as the destroyer of youthful beauty.

The “Hundred Counsels” (Sad Pand) was composed in 750/1350, and, as its name implies, comprises a hundred aphorisms, some serious, such as: “O dear friends, make the most of life”; “Do not defer until to-morrow the pleasure of to-day”; “Profit by the present, for life will not return a second time”; and some ironical and ribald, such as: “So far as you are able, refrain from speaking the truth, so that you may not be a bore to other people, and that they may not be vexed with you without due cause”; “Do not believe the words of pious and learned men, lest you go astray and fall into Hell”; “Do not take lodgings in a street where there is a minaret, so that you may be safe from the annoyance of cacophonous mu‘adhdhins”; “Despise not ribaldry, nor regard satirists with the eye of scorn.”
The "Definitions" (Ta'rifát), or "Ten Sections" (Dah Fasl) is, like the "Hundred Counsels" just mentioned, a tract of only a few pages. A few specimens from it will suffice to show its character.

"First Section: on the World and what is therein.

"The World. That place wherein no creature can enjoy peace.
The Wise Man. He who does not concern himself with the world and its inhabitants.
The Perfect Man. He who is not affected by grief or gladness.
Thought. That which wearies men to no purpose.
The Man of Learning. He who has not sense enough to earn his own livelihood.
The Ignorant Man. Fortune's favourite.

* * * * *

"Second Section: on the Turks and their friends.

"Gog and Magog. The Turkish tribes when they set out for a country.
The Infernal Guards. Their leaders.
Famine. The result of their advent.
The Constable. He who robs by night and demands payment from the shop-keepers by day.

* * * * *

"Third Section: on the Judge and his appanages.

"The Judge. He whom all men curse.
The Advocate. He who renders the truth of no effect.
Bribery. That which does the business of the helpless.
The Lucky Man. He who never sees the Judge's countenance.
The Preacher. An ass.
The Prefect. An ass's tail.
The Poet. A greedy coxcomb.

* * * * *

"Fourth Section: on Shaykhs and their dependents.

"The Shaykh. Iblís (the Devil).
The Devils. His followers.
The Šífí. He who eats what he has not earned.
The Hájji. He who swears falsely by the Ka'ba.

* * * * *
“Fifth Section: on the Gentry.

"Boasting and impudence. The Gentry’s stock-in-trade.
Nothing. Their existence.
Hollow. Their politeness.
Vanity and folly. Their talk.
Fault-finding, greed, avarice and envy. Their characteristics.
The Fool. He who hopes any good of them.

"Sixth Section: on Artisans and Officials.

The Shopman. He who fears not God.
The Druggist. He who wants to make everyone ill.
The Doctor. An executioner.
The Liar. The astrologer.
The Athlete. An idle rogue.
The Broker. The chartered thief of the market-place.
One per cent. What does not reach the landlord from his crops.
Complaint. What is carried to the landlord.

"Seventh Section: on Wine and its appurtenances.

Wine. The source of disturbance.
Backgammon, beauties, candles and desert. Its instruments.
The Harp, Lute and Dulcimer. Its music.
Soup and roasted meat. Its food.
The Garden and Parterre. Its appropriate place.
The ‘Destroyer of Joys.’ Ramadān.
The ‘Night of Worth.’ The eve of the festival.

"Eighth Section: on Bang and its accessories.

Bang. That which fills the Sūfī with ecstasy.
The Bejewelled, or the Noble on both sides. He who indulges simultaneously in bang and wine.
The Disappointed. He who enjoys neither.

"Ninth Section: the Householder and what appertains to him.

The Bachelor. He who laughs at the world’s beard.
The Unfortunate. The householder.
The Two-horned (Dhu’l-Qarnayn). He who has two wives.
The most unfortunate of the unfortunate. He who has more.
The Futile. The householder’s life.
The Wasted. His time.
The Dissipated. His wealth.
The Distracted. His mind.
The Bitter. His life.
The Abode of Mourning. His house.
The Enemy in the House. His son.
The Ill-starred. He who is afflicted with a daughter.
The Adversary. His brother.
The Kinsman. His deadly foe.
Joy after sorrow. The triple divorce.

"Tenth Section: on the true nature of Men and Women.

The Lady. She who has many lovers.
The House-wife. She who has few.
The Virtuous. She who is satisfied with one lover.
The Maiden. A name denoting what does not exist."

The "Joyous Treatise" (Risála-i-Dilgushá) is a collection of short Arabic and Persian stories and facetiae, mostly of a somewhat ribald character, preceded by a short Preface. A few specimens of both parts are here appended.

(Arabic Stories.)

"Juhá once went to al-Kínása ("the Dust-heap") to buy a donkey. A man met him and asked him where he was going. He replied, 'To al-Kínása to buy a donkey.' "Say, "Please God,"" answered the other. 'There is no "Please God" about it,' responded Juhá: 'the donkey is in the market and the money is in my sleeve.'

"Now when he entered the market, some pickpockets fell upon him and stole his money. And as he returned, the man met him again, and enquired whence he came. He replied, 'From the market, Please God. My money has been stolen, Please God. So I did not buy the donkey, Please God. And I am returning to my house disappointed and despoiled, Please God.'"

"A certain man met another riding on a sorry ass, and enquired of him, 'Whither away?' He replied, 'To try to reach the Friday prayer.' 'Out on thee!' exclaimed the other; 'To-day is Tuesday!' 'I shall be lucky,' answered the rider, 'if my ass gets me to the mosque by Saturday!'"
A man came to Iyás ibn Mu‘awiya and asked him: ‘If I should eat dates, would it harm me?’ He replied, ‘No.’ ‘What would happen,’ he continued, ‘if I were to eat fennel with bread?’ ‘Nothing would happen,’ he answered. ‘And if I then drank a little water?’ he asked. ‘What forbids?’ replied the other. Said the questioner, ‘Date-wine is compounded of these things: how then can it be unlawful?’ ‘If I threw some earth at you,’ said Iyás, ‘would it hurt?’ ‘No,’ said the man. ‘And if a little water was poured upon you, would any of your bones be broken?’ continued Iyás. ‘No,’ said the man. ‘But if,’ said Iyás, ‘out of the earth and the water I made a brick, and dried it in the sun, and then struck you on the head with it, how would it be?’ ‘It would kill me,’ answered the other. Said Iyás, ‘This case is like that.’

(Persian Stories.)

“A certain Shi‘ite entered a mosque and saw the names of the [four] Companions written up on the wall. He wished to spit on the names of Abú Bakr and ‘Umar, but his spittle fell on the name of ‘Alí. He was greatly annoyed at this, and exclaimed, ‘This is only what you deserve for keeping such company!”

“A certain man claimed to be God. He was brought before the Caliph, who said to him, ‘Last year someone here claimed to be a prophet, and he was put to death.’ ‘It was well done,’ replied the man, ‘for I did not send him.”

‘Juḥá in his childhood was apprenticed for some days to a tailor. One day his master brought a jar of honey to the shop. Desiring to go out on some business, he said to Juḥá, ‘There is poison in this jar: beware lest you partake of it, or you will perish!’ Said Juḥá, ‘What have I to do with it?’ When his master had gone, Juḥá gave a piece of cloth to a money-changer and bought a piece of baker’s bread, which he ate with all the honey. When his master returned, he demanded the piece of cloth. ‘Don’t beat me,’ said Juḥá, ‘so that I may tell you the truth. A thief stole the piece of cloth while I was not paying attention. I was afraid that when you came back you would beat me, so I said to myself that I would take poison, so that when you returned I should be dead. So I ate all the poison which was in the jar, but I am still alive. The rest you know.”

“A Qazwíní armed with an enormous shield went out to fight the Heretics. A stone fired from their stronghold struck him and broke

1 i.e. the four Orthodox Caliphs, Abú Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmán and ‘Alí, of whom the Shi‘ites regard the first three as usurpers.

2 Mādīhida, i.e. the Assassins, whose chief fortress, Alamút, was situated near Qazwín.
his head. He was much annoyed and exclaimed, 'O fellow, are you blind that you cannot see so large a shield and must needs hit me on the head?'

"The son of a certain Qazwíní fell into a well. 'O my dear boy,' he exclaimed, 'don't move from where you are until I go and fetch a rope and pull you out!'

"A certain mu'âadhhdhin was running along shouting the call to prayer. They asked him why he was running. He replied, 'They tell me that my voice sounds best from a distance, so I am running away from it to see if this is true.'

"Sultán Maḥmūd saw a feeble old man carrying on his back a load of firewood. Being moved to pity, he said, 'Old man, would you prefer that I should give you two or three gold dinârs, or a donkey, or two or three sheep, or a garden, so that you may be delivered from this misery?' 'Give me money,' said the old man, 'so that I may put it in my girdle, and ride on the donkey, and drive the sheep before me, and go to the garden, and rest there, through your favour, for the rest of my life.' The Sultán was pleased at his reply, and gave orders that this should be done.

"A man said to his friend, 'My eye hurts me. What should I do?' 'Last year,' replied his friend, 'one of my teeth hurt me and I pulled it out.'

"A bald man coming out from the bath found that his hat had been stolen, and had a violent altercation with the bathman, who declared that he had no hat on when he came. 'O Musulmáns!' exclaimed the man, 'is mine the kind of head which goes about hatless?'

"A certain Qazwíní was asked if he knew about 'Alí, the Commander of the Faithful. 'Of course I know about him,' he replied. 'Which of the Caliphs was he in order?' they asked. 'I know nothing about Caliphs,' he answered, 'but it was he whom Ḥusayn caused to die a martyr's death on the Plain of Karbalá!'

"A certain gipsy reproached his son, saying, 'You do nothing, and spend your life in idleness. How often must I tell you that you should

1 'Alí, the first Imám of the Shi'ítés and Fourth Caliph of the Sunnîtes, was assassinated by Ibn Muljam in A.D. 661. His younger son, Ḥusayn, the third Imám, called by the Persians 'the Chief of Martyrs,' was slain at Karbalá by Yazíd's myrmidons some twenty years later. The anecdote is intended to illustrate the stupidity and ignorance of the Qazwínís. For a similar anecdote given by Zamakhshârî see the English Preface to the Chaḥdâr Magâla ('E. J. W. Gibb Memorial' Series, Vol. xi), pp. xxi–xxii.
learn to turn somersaults, make dogs jump through hoops, or walk on the tight-rope, so that you may derive some profit from life. If you won't listen to me, by Heaven, I will send you to college to learn their moth-eaten science and to become a learned man, so that all your life you may continue in abasement, poverty and evil fortune, and be unable to earn a single barleycorn anywhere.'

"A certain Qazwini was returning from Baghdad in the summer. They asked him what he was doing there. He replied, 'Sweating.'"

With the "Joyous Treatise," from which the few anecdotes given above are taken, the printed edition of 'Ubayd-i-Zakani's works ends, except for two letters—models of unintelligible vulgarity and full of solecisms—ascribed to Shaykh Shihabu'd-Din Qalandar and Mawlana Jalalu'd-Din b. Husam of Herat, but no doubt written by 'Ubayd himself in order to hold them up to ridicule.

I have devoted to 'Ubayd-i-Zakani more space than he may be deemed by many students of Persian literature to deserve, but, in spite of his coarseness and cynicism, his strong originality and boldness of speech appear to me to entitle him to more consideration than he has hitherto received. His "Ethics of the Aristocracy" is valuable for the light it throws on the corrupt morals of his age, and it is at least conceivable that, as 'Ubayd's biographer suggests, it was really written with serious purpose to awaken his countrymen to the lamentable deterioration in public and private life which had taken place in Persia during the Mongol ascendancy. In style and subject-matter 'Ubayd-i-Zakani stands almost alone amongst the older poets, though he bears some resemblance to his predecessor Suanini, and to his successors Abu Ishaq (Bushaq) of Shiraz, the parodist and poet of the kitchen, and Mahmud Qari of Yazd, the poet of clothes. Amongst the moderns, the learned Mirza Habib of Isfahan, the editor of his books, who died in Constantinople towards the end of the nineteenth century, rivals and even surpasses him in hasaliyyat or ribald poems.

B. P.
4. 'Imádu'd-Dín Faqíh (the Jurisconsult) of Kirmán.

Such fame as this poet enjoys arises chiefly from the fact that he was a rival of the great Háfíz, and

'Imád of Kirmán is supposed to be aimed at in a rather spiteful poem¹ by the latter, especially in the verse:

اي کبک خوش خرای سکجا مبروی بایست

("O gracefully-walking partridge, whither goest thou? Stop! Be not deceived because the zealot's cat says its prayers!")

The story is² that 'Imád stood high in the favour of Sháh Shujá' the Muẓaffarí, with whom, on the other hand, Háfíz was by no means a persona grata. 'Imád, who, as his title Faqíh indicates, was a theologian, had a tame cat which he had taught to go through the appropriate postures and genuflexions when he prayed, and this art of mimicry was regarded by the Prince as miraculous, but by Háfíz as a piece of hypocritical cunning.

Notices of 'Imád are given by Dawlatsháh³ and Jámí (in the Baháristán, chapter vii), and in the Átash-káda⁴, the Haft Iqlím and the Habíbú's-Siyar (as mentioned above), and most other biographies of poets, but these contain very little indeed about his life. He is said to have been highly respected at Kirmán, and to have had a college or retreat there. "He was wont," says Jámí, "to recite his verses to all who visited the rest-house (khángáh), requesting them to criticize and amend them, whence it is that they say that his poetry is really the

¹ See Rosenzweig-Schwannau's edition of the Díván of Háfíz, vol. i, pp. 316-317, in the note to which, however, the allusion is otherwise explained. See also p. 243, n. 1 supra.
⁴ P. 110.
poetry of all the people of Kirmán." Dawlatsháh quotes the opinion of Ádharí, author of the "Gems of Mysteries" (Jawáhirul-Asrár), who says:

"Critical scholars hold that some redundancy ('stuffing'—hashw) is to be observed at times in the poetry of all the ancients and moderns except in that of Khwája 'Imád-i-Faqíh, in which, as they agree, there is absolutely no such lapse, either in words or ideas."

'Imád's extant work comprises a Diwán of lyric poetry, of which copies are not common1, and at least five mathnawi poems, of which the earliest, entitled Maḥabbat-náma-i-Šáhib-dilán, was composed in 722/1322, and the latest, the Múnisu'l-Abrá, in 766/1364. According to Dawlatsháh, he died in 773/1371-2, evidently at a fairly advanced age. The following is a translation of the first of the two odes of 'Imád quoted by this biographer2:

"The poor patient in the hospital of Religion who details his symptoms to the physicians who sit by the road,
What cares he for the road, the pain, the trouble and the sickness
Who has Khídr for his friend and Christ for his companion?
On the first day of Eternity Past I inscribed on the Tablet of my Soul
Of the words of my father (may his tomb be fragrant !) these :
'O child, if thou meetest with one who is fallen,
Do not mock him, nor look on him with the eyes of scorn!'"

For this reason did the great religious leaders ride on lions,
Because they trod the earth more gently than ants.
If no heart in the world is cheered by thee,
At least do not so act that any spirit may be saddened by thee.
O 'Imád, one cannot seek for any friend but God:
Help, O Helper! 'From Thee do we seek assistance3!'"

1 See the excellent Bankipore Catalogue, prepared under the supervision of Sir E. Denison Ross by Mawlawí 'Abdu'l-Muqtadír, and printed at Calcutta in 1908. ("Persian Poets," Firdawsí to Háfíz, pp. 217-219.)
2 See p. 254, l. 14, to p. 255, l. 4, of my edition for the text.
3 The last words are from the opening súra of the Qur'án, v. 4.
5. Salmán of Sáwa
(Jamálu’d-Dín Muḥammad Salmán b. ‘Alá’u’d-Dín Muḥammad).

Salmán of Sáwa, who has been already mentioned in connection with ‘Ubayd-i-Zákání, is another poet whose eminence has been certified by the great Ḥáfiz in the following verse:

"Dost thou know who is the chief of the scholars of this age
In the way of truth and certainty, not in the way of doubt and falsehood?
That monarch of the accomplished and king of the realm of verse
That ornament of Church and State (Jamálū’d-Dīn), the Master of the World Salmán."

He was essentially a court-poet and panegyrist, and was attached during the greater part of his long life to the Īl-kháni or Jalá’ir dynasty, his special patrons being Shaykh Ḥasan-i-Buzurg, the founder of that dynasty, his consort Dilshád Kháltún, and their son Shaykh Uways. Apart from the notices of him given by the biographers cited throughout this chapter, attention should be called to two excellent biographies by Indian scholars, one in English and the other in Urdu. The first, in the Catalogue of...the Oriental Public Library at Bankipore, Firdawsi to Ḥáfiz (pp. 219–225), is by Mawlawí ‘Abdu’l-Muqtadír, and gives a very good critical summary of the data furnished by the Persian biographers. The second is contained in an admirable collection of studies of some twenty eminent

Persian poets by Shibli Nu'mání entitled *Shīrūl-'Ajam* ("Poetry of the Persians"), compiled in 1324-5/1906-7, and lithographed at 'Aligarh.

That Salmán was born in or about the year 700/1300 is proved, as pointed out by Mawlawí 'Abdu'l-Muqtadír, by a verse in the *Firág-náma* ("Book of Separation"), composed in 761/1360, in which the poet says that his age had then passed sixty-one; and the same scholar gives good reason for believing that he died on Monday, Şafar 12, 778 (July 1, 1376). He composed two *mathnawi* poems, the above-mentioned *Firág-náma* and another entitled *Jamshíd u Khurshíd*, and a number of odes (ghazaliyyát), fragments (muqattatád), and quatrains (rubá'iyyát), but it is as a *qasida*-writer and panegyrist that he excels, often surpassing, as Jámi says, the earlier masters, such as Kamál Isma'íl, Žahir of Fáryáb, Athír-i-Awmání, Saná'í, etc., whom he took for his models. Of his odes (ghazaliyyát) Jámi says that they too are very agreeable and highly finished, but that, "being devoid of the savour of love and passion which is the essence of the ghazal, they are not very highly esteemed by men of taste." In the Bombay lithographed edition of Salmán's *Kulliyyát*, the *qasidas*, with two *tarjé-bands*, fill the first 135 pages, the *ghazals* pp. 136–230, and the quatrains the last six pages.

Salmán's earliest poems, as 'Abdu'l-Muqtadír observes, are apparently his elegies on the death of Sultán Abú Sa'íd (Nov.—Dec., 1335), and of his great minister Khwája Ghiyátu'd-Dín Muhammad, who was put to death on Ramaḍán 21, 736 (May 3, 1336). In this same year Shaykh Hasan-i-Buzurg established the dynasty known as Îl-khání, with its capital at Baghdád, and thither Salmán, attracted by the fame of that ruler's generosity to men of letters, made his way, probably soon after the cruel and

---

1 The notice of Salmán is in the second part of this work, pp. 196–211.
violent death of his earlier patron Ghiyáthu'd-Dín. It is
related by Dawlatsháh and other writers that he first won
Shaykh Ḥasan’s favour by the following verses which he
extemporized on some occasion when that Prince was
exhibiting his skill with the bow:

“When the King lifted his Cháchí bow
Thou would’st have said that the Moon was in the Sign of
Sagittarius.
I saw the two ‘crows’ of the bow and the three-winged eagle
Bring their heads together in one corner.
They laid their heads on the King’s shoulder:
I know not what they whispered in the King’s ear.
When the King loosed the bow-string from the finger-stall
From every side arose the twang of the string.
O King, the arrow is subject to thy schemes,
And fortune follows the flight of thy arrow.
In thy time complaints arise from none
Save from the bow, which it is but right should lament.
For, in the reign of this auspicious Sultan
None does violence save to the bow.”

It was, however, according to the biographers, chiefly
to the beautiful and accomplished Queen Dilshád Khátún,
and to the amiable Prince Uways, that Salmán owed the
favours which he enjoyed at the Íl-khání court, of which
he says:

“Through the auspicious fortune of this House I have captured the
world with the sword of my tongue.
To-day from the East to the West I am more famous than the Sun.”

Shaykh Uways succeeded to the throne in 757/1356
and reigned nearly twenty years, and to him a great

1 For the text, see my edition of Dawlatsháh, p. 257, ll. 15-21.
2 Chách, or Shásh, the modern Táshkand, is a place in Turkistán
celebrated for its bows.
3 Each of the two horns or tips of a bow is called zágh, “crow.”
The “three-winged eagle” is the arrow.
4 This indicates metaphorically the full drawing of the bow.
number of Salmán’s *qasidas* are addressed, while anecdotes given by Dawlatsháh and reproduced by Ouseley in his *Biographical Notices of the Persian Poets* show the intimacy which prevailed between the two. This prince is said by Dawlatsháh to have been of such striking beauty that when he rode out the people of Baghdád used to flock into the streets to gaze upon a countenance which seemed to reincarnate the legendary comeliness of Joseph. When overtaken by untimely death, he is said to have composed the following fine verses:

```
الیک یک روز روزی
بهرستان تَن رفتم;
غربی بودم اینجا
چند روزی با وطن رفتم;
غلام خواجه‌بودم گریزان
گشتئ از خواجه;
در آخر پیش او شرم‌ده با تیغ و کفم رفتم;
اِلَّا اِی هم‌شینان من محروم از بین دنیا;
شُهار عیش خوش بادا دریان خانه که من رفتم;
```

“From the spirit-world one day to the realms of Body and Sense did I roam;
I sojourned here for a few brief days, and now I am going home.
The servant was I of a mighty Lord, and I fled from my Liege and Lord,
Whom now in shame I am going to meet with a winding-sheet and a sword.
Comrades of mine, I leave you now to joys which I may not share,
And that you may enjoy this banquet long is my parting hope and prayer!”

As is usually the case with panegyrists, many of Salmán’s *qasidas* refer to definite historical events, and can therefore be dated. Mawlawí ‘Abdul-Muqtadir gives a list of ten such poems, with their dates and the occasions

---

2. A fugitive and repentant slave, to show his readiness to surrender himself unconditionally and submit to even the extremest punishment, goes back to his master bearing a sword, wherewith he may be slain, and a winding-sheet for his burial.
which called them forth, from the *Habibu's-Siyar*. The earliest of them, composed in 739/1338 on the occasion of the flight of Shaykh Ḥasan-i-Buzurg to Baghdád, begins:

> وقت سُبِحَست و لِبِ دِجله و انفاس بِبار

> It is the time of morning, and the brink of the Tigris, and the breath of Spring;

> O, boy, bring the wine-boat to the estuary of Baghdád!

The two latest, composed in 777/1375, celebrate a victory of Sháh Shuja' in Ādarbayján. The second of them, which won that Prince's high approval, begins:

> سِخْن بِوصفِ رُخْش چَون ز خاطِرِه سر زِد

> and it was after hearing it that Sháh Shuja' observed:

> "We had heard the fame of three notable persons of this country, and found them differing in their circumstances. Salmán exceeded all that was said in his praise; Yúsuf Sháh the minstrel agreed with his reputation; and Shaykh Kajahání fell short of his."

One of the most celebrated of Salmán's *qasidas*, however, was written to commemorate the death of Shaykh Uways, which took place in Jumáda ii, 776 (November, 1374). It begins:

> ای فلک آُهَسْتِه رَو ۰ ۰ کریر ۰ ۰ نه آَسَانَ کرِرده

> مَلِک ک ایران را بِمِرک شاه ویران کرِرده

> آَسَمَانَی را فرود آُروده ۰ از اَوِچ خویشش

> بر زمین افکِنده ۰ با خاک یکسان کرِردهٔ

---

1 *Bankipore Catalogue*, pp. 222-3.
2 This poem will be found on pp. 87-8 of the lithographed edition of the *Kulliyát* of Salmán.
3 *Habibu's-Siyar*, vol. iii, pt 2, p. 35.
4 See pp. 57-8 of the lithographed edition.
5 It does not seem to be included in the lithographed edition.
"O Heaven, go gently! It is no slight thing that thou hast done: Thou hast made desolate the land of Persia by the death of the King. Thou hast brought down a heaven from its zenith, And hast cast it on the earth and made it level with the dust. If thou walkest with truth, this is no insignificant matter: Thou hast attacked the life and property and honour of every Musulmán!"

As already stated, Salmán probably died in 778/1376, a year after the composition of two of the qasídás mentioned above, so that he evidently continued to write poetry until the end of his long life, and did not, as stated by Dawlatsháh¹, actually retire into seclusion, though he implies his desire and intention of so doing in an interesting poem cited by Shibli Nu'mání in his Shí'ru'í 'Ajam (vol. ii, pp. 198–200). In this poem he says that for nearly forty years he has celebrated his Royal patron's praises in the East and in the West; that he is now old and feeble, lame, and weak of sight, and wishes to retire from Court and spend the remainder of his days in praying for the King; that having been the master of the realm of poets, he desires to become the servant of the poor; that he has no doubt that the King will continue his allowance, but that he would like its source and amount to be definitely fixed; and finally that he owes considerable sums of money which he cannot pay, and prays the King to discharge these debts for him. In reply the King is said to have written two couplets on the poet's versified petition, in the first of which he orders his allowance to be continued as heretofore, while in the second he assigns him the revenues of the village of Írín near Ray.

Shibli Nu'mání concludes his notice of Salmán with a fairly detailed and wholly favourable appreciation of his skill in the different forms of verse. His skill is chiefly

¹ P. 261, l. 21, of my edition.
apparent in his qasidas, which are remarkable for grace and fluency of language, and for a felicity of diction possessed by none of the earlier poets, and peculiar to those of this middle period, between which two groups Salmán marks the transition. Shibli gives the following examples to illustrate his assertion:

"Thy mouth smiled, and produced a jar of sugar:
Thy lip spoke, and revealed glistening pearls.
Thy waist was undiscoverable, but thy girdle
Defly clasped it round, and revealed it in gold.
Cast aside the veil from thy face, for those black tresses
Have affected the fairness of thy cheeks."

1 On account of its extreme slenderness.
The breeze of the Naw-rúz brings the aroma of the beautiful rose, [And] brings the dust of the musk of Tartary from the borders of the desert.
The garden has decked the branch with the patterns of a peacock's tail;
The wind hath fashioned the bud into the likeness of a parrot's head.
The [red] anemone hath displayed from the mountain-slopes the fire of Moses;
The branch hath brought forth 'the White Hand' from its bosom.
The sweet-voiced nightingale, for the [delectation of the] Rose-Prince, Hath contributed the strains of Bárbad and the songs of Nikísá.
The zephyr-breeze hath conferred high rank on the cypress;
The sweetness of the air hath endowed the anemone with a noble robe."

Shibli next gives examples of Salmán’s skill in inventing those graceful and subtle conceits in which the poets of the middle and later periods take pride. The following specimens may suffice:

1 The Persian New Year's Day, or Naw-rúz, falls on March 21 and corresponds with the Vernal Equinox.
2 “The White Hand” is the hand that Moses drew forth from his garment “as white as snow.” Here the allusion is to the white blossoms.
3 Bárbad was the famous minstrel of Khusraw Parwíz the Sásánian, and Nikísá his harper.
"The cornelian of thy lip placed the coin of life in a casket of pearls; It was a precious stuff, so it put it in a hidden place. Thy lips put a ruby lock on the lid of that casket; Thy mole, which was of ambergris, set a seal upon it. A subtle thought, finer than a hair, suddenly came Into the heart of thy girdle, and named it 'waist.'"

"Henceforth make your rosary from the knots of the Magian's tresses; Henceforth take as your mihrab the arch of the idols' (fair ones') eyebrows. Arise joyous like the bubbles from the rose-red wine, and base no hopes On this bubble-like revolving dome [of sky]."

"For some while the revolution of this circle parted us from one another like the [points of a] compass, but at last brought us together [once more]."

"The Zephyr found the rose-bud laughing before thy mouth, And smote it so sharply in the mouth that its mouth was filled with blood."

1 This means that the life of the lover is in his sweetheart's mouth, which, on account of the brilliant teeth, he compares to a casket of pearls, and, on account of its smallness, to "a hidden place."

2 A slender waist and a small mouth are accounted amongst the chief charms of Persian beauties. Both are here described in the most exaggerated terms.
"I will not set my foot one hair's breadth outside this circle, Even though they should split me like a compass into two halves from head to foot."

Other points in Salmán's poetry noted by Shibli Nu'mání are his skill in the successful manipulation of difficult rhymes and awkward refrains. Thus he has long qaṣīdas in which each verse ends with such words as dāst ("hand"), pāy ("foot"), rū ("face"), bar sar ("on the head") preceded by the rhyming word, yet which maintain an easy and natural flow of words and ideas.

Shibli Nu'mání next deals with the poet's "fragments" (muqattāʼāt), or occasional verses, which, as usual with this class of verse, are connected with various incidents in his life, and therefore have a more personal note than the odes (ghasalīyyāt) and elegies (qaṣīdāt), but which are unfortunately omitted from the Bombay lithographed edition.

On one occasion the King gave Salmán a black horse, which he did not like and wished to exchange for one of another colour, but the Master of the Horse apparently would not permit this. Thereupon he wrote as follows to his patron:

("I have been called by my friend Muhammad ʼIqbal to the following parallel verse by Ḥāfiz, from which it appears that the circle formed by the down on the cheeks is here intended:


1 My friend Muḥammad ʼIqbal has called my attention to the following parallel verse by Ḥāfiz, from which it appears that the circle formed by the down on the cheeks is here intended:

O King, thou didst promise me a horse: no further discussion is possible about the word of Kings.
They gave me an old, black horse, and I am of opinion that no more aged black is to be found in the world.
I gave back that horse so that I might get another in such wise that none should have knowledge of this secret.
I gave back a black horse, but they would not give me one of another colour; yes, indeed, 'There is no colour beyond black!'

Salmán further satirized this unfortunate horse as follows:

"O King, I had hopes that, through thy good fortune, I might mount a tall, young and ambling horse.
They give me an old, lazy, undersized horse, not such a horse as I can ride.
It is a horse black, feeble and lean as a pen: it would be the height of folly to mount such a beast.
In truth it must be thirty years older than myself, and it is disrespectful to sit upon one's elders."

In another fragment Salmán excuses his absence from the Court on the plea that his eyes are bad, and that though the dust of the King's threshold is a collyrium, yet the evil eye must be kept far from him:

1 This is a common proverbial saying in Persian.
Finally Shibli Nu‘mání speaks of the innovations introduced by Salmán, and especially of his skilful use of the figure called ḥam or “ambiguity.”

The general conclusion seems to be that Salmán deserves to be ranked amongst the great panegyrists and qaṣida-writers; that he was an ingenious, skilful and to a certain extent original poet, but that he lacks the fire, passion and conviction which make a poet great and famous beyond the limits of his own time and country.

6. Ḥāfiz of Shírāz (Shamsu’d-Din Muḥammad Ḥāfiz).

What has been already said generally at the beginning of this chapter as to the extraordinary dearth of trustworthy information concerning the poets of this period applies especially to the most eminent and famous of them, and indeed of all the poets of Persia, the immortal and incomparable Ḥāfiz of Shírāz, entitled by his admirers Lisání‘l-Ghayb (“the Tongue of the Unseen”) and Tarjumání‘l-Asrár (“the Interpreter of Mysteries”). Notices of him naturally occur in all the numerous bio-
graphies of poets composed subsequently to his death, beginning with Dawlatsháh, who wrote just a century after this event, down to quite modern compilations, like Ridáqulí Khán's Majma‘ul-Fuṣahá and Riyáḍu‘l-‘Arifín; but these contain few trustworthy biographical details, and consist for the most part of anecdotes connected with certain verses of his poems, and probably in most cases, if not all, invented to explain or illustrate them. The only contemporary mention of Ḥáfíz with which I am acquainted is contained in the Preface of his friend and the collector and editor of his poems, Muḥammad Gulandám, who, after expatiating on the poet's incomparable genius, his catholic sympathy, and the celebrity attained by his verse even in his lifetime, not only in Persia, from Fárs to Khurásán and Ádharbáyján, but in India, Turkistán and Mesopotamia, proceeds as follows:

"However, diligent study of the Qur'án, constant attendance to the King's business, the annotation of the Kashsháf1 and the Miṣbáḥ, the perusal of the Maṭáli2 and the Mištáḥ3, the acquisition of canons of literary criticism and the appreciation of Arabic poems prevented him from collecting his verses and odes, or editing and arranging his poems. The writer of these lines, this least of men, Muḥammad Gulandám, when he was attending the lectures of our Master, that most eminent teacher Qiwdmu’d-Dín ‘Abdu’lláh, used constantly and repeatedly to urge, in the course of conversation, that he (Ḥáfíz) should gather together all these rare gems in one concatenation and assemble all these lustrous pearls on one string, so that they might become a necklace of great price for his contemporaries or a girdle for the brides of his time. With this request, however, he was unable to comply, alleging lack of appreciation on the part of his contemporaries as an excuse, until he bade farewell to this life... in a.H. 791" (A.D. 1389).

1 The celebrated commentary on the Qur'án of az-Zamakhshári.
2 Of the many works of this name that of al-Muṭarrízí (d. 610/1213) on Arabic grammar is probably intended.
3 The Maṭáli’l-Anzár of al-Baydáwí (d. 683/1284) is probably meant.
4 The Mištáḥu‘l-‘Ulüm of as-Sakkákí (d. 626/1229) is probably intended.
The notice of Hāfiz contained in that agreeable work of Sir Gore Ouseley, the *Biographical Notices of Persian Poets*, gives most of the anecdotes connected with verses in his Divān to which I have already alluded; while an admirable account of the times in which he lived and the general character of his poetry is to be found in the Introduction to Miss Gertrude Lowthian Bell’s *Poems from the Divan of Hafiz* (London, 1897), which must be reckoned as the most skilful attempt to render accessible to English readers the works of this poet. On the whole, however, the best and most complete critical study of Hāfiz with which I am acquainted is contained in Shibli Nu’mani’s Urdu work on Persian Poetry entitled *Shi’rul-'Ajam*, already repeatedly quoted in this chapter. I feel that I cannot do better than summarize at any rate that portion of this notice which deals with the poet’s life, and the few facts concerning his personal circumstances and relations with his contemporaries which can be deduced from his poems, indicating at the same time the Persian biographical sources to which the learned author refers. Amongst these he specially mentions the well-known *Habibu’s-Siyar* of Khwāndamīr and the *May-khāna* (“Wine-tavern”) of ‘Abdu’n-Nabi Fakhru’z-Zamān (compiled in 1036/1626-7, in the reign of Jahāngīr), of which latter I have no copy at hand. The Persian biographical works which I have consulted, and which yield but scanty results (since, as Shibli points out, they generally copy from one another and often make statements not merely unsupported by any respectable evidence but mutually destructive) are Dawlatsháh’s “Memoirs of the Poets”; Jāmi’s *Baháristán* and *Nafahátul-

---

1 Pp. 23-42.
4 P. 90 of the Constantinople printed ed. of 1294/1877.
Uns; Lutf ‘Alí Beg’s Ātash-kada ("Fire-temple"), which mainly follows Dawlatsháh; the Haft Iqlím; and the quite modern Majma’u’l-Fuṣahá ("Assembly of the Eloquent"), which gives several fresh particulars of doubtful authenticity, such as that Ḥáfiz came originally from Túysirkán and that he composed a commentary on the Qur’án.

Shibli Nu’mání arranges his matter systematically, beginning with an account of the poet’s parentage and education derived from the above-mentioned May-khdna, to which, however, he apparently attaches little credence. According to this account, the father of Ḥáfiz, who was named Bahá’u’d-Dín, migrated from Isfahán to Shíráz in the time of the Atábeks of Fárs, and there enriched himself by commerce, but died leaving his affairs in confusion, and his wife and little son in penury, so that the latter was obliged to earn a livelihood by the sweat of his brow. Nevertheless he found time and means to attend a neighbouring school, where he obtained at least a respectable education and learned the Qur’án by heart, in consequence of which he afterwards adopted in his poems the nom de guerre of “Ḥáfiz” ("Rememberer"), a term commonly applied to those who have committed to memory and can recite without error the sacred book of Islám. He soon began to compose and recite poems, but with small success until in a vigil at the shrine of Bábá Kúhí on a hill to the north of Shíráz he was visited by the Imám ‘Alí, who gave him to eat some mysterious heavenly food and told him that henceforth the gift of poetry and the keys of all knowledge should be his.

Shibli Nu’mání next passes to the enumeration of the several kings and princes whose favour and patronage Ḥáfiz enjoyed. Of these the first was Sháh (or Shaykh) Abú Isḥáq Injú, the son of Mahmúd Injú who was appointed governor of Fárs in the reign of

---

1 W. Nassau Lees’ Calcutta printed ed. of 1859, p. 715.
2 According to the Fárs-náma he was put to death by Arpa (in 736/1335–6), who was in turn put to death by his son Maš’úd Injú.
HÁFIZ (left) and ABÚ ISHÁQ (right)

Add. 7468 (Brit. Mus.), f. 34b
Gházán Khán. This Abú Ishāq was a poet and friend of poets, heedless, pleasure-loving, and so negligent of the affairs of state that when he was at last induced by his favourite Shaykh Aminu’d-Dīn to fix his attention on the Muẓaffarī hosts who were investing his capital, he merely remarked that his enemy must be a fool to waste the delicious season of Spring in such fashion, and concluded by reciting the verse:

"Come, let us make merry just for this one night,
And let us deal tomorrow with tomorrow's business."

Concerning Abú Ishāq’s brief but genial reign at Shíráz, Háfiz says:

"In truth the turquoise ring of Abú Ishāq
Flashed finely, but it was a transitory prosperity."

The following verses, commemorating five of the chief ornaments of Shaykh Abú Ishāq’s court, also belong to this period:

1 According to the Fārs-nāma he captured Shíráz in 743/1342-3, was besieged there by Mubārizu’d-Dīn Muḥammad b. Muẓaffar in 753/1352-3, when, after losing his little son ‘Alf Sahl, he was driven back to Isfahán, and was finally captured and put to death by his rival in 758/1357.
During the period of Sháh Shaykh Abu Isháq’s rule
The kingdom of Fárs throve wondrously through five persons.
First, a king like him, a giver of governments,
Who, thou would’st say, snatched preeminence by justice, bounty and equity.
Secondly, that Remnant of the Abdál, Shaykh Amínú’d-Dín,
Who was numbered amongst the ‘Poles’ and was the meeting-place of the Awtád.
Thirdly, one like that just judge Aşflu’l-Millat wa’d-Dín, Than whom Heaven remembers no better judge.
Again one like that accomplished judge ‘Açudra[‘u’d-Dín al-Ijí],
Who dedicated his explanation of the Mawdíqif to the King.
Again one so generous as Hájjí Qiwám, whose heart is as the Ocean,
Who, like Hátim, invited all men to partake of his bounty.
These departed, leaving none like unto themselves:
May God most Great and Glorious forgive them all!

1 The Abdál (“Substitutes”), Aqtáb (“Poles”), and Awtád (literally “Tent-pegs”) are three classes of the Rijálu’l-Ghayb, or “Men of the Unseen World,” who are supposed by the Súfís to watch over the order of the world and the welfare of mankind. Their number and functions are discussed in the “Definitions” (Ta’rifat) of ash-Sharíf al-Jurjáni, who was appointed by Sháh Shuja’ to a Professorship in Shíráz, and must have been acquainted with Háfíz. He died in 816/1413.
2 ‘Açudu’d-Dín ‘Abdu’r-Ráhmn b. Aḥmad al-Ijí composed a number of works on theology, ethics, philosophy, etc., amongst which the Mawdíqif fi ‘Ilmi’l-Kalám (on which al-Jurjáni, mentioned in the preceding note, wrote a commentary) is the most celebrated. He died in 756/1355. See Brockelmann, Gesch. d. Arab. Litt., ii, pp. 208-9.
3 Hájjí Qiwám is celebrated by Háfíz in other poems, as in the well-known verse:

He died, according to the Fárs-náma, in 753/1352.
Mubārizu’d-Dīn Muḥammad b. Muẓaffar, who ruled over Fārs from 754/1353 to 759/1357, was of a very different type to his pleasure-loving predecessor and victim. Harsh, stern and ascetic in character, he had no sooner taken possession of Shīrāz than he caused all the taverns to be closed, and put a stop, as far as possible, to the drinking of wine, to the great annoyance of Ḥāfiz, who refers to these lean days in the following amongst other passages of his poems:

"Though wine gives delight and the wind distils the perfume of the rose,
Drink not wine to the strains of the harp, for the constable is alert.
Hide the goblet in the sleeve of the patch-work cloak,
For the time, like the eye of the decanter, pours forth blood.
Wash your dervish-cloak from the wine-stain with tears,
For it is the season of piety and the time of abstinence."

1 Muḥtasib, a police officer charged with the superintendence of the weights, measures and morals of a town. His activities in certain aspects correspond with those of a University Proctor.
O will it be that they will reopen the doors of the taverns,
And will loosen the knots from our tangled affairs?
Cut the tresses of the harp [in mourning] for the death of pure wine,
So that all the sons of the Magians may loosen their curled locks!
Write the letter of condolence for the [death of the] Daughter of the Grape,
So that all the comrades may let loose blood [stained tears] from their eyelashes.
They have closed the doors of the wine-taverns; O God, suffer not
That they should open the doors of the house of deceit and hypocrisy!
If they have closed them for the sake of the heart of the self-righteous zealot
Be of good heart, for they will reopen them for God's sake!"

Sháh Shujá', who succeeded his father Mubárizu'd-Dín and relaxed his oppressive restrictions, composed the following quatrain on the same subject:

"In the assembly of the time the concomitants of wine-bibbing are laid low;
Neither is the hand on the harp, nor the tambourine in the hand.
All the revellers have abandoned the worship of wine
Save the city constable, who is drunk without wine."

1 *I.e.* strings or chords.
2 The sale of wine in Muhammadan countries is carried on by non-Muslims, Jews, Christians, or Zoroastrians. With Ḥāfiz and his congener the "Elder of the Magians" (Pīr-i-Mughán) and the "Magian boys" (Mugh-bacha-hād) are familiar concomitants of the tavern.
3 *I.e.* Wine, similarly called by the Arabs Bintu 'l-ʿInab.
The reopening of the taverns is celebrated by Ḥāfīz in the following verses:

سحر ز هاتن غیبر رسد آتشد بکوش،
که دوو شاه شجاع است می دلیر بنوش،
شاد آنکه اهل نظر بن شناره میرفتند،
هزار گونه سخن بر دهان و لب خاموش,
بنانگ چنگ بگوش ایم آن حکایتی،
که از شنیدن آن دیگر سینه میزد چوش,
رمؤز مملکت خویش خسروان داند،

"At early dawn good tidings reached my ear from the Unseen Voice:
'It is the era of Sháh Shujá': drink wine boldly!'
That time is gone when men of insight went apart
With a thousand words in the mouth but their lips silent.
To the sound of the harp we will tell those stories
At the hearing of which the cauldron of our bosoms boiled.
Princes [alone] know the secrets of their kingdom;
O Ḥāfīz, thou art a beggarly recluse; hold thy peace!"

In another poem Ḥāfīz says:

قسم بحسیت و جاه و جلال شاه شجاع
که نیست با کسر از بحر مال و جاه نزاع
بیبن که رقص می نان میرود بناله چنگ
کسی که اذن نمی داد استعیاب سباع

"I swear by the pomp and rank and glory of Sháh Shujá
That I have no quarrel with anyone on account of wealth and position.
See how he who [formerly] would not permit the hearing of music
Now goes dancing to the strains of the harp."

In another poem he says:

چنگ در غله آمد که چجا شد منگر
جام در قبیله آمد که چجا شد مناع
The harp began to clamour 'Where is the objector?'
The cup began to laugh 'Where is the forbinder?'
Pray for the King's long life if thou seekest the world's welfare,
For he is a beneficent being and a generous benefactor,
The manifestation of Eternal Grace, the Light of the Eye of Hope,
The combiner of theory and practice, the Life of the World, Sháh Shujá'."

In spite of this and other verses in praise of Sháh Shujá', the relations between the Prince and the Poet are said to have been somewhat strained. Sháh Shujá' had a great opinion of a poet named 'Imád-i-Faqíh ("the Jurisconsult") of Kirmán, who is said to have taught his cat to follow him in its genuflections when he performed his prayers. This achievement was accounted by the Prince almost a miracle, but by Háfíz a charlatan's trick, concerning which he said:

"The Súfi hath made display of his virtues and begun his blandishments;
He hath inaugurated his schemings with the juggling heavens.
O gracefully-moving partridge who walkest with so pretty an air,
Be not deceived because the cat of the ascetic hath said its prayers!"

1 The reference in this line is otherwise explained on p. 243 supra. Cf. also p. 258. The text given in Rosenzweig-Schwannau's edition (vol. i, p. 316: No. 8 in Ḥ) differs somewhat from that adopted by Shibli which is here given.
The scorn expressed by Ḥāfiz for 'Imád is said to have been the original cause of Sháh Shujá’s dislike for him, but the Prince himself was his not very successful rival in the field of poetry, and jealousy appears to have increased that dislike. On one occasion the Prince criticized Ḥāfiz’s verse on the ground of its many-sided aspects: no one motive, he complained, inspired it; it was at one moment mystical, at another erotic and bacchanalian; now serious and spiritual, and again flippant and worldly, or worse. “True,” replied Ḥāfiz, “but in spite of all this everyone knows, admires and repeats my verses, while the verses of some poets whom I could name never go beyond the city gates.”

Sháh Shujá was greatly incensed at this answer, and soon afterwards came across the following verse of Ḥāfiz which seemed to deliver the poet into his hands:

"If Muḥammadanism be that which Ḥāfiz holds, Alas if there should be a to-morrow after to-day!"

Ḥāfiz, being warned that this verse was to be made the ground of a charge of heresy or agnosticism against him, went in great perturbation to Mawláná Zaynu’d-Dín Abú Bakr Táyabádí, who happened at that time to be in Shíráz, and asked his advice. The latter recommended him to add another verse placing the words to which exception was taken in the mouth of another, on the principle that “the reporting of blasphemy is not blasphemy.” Thereupon Ḥāfiz prefixed the following verse to the one cited above:

"How pleasant to me seemed this saying which at early morn A Christian was reciting at the door of the tavern with tambourine and flute:"

"If Muḥammadanism be that which Ḥāfiz holds, Alas if there should be a to-morrow after to-day!"
On being charged with atheism he produced this verse along with the other, and said that he was not responsible for the opinions expressed by a Christian.

Sháh Shujá died in 785/1383-4 or 786, and was succeeded by his son Zaynu'l-Ábidín, who, however, was deposed and imprisoned by his cousin Sháh Manşúr in 789/1387. Háfiz celebrated his triumph in a poem beginning:

"Come, for the standard of King Manşúr has arrived; The good tidings of conquest and victory have reached the Sun and the Moon."

The deposed ruler Zaynu'l-Ábidín (who was subsequently blinded) had accepted the suzerainty of Tímúr, received his ambassador, Qutbu'd-Dín, and inserted his name in the khutba and on the coins, and Tímúr himself entered Shíráz in 789/1387, some time before Zaynu'l-Ábidín's deposition. It must have been at this time, if at all, that the meeting between Tímúr and Háfiz, described by Dawlatsháh and those who follow him in connection with Tímúr's second entry into Shíráz in 795/1393, three or four years after the poet's death, actually took place. The story, which is more celebrated than authentic, has been already given on pp. 188-189 supra. Dawlatsháh, with characteristic inaccuracy, first gives the date of this supposed meeting as 795/1393, and then states (incorrectly) that Háfiz died in the previous year, 794/1392. As a matter of fact he died in 791/1389, or possibly in the following year. The former date is that given by

1 This anecdote is given by the Ḥabibu's-Siyar, vol. iii, pt 2, pp. 37 et seqq.

2 The latter is the date given by the Mujmal of Faşíhí in the chronogram حیف از شاه شجاع

the chronogram on his tombstone, so ingeniously paraphrased by Herman Bicknell¹ as follows:

\[
\text{Tarih}
\]

\[
\text{چراغ اهل معنى خواجه حافظ} \quad \text{كَه شمعى بود از نور تجلی}
\]

\[
\text{چو در خاک مصلى ساخت منزل} \quad \text{بجو تاریخش از خاک مصلى}
\]

**Chronogram.**

"On spiritual man the lamp of Ḥafiz gleamed;
'Mid rays from Glory's Light his brilliant taper beamed;
Muşallâ was his home: a mournful date to gain.
Thrice take thou from MOSALLA'S EARTH ITS RICHEST GRAIN."

The sum of the letters composing the words خاک مصلى is 791, and the same date is obtained by subtracting three times CIII (= 309) from MLL (= 1100)². The same date is given by Muḥammad Gulandám, the editor of Ḥafiz's *Dīwān*; while the following year (792) is given by Jāmī in the *Nafaḥātu'l-UNS*, by Khwándamīr in the *Habībū's-Siyar*, and by Faṣīhī of Khvāf in his *Mujmal* or Compendium of History and Biography.

Celebrity of Ḥafiz during his lifetime

Mention has already been made of the celebrity achieved by Ḥafiz even during his lifetime. As he himself says:

\[
\text{بهضر حافظ شیراز می گویند و می رقصند}
\]

\[
\text{سه چشمان خشیری و ترکان سهرتندی}
\]

"The black-eyed beauties of Cashmere and the Turks of Samarqand Sing and dance to the strains of Ḥafiz of Shíráz's verse."

In another passage³ he says, speaking of a poem he had just composed:

\[
\text{شکر شکن شوند همه طوطيان هند}
\]

\[
\text{زین قند پارسی که به بنگاله میروند}
\]

All the parrots of India become sugar-breakers
Through this Persian candy which is going to Bengal.
Behold the annihilation of space and time in the pilgrimage of Poetry,
For this infant, though but one night old, is going on a year's journey!

Not only with the Mužaffarí rulers of Shiráz, but with many other contemporary princes, Ḥáfiz entered into relations. Sultán Ahmad ibn Uways-i-Jalá'ír, the accomplished Īl-khání ruler of Baghída, himself a poet, musician, painter and artist, repeatedly strove to induce Ḥáfiz to visit his court, but, as the poet himself sang:

"The zephyr-breeze of Mušallá and the stream of Ruknábád
Do not permit me to travel or wander afield."

However he composed verses in this Prince's praise, amongst others the following:

"I praise God for the justice of the King
Ahmed the son of Shaykh Uways the son of Hasan Īl-khání;
A Khán and the son of a Khán, a King of kingly descent,
Whom it were meet that I should call the Soul of the World."
No rose-bud of delight bloomed for me from the earth of Fārs:
O for the Tigris of Baghdād and the spiritual wine!
Curl your locks in Turkish fashion, for in thy fortune lie
The Empire of Khusraw and the status of Chingiz Khān."

But, though Hāfiz never achieved the journey to Baghdād, he seems often to have thought of it:

"In Shīrāz we did not find our way to our goal;
Happy that day when Hāfiz shall take the road to Baghdād!"

Two kings of India also sought to persuade Hāfiz to visit their courts. One of these was Mahmūd Shāh Bahmani of the Deccan, a liberal patron of poets, who, through his favourite Mīr Faḍlu’l-lāh, invited Hāfiz to his capital, and sent him money for his journey. Hāfiz spent a considerable portion of this sum before leaving Shīrāz, and on arriving at Lār on his way to the Persian Gulf met with a destitute friend to whom he gave the remainder. Two Persian merchants, Khwája Zaynu’l-Dīn of Hamadān, and Khwája Muḥammad of Kāzarūn, who were on their way to India, offered to defray the poet’s expenses in return for the pleasure of his company. He went with them as far as the port of Hurmuz, where a ship was waiting to convey him to India, but a tempest which arose just as he was embarking caused him such lively consternation that, abandoning his intention, he returned to Shīrāz and sent to Mahmūd Shāh the poem beginning:

"Đemī bā ʿagīr bṣer ʿordn jehān yksr nmī ʿardzd,‘
Bmī bfrwsh dqlt ma ṣχzn bṣtr nmī ʿardzd,‘
Ṣkhwṭ tāḥ ṣltnnī ṭkh bṣhr jhn drw drgst,
Khlḥ drk h ṣttn ē mā bṭrk sṛnmī ʿardzd,‘
A verse-translation of the whole of this poem (though the verses stand in an order different from that given above) will be found amongst Miss Gertrude Lowthian Bell’s graceful renderings of *Poems from the Divan of Hafiz*¹ (No. xxi, pp. 91–93), in which the stanzas corresponding to the four couplets cited above are as follows:

"Not all the sum of earthly happiness
Is worth the bowed head of a moment’s pain,
And if I sell for wine my dervish dress
Worth more than what I sell is what I gain!

*      *      *      *

The Sultan’s crown, with priceless jewels set,
Encircles fear of death and constant dread;
It is a head-dress much desired—and yet
Art sure ’tis worth the danger to the head?

*      *      *      *

Down in the quarter where they sell red wine
My holy carpet scarce would fetch a cup—
How brave a pledge of piety is mine,
Which is not worth a goblet foaming up!

*      *      *      *

Full easy seemed the sorrow of the sea
Lightened by hope of gain—hope flew too fast!
A hundred pearls² were poor indemnity,
Not worth the blast³."

Another Indian king, Sulṭān Ghiyāthu’d-Dīn ibn Sulṭān Sikandar of Bengal, stated by Shiblí Nu‘máni (who is

---

¹ London: William Heinemann, 1897.
² This translation corresponds with the alternative reading بصد in place of ـصد.
³ This story rests on the authority of the historian of India, Muḥammad Qásim Firishta of Astarábád, who wrote in 1015/1606–7.
responsible for the story\(^1\) to have ascended the throne in 768/1366-7, is said to have corresponded with Háfiz, who wrote for him the ode beginning:

> ساغی حديث سرو و گل و لاله ميرود.
> وبن بحث با ثلاثیه غزاله ميرود.
> شکر شکن شوند همه طوطیان هند.
> زبن قند پارسی که بناللیه ميرود.
> حافظ ز شوی مجلس سلطان غیاث دین
> گافل مشو که کمار تو از ناله میرود.

"O cup-bearer there is talk of the cypress, the rose and the anemone,
And this discussion goes on with ‘the three cleansing draughts’\(^2\)?
All the parrots of India will crack sugar
Through this Persian candy which is going to Bengal.
O Háfiz, be not heedless of the enthusiasm of the Court of Sultán Ghiyáthu’d-Dín,
For thy affair will be furthered by thy lamentation.”

Having spoken of Háfiz’s relations with contemporary princes, we pass now to the little that is known or conjectured as to his personal circumstances. For the statement that he fell in love with and ultimately married a girl called Shákh-i-Nabát ("Branch of Sugar-cane") there is no weighty authority, nor are such domestic particulars to be expected from Persian biographers, in view of their reticence on all

\(^1\) In Mawlá\(i\) ‘Abdu’l-Muqtádir’s excellent Bankipore Catalogue (Persian Poets: Firdawsi to Háfiz: pp. 253-4) the King in question in this anecdote is the same as in the last, \textit{viz.} Maḥmúd Sháh Bahmaní, who reigned 780-799/1378-1396, and the anecdote assumes a different and fuller form.

\(^2\) This is generally explained as meaning three draughts of wine taken in the morning after a debauch to "break the headache" caused by previous excess. The author of the Catalogue cited in the last note makes it refer to three of the Sultán’s handmaidens called respectively Cypress, Rose, and Anemone, and named collectively, for reasons which he gives, "the three washerwomen.”
matrimonial matters. That he married and had several
children is probable. To the death of his wife he is supposed
to allude in a poem beginning¹:

آن یار گزوه خانه ما چاپ بری بود؛
سر تا قدمش چون چون از عیب بری بود؛

"That sweet-heart through whom our home was Fairyland,
And who, from head to foot, was like a fairy, free from blemish,"
but there is nothing in the poem to show that his wife
is the person referred to. There is, however, a clearer
reference to the premature death of a son in the following
verses:

دلا دیدی که آن فرزندن فرزند؛
چه دید اندر خیر این طاق رنگین؛
بجای لوح سیمین در خنارش؛
فلك بر سر نبادش لوح سکین،

"O heart, thou hast seen what that clever son
Has experienced within the dome of this many-coloured vault:
In place of a silver tablet² in his bosom
Fate hath placed a stone tablet³ on his head."

The following fragment⁴, also believed to refer to the
death of this or another son, gives the date of this loss as
Friday, 6th of Rabi’ 1, 764 (Dec. 24, 1362):

صبح جمعه بَد و سادسٮ ربيع نُكشت،
که از دلم رخ آن ماه روي شد زائل،
بِسال هفصید و شست و چهار از هجرت،
چو آب گشت بین حل حکایت مشکل،

² Corresponding to a slate on which a child does sums and
exercises.
³ I.e. a tombstone.
⁴ Ed. Rosenzweig-Schwannau, iii, p. 280.
"It was the morning of Friday and the sixth of the first Ribbi'.
When the visage of that moon-faced one declined from my heart.
In the year seven hundred and sixty four of the Flight
This difficult story became clear to me like [lucid] water.
How can regret, grief or sorrow profit
Now that life has passed in vanity without result?"

According to a biography of poets entitled Khizána-i-‘Amira, composed in India by Mfr Ghulám ‘Alí Khán Azád in 1176/1762-3, a son of Háfiż named Sháh Nu’mán came to India, died at Búrhánípúr, and is buried in the Asír-Garh.

As regards Háfiż’s intellectual attainments, his bilingual poems alone show that he had a good knowledge of Arabic, apart from the statements of his editor, Muḥammad Gulándam, as to his more scientific work in the language. He himself says:

"No one of the Háfiżes in the world hath combined as I have
The aphorisms of the Philosophers with the Scripture of the Qur’án."

That he knew the Qur’án by heart is proved by the verse:

"I have never seen any poetry sweeter than thine, O Háfiż,
[I swear] by that Qur'án which thou keepest in thy bosom."

Mawlawí Shibli Nu’mání points out that the oft-made assertion that Háfiż was indifferent to the favour of kings and princes is not borne out by his poems, in which there occur incidentally praises of the majority of contemporary rulers, including Sháh

1 See p. 272 supra.
2 I.e. those who have learned the Qur’án by heart.
Shujá', Shaykh Abú Isháq, Sulţán Maḥmúd, Sháh Mansúr, and the rulers of Yazd and Hurmuz:

"The King of Hurmúz did not see me, yet showed me a hundred favours without a word [of praise on my part];
The King of Yazd saw me, and I praised him, but he gave me nothing.
Such is the conduct of Kings: be not thou vexed, O Ḥāfiz;
May God, the Giver of daily bread, vouchsafe them His Grace and Aid!"

To the King of Yazd's failure to reward him, he again alludes in a very famous and beautiful ode¹:

These lines are thus rendered by Herman Bicknell²:

"Many a year live on and prosper, Sáqts³ of the Court of Jam⁴,
E'en though I, to fill my wine-cup, never to your circle come:
East-wind, when to Yazd thou wingest, say thou to its sons from me:
'May the head of every ingrate ball-like 'neath your mall-bat be!
'What though from your dais distant, near it by my wish I seem;
'Homage to your King I render, and I make your praise my theme.'"

¹ Ed. Rosenzweig-Schwannau, vol. i, pp. 4-7.
³ Cup-bearers.
⁴ Jam or Jamshíd, a legendary king of Persia, whose reign is associated with much glory. He corresponds to the mythical Yima of the Avesta. The king of Yazd and his courtiers are here alluded to.
The difference between Ḥāfīz and most Persian panegyrists is, however, as Mawlawí Shiblí Nuʿmání well points out, that, unlike even such great poets as Anwārī, Zāhír of Fáryáb and Salmán of Sáwa, he never employs mean and despicable methods to extort money, or has recourse to satire when panegyric fails.

We have already seen how devoted Ḥāfīz was to Shírász, and he never wearies of singing the stream of Ruknábád and the rose-gardens of Muṣallá:

٢٩١

بده ساقی می باقی حَجّه در جَنَّت نخواهی یافت
کختار آب رکناباد و ندشتی مصلاراً

"Bring, Cup-bearer, all that is left of thy wine!
In the Garden of Paradise vainly thou'lt seek
The lip of the fountain of Ruknábád
And the bowers of Muṣallá where roses twine."

And again:

فرق است ز آب خضر خیانت چای اوست
ت آب ما که منبعش لله اکبرست

"There is a difference between the Water of Khiḍr, which dwells in the Darkness, And our water, of which Alláhu Akbar is the source."

Although it is chiefly of the Spring, the Rose, the Nightingale, Wine, Youth and Beauty that Ḥāfīz sings, and at times of the Eternal Beauty of which all fair and desirable things are but the pale reflection, he sometimes

1 Miss G. L. Bell's Poems from the Divan of Hafiz, pp. 71-2.
2 I.e. the Water of Life, said to be situated in the Land of Darkness. It was sought in vain by Alexander the Great, but found by his saintly companion and guide Khiḍr (sometimes identified with Ilyás or Elias), who drunk of it and became immortal.
3 The Tang-i-Alláhu Akbar is the narrow defile whence the traveller approaching from the North first sees Shírász. See the plate on p. xxi of Herman Bicknell's translation of Ḥāfīz.
makes incidental mention of various statesmen and scholars whose favour and patronage he has enjoyed. Amongst these are Hájjí Qiwám, Qiwámu'd-Dín Hasan, Khwája Jalálú'd-Dín, Sháh Yahyá Nuṣratu'd-Dín and others, besides the kings and princes already mentioned. And though he wrote mathnawís, "fragments" (muqáṭṭa'át), qasídás and quatrains (rubá'íyyát), it is in the ode or ghazal that he especially excels. To his incomparable skill in this branch of verse many of his successors have borne testimony, amongst them Şá'íb, Salím and 'Urfí; but no one has better expressed it than Sir Gore Ouseley, who says:

"His style is clear, unaffected and harmonious, displaying at the same time great learning, matured science, and intimate knowledge of the hidden as well as the apparent nature of things; but above all a certain fascination of expression unequalled by any other poet."

It is, however, to Miss Gertrude Lowthian Bell that we are indebted for the best estimate of Háfíz, at once critical, sympathetic, and full of insight. In particular she compares and contrasts him in the most illuminating manner with his elder contemporary Dante, after characterizing whose poetry she says:

"To Háfíz, on the contrary, modern instances have no value; contemporary history is too small an episode to occupy his thoughts. During his life-time the city which he loved, perhaps as dearly as Dante loved Florence, was besieged and taken five or six times; it changed hands even more often. It was drenched with blood by one conqueror, filled with revelry by a second, and subjected to the hard rule of asceticism by a third. One after another Háfíz saw kings and princes rise into power and vanish 'like snow upon the desert's dusty face.' Pitiful tragedies, great rejoicings, the fall of kingdoms and the clash

---

1 The verses in question are given by Shibli on p. 232 of vol. ii of his Shírú'l-Ajam.
2 See the Introduction to Miss G. L. Bell's Diván of Hafíz, pp. xxii–iii.
3 See p. 234 of Shibli's above-mentioned work.
of battle—all these he must have seen and heard. But what echo of them is there in his poems? Almost none. An occasional allusion which learned commentators refer to some political event; an exaggerated effusion in praise first of one king, then of another; the celebration of such and such a victory and of the prowess of such and such a royal general—just what any self-respecting court-poet would feel it incumbent upon himself to write; and no more.

"But some of us will feel that the apparent indifference of Ḥāfiẓ lends to his philosophy a quality which that of Dante does not possess. The Italian is bound down within the limits of his philosophy, his theory of the universe is essentially of his own age, and what to him was so acutely real is to many of us merely a beautiful or a terrible image. The picture that Ḥāfiẓ draws represents a wider landscape, though the immediate foreground may not be so distinct. It is as if his mental eye, endowed with wonderful acuteness of vision, had penetrated into those provinces of thought which we of a later age were destined to inhabit. We can forgive him for leaving to us so indistinct a representation of his own time, and of the life of the individual in it, when we find him formulating ideas as profound as the warning that there is no musician to whose music both the drunk and the sober can dance."

Shibli Nu'máni ascribes the perfecting of the ghazal and the extension of its scope to Ḥāfiẓ, and in a lesser degree to his contemporaries Salmán and Khwájú. With the earlier masters, such as Sa'dí, Amír Khusraw and Ḥasan of Dihli, its almost invariable theme was love. Khwájú sang of other matters as well, such as the transitoriness of the world, while Salmán excelled in rhetorical artifices and novel comparisons and similes. Ḥāfiẓ combined the merits of all, adding to them a charm all his own, and often it pleased him to take from their Diwáns a couplet or hemistich and modify it so as to add to its beauty. In the case of Sa'dí I have given some instances of this in the second volume of my Literary History of Persia¹, and Shibli Nu'máni gives others as between Ḥāfiẓ and Khwájú and Salmán respectively. Amongst these latter are the following:

¹ Pp. 536–9. See Mawlawí 'Abdu'l-Muqtadir's remarks on this at p. 255 of the Bankipore Catalogue (Firdawsí to Ḥāfiẓ).
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Khvājū.  

چنان مروّ که غباری بدو رسد ز گذار،
بدان طرف چو وسیدی چنان بدان که تو دانی;

بگو که جان ضعیف‌تر دست رفت خدارا;
ز لعل‌ روح فنزايت بخش از آنکه تو دانی;
من این دو حرف نوشتم چنانکه غیر ندانتت;
تو هر روزی درمات بخوان چنانکه تو دانی;

(3)  

دل درین پیروزن عشه گر دهر مبند;
کگین عروسی است که در عقد بسی داماد است;

مجوز درستی عهد از جهان بی پنیاد;
که این عجیوه عروس هزار داماد است;

(4)  

منزل ار بار قربین است چه دوزخ چه پشت;
سجده گر به نیاز است چه مسجد چه کشت;

همه کس طالب یارند چه هشیار و چه مست;
همه چا خانه عشق است چه مسجد چه کشت;

(5)  

عشق تو در وجود و هوی تو در دلم;
با شیار در دل آمد و با جان بدر شود;

که بر کنار دل از رخ جانان چه میراوا;

Haftiz.  

Hafiz.
Shibli Nurmání says that he could give many other parallels between Háfiz and Khwájá, but deemed these few examples sufficient. In each case he discusses the relative merit of the parallel couplets, generally, but not always, giving the verdict in favour of Háfiz. He then passes to a similar comparison between Háfiz and Salmán.
Salmán.

۱۳۳۳

۳۳۳

۳۰۳

۱۰۳

۳۸

Háfíz.

۱۳۳۳

۳۳۳

۳۰۳

۱۰۳

۳۸

راز درون پرده ز رندان مست پرون;

کسین حال نیست زاهد عالی مقام را;

مگن ملامت رندان دکر بدنامی;

کس هرچه پیش تو نگک است نزد ما نام است;

غرض از کلبه و بُت خانه توئی سلیمان را;

چکنار خانه، بی خانه خدا باید رفت;

عتق و رند و نظر بازم و میگویم فاش;

تا بدنانی که بچندهن هنر آراسته ام;

چه این نشانه، رندانی دردی آشام است;

بچه هرچه پیش تو نگک است نزد ما نام است;

چکنار خانه، بی خانه خدا باید رفت;

جالوه بر می مفوش ای ملل الحج که تو;

خانه می بینی و من خانه خدا می بهنم;

بشنامی از اهل صلاح و زهد مجوی;

کسین حال نیست زاهد عالی مقام را;

در ملامت رندان دکر بدنامی;

ما نمی خواهم تنک و نامرا;

رند و نظر بازم و میگویم فاش;

تا بدنانی که بچندین هنر آراسته ام;
Shibli Nu'mání gives a great number of other instances of parallels between Hāfīz and Salmán and Hāfīz and Khwájú, but the specimens cited above suffice to establish the fact of this parallelism, which, so far as I know, has not been hitherto noticed by any European Orientalist. It is interesting to note another fact to which reference has been previously made in vol. ii of my Literary History of Persia (pp. 83–9), viz. the tendency of most Oriental literary critics to show less interest in the diversity of ideas of two poets than in the diversity of form in which they have expressed an idea common to both. And it is because this same tendency exists in the poets themselves that we find so great a poet as Hāfīz, for instance, taking a couplet or a whole ode from one of his elder contemporaries, such as Salmán or Khwájú, and endeavouring to give a new and more attractive turn to the phraseology, while keeping the form, the rhyme and the general sense. Such appropriation of the work of others is regarded as entirely legitimate, and is not reckoned as plagiarism, when the object of the appropriating poet is to show that he can better the work of
his predecessor or contemporary. This, of course, is quite different from parody, such as that indulged in by ‘Ubayd-i-Zákání and Busháq, where the object is not to surpass but to deride.

The number of commentaries on the poems of Ḥáfiz, not only in Persian but also in Turkish, and possibly in Urdu also, is very considerable, but few of those which I have had occasion to examine are either very critical or very illuminating. The three best-known Turkish commentaries are those of Surúrí, Shem'i and Súdí, of which the last is the most accessible and the most useful, since the author very wisely confines himself to the elucidation of the literal meaning, and avoids all attempts at allegorical interpretation and the search for the “inner meaning.” That many of the odes are to be taken in a symbolic and mystical sense few will deny; that others mean what they say, and celebrate a beauty not celestial and a wine not allegorical can hardly be questioned; that the spiritual and the material should, as Sháh Shujá' complained, be thus mingled will not surprise any one who understands the character, psychology and Weltanschauung of the people of Persia, where it is common enough to meet with persons who in the course of a single day will alternately present themselves as pious Muslims, heedless libertines, confirmed sceptics and mystical pantheists, or even incarnations of the Deity. The student of Ḥáfiz who cannot decide for himself which verses are to be taken literally and which

1 His commentary on the first 80 odes is included in Brockhaus’s Leipzig edition of the Díván (1854-6), and the whole has been printed with the text and another Turkish commentary at Constantinople about 1870. The English reader who desires to acquaint himself with Súdí’s methods may consult W. H. Lowe’s Twelve Odes of Ḥáfiz done literally into English together with the corresponding portion of the Turkish Commentary of Súdí, for the first time translated (Cambridge, 1877, pp. 80). See also Lieut.-Col. H. Wilberforce Clarke’s English prose translation (2 vols, London, 1891).

2 I have endeavoured to depict this type of Persian in the chapter of my Year amongst the Persians entitled “Amongst the Qalandars.”
symbolically is hardly likely to gain much from a commentator who invariably repeats that Wine means Spiritual Ecstasy, the Tavern the Şûfî Monastery, the Magian elder the Spiritual Guide, and so forth. To the English reader who desires to pursue this method of study, however, Lieut.-Colonel H. Wilberforce Clarke's complete prose translation of the *Divân* of Ḥâfîz "with copious notes and an exhaustive commentary" may be recommended. On the symbolical meaning of the erotic and Bacchanalian phraseology of the mystic or pseudo-mystic poets of Persia generally E. H. Whinfield's excellent edition and annotated translation of Maḥmûd Shabistari's *Gulshan-i-Râz* ("Rose-garden of Mystery") and the late Professor E. H. Palmer's little work on *Oriental Mysticism* may be consulted with advantage. On the origin, doctrines and general character of Ṣûfîism I must refer the reader to chapter xiii (pp. 416-444) of the first volume of my *Literary History of Persia*.

One little Persian treatise on Ḥâfîz, to which my attention was first called by Mr Sidney Churchill, formerly Oriental Secretary of the British Legation at Tihrân, deserves a brief mention, chiefly because it formulates and subsequently endeavour to refute certain adverse criticisms on his poetry made by some of his compatriots. This little book is entitled *Latifâ-i-Ghaybiyya* and was written by Muḥammad b. Muḥammad of Dârâb, concerning whose life and date I have been unable to learn anything. It comprises 127 pages of small size, was lithographed at Tihrân in 1304/1886-7, and chiefly consists of explanations of different verses. The three hostile criticisms which it seeks to refute are stated as follows on p. 5:

(1) That some of his verses are meaningless, or that, if they have any meaning, it is very far-fetched and enigmatical. The following instance is given:

1 See n. 1 on the preceding page.
HAFTIČ CRITICIZED

Ma jra چمرگان و بازآ که مرا مدم چشم,
خروقی از سر بدر آورد و بشارانه بسخت

"Cease your recriminations and return, for the pupil of my eye
Hath pulled off the cloak over its head and burned it as a thank-offering."  

(2) That some of his verses are evidently secular and profane, and refer to the pleasures of the senses in a manner which cannot be explained as allegorical, as for instance:

دل من در هوا زی روی فرخ، به آشفته همگون می‌روی فرخ
"My heart, in love with Farrukh's face, is agitated like Farrukh's hair."

And again:

هزار آوین بر می‌سرخ باد، که از روی ما گنج‌زردی گردید

"A thousand blessings be on the red wine which hath removed the sallow complexion from my face!"

(3) That many of his verses smack of the Ash'arí (Sunní) doctrines, which are repudiated and execrated by the Imámí (Shí'a) doctors, e.g.:

در گویی نیکتامی مارا گذر ندادند

گر تو نمی‌پسندی تغییر گن قادر

"They did not suffer me to pass through the street of good repute:
If thou dost not approve, then change Destiny."

این جان عاریت چه بحافص سهرد دوست

روزی رُخش بینم و تسخیر وی گنیر

"This borrowed life which the Friend hath entrusted to Ḥafiz—
One day I shall see His Face and shall yield it up to Him."

1 For Súdí's explanation of this verse, see Rosenzweig-Schwannau's edition of Ḥafiz, vol. i, No. 26 in ت، p. 769 in the notes. It is not very convincing, and I have never met with any other allusion to the custom there alleged.

2 It is worth noting that the extreme Fatalism commonly regarded in Europe as characteristic of Islám is repudiated by Muslims of the Shí'a sect.

3 The doctrine called Ruyatu'lláh ("The Vision of God") belongs, I think, especially to the Ḥanbalí sect, but is held in detestation by the Shí'a.
Although manuscripts of Háfiz offer as many variants as is usually the case with Persian texts, there exists of this poet’s works an established and generally accepted text which we owe, I think, to the Turkish commentator Súdí, and which has been popularized in Europe by the editions of Brockhaus and Rosenzweig-Schwannau, so that it is usual to refer to the odes of Háfiz by the numbers they bear in the latter edition. Turkish editions of Persian poetry, such as the Mathnawi of Jalálu’d-Dín Rúmí, the Diwán of Háfiz, etc., are generally more accurate and trustworthy than those produced in India, which commonly contain many spurious and interpolated lines composed by the editors, lines which a Persian would be ashamed and a Turk unable to produce; for the Persian editor has in most cases enough taste (dhawq) to know that he cannot produce verses likely to be accepted as those of the master whom he is editing; while the Turkish editor is generally conscientious and laborious, but incapable of producing any Persian verses at all. The Indian editor, on the other hand, often has a certain facility of versifying without much critical taste.

This “authorized version” of the Diwán of Háfiz (which could probably be much improved by a fresh and careful collation of all the best and oldest manuscripts) contains in all 693 separate poems; to wit, 573 odes (ghazaliyyát); 42 fragments (muqatla’át); 69 quatrains (rubá’iyyát); 6 mathnawis; 2 qasidas, and one “five-some” or mukhammas. Of all of these poems German verse-translations are given by Rosenzweig-Schwannau, and English prose translations by Wilberforce Clarke. There exist also many translations of individual odes or groups of odes in English, German, Latin, French, etc., either in verse or prose1. Of English verse translations the largest and most sumptuous collection is that of Herman Bicknell,

1 For a list of the chief of these, see Dr H. Ethé’s Catalogue of the Persian MSS in the India Office, No. 1246 (col. 720), and the Banki-pore Catalogue (Firdawsi to Háfiz), pp. 256–7.
who was born in 1830, studied Medicine at St Bartholomew's Hospital and took the degree of M.R.C.S. in 1854, entered the Army Medical Service, went through the Indian Mutiny, travelled widely in Europe, Asia, Africa and America, made the pilgrimage to Mecca under the name of 'Abdu'l-Wahid in 1862, and spent some time at Shiráz "with the object of clearing up doubtful points [in the Diwán], and of becoming personally acquainted with the localities mentioned by the Poet." He died in 1875, and his posthumous work was brought out with loving care by his brother, A. S. Bicknell, in the same year. It contains, besides the Preface, Introduction, Appendix and Indices, and nine illustrations, translations, complete or partial, of 189 ghazaliyyát, all the 42 muqatta'ádt and 69 rubá'iyyát, 2 out of the 6 mathnawís, and the one mukhammas.

Of most of these translations of Ḥáfiz, from the Latin renderings of Meninski (1680), Thomas Hyde (1767) and Revisky (1771); the French (1799) and English (1792) versions of Sir William Jones; the numerous German versions from Wahl (1791) to Bodenstedt (1877); and the later English efforts of Payne, Justin McCarthy and Wilberforce Clarke, I do not propose to speak here; but I shall say something of three of the English verse-translations which seem to me the most worthy of attention. Of the oldest of these three, that of Herman Bicknell, published in 1875, I have already spoken above. The next in point of time is that of Miss Gertrude Lowthian Bell (London, 1897), which contains, besides an admirable Introduction on the life, times and character of the poet, verse-translations of 43 of the odes. These, though rather free, are, in my opinion, by far the most artistic, and, so far as the spirit of Ḥáfiz is concerned, the most faithful renderings of his poetry. Lastly, in 1898 Mr Walter Leaf published 28 "Versions from Ḥáfiz," in which he endeavoured to reproduce the form as well as the sense of the original poems, with as much success, probably, as is attainable
under these conditions. The existence of these three versions exonerates me from attempting, as I have done in the case of other less known Persian poets, to produce versions of my own. In their different ways they are all good: Herman Bicknell's are accurate as regards the sense, and often very ingenious, especially the chrono-grams; Walter Leaf's give an excellent idea of the form; while Miss Bell's are true poetry of a very high order, and, with perhaps the single exception of FitzGerald's paraphrase of the Quatrans of 'Umar Khayyám, are probably the finest and most truly poetical renderings of any Persian poet ever produced in the English language; for, though some of Sir William Jones's verse-translations are pretty enough, they can hardly be dignified by the name of poetry, and are, moreover, so free that they can scarcely be called translations.

For the sake of comparison I gave elsewhere^1 five different English verse-translations of one of the best-known of the odes of Háfíz, that beginning^2:

\[\text{"بختال هندوش بخشمر سرقند و بخارارا\"}}\]

which has been rendered into English verse by Sir William Jones, Herman Bicknell, Miss Bell, Walter Leaf, and myself. I cannot find so many English verse-renderings of any other of the odes of Háfíz, for, though many of those translated by Miss Bell are also to be found in Herman Bicknell's translation, only three or four of the former are included amongst the 28 published by Walter Leaf. The one fault to be found with Miss Bell's versions is that they are not arranged in any order, nor is any indication given of the opening words of the original, nor reference to its position in the text of Rosenzweig-Schwannau which she has followed;

---

1 In a lecture on the Literature of Persia delivered to the Persia Society on April 26, 1912, and afterwards published for that Society by John Hogg, 13, Paternoster Row, London, E.C., price one shilling.

2 See Rosenzweig-Schwannau's ed., vol. i, p. 24 (No. 8 in \textit{alif}).
and only after I had succeeded, with considerable labour, in identifying the originals of all but nine or ten of her translations did I ascertain that my friend Mr Guy le Strange possessed an annotated copy of her book containing all the references I required save one (No. xv), which was wrongly given, and which I am still unable to identify. For the convenience, therefore, of other readers of her admirable book, I give below the reference to each original in Rosenzweig-Schwannau's edition, specifying the volume, page, and number under each rhyming letter, and adding a reference to Bicknell and Leaf in cases where an ode has also been rendered by them.

(No. in Miss Bell's trans.) (Reference to original in Rosenzweig's ed.) (Reference to H. Bicknell's transl.)

1 No. i (p. 67) vol. i, p. 2 (l 1) No. i (p. 3)
No. ii (p. 68) vol. i, p. 194 (т 58) No. ii (p. 83)
No. iii (p. 69) vol. i, p. 204 (т 63) No. iv (p. 85)
No. iv (p. 70) vol. i, p. 100 (т 19) —
2 No. v (p. 71) vol. i, p. 24 (l 8) No. vii (p. 73) vol. ii, p. 86 (с 6) No. cxxvi (p. 172)
No. vii (p. 74) vol. i, p. 152 (т 41) —
No. viii (p. 75) vol. i, p. 110 (т 24) No. x (p. 76) vol. i, p. 8 (l 3) No. iii (p. 9)
3 No. x (p. 78) omitted No. xi (p. 79) vol. i, p. 138 (т 36) No. clxxii (p. 240)
No. xi (p. 79) vol. i, p. 138 (т 36) No. xxvii (p. 172)
No. xii (p. 80) vol. i, p. 32 (l 12) No. xii (p. 29)
No. xiii (p. 81) vol. i, p. 276 (т 90) No. lxv (p. 99)
No. xiv (p. 83) vol. i, p. 302 (д 3) No. lxx (p. 107)
No. xv (p. 84) —
No. xvi (p. 85) vol. i, p. 222 (т 69) No. lvi (p. 88)
No. xvii (p. 86) vol. i, p. 148 (т 40) No. xlivii (p. 75)
No. xviii (p. 88) vol. i, p. 360 (д 23) —
No. xix (p. 89) vol. i, p. 368 (д 26) —
No. xx (p. 90) vol. ii, p. 18 (р 6) —

1 See also Palmer's *Song of the Reed*, pp. 53-4.
2 W. Leaf, No. iv, pp. 27-8.
3 W. Leaf, No. i. p. 23; Palmer, pp. 49-50.

B. P. 20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reference to original in Rosenzweig’s ed.</th>
<th>Reference to H. Bicknell’s transl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xxxi</td>
<td>vol. i, p. 374 (28)</td>
<td>No. lxxx (p. 122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxii</td>
<td>vol. i, p. 410 (41)</td>
<td>No. ci (p. 147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxiii</td>
<td>vol. i, p. 596 (113)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxiv</td>
<td>vol. iii, p. 86 (31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv</td>
<td>vol. i, p. 502 (78)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvi</td>
<td>vol. i, p. 520 (85)</td>
<td>No. xc (p. 133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvii</td>
<td>vol. i, p. 256 (82)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxviii</td>
<td>vol. i, p. 490 (73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxix</td>
<td>vol. ii, p. 8 (3)</td>
<td>No. cxv (p. 158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>vol. ii, p. 104 (7)</td>
<td>No. cxxviii (p. 176)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxi</td>
<td>vol. i, p. 560 (99)</td>
<td>No. xcvi (p. 140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxii</td>
<td>vol. ii, p. 32 (11)</td>
<td>No. cvii (p. 162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxiii</td>
<td>vol. i, p. 576 (105)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxiv</td>
<td>vol. i, p. 584 (108)</td>
<td>No. ci (p. 144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxv</td>
<td>vol. i, p. 662 (139)</td>
<td>No. cvii (p. 151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxvi</td>
<td>vol. ii, p. 78 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxvii</td>
<td>vol. ii, p. 68 (10)</td>
<td>No. cxxi (p. 166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxviii</td>
<td>vol. i, p. 650 (135)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxix</td>
<td>vol. i, p. 416 (44)</td>
<td>No. lxxxi (p. 123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xl</td>
<td>vol. ii, p. 120 (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xli</td>
<td>vol. iii, p. 296 (qift'a)</td>
<td>Qit’a xxxiii (p. 292)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlii</td>
<td>vol. i, p. 586 (109)</td>
<td>No. clxiii (p. 227)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xliii</td>
<td>vol. ii, p. 398 (74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As already noted, only three or four of the odes have been rendered in English verse by Miss Bell, Herman Bicknell and Walter Leaf, and of one of them (Agar an Turk-i-Shirazi...) the parallel renderings were published in my paper on Persian Literature, to which reference has been already made, together with others. Another ode rendered by the three writers above mentioned is that beginning¹:

\[
\text{شکفتہ شد گل حمرا و گشت بلبل مست}
\]

¹ See Rosenzweig-Schwannau’s ed., vol. i, p. 110, No. 24 in ت; Miss Bell, No. viii, pp. 75–6; Bicknell, No. xxxi, p. 60; and Walter Leaf, No. v, p. 29.
Of this also, for the sake of comparison, I here reprint the three versions, beginning with Herman Bicknell’s, which is as follows:

_Bicknell’s translation_ (No. xxxi, p. 60).

(1) “In blossom is the crimson rose, and the rapt bulbul trills his song; A summons that to revel calls you, O Súfís, wine-adoring throng!

(2) The fabric of my contrite fervour appeared upon a rock to bide; Yet see how by a crystal goblet it hath been shattered in its pride.

(3) Bring wine; for to a lofty spirit, should they at its tribunal be, What were the sentry, what the Sultan, the toper or the foe of glee?

(4) Forth from this hostel of two portals as finally thou needst must go, What if the porch and arch of Being be of high span or meanly low?

(5) To bliss’s goal we gain not access, if sorrow has been tasted not; Yea, with Alastu’s¹ pact was coupled the sentence of our baleful lot.

(6) At Being and Not-being fret not, but either with calm temper see: Not-being is the term appointed for the most lovely things that be.

(7) Áṣaf’s display, the airy courser, the language which the birds employed, The wind has swept; and their possessor no profit from his wealth enjoyed².

(8) Oh! fly not from thy pathway upward, for the winged shaft that quits the bow A moment to the air has taken, to settle in the dust below.

(9) What words of gratitude, O Ḥáfiz, Shall thy reed’s tongue express anon, As its choice gems of composition From hands to other hands pass on?

---

¹ “It is maintained by certain interpreters of the Koran that Adam and the whole of his future race appeared before their Creator on the first day of the world. God said to them: ‘A-lastu bi-Rabbi-kum,’ ‘Am I not your Lord?’ All responded ‘Balá,’ ‘Yes.’ But the word ‘balá’ has the additional signification of ‘bale’ or ‘evil.’ Hence the sentence of bale, or evil, was annexed to the pact of the ‘Day of Alast,’ and was constituted a condition of existence.”

² “How vain were the glories of Solomon! Áṣaf was his minister, the East-wind his courser, and the language of birds one of his accomplishments; but the blast of Time has swept them away.”
Walter Leaf's translation (No. v, p. 29).

(1) "Aflame with bloom is the red rose, the bulbul drunk with Spring; What ho, adorers of Wine! Hear the call to mirth that they fling.

(2) The corner-stone of repentance that seemed a rock firm-set
Is rent and riven asunder by touch of glasses a-ring.

(3) Fill high the bowl with the red wine, for here is Liberty Hall,
The sage is one with the toper, the ploughman e'en as the king.

(4) From out this Hostel of Two Doors the signal calls us away,
Alike if low be the roof-tree or lofty dome upspring.

(5) We conquer only through anguish the resting-place of delight;
To life, by bond of Alast-vow, the long 'Alas' must cling.

Miss Bell's translation (No. viii, p. 75).

(1) "The rose has flushed red, the bud has burst,
And drunk with joy is the nightingale—
Hail, Śūfis, lovers of wine, all hail!
For wine is proclaimed to a world athirst.

(2) Like a rock your repentance seemed to you;
Behold the marvel! Of what avail
Was your rock, for a goblet has cleft it in two!

(3) Bring wine for the King and the slave at the gate!
Alike for all is the banquet spread,
And drunk and sober are warmed and fed.

(4) When the feast is done and the night grows late,
And the second door of the tavern gapes wide,
The low and the mighty must bow the head
'Neath the archway of Life, to meet what...outside?

1 See note i on previous page. Mr Leaf has here sought to paraphrase the word-play on َّبَلَتْ (‘Yea’) and َّبَلَتْ (Woe) in the original.
(5) Except thy road through affliction pass,  
None may reach the halting-station of mirth;  
God's treaty: Am I not Lord of the earth?  
Man sealed with a sigh: Ah yes, alas!

(6) Nor with is nor is not let thy mind contend;  
Rest assured all perfection of mortal birth  
In the great is not at the last shall end.

(7) For Assaf's pomp, and the steeds of the wind,  
And the speech of birds down the wind have fled,  
And he that was lord of them all is dead;  
Of his mastery nothing remains behind.

(8) Shoot not thy feathered arrow astray!  
A bow-shot's length through the air it has sped,  
And then...dropped down in the dusty way.

(9) But to thee, oh Ḥāfīz, to thee, oh tongue  
That speaks through the mouth of the slender reed,  
What thanks to thee when thy verses speed  
From lip to lip, and the song thou hast sung?"

This one example of three parallel translations will suffice to show generally the style of work of the three translators. Miss Bell's is the least literal, but by far the most poetical, and is a wonderful interpretation of the spirit of the original. Walter Leaf aims especially at exactly reproducing the form (both as regards rhyme and metre), as well as the sense, of the original. Herman Bicknell steers a middle course, making each verse of his translation correspond with its original, but not attempting to preserve the same rhyme throughout the poem.

In view of these and other excellent translations of Ḥāfīz into verse and prose in English and other European languages, I will content myself with quoting here the renderings by Miss Bell and Herman Bicknell of one more ode of Ḥāfīz, which has a certain special interest because it is engraved on his tombstone^1, and which begins:

مَؤَهَّدٍ، وَصِلَّ تَوْبًا چَزَر ہِناک قَبْضَہ، ہَرِیْنِز
طَایِرٕ قُدّاَسَم وَ از دَامِ ہِناک قَبْضَہ، ہَرِیْنِز

^1 For a complete translation of the inscription on the tombstone, see the plate facing p. xvi of Herman Bicknell's work above mentioned.
Bicknell's translation (p. 227, No. clxiii).

"Where doth Thy love's glad message echo for my rapt soul
To rise?
This sacred bird from the world's meshes yearns to its goal
To rise.
I swear, wilt Thou Thy servant name me, by all my love sublime
Higher than my desire of lordship o'er space and time
To rise.
Vouchsafe, Lord, from Thy cloud of guidance to pour on me Thy rain,
Ere Thou command me as an atom from man's domain
To rise.
Bring minstrels and the wine-cup with thee, or at my tomb ne'er sit:
Permit me in thy perfume dancing from the grave's pit
To rise.
Though I am old, embrace me closely, be it a single night:
May I, made young by thy caresses, at morn have might
To rise!
Arouse thee! show thy lofty stature,
Idol of winning mien:
Enable me, as soul-reft Ḥāfīz,
From Nature's scene
To rise!"

Miss Bell's translation (No. xliii, pp. 118-119).

"Where are the tidings of union? that I may arise—
Forth from the dust I will rise up to welcome thee!
My soul, like a homing bird, yearning for Paradise,
Shall arise and soar, from the snares of the world set free.
When the voice of love shall call me to be thy slave,
I shall rise to a greater far than the mastery
Of life and the living, time and the mortal span:
Pour down, oh Lord! from the clouds of Thy guiding grace
The rain of a mercy that quickeneth on my grave,
Before, like dust that the wind bears from place to place,
I arise and flee beyond the knowledge of man.
When to my grave thou turnest thy blessed feet,
Wine and the lute shalt thou bring in thy hand to me,
Thy voice shall ring through the folds of my winding-sheet,
And I will arise and dance to thy minstrelsy.
Though I be old, clasp me one night to thy breast,
And I, when the dawn shall come to awaken me,
With the flash of youth on my cheek from thy bosom will rise.
Rise up! let mine eyes delight in thy stately grace!
Thou art the goal to which all men's endeavour has pressed,
And thou the idol of Hāfiz's worship; thy face
From the world and life shall bid him come forth and arise!"

The tomb of Hāfiz is in a beautiful garden, called after him the "Hāfiziyā," situated near Shīrāz. It was much

The tomb of
Hāfiz

beautiful by Abu'l-Qāsim Bābur, the great-grandson of Tīmūr, when he conquered Shīrāz in 856/1452, the work being entrusted by him to Mawláná Muḥammad Mu'ammā'ī. At a later date (1226/1811) it was further embellished by Karím Khán-i-Zand, one of the best rulers that Persia has ever had, by whom the present tombstone, a slab of fine alabaster, was contributed. The Hāfiziyā is much honoured and much frequented by the people of Shīrāz and by visitors to that city, and the poet's grave is surrounded by the graves of many others who have sought proximity to those illustrious ashes, so that his own words have been fulfilled when he said:

"When thou passest by our tomb, seek a blessing, for it shall become a place of pilgrimage for the libertines of all the world."

Before passing on to the mention of other poets, something must be said as to the practice of taking an augury (tafīdul) from the Divān of Hāfiz which is so prevalent in Persia, where the only other book used for this purpose (and that much more rarely) is the Qur'ān itself, just as the ancient Romans used to use Vergil (Sortes Vergilianæ). It has been already mentioned that Hāfiz is often entitled Lisānul-Ghayb

1 Not the great Bābur who was the great-great-great-grandson of Tīmūr, and who founded the so-called "Mogul Dynasty" in India.
("The Tongue of the Unseen") and *Tarjumánu'l-Asrár* ("The Interpreter of Mysteries"), and it is generally believed by his fellow-countrymen that, in case of doubt as to the course of action to be pursued, valuable indications may be obtained by opening the *Dīwān* at random, after the utterance of suitable invocations, and taking either the first verse on which the eye falls, or the last ode on the open page, with the first line of the succeeding ode. Tables, called *Fāl-nāma*, comprising a number of squares (always a multiple of some number such as 7 or 9) each containing one letter are also employed for the same purpose; and one of these, with instructions for its use, is often prefixed to Oriental editions of the *Dīwān*. These tables, however, in spite of their mysterious and impressive appearance, only give a very limited number of answers—seven when the squares are a multiple of seven, nine when they are a multiple of nine, and so on; and as Lane has well observed, in speaking of similar squares used by the Egyptians, in consequence of the view prevailing in the East generally that, if in doubt, it is better, as a rule, to refrain from action, a majority of the answers provided for are generally distinctly discouraging or of a negative character, and only a few encouraging.

The table referred to in the last foot-note comprises $15 \times 15 = 225$ squares, each containing one letter. Nine hemistichs each containing 25 letters are chosen $(9 \times 25 = 225)$. In the first square is placed the first letter of the first hemistich; in the second square the first letter of the second hemistich, and so on to the ninth square, in which is placed the first letter of the ninth hemistich. Next follow the second letters of each hemistich in the same order, the second letter of the first hemistich in the tenth square, the second letter of the second hemistich in the eleventh square, and so on.

1 A specimen of these tables will be found on p. 233 of the Banki-pore *Catalogue*, in the volume consecrated to *Persian Poetry from Firdawsi to Hāfiẓ*. 
until the table concludes at the 225th square with the last (25th) letter of the last (ninth) hemistich. In using the table, the finger is placed at random on one of the 225 squares, and the letter it contains is written down, and after it, in a circle, the 24 letters obtained by taking each 9th square from the point of departure until the cycle is completed. By beginning at the proper point, these 25 letters give the first hemistich of one of the odes, which can then be readily found in the *Dīwān*. The table in question gives the following nine hemistichs, to each of which I have added the second hemistich (not included in the table, but needed to complete the verse), the reference to Rosenzweig’s edition, and the English translation.


ما آزموده اییر درین شهر بخت خوشیه

"We have tried our fortune in this city; we must withdraw our gear from this gulf."

This would supply an answer to one who was hesitating as to whether he should emigrate from the place where he was, or not.


مرحباء طائر فرخ پی فرخنده پیام؛

"Welcome, O bird of auspicious advent and fortunate message! Good is thy arrival! What news? Where is the Friend? Which is the road?"


در آنجا گبخ روم عاقل و فرزانه روم;

"If I go home from this abode of exile, then, when I go thither, I shall go wisely and sensibly."
This would supply an answer to a traveller or exile who was wondering whether he would not do well to return home.


"Should my lucky star aid me, I will lay hold on his skirt; Should I pluck it, O the delight! And should he slay me, O the honour!"


"Show thy face and take away from my memory all thought of my own existence; Bid the wind bear away all the harvest of those who are burned out!"


"I said, 'I have longing for thee!' She replied, 'Thy longing will come to an end.' I said, 'Be thou my Moon!' She replied, 'If it comes off!'


"O Lord, that fresh and smiling rose which Thou didst entrust to me I now entrust to Thee from the envious eye of the flower-bed."


"Brave Niadem, Brave Tahiri! Let me remember, Let me remember!"
"My desire hath not yet been fulfilled in respect to my craving for thy lip;
In the hope of the ruby goblet [of thy mouth] I am still a drainer of dregs."


"Arise, that we may seek an opening through the door of the tavern,
That we may sit in the Friend's path and seek [the fulfilment of] a wish!"

As will be seen, the answers supplied by these vague oracles are often of a somewhat uncertain nature, besides being limited in number to nine. The other method of opening the Dīwān at random gives, of course, much richer results, and there stands on record many a remarkable response, which si non é vero é ben trovato. Six of these are recorded at the end (pp. 122-7) of the little treatise entitled Latīṣa-i-Ghay-biya which has been already mentioned.1

The first refers to Sháh Isma'il the Great, the founder of the Šafawí dynasty, who made the Shí'a doctrine the official creed of Persia, and carried his energy so far in this endeavour that he ordered the tombs of persons of suspected orthodoxy or of known Sunnî proclivities to be destroyed. One day, accompanied by a certain ignorant and fanatical priest known as Mullá Magas2, he visited the tomb of Ĥáfiz, and Mullá Magas urged him to have it destroyed, alleging (as had been alleged by the poet's contemporaries) that he was unorthodox in belief and dissolute in life. The King thereupon announced his intention of taking an augury from the Dīwān of Ĥáfiz, which opened at the following verse:

"At dawn Orion displayed his belt before me,
As though to say, 'I am the King's slave, and this I swear.'"

1 See p. 300 supra.  2 Magas is the Persian for "a fly."
This, it is to be supposed, Sháh Isma‘íl took as an expression of the deceased poet’s loyalty to himself, and thereupon, well pleased, he again opened the book at random and was confronted by the following verse, which was even more evidently intended for his ecclesiastical companion:

"O fly (magās) \(^1\) the presence of the Símurgh\(^1\) is no fit place for thy evolutions:
Thou dost but dishonour thyself and vex us!"

After this it may be assumed that Mullá Magas effaced himself!

The story referred to above, but not given in the Latifa-i-Ghaybiyya, is that, when Háfiz died, some of his detractors objected to his being buried in the Muslim equivalent of consecrated ground, but that, on an augury being taken from his poems to decide the question, the following very appropriate verse resulted:

"Withhold not thy footsteps from the bier of Háfiz,
For, though he is immersed in sin, he will go to Paradise!"

The second instance given by the Latifa-i-Ghaybiyya refers to another king of the same dynasty, Sháh Ţahmásp\(^2\), who one day, while playing with a ring which he valued very highly, dropped it, and, though he caused an exhaustive search for it to be made under the carpets and cushions,

\(^1\) A mythical bird of great size and wisdom and almost or quite immortal, which is supposed, like its Arabian equivalent the ‘Anqá, to dwell in the Mountains of Qáf or of the Alburz, and which played an important part in the legend of Sám and Zál (the grandfather and father of Rustam respectively) as recounted in the Sháh-náma of Firdawsí.

\(^2\) There were two Šafawí kings of this name. The first reigned A.D. 1524-1576; the second 1722-1731.
could not find it. An augury taken from Hāfiz gave the following result:

"What cares a heart which mirrors the Unseen and possesses the Goblet of Jamshid for a ring which is mislaid for a moment?"

The king clapped his hands on his knees in admiration for the appositeness of this verse, and immediately felt the ring in a fold of his robe into which it had accidentally slipped.

The third anecdote refers to yet another Șafawí King, Sháh ʿAbbás the Second (A.D. 1642–1667), who obtained the following augury as to a campaign which he was meditating against the province of Ádharbáyján, of which Tabríz is the capital:

"Thou hast captured Iráq and Fárs by thy verse, O Hāfiz: Come, for it is now the turn of Bagh dád and the time for Tabríz."

This decided the king in favour of the campaign, which turned out completely successful.

The fourth anecdote refers to the same king as the last. He had a servant named Siyáwush, whom his fellow-servants, through jealousy and malice, desired to destroy, so that they...
were constantly striving to convince the King that he was worthy of death. The result of an augury from the *Divân* of Hâfiz was this verse:

"The King of the Turks hearkens to the speech of the accusers:
May he be ashamed of the wrong of [shedding] the blood of Siyâ-wush!"

The fifth instance is from the author’s own experience. In 1052/1642-3 he reached Ahmâd-âbâd, then the capital of Gujerât in India, and there made the acquaintance of a certain Kanân Beg, one of the notables of the place, who had a brother named Yûsuf Beg. The latter, who was in the army of Gujerât, had a little time previously been reported missing in a battle fought near Ahmâd-âbâd against a hostile force. His brother, Kanân Beg, was greatly disquieted until the following augury from Hâfiz assuaged his anxiety, which was soon afterwards dispelled by his brother’s safe return:

"Lost Joseph (Yûsuf) will return to Canaan (Kanân): grieve not!
The house of sorrows will one day become a rose-garden: grieve not!"

The sixth and last instance refers to a certain Fath-‘Alî Sulṭân, the son of Imám-quli Khán, a youth remarkable for his beauty, who was the author’s contemporary. One day, flushed with wine, and clad in a green coat (qabâ) embroidered with gold, he visited the tomb of Hâfiz on the day specially set apart for this, which falls in the latter part of the month of Rajab, and while there took an augury from the *Divân*, which gave the following verse:

1 See ed. Rosenzweig-Schwannau, vol. i, p. 620, and the note on p. 823, which explains the allusion to the old legend in question.
“When thou passest by, drunk with wine and clad in a gold-embroidered coat,
Vow one kiss to Háfiz who is clad in wool!"

“What is one kiss?” exclaimed Fath-ʿAlí; “I promise two kisses!” A week passed ere he revisited the tomb, and took another augury, which was as follows:

“Thou didst say, ‘I will get drunk and give thee two kisses’: The promise has passed its limit [of time], and we have seen neither two nor even one.”

“What are two kisses?” cried the lad; “I promise three kisses!” And again he went away without discharging his vow, and did not return until another week had elapsed, when he again took an augury, and received the following answer:

“Thereupon Fath-ʿAlí Sulṭán leapt from his seat and imprinted kiss after kiss upon the poet’s tombstone.

Other instances of omens taken from the Divván of Háfiz by the Moghul Emperor Jahángír, and recorded in his own handwriting in the margins of a manuscript formerly in his possession, are given in the Bankipore Catalogue (Persian Poetry: Firdawsí to Háfiz), pp. 231-52.
7. Kamál of Khujand
(Kamálh'ád-Dín b. Mas'úd).

Not much is known concerning this poet, who, however, since his verses won the admiration of Háfiz, cannot be passed over. Jámi says¹ that he was a great saint, and that if he deigned to write verse it was to conceal the fullness of his saintly nature and spiritual attainments, to prevent the complete suppression of his exoteric by his esoteric life, and to maintain the position of “servitude” to God against an overmastering tendency to be merged in the Deity; an assertion in support of which he quotes Kamál’s verse:

این تکلیف‌های من در شعر من، یا حمایتی یانه‌ی من است،

“These efforts of mine in my poetry are my ‘Speak to me O Ḥumayrā’!”

Kamál’s spiritual guide was a certain Khwája ‘Ubaydulláh who resided for some time at Shásh², a place situated like Khujand in Transoxiana. At an unknown but probably fairly early period of his life Kamál migrated to Tabríz, where he made his home, and for which he conceived a great affection. The Jalá’írí Sulṭán Husayn, son of Uways (776–784/1374–1382) showed him much favour and built for him a monastery or rest-house. Jámi says that when after Kamál’s death they entered his private room in this rest-house, they found in it no furniture save a mat of coarse reeds on which he used to sit and sleep, and a stone which served him for a pillow. In Tabríz, where he obtained a great reputation for sanctity,

² The Prophet Muḥammad, when recovering from the state of exhaustion into which he used to fall after receiving a revelation, was wont to summon his wife ‘Á’ísha to come to his side and talk to him, with the words Kallimi-ni yá Ḥumayrá, “Speak to me O little red one!”
³ Or Chách, the modern Táshkand and ancient Banákat or Fanákát. Cf. pp. 100 and 110 supra.
he came under the influence of Shaykh Zaynu’d-Din Khwáshi.

In 787/1385 Túqtámish, Khán of Qipcháq, raided Tabríz, and, after the fashion of Tímúr and other conquerors of those days, carried off Kamál amongst other learned and pious persons to his own capital, Saráy. There he remained for four years, at the end of which period he returned to Tabríz where he died, according to most authorities, in 803/1400-1. Dawlatsháh places his death in 792/1390, a date which Rieu shows reason for regarding as much too early. A still later date (808/1405-6) is given by the Majálisul-‘Ushsháq. On the poet’s tomb was inscribed the verse:

\[\text{کمال از یکه رفتی بر در یار} \]

"O Kamál! Thou hast gone from the Ka’ba to the door of the Friend:
A thousand blessings on thee! Thou hast gone right manfully!"

During his second sojourn at Tabríz Kamál was patronized by Tímúr’s son Míráňsháh, who was then governor of Ádharbáyján, and who is said to have given the poet, in return for some fruit which he or his soldiers had eaten from his garden, a sum of a thousand dínárs wherewith to discharge his debts.

The Diwán of Kamál of Khujand has never, so far as I know, been published, and is not common in manuscript, though copies are to be found in most of the larger collections of Persian books. I possess an undated but well-written and fairly ancient manuscript, from which the following selections are taken.

(1)

\[\text{کمال از هر منه اشکت مگر هنرگی سپیان شد} \]

\[\text{جز از اشعار مدرم برد معنی‌های رنگین‌را} \]

1 See pp. 569-72 of Jámí’s Nafáhát and Ibn ‘Arabsháh’s ‘Ajá’íb’ul-Maqdúr, p. 34 of the Calcutta ed. of 1818.
3 The Atash-kada alone says that he died at Yazd.

B. P.
"O Kamál, have thy tears from every eye-lash assumed the hue of Salmán
Because he hath stolen from other people's poetry his brilliant ideas?"

(2)

شَاهِنَهُ زَدَ بَادِ زِلْفُ يَارَ مَرَا;
تأ بِلَا لَوْ تَوْ رَأْسَ قَوْنَ الْفَرِّ;
ما جَوَّ لَامِيْمَ درَ مِئَانَ بُلَا;
كَهُ بِمِرْطُوبْ بِهِ بُوْدُ حَلْوَا;
كَهُ قَتَّاجُ دَرَوْ خَيَالِ دَوَ;
شَدَّ قَنْانَ بَرَ زَ دَرَ دِلُّ رَيْشَ;
فُوُهُ مَاَالْحَبَّةِ فِيهِ شَفْإَ;

"The breeze combed the tresses of my Friend; may God keep him in health for ever!
So long as thou art upright in figure like an alif, we are like a lám in the midst of woe!
The moist eye is best [laid] on thy lips, for sweet-meats are best [eaten] with what is moist.
The wounded heart is so filled with the pain of thy love that the very idea of healing cannot enter it.
Vex not thy heart with grief for the Friend, O Kamál: his mouth is the Water of Life wherein is healing."

(3)

دَسْوَارٌ سْكَنَدْ نَقْشُ دَوُ اَبْرَوَى تَوْ نَقْاشُ;
آَسَانِ نَتَوَانَدْ سَكَيْدَنَ دُوْ سَكِيَانَراَ;

"Hardly can the artist draw the picture of thy two eyebrows;
They cannot easily draw a double bow!"

(4)

اَيْنَ چَهِ مَجْلِسْ چَهِ بِبْشَتْ اَيْنَ چَهِ مُقَامَسَتْ اَيْنِجاَ;
عَمْرُ بَاتِيْ لَبَ سَابِقَ لَبَ جَامَسَتْ اَيْنِجاَ;

1 A graceful upstanding figure is compared to the letter alif (ا), one bent with age or sorrow to lám (ل) or dál (د) Lám is the middle letter of the word balá (بَلَا), "woe."
What company, what paradise, what resting-place are here!  
Lasting life, the lip of the cup-bearer, the brim of the goblet are here!  
That Fortune which fled from all [others] did not pass by this door;  
That joy which escaped all is here a servant!  
When thou enterest our joyous abode with sorrow in thy heart  
All say, ‘Indulge not in sorrow, for it is forbidden here!’  
We are on the roof of heaven: if thou passest by us  
Go gently, for here is the glass and the edge of the roof!  
In our audience-chamber there is neither seat of honour nor threshold;  
Here King and dervish know not which is which!  
Like wood of aloes we are all hot-footed and burning,  
Save the ice-cold ascetic, who is here [accounted] raw.  
How often, O Kamál, wilt thou ask, ‘What station is this which thou possessest?  
Whose station is this? For here is neither abode nor lodging!’

1 A proverbial expression for what is very precarious.  “A glass in a stone-swept way” is another similar idiom.  
2 Ṣaff-i-ni’āl (“the shoe-row”) is at the lower part of the room, where the servants stand, and visitors kick off their shoes before stepping on to the raised and carpeted dais.
"O Moon of mine, the Festival\(^1\) is come: may it bring thee happiness! What wilt thou give as a festal-gift to thy lovers? Thy cheek is at once our festal-gift and our Festival: Without thy cheek may our Festival be no Festival! Thou hast said: 'I will ask after thee next Festival': Alas! for this promise is of long standing! Deliver my soul from grief since the Festival hath come, For at the Festival they set free captives. The Festival is come: cease to threaten Kamál; At the festal season they make glad the hearts of all!"

---

\(^1\) The great Persian festival is the *Nawrúz*, or New Year's Day, which corresponds with the vernal equinox (March 21). The two great festivals of Islám are the 'Idul-Fitr at the end of Ramadán, and the 'Idul-Adhá on the 10th of Dhu'l-Hijja, the month of the Pilgrimage.
KAMÁL OF KHUJAND

Thy pain is better than balm, O Friend! Thy sorrow enlargeth the soul, O Friend! He who begs of thee at thy door Seeks naught but pain and calamity, O Friend! Notwithstanding that through poverty I have not Aught which is worthy of thine acceptance, O Friend. I will lay before thee my two bright eyes, I will say, 'It is the gaze of sincerity, O Friend!' Thou didst say, 'I will slay thee,' but this is not right: Is it right that a friend should slay, O Friend? Whatever the heart said in praise of thy stature God brought true (or straight), O Friend! Straight have I made this ode to thy stature: Write, 'It is by Kamál,' O Friend!

Kamál is, so far as I know, the only poet who endeavours as far as possible to make all his odes of a uniform length, namely seven verses, as he expressly declares in the two following fragments:

My odes are for the most part seven verses, Not forgotten like the utterance of Salmán. When Ḥāfiz recites them in Iráq Fluently and aloud, [they are] like the seven hard ones; All seven [are] like heaven in their foundation, And of such sort 'Imád [of Kirmán] has not a single verse.'

The "Seven Lean Years" are so called in the Súratu Yúsuf (Qur'án, xii, 48). In another passage (lxxviii, 12) the same expression is used of the Seven Heavens, which is the meaning intended here.
The odes of Kamál are seven verses; Of the grace thereof the 'Five Treasures' are but a tenth part. There exist also poems of seven verses by some of my friends, Each one of which is limpid and fluent and charming, But of every seven of them there should be erased Four verses from the beginning and three from the end!

"When the Dîwán of Kamál falls into thine hand Copy of his poetry as much as thou wilt. If thou wishest to understand aright His rare ideas and expressions and words Do not pass swiftly over each word like the pen, But dive down into every letter like the ink."

1 This (Panj Ganj) is the title given to the Five Romantic Poems of Niẓâmi of Ganja.
There are two Kamáls famous in the world,
One from Isfahán and one from Khujand.
This one is incomparable in the ode,
And that one unrivalled in the elegy.
Between these two Kamáls, in a manner of speaking,
There is no more than a few hairs’ breadths’ difference!

Salmán requested from me a poem, saying, ‘In my album there is
no specimen of that verse.’
I gave him those answering words like unto which [in value] is no
pearl in [the Sea of] Aden.
I wrote them for thee, but his words are naught in my sight.

That Súfí with his nose cut off hath nothing for us but helplessness
and humility;
One cannot accuse him of the fault of self-conceit (khud-bíni).
For the poor wretch hath not even a nose (khud bíni na-dárad)!

Some account of Kamálu’d-Dín of Isfahán, called “the Creator
of [new] ideas” (Khalláqu’l-Má’ání), will be found in vol. ii of my
Literary History of Persia (pp. 540-42).

The whole point of this verse lies in the untranslateable word-play
on khud-bíni.
Two or three "fragments" are addressed to a certain Hāfiz, who, however, appears to be a minstrel or harper of that name, not the celebrated poet of Shíráz. The following, however, almost certainly alludes to the contemporary poet 'Aṣṣár of Tabrız:

(14)

عاقبت عصّار مسكن مرّد و رفت؛
خوون دیواناها گردان مرّد و رفت؛

"At length poor 'Aṣṣár died and departed: he took upon his neck the blood of the courts and departed."

(15)

The following fragment, to which Rieu refers, contains an allusion to an historical event, viz. the invasion of Túqtámish:

گفت فرهاد ما ببر و لی؛
بیده هر از برای این بی‌پای؛
بود مسکن بشغل کوه گنی؛
آمد و هانف این ندا در داد؛
لشکر پادشاه توقتمش؛
سک بهبوده می گنبد فرهاد؛

"Our Farhád said to Mír Wálí, 'Let us restore the Rashídíyya quarter; Let us give gold to the Tabrízí for bricks and stone for this building.' The poor fellow was busy with his hill-piercing when, more numerous than the ants of the mountain and the plain,

1 Some account of him will be found in Ouseley's *Notices of the Persian Poets*, pp. 201-226, and another notice by Fleischer in the *Z.D.M.G.*, xv, 389-396. The date of his death is variously given as A.H. 779 and 784 (A.D. 1377-8 and 1382-3).

2 I do not understand these words, which suggest that 'Aṣṣár was put to death.


4 This was the quarter of Tabríz originally built by the great minister and historian Rashídú'd-Dín Faḍlu'lláh. See pp. 70-71 *supra.*
The army of King Tuqtámish arrived, and the Unseen Voice thus cried:

‘Shfrín’s ruby [lip] became the portion of Khusraw [Parwíz],
While Farhád vainly pierces the rock!’

The following fragment refers to the poet Humám of Tabríz (a contemporary of Sa’dí) and contains an “insertion” (Taḏmin) or citation from his poems:

(16)

I said, ‘From the region [or Egypt] of ideas I will send thee
A few sweet trifles which will be like sugar in thy mouth’:
Again I feared this criticism, that thou mightest say like Humám
‘Do not again bring sugar from Egypt to Tabríz!’

Other fragments contain allusions to Nizámí and Sa’dí, while one is addressed to a poet named Ma’jári of Samarqand, and the following to another (presumably a contemporary rival) called Ma’ádhí:

(17)

‘This is my petition in my every private prayer, ‘O my Succour and my Refuge,
Save all people of taste and lovers of music from the harp of Maláṭí
and the poetry of Ma’ádhí!’

1 The allusion in the last verse is to the well-known romance of Khusraw and Shfrín.
The following is a rather original and pretty conceit:

ز کیست قبقه، شبیهای می دانی،
بریش محطسب شهر می کند خنده،

"Knowest thou what is the cause of chuckling of the wine-bottles?
They are laughing at the beard of the town-constable!"

The following fragment seems to show that Kamál’s odes were not collected into a Diwán until after his death:

‘گفت صحابدی بین که چراست،
که ترا شعر هست و دیوان نیست،
گفت تر از بهر آنکه چون دکران،
سخن من پر و فراوان نیست،
گفت هر چند گفته تو کمست،
کهتر از گفتهای ایشان نیست،

"A certain man of discernment said to me, ‘Why is it
That thou hast [composed] poetry, yet hast no Diwán?’
I replied, ‘Because, like some others,
My verse is not copious and abundant.’
He said, ‘Although thy verse is scanty [in amount]
It is not less [in value] than their utterances.’"

As is so often the case with Persian poets, Kamál’s fragments are much more intimate and personal, and contain more allusions to contemporary events and persons (though for lack of fuller knowledge these allusions must often remain obscure) than his odes; and for this reason I have here quoted them to a disproportionate extent.

8. **Maghribi**

(*Muhammad Shirin Maghribi of Tabriz*).

Of the life and circumstances of Maghribi, one of the most thorough-going pantheistic poets of Persia, little is known, though notices of him are given
by most of the biographers. He is generally stated to have died in 809/1406–7 at Tabrız at the age of sixty years, so that he must have been born about 750/1349–1350; but by a minority of the biographers his death is placed two years earlier. The learned modern historian Riḍá-qulí Khán states that he was born at Nā‘ín, near Isfahán, and buried at Ištahbánát in Fárs, but he is generally reckoned a native of Tabrız. His poetical name Maghribí is said to be due to the fact that he travelled in the Maghrib (N.W. Africa), where he was invested with the dervish cloak (khirqa) by a Shaykh who traced his spiritual pedigree to the great Maghribí mystic Shaykh Muhiyyu‘d-Dín ibnu‘l-‘Arabí, whose thought even at the present day has a great influence in Persia, and whose Persian disciples, poets like ‘Iráqi, Awhadu‘d-Dín, Maghribí and even the later Jání, are conspicuous for their thorough-going pantheism. Of Maghribí Riḍá-qulí Khán truly says in his Majma‘u‘l-Fitsahá:

"His doctrine is the Unity of Being (Pantheism), and his inspiration the rapture of Vision, nor can one find throughout all his verse aught save this one idea. His tarjí‘-bands and ghazals are all filled with the verities of the true Unitarianism."

Maghribí is said by Jání and other biographers to have been personally acquainted with the poet last discussed, Kamál of Khujand, which is probable enough, since the


2 I.e. of beholding the infinite manifestations of the Divine Beauty in the beautiful things of the Phenomenal World.

3 Formal or exoteric Unitarianism is the declaration that there is only One God; esoteric Unitarianism is the conviction that there is only One Being who really exists.
two were contemporaries and spent at any rate a considerable part of their lives at Tabriz. On one occasion he is said to have found fault with the following verse of Kamál's on the ground that it evidently referred to material charms, and was not susceptible of a mystical interpretation:

‘جمهير اگر اینست و ابرو این و ناز و شیوه این‘

الوداع ای زهد و تقوی الفراق ای عقل و دین‘

“If eyes be such, and eyebrows such, and charm and coquetry such, Farewell, abstinence and piety! Good-bye, reason and religion!”

Kamál, hearing this, sought an interview with Maghríbi, and said: “[The Persian] chashm is [equivalent to the Arabic] ‘ayn; so it may be that in the language of allusion it is to be interpreted as the Eternal Essence (‘Ayn-i-Qadím), which is the Divine Personality. So also [the Persian] abrú is [equivalent to the Arabic] ḥājib, so it may be that it may be taken as alluding to the Divine Attributes, which are the veil of the Essence.” Maghríbi, on hearing this explanation, apologized and withdrew his criticism. If it be true, however, as stated by Rieu⁴, that Kamál superseded Maghríbi in the favour of Timúr’s son Míránsháh, the Governor of Ádharbáýján, it is possible that the relations of the two poets were not of the most cordial character.

As the above particulars practically exhaust the little we know of Maghríbi’s life, we may now pass on to his poetry, which is represented by a comparatively small Díwán, comprising for the most part odes (ghazaliyyát) with a few tarjí‘-bands and quatrains. It has been several times lithographed in Persia⁵, and I also possess a good and well-written, but undated, manuscript. The lithographed

---

¹ Naðaḥát, p. 714.
² Both mean “eye,” but ‘ayn in Arabic also means the exact counterpart of a thing, or its essence.
³ Both mean “eyebrow,” but ḥājib also means a veil or curtain.
⁵ I have two editions, dated A.H. 1280 and 1287 (A.D. 1863-4 and 1870-1) respectively.
edition comprises 153 smallish pages each containing 17 lines, and the total number of verses may be estimated at about 2300. The poems, so far as I have examined them, are entirely mystical, and contain no allusions to the poet's life and times. The following specimens are typical:

When the Sun of Thy Face appeared, the atoms of the Two Worlds became manifest.

When the Sun of Thy Face cast a shadow, from that shadow Things became apparent.

Every atom, through the Light of the Sun of Thy Countenance, became manifest like the Sun.

The atom owes its existence to the Sun, while the Sun becomes manifest through the atom.
The Ocean of Being was tossed into waves; it hurled a wave towards the shore.
That wave sunk and rose in some heart-delighting raiment and form.
Like violets the Ideas sprung up like the pleasant down on some fair beauty's face.
The anemones of the [Eternal] Realities blossomed; a thousand tall cypresses appeared.
What were all these? The counterpart of that Wave; and what was that Wave? Identical [in substance] with the Ocean.
Every particle which exists is identical with the whole; then is the whole altogether the parts.
What are the parts? The manifestations of the All; what are things? The shadows of the Names.
What are the Names? The revelation of the Sun, the Sun of the Beauty of the Supreme Essence.
What is the Shore? The land of Contingent Being, which is the Book of God Most High.
O Maghribi, cease this discourse: do not make plain the Mystery of the Two Worlds!"

(2)

ای جمله جهان در رخ جانبخش تو پیدا ی.
وی روى تو در آینه کون هویدا ی.
تا شاهد حسن تو در آینه نظر کرد ی.
عكس رخ خود دید بشد وله و شیدا ی.
هر لحظه رخت داد جمال رخ خودرا ی.
بر دیده خود جلوه بصد كسوت زیبا ی.
از دیده عشاق برون کرد نگاهی ی.
تا حسن خود از روى بتان کرد تهاشان ی.
رویت ز پي جلوه كری آینه ساخت ی.
آن آینه‌را نام نباد آدم و حوّا ی.
حسن رخ خودرا بهه روى در او دید ی.
ز آنروي شد او آینه جمله اسما ی.
“O Thou in whose life-giving Face all the Universe is manifest,
And O Thou whose Countenance is apparent in the Mirror of the
Universe!
Since the Darling of Thy Beauty looked in the Mirror
And saw the reflection of his face, he became wild and mad [with
love].
Every instant Thy Countenance displays the beauty of its features
To its own eyes, in a hundred fair vestments.
It looked forth from lovers’ eyes
So that it beheld Its Beauty in the faces of Idols.¹
Thy Face wrought a Mirror for Its self-display,
And called that Mirror ‘Adam and Eve.’
He beheld the Beauty of His Face in every face through him²,
Therefore hath he become the Mirror of all the Names.
O Thou whose Beauty hath shone forth to Thine own eyes,
And who hast plainly seen Thy Face in Thine own eyes,
Since Thou art at once the Seer and the Seen, there is none other
than Thee:
Wherefore, then, hath all this strife become apparent?
O Maghribi, the horizons are filled with clamour
When my King of Beauty pitches His tent in the Plain!”

¹ I.e. beautiful persons. Both sanam (“idol”) and nigdr (“picture”) are constantly used in this sense. The same idea is also expressed in the following well-known quatrain attributed to ‘Umar-i-Khayyám:—

‘بَتْ كَفَتِ بِبِتَّرَسَتِ كَعَابِ ما’

‘دَائِنِي زَرَى رُوِيَ كَشْتِهِ سَاجَدَ ما’

‘بَرْ ما لَجِمَالِ خَوْدِ تُجَلَّى كَرَدْتَ’

‘آَنَ شَخْصُ كَهْ زَنُّتُ نَاظِرَ ای شَاهَدَ ما’

² In both cases Adam is meant.
"O Centre and Pivot of Being, and Circumference of Bounty,
O Fixed as the Pole, and Fickle as the Sphere!
If I send greetings to Thee, Thou art the greeting,
And if I invoke blessings on Thee, Thou art the blessing!
How can any one give Thee to Thyself? Tell me now,
O Thou who art Thine own alms-giver and Thine own alms!
O Most Comprehensive of Manifestations, and Most Perfect in
Manifestation,
O Gulf of gulfs, and O Combiner of diversities!
O most Beauteous of the beautiful, and O most Fair of the fair,
O most Gracious of the graceful, O most Subtle of subtleties!
Thou art at once both the Bane and the Balm, both Sorrow and Joy,
Both Lock and Key, both Prison and Deliverance!"
Thou art both the Treasure and the Talisman, both Body and Soul,
Both Name and Named, both Essence and Attribute!
Thou art both Western (Maghribi) and West, both Eastern and East,
Alike Throne, and Carpet, and Element, and Heavens, and Space!  

(4)

ای از دو جهان نبان عیان کیست؛
وی عیان یاس این نبان کیست؛
آن کس که بصد هزار صورت؛
هر لحظه همی ثود عیان کیست؛
و آن کس که بصد هزار جلوه؛
بنمود جمال هر زمان کیست؛
گوئی که نبان از دو عالم؛
پیدا شده در یکان پکان کیست؛
کفتن که همیشه من خموش؛
گویا شده پس به رزبان کیست؛
کفتن که در جسر و جان برون؛
پوشیده لباس جسر و جان کیست؛
کفتن که نه اینم و نه آنی؛
پس آنکه بود هم این هر آن کیست؛
ای آنکه گرفته، کرانه؛
بالله تو بگو دری دریان کیست؛
آن کس که همی کند تجلی؛
از حسین و جمال دلبران کیست؛
و آن کس که نبود حسن خودرا؛
و آشوب فگنده در جبان کیست؛
ای آنکه تو مانده در گمنایی؛
نا کرده یقین که در گیان کیست؛
از دیده، مغری نبان یاو،
وز دیده، او بین عیان کیست؛
"O [Thou who art] hidden from both worlds, who is He who is apparent?
And O [Thou who art] the Essence of the Apparent, who then is the Hidden One?
Who is that One who in a hundred thousand forms
Is apparent every moment?
And who is that One who in a hundred thousand effulgenes
Showeth forth His Beauty every moment?
Thou sayest, ‘I am hidden from the Two Worlds’:
Who then is He who appeareth in each and all?
Thou didst say, ‘I am always silent’:
Who then is He who speaketh in every tongue?
Thou didst say, ‘I stand outside body and soul’:
Who then is He who clothes himself in the garment of body and soul?
Thou didst say, ‘I am neither this one nor that one’:
Who then is He who is both this one and that one?
O Thou who hast withdrawn apart,
I conjure Thee by God tell me who is in the midst?
Who is He whose effulgence shines forth
From the beauty and comeliness of the charmers of hearts?
And who is He who hath shown His beauty
And who hath cast turmoil into the world?
O thou who remainest in doubt,
Not knowing certainly who lurks in thy doubt,
Be hidden from the eyes of Maghribí,
And see who is apparent through his eyes!

The opening lines of the following poem strike an almost Christian note:

آن چس که ٢٨ نبح بود زما آمد و ما شد،
و آن چس که زما بود و شیا ما و شها شد;
سلطان سرتخت شهی کرد تنزل،
با آنکه جز او هیچ شی نیست گدا شد;
آن کس که زفقر و زگنا هست منزه،
در کسوت فقر از پی اظهار غنا شد،
That One who was hidden from us came and became us,
And He who was of us and you became us and you.
The King of the topmost throne of Sovereignty condescended,
And, notwithstanding that there is no King save Him, became a beggar.
He who is exempted from poverty and wealth
Came in the garb of poverty in order to show forth [true] riches.
Who hath ever heard aught stranger than this, that one and the same person
Became both his own house and his own householder?
That pure substance and that peerless pearl
When it germinated became earth and heaven.
Into the raiment of 'how-ness' and 'why-ness' one cannot say
How and why that 'how-less' and 'why-less' Charmer of hearts entered.
His eyebrow revealed itself from the eyebrows of the beautiful,
Until it was pointed at by every finger, like the new moon.
In the garden of the Universe, like the straight cypress and the anemone,
He became both red-capped and green-robed.
That Sun of the Eternal Sphere shone forth
So that it became Western (Maghríbi) and Eastern, Sun and Light.
"Ask not the road to the College or the customs of the Monastery; 
Pass by road and custom; ask not about way and road.
Adopt the path of [religious] Poverty and Annihilation, and be happy; 
Look not behind thee, and ask not save of what lies before. 
When thou steppest forth from the narrow cell of the body
Ask not save of the Holy Precincts and of the King.
Ask about the delights of Poverty and Annihilation from those who have tasted them;
Ask not of him who is the slave of wealth and rank."
When the Royal Umbrella appears, acclamation arises:
Ask no longer then about the King from the army and the host!
When thou hast stepped forth in sincerity and staked thy head,
Ask not of thy cap, if they steal it of thee.
Since my state, O Friend, is not hidden from thee
Do not again enquire of my state from witnesses.
Wipe out the sin of his existence, since thou thyself art obliterated;
Do not again ask of sin concerning the sin of his existence!
O Friend, since Maghribí hath come to Thee to make his excuses
Overlook in Thy Grace, and ask not concerning the sin of him who apologizes!"
"We have escaped from the Monastery, the Chapel and the College,
And have settled in the quarter of the Magians with Wine and the
Beloved.

We have cast aside the prayer-mat and the rosary,
We have girt ourselves with the pagan girdle\(^1\) in the service of the
Christian child.

On the benches [of the Wine-house] we have torn up the dervish-
cloak of hypocrisy;
In the taverns we have broken our hypocritical repentance.
We have escaped from counting the beads of the rosary;
We have sprung forth from the snares of virtue, piety and asceticism.
In the quarter of the Magians we became annihilated from all exist-
ence:
Having become annihilated from all existence, we have become all
existence.
Hereafter seek not from us any knowledge or culture,
O wise and sensible friend, for we are lovers and intoxicated!
Thanks be to God that from this worship of self
We are wholly delivered, and are now worshippers of wine.
We are drunkards, wastrels, seekers of wine,
And we are most at ease with him who is, like ourselves, drunk and
ruined.
Since Maghribí has removed his baggage from our assembly
And has departed (for he was the barrier in our path), we are free!"

\(^{(8)}\)

\[\text{قطره} \text{ از قاعر دریا دم مزن؛}
\text{زره} \text{ از مهر والا دم مزن؛}
\text{مرد اموروزی هم از اموروز گوی؛}
\text{از پری و دی و فردی دم مزن؛}
\text{چون نبی دانی زمین و آسیان؛}
\text{بیش ازین از زیر و بالا دم مزن؛}
\text{چون اصول طبع موسیقت نیست؛}
\text{اژتانا وزنا و تانا دم مزن؛}\]

\(^1\) The Zunnár (Zonarium), regarded by the Muslim poets as the
symbol of misbelief, represents the *Kushti*, or "Kosti," of the Zoro-
astrians, the sacred thread of the Brahmans, and presumably the cord
worn round the waist by Christian monks.
Thou art but a drop: talk not of the depths of the Ocean; 
Thou art but a mote: talk not of the high Sun! 
Thou art a man of to-day: talk then of to-day; 
Do not talk of the day before yesterday and yesterday and to-morrow! 
Since thou knowest not earth and heaven 
Talk no more of below and above! 
Since thou hast not the elements of musical talent 
Talk not of 'except' and 'no'? 
If they bid thee lay down thy life, 
Go, lay down thy life, and talk not! 
Until thou knowest who 'I' and 'We' are 
Be silent! talk not of 'I' and 'We'! 
Until, like Adam, thou receivest from God the Science of the Names 
Do not talk about the Names! 
He who hath become the Counterpart of all Things 
Hath said to Maghríbí, 'Speak not of Things!"'

The above specimens should suffice to give a fair idea of Maghríbí's thought and style. He belongs essentially to the same class of mystical poets as Saná'í, Shams-i-Tabríz

1 Or, as we might say, "of sol, fa, re," or "ta, ta-at, ta-te," or "of crotchets, minims and quavers."

2 Lá ("No") and illá ("except") is the Muhammadan profession of faith, Lá iláha illàlláh ("There is no god but God").
(i.e. Jalālū’d-Dīn Rūmī), and ‘Irāqī, and, as he asserts, Farīdu’d-Dīn ‘Aṭṭār:

\[
\text{‘Az Mughj ou Shdh 'ast 'Irāqī 'w Maghibī, '}
\]

\[
\text{wz Gūsh ‘w San'ī ‘w ‘Aṭṭār ‘imād, ‘}
\]

"From His waves\(^1\) arose ‘Irāqī and Maghribī, And from His ferment came Sanā’ī and ‘Aṭṭār."

Yet though of the same category as these, he seldom reaches their level.

9. \textit{Abū Ishāq ("Bushaq") called "Aṭ‘ima" (Fakhru’d-Dīn Ağmad-i-Hallāj of Shīrāz).}

Although there are several other poets of this period who are not undeserving of notice, such as ‘Aṣṣār of Tabrīz, Jalāl-i-‘Aṣjudī, Jalāl-i-Ṭabīb, etc., this chapter has already reached so considerable a length that I shall make mention of only one other, Abū Ishāq of Shīrāz, the poet of foods, hence called Aṭ‘ima, who offers the greatest possible contrast to Maghribī, the mystic and pantheist.

Of Abū Ishāq’s life, as usual, very little is known, except that he appears to have spent the greater part of it at Shīrāz, where he enjoyed the favour of the great, and especially of Tīmūr’s grandson Iskandar ibn ʿUmar Shaykh Mīrzā, who governed Fārs and Iṣfahān from A.H. 812 to 817 (A.D. 1409–1415). Dawlatshāh consecrates a long article to him\(^2\), which, however, chiefly consists of quotations from his poems and an account of the ambitious designs and tragic fate of his patron Iskandar, who was deprived of his sight by his uncle Shāh-rukh on the 2nd of Jumāda i, 817 (July 20, 1414), and died the following

\(^1\) \textit{i.e.} God, considered as the Ocean of Being, whose waves are phenomena.

year. By trade Abú Isháq was, as his title Ḥalláj indicates, a carder of cotton. On one occasion, when he had been absent for several days from Prince Iskandar’s receptions, the latter asked him, when he reappeared, where he had been; to which he replied, “I card cotton for a day, and then spend three days in picking the cotton out of my beard.” Short notices of Abú Isháq are given in the Šāfī-kada, the Haft Iqlim and the Majma‘ul-Fuṣahá (vol. ii, p. 10), but they add nothing to the little recorded by Dawlatsháh, save a brief anecdote in the last named, according to which Abú Isháq considered himself the disciple and admirer of Sháh Ni‘matu’lláh, the mystical poet of Máhán, a little village near Kirmán, where he is still commemorated in a handsome shrine served by dervishes of the order which he founded. Abú Isháq’s admiration took the dubious form of parodying Ni‘matu’lláh’s mystical rhapsodies in profane poems addressed to various culinary delicacies. Thus Ni‘matu’lláh has a poem quite in the style of Maghribi, beginning:

"We are the pearl of the shoreless Ocean; sometimes we are the Wave and sometimes the Sea;
We came into the world for this purpose, that we might show God to His creatures."

Busháq parodied this as follows:

"We are the dough-strings of the bowl of Wisdom; sometimes we are the dough and sometimes the pie-crust;
We came into the kitchen for this purpose, that we might show the fried meat to the pastry."

When subsequently Sayyid Ni‘matu’lláh met Abú Isháq, he said, “Are you the dough-strings of the bowl
of Wisdom"? To which the latter replied, "Since I am not in a position to talk about God (Allah), I talk about God’s bounty (Ni’matul’lah)."

Manuscripts of Abū Ishāq’s works are not common. The British Museum possesses a copy of one of them, the Kanzul-Ishtihād (“Treasure of Appetite”)¹, and I once had the opportunity of examining an excellent and very complete manuscript from the collection of the late Dr Wolf of Bukhārā fame, to whom it was given by a certain Ḥājjī ‘Uthmān Nūr’ud-Dīn, and by whom it was left to the Society for the Propagation of Christianity amongst the Jews. This manuscript was copied in 970/1562–3, contains 162 ff. of 22.4 × 12.7 c. and 17 lines to the page, and is written in a small, neat ta’liq hand between blue and gold lines. It is remarkable for containing (on ff. 137–8 and 160–61) some half dozen poems in dialect, comprising in all 44 couplets. The book, however, would have remained hardly known but for the excellent edition printed by the late learned and indefatigable Mīrzā Ḥābīb of Isfahān at Constantinople in 1303/1885–6. This volume, which comprises 184 pages, begins with an extract from Dawlatshāh’s notice of the author, and ends with a vocabulary of the culinary terms occurring in the course of the work, many of which are now obsolete in Persia, often representing dishes no longer prepared, of which the exact nature must in many cases remain doubtful. The actual text of Abū Ishāq’s works begins with the Kanzul-Ishtihād (“Treasure of Appetite”), to which is prefixed a short prose Preface. Then follow the poems, mostly parodies, in which almost every variety of verse (qaṣṭda, tarji‘-band, ghazal, qī‘a, rubū‘ and mabhawt) is represented; and these in turn are followed by several treatises in mixed prose and verse, to wit “The Adventure of the Rice and the Pie-crust” (bughrā), “Abū Ishāq’s Dream,” the “Conclusion” (Khātima), and a “Glossary” (Farhang).

¹ See Rieu’s Pers. Cat., p. 634.
by the author, not to be confounded with the vocabulary above mentioned, which was added by the Editor, who also supplements Dawlatsháh’s account of the poet with a few observations of his own. In these he emphasizes the philological and lexicographical value of Abú Isháq’s works, and adds that though they have been printed or lithographed several times in Persia, these editions are so marred by errors that they are almost valueless. He adds that he discovered two MSS. at Constantinople, and that, though both were defective, he succeeded from the two in constructing what he hopes and believes to be a fairly complete and trustworthy edition.

The poems, filled as they are with the strange and obsolete culinary terminology of mediaeval Persia, and deriving such humour as they possess from being parodies of more serious poems familiar to the author’s contemporaries, do not lend themselves to translation. In the Preface to the “Treasure of Appetite” (Kanzú‘l-Ishtihá) he claims to have written it to stimulate the failing appetite of a friend, just as Azraqí in earlier times wrote his Alfiyya Shalfiyya to quicken the sexual desires of his royal patron, Ťugháňsháh the Seljúq¹. Here is a translation of this Preface, omitting the doxology:

“But to proceed. Thus saith the weakest of the servants of God the All-Provider, Abú Isháq, known as the Cotton-carder (Halláj), may his comforts endure! At the time when the tree of youth was casting its shadow, and the branch of gladness was heavy with the fruit of hopes, a few verses, of an extemporized character and appropriate to every topic, were produced by me. I thought within myself, ‘The wisest course is this, that I should in such wise guide the steed of poetry through the arena of eloquence, and so spread the banquet of verse on the table of diction, that those who partake at the board of pleasure should obtain the most abundant helping; and that the masters of eloquence should be filled

¹ See vol. ii of my Lit. Hist. of Persia, p. 323, and, besides the references there given, Jámf’s Baháristán, Const. ed. of A.H. 1294, pp. 78–9 (near the beginning of chapter vii); and a note by Von Hammer in the Journal Asiatique for 1827, vol. x, p. 255.
with admiration therefor, so that this may conduce to my greater fame
and popularity.' For I had heard this verse which says:

\[
\text{سخن هرچه گوناپر همین گفته اند، برو بروم یا همه سفت مینه اند،}
\]

'Whatever verse I may utter, others have uttered it all,
And have penetrated all its domain and territory.'

"For some days my thoughts ran in this channel: 'having regard
to the epic narrative of Firdawsī, the salt of whose speech is the
flavouring of the saucepan of every food; and the \textit{mathnawīs}
of Niẓāmī, the sugar of whose verses is the dainty morsel of sweet-tongued
parrots; and the \textit{ṭayyībāt} of Saʿdī, which, by general accord, are like
luscious honey to the palate of the congenial; and the odes of Khwāja
Jamālū'd-Dīn Salmān, which take the place of milk and honey in the
mouths of philologists; and the products of the genius of Khwājū of
Kirmān, the carroway-syrup of whose utterances is a cure for the
melancholics of the fetters of verse; and the subtle sayings of \textit{Imād-i-
Faqīh}, whose sweet utterances are as fragrant spices and delicious
potions; and the fluent phraseology and well-weighed thoughts of
Hāfīz, which are a wine fraught with no headache and a beverage
delicious to the taste; and other poets, each of whom was the celebrity
of some city and the marvel of some age, what fancies can I concoct
whereby men can be made glad?'

"While I was thus meditating, on a favourable morning, when ac-
cording to my wont and habit, the smoke of an unfeigned appetite rose
up from the kitchen of the belly, there suddenly entered through the
door my silver-bosomed sweetheart, my moon-faced darling, whose eyes
are like almonds, whose lips are like sugar, whose chin is like an orange,
whose breasts are like pomegranates, whose mouth is like a pistachio-
nut, smooth-tongued, melodious of utterance, lithe as a fish, sweet-
voiced, with a mole like musk; even as the poet says:

\[
\text{از خندہ شیرین نیکندان یہانہ}
\]

\[
\text{خون میرود از دل چو نیکسوده کبابی}
\]

'By reason of the sweet smiles of the salt-cellar of her mouth\textsuperscript{1}
Blood flows from the heart, as from a salted \textit{kabāb}.'

"Said she, 'I have quite lost my appetite, and suffer from a feeling
of satiety; what is the remedy?' I replied, 'Just as in the case of that
person who went to a physician, complaining that he was impotent, and

\textsuperscript{1} A particular kind of charm or beauty is called \textit{malāḥat} (from
\textit{milh}, "salt"), which may be rendered as "piquancy" or "spiciness,
and it is in reference to this that a saucy and provocative mouth is
compared to a salt-cellar.
the physician thereupon composed for him the [book entitled] *Alfiyya Shalfiyya*, which when he had perused he at once took to his embraces a virgin girl, so will I compose for thee a treatise on the table, such that when thou hast once read it, thy appetite will return. So for her sake I girded up the loins of my soul, and cooked a meal garnished with verbal artifices and rhetorical devices, and baked in the oven of reflection with the dough of deliberation a loaf which rivalled the orb of the sun in its conquest of the world; so that I can proudly exclaim:

'I have spread a table of verse from Qaf to Qaf:
Where is a fellow-trencherman who can rival me?'

'I have entitled this table 'the Treasure of Appetite' (*Kanzul-Ishtihâd*), because the day was the 'Idul-Fitr'; and the cause of the revelation of this book is commemorated in the following fragment.'

---

1 See note on p. 347 *supra.*
2 The Mountains of Qaf are supposed to form the boundaries of the habitable globe.
3 The Festival of the breaking of the Fast, called by the Turks *Sheker Bayrâm*.
4 As this merely repeats the substance of the prose preface translated above, I give the text only without translation.
The whole poem is divided into ten sections (fasl), comprises 108 verses with the same rhyme throughout, and is a parody on Sa‘di’s *qasida* beginning:\footnote{See the Calcutta printed edition of 1795, vol. ii, ff. 223–224.}

The first verse of the parody is:

The "Treasure of Appetite" is followed by a *qasida* entitled *Afāq u Anfus* ("Horizons and Souls") in praise of Sháh Sayfu’d-Dín, and this in turn by parodies of *qasidas* by Zahírú’d-Dín Fáryábi, Khwájú of Kirmán, Najmí, ‘Imád-i-Faqíh of Kirmán, Háfíz, Salmán of Sáwa, Ḥasan of Díhlí, Mawláání ‘Alí Dur-duzd, Sa‘dí, Jalálu’d-Dín Rúmí, Jalá’i-‘Ādud, Ṣadrú’d-Dín Qayruwání, Kamál of Khujand, Sa’dú’d-Dín Našír, Anwari, Shaykh Farídu’d-Dín ‘Aṭṭár, Kamálu’d-Dín of Káshán, Sháh Ni’matu’lláh of Kirmán, Amínu’d-Dín, Muhammad Jawhari, ‘Iráqí, Abú Nasír-i-Faráhí, ‘Ádharí, ‘Ubayd-i-Zákání, Jalá’i-Ṭábíb, Firdawsí, Niżámi of Ganja, etc. These are
followed by the two prose treatises already mentioned, the "Conclusion" (Khátima), the "Glossary" (Farhang), a qaṣīda in praise of Kajrī ("Kedgeree"), and the Editor's Vocabulary of Culinary Terms which fills twelve pages.

For the reasons already given it is practically impossible to translate these poems so as to preserve any of their point, and it is sufficient for our purpose to note that Abú Iṣháq, with his predecessor ‘Ubayd-i-Zákání (already discussed earlier in this chapter) and his successor Nizámu’d-Dín Mahmúd Qáří of Yazd, represents a definite school of satire and parody.


Of the last-named poet, who took for his subject clothes, as Abú Iṣháq had taken foods, we have an excellent edition by the same Mírzá Ḥabíb who edited the works of the two other poets of the group, all three volumes being uniform in size and style. In the short preface prefixed to the Diwán-i-Albisa, which contains the sartorial poems of Mahmúd Qáří of Yazd, the learned editor says that he believes the manuscript on which his text is based to be unique, and that he had never met with another copy in any of the numerous libraries in Persia and at Constantinople which he had examined, nor had he found any mention of the author or his date in any biographical or historical work except in one Indian tadhkira (neither named nor cited by him), and a single verse of his cited in evidence in the well-known Persian dictionary entitled Burhán-i-Jámī.

The Diwán-i-Albisa was avowedly inspired by the Diwán-i-Afíma, which, in style and arrangement, it closely follows. There is a prose preface, which, unfortunately, throws no light on the author’s date; a qaṣīda-i-Áfíq, u

---

1 This excellent and concise dictionary ("the Comprehensive Proof") is essentially an abridgement of the better-known Burhán-i-Qáří, or "Decisive Proof." The former has been well lithographed at Tabríz in Shawwal, 1260 (Oct.–Nov. 1844).

Dispute between Food and Clothes, the Dream of the Bath, Eulogies of the chief Persian poets in terms of clothes and stuffs, the story of the clothes-thief, Wool’s letter to Satín, and other similar letters and official documents, the Āráyish-náma (“Book of Adornment”), the Book of Definitions entitled *Dah Wašl*, containing, as its name implies, ten sections, the treatise entitled *Sad Wa'z* (“A Hundred Counsels”), a mock-heroic *mathnawi* in the style of the *Sháh-náma* on the battle between Wool and “Cincob” (*Kamkhá*) entitled *Mukhayyat-náma*, and finally a Glossary (*Farhang*) of articles of clothing. The only indication of the author’s

date which I can find is supplied by the list of contemporary poets occurring at the end of the Eulogies of Poets (pp. 138–9 of the text), which includes Qásim[u'l-Anwár], who died 837/1433–4; ‘Ismat [of Bухárá], d. 829/1425–6; Kátibí, d. 838/1434–5; Khayálí [of Bухárá], d. *circa* 850/1446–7; Sháhí, d. 857/1453; and Ádharí, d. 866/1461–2. We must therefore conclude that Mahmúd Qárí of Yázd wrote subsequently to the date last
given, so that he really belongs to a later period than that which we are now considering, though it seemed convenient to mention him here on account of his close literary affinity with Abú Isháq, to whom his work evidently owed its chief inspiration. Sayyid Ni'matu'lláh, on the other hand, who is one of the poets parodied by Abú Isháq, should, strictly speaking, be included in this place, but since he survived until 834/1430–1, and this chapter has already grown to an inconvenient length, I shall defer his consideration, with that of ‘Ismat, Kâtibí and others, to a later section of this book.

**ARABIC PROSE-WRITERS OF THIS PERIOD.**

Although it is not necessary to speak at nearly the same length about the prose-writers of this period as about the poets, some at least of them deserve at any rate a passing mention, including one or two who wrote chiefly or exclusively in Arabic.

Tímúr resembled another great Eastern conqueror of Turkish origin who lived four centuries before him, namely Sulţán Maḥmúd of Ghazna, in his passion for collecting and carrying off to his capital eminent scholars from the towns which he conquered, and thus endeavouring to increase the splendour of his Court and his own reputation as a patron of letters. Amongst those whom Tímúr thus abducted the most celebrated were Sa’du’d-Dín Taftázání and as-Sayyid ash-Sharíf al-Jurjání.

1. Sa’du’d-Dín Mas’úd ibn ‘Umar at-Taftázání.

This eminent scholar, who was described by the contemporary ‘ulamá of Transoxiana as “at the present time the chief man of learning in the world, and the exemplar of scholars amongst

---

1 For an instance of this, see my translation of the *Chahár Maqála*, p. 119 of the *tirage-à-part*.

2 See the *Habíbú’s-Siyar* (vol. iii, pt 3, pp. 87–90), which devotes a long notice to him.
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the sons of men," and of whose works sixteen are enumerated by Brockelmann¹, was born at Taftázán near Nasá in Khu- rásán in 722/1322, and is said to have written his first book (a commentary on az-Zanjání’s Arabic Grammar) at the early age of sixteen. Another of his works, the Muṭawwal, he is said to have dedicated to Malik Mu‘izzu’d-Dín Ḥusayn- i-Kurt (who reigned at Herát from A.D. 1331 to 1370). He then settled at Khwárazm, at that time a great centre of learning, where he composed his Mukhtasar, which he dedicated to Jání Beg Khán of the Golden Horde, a descendant of Bátú the Mongol, who reigned in Western Qipcháq from A.D. 1340 to 1357. When Tímúr captured Khwárazm he allowed Malik Muḥammad of Sarakhs, the youngest son of the above-mentioned Malik Mu‘izzu’d-Dín, to take Taftázání with him to Sarakhs, where he was given a professorship; but later, learning how great was his reputation as a scholar, he summoned him to his own capital Samarqand, where he remained for some years, greatly honoured by all. He died in 791/1389 (in the same year as the poet Ḥáfiz), or, according to others, in 797/1394–5², and was buried at Sarakhs. He left a son named Mawláná Muḥammad who died of the plague at Herát in 838/1434–5, and concerning whom an anecdote is related in the Habíb’s-Siyar which reflects but little credit either on his filial piety or his sincerity.

Of Taftázání’s works it is unnecessary to speak in detail, for not only are they written in Arabic, but they do not even fall into the category of belles lettres, being for the most part on logic, Arabic grammar, philosophy, theology, exegesis and jurisprudence. I am not aware that he wrote anything in Persian, but, by virtue of a Turkish metrical translation of Sa’dí’s Bústán which he composed, he is included by the late Mr E. J. W. Gibb in his History of Ottoman Poetry³.

² According to the Mujmal of Faṣiḥí in 787/1385.

As-Sayyid ash-Sharif, chiefly known to European scholars by his book of “Definitions” (ta‘rīfūt) of technical and especially Ṣūfī terms, was born, as his title al-Jurjani indicates, in the Caspian province of Gurgan or Jurjan, near Astarabād, in 740/1339. In 779/1377 he was presented by Sa‘du’d-Dīn Taftazānī to the Muẓaffarī prince Shāh Shujā‘ who was then residing at Qaṣr-i-Zard, and who took him with himself to Shīrāz, where he became a professor at the Dāru’sh-Shifā. In 789/1387 Tīmūr conquered Shīrāz and transported him to Samarqand, where he again foregathered with Taftazānī, with whom he had many scientific controversies. On the death of Tīmūr in 807/1405 he returned to Shīrāz, where he died in 816/1413 at the age of 76. Brockelmann enumerates 31 of his works, all of which are in Arabic. Three Persian works, a well-known Arabic grammar commonly known as Ṣarf-i-Mīr, a treatise on Logic (al-Kubrā fi’l-Mantiq), and another on the Degrees of Existence, written by or ascribed to him, are mentioned in Rieu’s Persian Catalogue, but he seems to have composed but little in his mother-tongue.


A third but much younger writer of note who was carried off by Tīmūr from his native place, Damascus, in 803/1400, when he was only twelve years of age, together with his mother and brothers, was Abu’l-‘Abbās Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn ‘Abdu’llāh ibn ‘Arabshāh, chiefly famous for the bitterly hostile biography of Tīmūr which he composed under the title of ‘Ajā‘ibu’l-Maqdūr fi nawd’ibi Tīmūr, and to which reference has been made in the last chapter. He studied at Samarqand with the above-

---

2 Pp. 522, 812, 864, etc.
3 See Brockelmann’s Gesch. d. Arabisch. Litt., vol. ii, pp. 28–30, where five of his works are described.
mentioned al-Jurjáni, mastered the Turkish and Persian languages, translated from the latter into Arabic the *Marzubán-náma* of Sa'du'd-Dín Waráwiní, travelled widely, visiting Khaţá (Chinese Tartary), Khwárazm, Dasht, Astrachan and Adrianople (where he became for a time private secretary to the Ottoman Sultan Muḥammad I). He returned to his native town, Damascus, in 825/1422, made the pilgrimage to Mecca seven years later, settled in Cairo in 840/1436, and died in 854/1450. The undisguised hatred of Tímúr revealed in every page of his history forms a piquant contrast to the fulsome flattery of Sharafu'd-Dín 'Alí Yazdí and other Persian biographers. Of Ibn 'Arab-sháh's other works the best known is the *Fákihatu'l-Khulafá*.

4. 'Aḍudu'd-Dín al-Íjí.

Of Arabic writers of this period who had no connection with Persia, such as al-Yáfi'i and aš-Šafadí, to both of whom we are indebted for valuable biographical and historical material, I do not propose to speak here, but two other Arabic-writing Persians deserve at least a brief mention.

The first of these, 'Aḍudu'd-Dín 'Abdu'r-RRahmán ibn Ahmad al-Íjí, who died in 756/1355, wrote in Arabic a good many books on philosophical, religious and ethical subjects, of which the *Mawáqif* is the most celebrated; but it is chiefly on account of his connection with the Muẓaffarí dynasty that he is mentioned here, for though his birthplace was in Fárs at Íj, a place between Dárábjírd and Nayríz, he seems to have written little or nothing in his mother-tongue, though, as we have seen above, he is celebrated by Ḥáfíz as one of the chief intellectual ornaments of Shíráz. He was a Sháfi'i jurisconsult, a judge (*qádi*), and a mystic; but he was also

---

2 Brockelmann (*op. cit.*, vol. ii, pp. 208–9) enumerates eleven.
3 See G. le Strange's *Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, p. 289.
4 See p. 276 *supra*, and n. 2 *ad calc.*
employed at times in a diplomatic capacity, for we learn from the *Fárs-náma-i-Náširi* that he was sent by Shaykh Abú Ishaq, at that time ruler of Shíráz, in 753/1352-3, to the Amír Mubárizu’d-Dín Muḥammad the Muẓaffarí, who was then in the neighbourhood of Kirmán, to endeavour to dissuade him from attacking Shíráz. In this mission he failed; but he was well received by Mubarizu’d-Dín, whom he had to entertain for three days at his native town of Íj, and had the honour of reading and explaining the commentary on the *Mufassal* (a well-known work on Arabic grammar by az-Zamakhshari) to the Amír’s son Sháh Shujá’, afterwards ruler of Shíráz and alternately patron and rival of the poet Háfiz.

5. *Al-Fírúzábádí.*

Another Persian man of learning who met and received favours from Tímúr was the great Arabic scholar and lexicographer, best known by his monumental dictionary the *Qámús*, or “Ocean,” Abu’ṯ-Ṭáhir Muḥammad ibn Ya’qūb ash-Shírázáí al-Fírúzábádí. He was born in 729/1326 at Fírúzábád in Fárs, and studied first at Shíráz, then at Wásíṭ in Mesopotamia, then at Baghdád (745/1344), and afterwards (750/1349-1350) at Damascus, where he attended the lectures of as-Subkí, whom he accompanied to Jerusalem. There he lectured for some ten years, after which he set out again on his travels, in the course of which he visited Asia Minor, Cairo, Mecca (770/1368), where he remained fifteen years, and India, where he spent five years in

---

1 This copious and valuable account of the province of Fárs, which contains some 372 large pages, was lithographed at Tihrán in 1313/1895-6.

2 See Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, ii, pp. 181-3, from whom the particulars here given are taken. Al-Fírúzábádí is also mentioned in six or seven places in al-Khazraji’s *History of Yaman*. See the second half of the Arabic text (“E. J. W. Gibb Memorial” Series, iii, 5), pp. 264-5, 278, 286, 290, 297, 303-4, and 311, where mention is made of him in every year from 796/1393-4 to 802/1399-1400.
Dihlí. He then returned to Mecca, where he spent another ten years. In 794/1392 he visited the court of the Jalá'ír Sultán Aḥmad ibn Uways at Baghdád; and he also visited Tímúr at Shíráz, probably in 795/1393, and was received with much honour. Thence he went by way of Hurmuz on the Persian Gulf to Yaman, where he arrived in the following year (796/1394), and remained at Ta'izz for fourteen months. He was then made Chief Judge (Qādīl-gudāt) of Yaman, and received in marriage the daughter of the Sultán al-Malik al-Ashraf. In 802/1400 he again visited Mecca, where he established a small college of Māliki jurisprudence: and, after visiting al-Madína, returned to Zabíd in Yaman, and died there in 817/1414.

Of the five Arabic writers mentioned above all save Ibn 'Arabsháh (who is included on account of his connection with Tímúr) were Persians; and, for reasons which I have elsewhere given, I consider that no literary history of the Persians which, confining itself to what is written in Persian, ignores the immense amount of valuable work produced by Persians in Arabic, can be regarded as adequate in its scope, or just to this talented people.

Persian Prose-Writers of This Period.

The period which we are now considering is far less rich in notable prose-writers than in poets, and not more than four or five need detain us here.


The first writer who deserves mention is Shams-i-Fakhřī, whose full name is given above. He compiled in 745/1344 a very excellent work on the Persian language entitled Mi'yár-i-Jamālī, which he dedicated to the amiable and talented but unfortunate Shaykh Abú Isḥáq Īnjú. It is divided into four parts as follows:

2 See p. 164 supra.
Part i, in 9 chapters, on Poetry and Prosody.

Part ii, in 5 chapters, on Rhyme, the different varieties of Poetry, etc.

Part iii, on Rhetorical Devices, Tropes and Figures of Speech, etc.

Part iv, on the Persian language and its rare and archaic words.

The fourth part, which is of most interest to philologists, was printed at Kazan in 1885 by Carl Salemann. I possess a good MS. of the whole work (except for one leaf missing at the beginning) which was given to me by my friend Dr Rızâ Tevfîq in August, 1909. The date of composition is given in a poem of 11 bayts in praise of “the son of Maḥmūd Sháh” (i.e. Shaykh Abú Ishaq Ínjú) in the following lines:

بنام شنشاه گیتبی پنیا
زهر جرت شده هفصد و پنج و چهل
شد این درج پر درج گوهور تیمام
کوز فاضلانا بود آب و چاه

The rare Persian words explained in this fourth part are arranged under the final letter, and each group is worked up into a qasida, of which they constitute the rhymes, in praise of the author’s royal patron. The first three (unpublished) parts of the book, though good, are relatively of less value than the fourth, since the matters of which they treat are more fully discussed in such older books as the Mu’jam fi Ma’dyri Ash’ari’l-Ajam1 of Shams-i-Qays, and the Hadâ’iq’s-Sihr of Rashídú’d-Dín Waṭwát.

2. Mu’inu’d-Din-i-Yazdî.

Nearly all that is known of this writer is recorded by Rieu² in his notice of one of the British Museum mss. of the Mawâhib-i-Ilâhi, a historical monograph on the House of Muẓaffar from its origin until the battle fought at Shiráz in 767/1365-6

---
1 Published in the “E. J. W. Gibb Memorial” Series, vol. x (1909).
between Sháh Shujá‘ and his brother and rival Sháh Maḥmúd. Mu‘inu’d-Dín is described by his fellow-townsman Mufíd in the Jámi'-i-Mufíd (composed in 1082–1090/1671–79)\(^1\) as the greatest of the ‘ulamá of his day. His lectures were crowded with students, and occasionally honoured by the presence of his patron Sháh Shujá‘ the Muṣaffári, at whose instigation and encouragement, seconded by that of his father Mubárizu’d-Dín Muḥammad, Mu‘ín began the composition of his history at Iṣfahán in 757/1356, though, as indicated above, he did not complete it until ten years later. Two years earlier, in 755/1354, according to the abstract of his history included in some manuscripts of the Tadríkh-i-Guzída\(^2\), he was made professor at a college at Kirmán. He died in 789/1387.

The Mawáhib-i-Ilàhi, of which I possess two MSS. from the late Sir A. Houtum-Schindler’s library\(^3\), besides having access to a manuscript belonging to the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge, is a disappointing book, written, as Rieu justly remarks, like the History of Waṣṣáf, mainly “with a view to rhetorical display.” It is in fact intolerably florid and bombastic, a fault which we might more readily excuse but for the undoubted value of the information which it contains. Happily the simplified abstract of its contents mentioned at the end of the last paragraph dispenses us in large measure from the necessity of reading it in its unabridged form.

3. Shaykh Fakhru’d-Dín Abú’l-‘Abbás Ahmad of Shíráz.

This author, a grandson of the famous Shaykh Zarkúb of Shíráz, deserves mention on account of a monograph on his native town, entitled Shíráz-náma, which he composed in 744/1343–4, and which is described by Rieu\(^4\). Manuscripts of this work,

---

\(^1\) See Rieu’s Pers. Cat., pp. 207–8.
\(^2\) This abstract, by a certain Maḥmúd Kutbí(?), is included in the MS. published in fac-simile in the “E. J. W. Gibb Memorial” Series (vol. xiv, pp. 613–755; and vol. xiv, 2, pp. 151–207).
\(^3\) See my list of these MSS. in the J.R.A.S. for Oct. 1917, pp. 670–1.
\(^4\) Rieu’s Pers. Cat., pp. 204–5.
which has never been published, are rare; and it is a matter of regret that the author has devoted his attention in the biographical portion of the work so much more to Shaykhs and holy men than to poets.


This writer, called Shamb-i-Ghāzānī after a mausoleum erected for his own sepulture by the Mongol Ghāzān Khān two miles to the S.W. of Tabrīz, is notable as the author of the only known history of Tīmūr compiled during his life-time. This history, entitled, like the later and much more celebrated book of Sharaf-u’d-Dīn ‘Alī of Yazd, Zafar-nāma (“The Book of Victory”), is extremely scarce, the only manuscript which I know of being the British Museum codex (Add. 23,980), of which I possess a copy made for me by my friend Dr Ahmad Khān. Our knowledge of Niẓām-i-Shāmī is chiefly derived from incidental remarks occurring in his history, some of which are copied by his successor Sharaf-u’d-Dīn ‘Alī, ‘Abdu’r-Razzāq (in the Maṭla‘u’s-Sa‘dayn), Mīrkhwānd and Khwāndamīr. Rieu has admirably summarized all that is known about this author.1 He was living at Baghdaḏ when it was conquered by Tīmūr in 795/1392–3, and was amongst the first who came out to do homage to the conqueror, by whom he was graciously received; and he describes the impression made on him by the Tartar attack. In 803/1400–1 he was detained as a prisoner at Aleppo, and describes an attack on the citadel of which he was a witness. In 804/1401–2 Tīmūr summoned him to his presence and ordered him to write the history of his reign and his conquests, placing at his disposal the necessary records, memoranda and official papers, and bidding him especially avoid bombast and rhetoric, and


2 As has been already pointed out, the absence of any mention of the so-called Institutes of Tīmūr in this place is one of the strongest arguments against their authenticity. See pp. 183–4 supra.
write in a simple and straightforward style which ordinary people could understand. In 806/1403–4 he preached a homily before Tîmûr in his camp near Ardabil on the occasion of the 'Id or Festival at the end of the Ramaḍān fast (April 12, 1404). Soon afterwards Tîmûr set out for his capital Samarqand, and allowed Nizâm-i-Shâmi to return "home" (apparently to Tabrîz), furnishing him with letters of recommendation to his grandson Prince ʿUmar Bahâdûr, son of Mîrân-shâh, who had just been appointed Governor of Persia; a post which he held until 808/1405–6, when he was dispossessed by his brother Prince Abû Bakr.

It does not appear that the history was continued beyond the year 806/1404, when Tîmûr, having enjoyed a brief period of repose after his last Georgian campaign, set out on his last return journey to his capital Samarqand, which he quitted on December 28, 1404, on his projected campaign against China. This campaign was rendered abortive by Tîmûr's death on March 19, 1405. Particulars of the last year of his life, therefore, are not included in Nizâm-i-Shâmi's work, but must be sought for in the homonymous Zafar-nâma of Sharafuʿd-Dîn ʿAlî Yazdî, who wrote in 828/1424–5 and died thirty years later. Although he strictly belongs, therefore, to the period which will be discussed in the next chapter, it will be more convenient to consider him here in connection with the author of the original Zafar-nâma, of which his later Zafar-nâma is essentially a more florid and verbose enlargement, garnished with many more verses, and increased in bulk by about fifty per cent.

5. Sharafuʿd-Dîn ʿAlî Yazdî.

All that is known about this historian, either from his own statements or from such books as the Jâmiʿ-ı-Mufîdî, Maṭlaʿuʿs-Saʿđayn, Haft Iqîm, Taʿrîkh-i-Rashîdî, Habîbîʿs-Siṭâr, Laṭâʿîf-nâma, and Dawlatshâh's "Memoirs of the

---

1 Vol. iii, pt 3, p. 148.
Poets," is, as usual, admirably summarized by Rieu. It is as a poet writing under the *nom de guerre* of Sharaf, and with a special skill in versifying riddles and acrostics (*mu'ammâ*) that he is mentioned by Dawlatsháh, who also speaks in terms of exaggerated praise of his history of Tímúr, the *Zafar-náma*, on which his fame chiefly rests, though its style is intolerably inflated and bombastic, and its facts—in spite of the author's implication that he collected them from original documents and orally from old men who had taken part in the events described—appear to have been mostly borrowed with little or no acknowledgement from his predecessor Nižám-i-Shámi, to whom he is even indebted for many of his citations from the Qur'an and from the poets. His work, however, has entirely eclipsed that of his predecessor. It has been published at Calcutta in the Bibliotheca Indica Series in two volumes (1887–8), and translated into French by Petis de la Croix (1722) and from the French into English by J. Darby (1723). The author of the *Haft Iqlim* calls Sharafu’d-Dín "the noblest of the scholars of Persia in his time, and the subtlest of the doctors of that period; luminous in exposition, sharp-tongued, conspicuous in merit, the illuminator of every assembly, the adorner of every company"; and, in speaking of his *Zafar-náma*, says that "no book so elegant has ever been written in Persian on the science of history." He adds that it was composed in 828/1424–5, a date expressed by the chronogram *صُنُف فِي شيراز* ("It was composed in Shiráz"), and that the author also wrote a treatise on riddles and acrostics; a commentary on the celebrated Arabic poem in praise of the Prophet entitled *al-Burda* ("The Mantle") by al-Búsírí; a book on magical squares and lucky numbers, entitled *Kunhu’l-Murâd dar ‘Ilm-i-Waqf-i-‘A’dád*; and a number of odes, quatrains and *mathnawi* poems, of which he gives only one short specimen.

---

“Sharafu'd-Dín,” says Rieu, “attained a position of great eminence, no less by his learning and piety than by the rare elegance of his style, and was for a long time the favourite companion of Sháh-rúkh and of his son Mírzá Ibráhím Sulțán. It is related in the *Tárikh-i-Rashidí* that the former entrusted to his keeping and able tuition Yúnus Khán, the young Khán of the Moghuls, who had been captured in 832/1428-9 by Mírzá Ulugh Bey, and who stayed with Sharafu’d-Dín till the latter’s death. In 846/1442-3 Mírzá Sulțán Muḥammad, who had been appointed Governor of ‘Iráq and established his residence in Qum, invited Sharafu’d-Dín, who was then teaching crowds of pupils in his native city, to his court, and kept him there as an honoured guest and trusted adviser. When some years later, in 850/1446-7, the Prince having raised the standard of rebellion, Sháh-rúkh came with an army to Iṣfahán to enforce his submission, and ordered several of his ill-advised councillors for execution, Sharafu’d-Dín, who was also accused of having incited the Prince to revolt, was rescued from danger by the timely interference of Mírzá ‘Abdu’l-Latíf, who, on the plea that his father, Mírzá Ulugh Bey, required the Mawláná’s assistance for his astronomical observations, despatched him to Samarqand. After the death of Sháh-rúkh, Sulțán Muḥammad, then master of Khurásán, gave him leave to go back to Yazd. Sharafu’d-Dín returned to his birthplace in 853/1449-1450, and settled in the neighbouring village of Taft. He died there in 858/1454, and was buried in the precincts of a college built by himself and called after him *Sharafiyya*.

Some manuscripts of the *Zafar-náma* contain “an *Introduction* treating of the genealogy of the Turkish Kháns and of the history of Chingíz Khán and his descendants down to the time of Timúr*”. This was compiled in 822/1419,

---

1 See Erskine’s *History of India*, vol. i, pp. 45 and 49; and the *History of the Moghuls of Central Asia*, by N. Elias and E. D. Ross, p. 74 (ch. xxxvi), and pp. 84-5 and 155.

six years earlier than the Zafar-náma. It is instructive to compare parallel sections of the histories of Niżám-u’d-Dín Shámi and Sharafu’d-Dín ‘Alí Yazdí, so as to see how the latter has amplified and embroidered the work of his predecessor; and, did space allow, it would not be without interest to offer side by side translations of such parallel passages, e.g. the account of the Battle of Angora (June 16, 1402), which resulted in the overthrow and capture of the Ottoman Sulţán Báyázíd, called “the Thunder-bolt” (Yıldirim). Since Sharafu’d-Dín’s later work, for all its faults of taste and style, probably contains all or nearly all the matter chronicled by Niżám-i-Shámi, it is doubtful whether the work of the latter, though more desirable in itself on account of its priority, as well as of its greater simplicity and concision, will ever be published.

**The Ḥurúfí Sect and Its Founder, Faḍlu’lláh of Astarábád.**

Before concluding this chapter, it is necessary to say something about the strange heretical sect of the Ḥurúfis (“Literalists”) invented and propagated by a certain Faḍlu’lláh of Astarábád in the reign of Timúr; a sect worthy of attention not only on account of its extraordinary doctrines and considerable literature (including not a little poetry, especially in Turkish), but on account of events of some historical importance, persecutions on the one hand and assassinations on the other, to which it gave rise. The sect does not seem to have maintained its position long in Persia, but it passed over into Turkey and there found a suitable medium for its development in the order of the Bektáshi dervishes, who are at the present day its chief if not its only representatives.

Concerning this sect and its founder the Persian historians of the period are unaccountably silent, and the only reference to it which I have met with occurs in the Mujmal of Fašíhi of Khwáf under the year 829/1426, and in a fuller form in
the Habibu's-Siyar, which places the event described a year later. On the 23rd Rabî' ii, 829 (March 4, 1426), or on the same day of the month of the following year (Feb. 21, 1427), a certain Ahmad-i-Lur, described as "a disciple (murîd) of Mawlâná Faḍlu'llâh of Astarábâd," on the usual pretence of presenting a petition to Sháh-rukh, Tîmûr's son and successor, stabbed him in the stomach as he was leaving the mosque at Herât, without, however, inflicting a mortal wound. The would-be assassin was killed on the spot by one of the King's servants named 'Alî Sulţân Qûchîn; a fortunate thing for him, as he was undoubtedly saved thereby from torture, but subsequently a matter of regret to Mîrzá Baysunqur and the nobles charged with the investigation of the matter, who were thus deprived of a valuable clue. However, they found in the dead man's pocket the key of a certain house, the tenants of which being examined cast suspicion on a certain Mawlâná Ma'rûf, a notable calligraphist, scholar and wit, who had formerly been in the service of Sulţân Aḥmâd-i-Jalâ'îr at Baghdád, and afterwards in that of Mîrzá Iskandar of Shíráz, whence Sháh-rukh had brought him to Herât. Here he had associated with many men of letters, dervishes and others, and apparently amongst them with Aḥmâd-i-Lur. Baysunqur Mîrzá, who had a private grudge against him, wished to put him to death, but, after he had been brought beneath the gallows several times, he was finally imprisoned in a dungeon of the Castle of Ikhtiyâru'd-Dîn. Others, more unfortunate, were put to death and their bodies burned. Amongst these was Khwájâ 'Adudu'd-Dîn, the grandson of Faḍlu'llâh of Astarábâd the Hurûfî. The poet Sayyid Qâsimu'l-Anwâr, of whom we shall speak in another chapter, also incurred some suspicion, and was expelled from Herât by Mîrzá Baysunqur.

One of the few notices of Fadlu'llâh "al-Hurûfî" which I have met with occurs in the Inbâ of Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalânî (died 852/1448–9) and runs as follows:

"Fadlu'llâh, the son of Abû Muḥammad of Tabrîz, was one of those innovators who subject themselves to ascetic discipline. Imbued with heretical doctrine, he finally evolved the sect known as the Hurûfis, pretending that the Letters [Hurûf] of the alphabet were metamorphoses of men, together with many other idle and baseless fancies. He invited the Amîr Tîmûr the Lame [Tamerlane] to adopt his heresies, but he sought to slay him. This came to the knowledge of his [Tîmûr's] son [Mîrânshâhî] with whom he [Fadlu'llâh] had sought refuge, and he struck off his head with his own hand. When this was made known to Tîmûr, he demanded his head and body and burned them both in this year 804/1401–2."

The doctrines of Fadlu'llâh were originally set forth in a most extraordinary book, written partly in Arabic, partly in Persian, and partly in a dialect of Persian, entitled Jâwidân-i-Kâbîr ("the Great Eternal"), of which manuscripts exist in the library of St Sofia at Constantinople, at Leyden, in the British Museum (Or. 5957), in the Cambridge University Library (EE. i. 27), and in my own collection. The first European description of this curious book was, I believe, the brief notice of the Leyden MS. contained in vol. iv (p. 298) of the old Leyden Catalogue of 1866, the author of which observes "alternum exemplar non vidi obvium." A much fuller account of the work was published by M. Clément Huart in the Journal Asiatique for 1889 under the title Notice d'un manuscrit pehlvî-musulman, and was based on the Constantinople MS., which was apparently labelled not by its proper title but as "Questions connected with the Qur'ân." M. Huart did not concern himself with the contents so much as with the language of this manuscript, which he did not at that time

1 This book is not accessible to me, but the passage in question is cited by Flügel at pp. vii–viii of the preface to vol. ii of his edition of Ḥâjjî Khalîfâ's Kashfûz-Zunûn.

2 viii* Série, t. xiv, pp. 238–70.
recognize as the Jāwīdān-i-Kābīr, or as the chief text-book of the Ḥurūfīs, or as the work of Faḍlullāh of Astarābād. In my Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the Library of the University of Cambridge, published in 1896, I devoted a long notice (pp. 69–86) to our excellent copy of the Jāwīdān-i-Kābīr, which was “bought at Constantinople, Oct. 1681, price ten Lion dollars.” A feature of special interest in this manuscript is an appendix containing accounts, written in a dialect of Persian explained to some extent by interlinear glosses in red, of a series of dreams seen presumably by Faḍlullāh himself. Many of these are dated, the earliest in 765/1363–4, “at a time before the explanation of visions and interpretation of dreams was vouchsafed”; the latest in 796/1393–4. They thus cover a period of thirty years, and contain references to a number of places and persons. Amongst the former are Astarābād, Baghdad, Bākū, Burūjird, Dāmghān, Egypt, Fīrūz-kūh, ‘Īraq, Īsfahān (especially a building there called ‘Imārat-i-Ṭākhjī or Ṭūqchī), Khwārazm, Mesopotamia (Jazīrā), Qazwīn, Samarqand, Tabríz, and the two celebrated strongholds of the Assassins, Rūdbār (near Astarābād) and the Fortress of Gird-i-Kūh. Amongst the latter are Amīr Tīmūr (Tamerlane), “King” Uways 1, Tūqtāmish Khān 2, Pīr Pāshá, Sayyid ‘Īmādu’d-Dīn (i.e. the Turkish Ḥurūfī poet Nesīmī 3), Sayyid Shamsu’d-Dīn, Sayyid Tāju’d-Dīn, Khwāja Fakhru’d-Dīn, Khwāja Ḥasan, Khwāja Bāyazīd, Mawlānā Kamāl-u’d-Dīn, Mawlānā Mahmūd, Mawlāná Majdu’d-Dīn, Mawlāná Qiwāmu’d-Dīn, Mawlāná Ṣadru’d-Dīn, Shaykh Hasan, Shaykh Mansūr, Malik ‘Izzu’d-Dīn, Amīr Shams, Darwīsh Tawakkul, Darwīsh Musāfīr, Darwīsh Kamālu’d-Dīn, ‘Abdu’r-Rahīm, ‘Abdu’l-Qādir, Ḥusayn Kiyā, ‘Umar-i-Sultānīyya, and Yūsuf of Dāmghān.

1 Presumably Shaykh Uways the Jalāʿīr, who reigned 757–777/1356–1375.
2 See p. 321 supra.
3 See Gibb’s History of Ottoman Poetry, vol. i, pp. 343–68. He was flayed alive for heresy in 820/1417–18.
The accounts of these dreams, even with the aid of the interlinear glosses which explain most of the words in dialect, are very elliptical and difficult to understand, being apparently mere memoranda sufficient to recall the vision to the memory of the writer. They seem to form no part of the Jāvīdān-i-Kabīr, and do not, I think, occur in most copies of it.

On Oct. 23, 1896, soon after the publication of my Catalogue, my friend the late Mr. E. J. W. Gibb called my attention in a letter to the fact that in several Turkish biographies of poets (such as those of Latīfī and 'Āshiq Chelebi) the Turkish poet Nesīmī mentioned in the last paragraph but one is described as "the Ḥurūfī," and his connection with Faḍlū'llāh is established by some of his own verses, e.g.:

"If thou would'st gain knowledge of wisdom's lore, come hither, O sage; Hearken to the speech of Nesīmī and behold the Grace of God"

[Faḍlū'llāh]!

Mr. Gibb, following up this clue, devoted a chapter (the seventh, pp. 336–388) in the first volume of his History of Ottoman Poetry to the Ḥurūfīs, and especially to two of the Turkish Ḥurūfī poets, Nesīmī¹ and Refī', of whom the latter was a disciple of the former. Mr. Gibb was unable to trace the Ḥurūfīs beyond the middle of the seventeenth century, but gives (pp. 381 et seqq.) two interesting extracts from Turkish chronicles showing the fierce persecution of which the sect was on several occasions the object. The first extract (from the Memoirs of Turkish Divines entitled Shaqā'iqūn-Nw- māniyya, which Gibb renders as "the Crimson Peony")

¹ Nesīmī, who was a native of Baghdād, was bilingual, and his Diwān includes a Persian as well as a Turkish section. Both were printed at Constantinople in one thin volume in 1298/1881. Mr. Gibb calls Nesīmī "the first true poet of the Western Turks, the only true poet of this far-off period."

B. P.
relates how the Persian Muftí of Constantinople, Fakhru’d-Dín-i-‘Ajamí, a pupil of as-Sayyid ash-Sharíf al-Jurjáni, seized and caused to be burned to death as heretics certain Hurufís who had succeeded in gaining the confidence and favour of the reigning Sulṭán Muhammad II, the “Conqueror” of Constantinople, who, apparently, for all his power, was unable to protect them from the fury of the ‘ulamá and the fanaticism of the orthodox. It is even related that the Muftí was so carried away by his religious zeal that, in blowing the fire kindled for his victims, he singed the long beard for which he was conspicuous.

The second extract (from Laṭífi’s Biographies of Turkish poets) denounces the heresies and “blasphemous nonsense” of a Hurufí poet named Tamanná’í, who with others of the sect was put to death by sword and fire in the reign of Sulṭán Báyázid, who, as we have seen above, was defeated by Tímúr at the Battle of Angora in 804/1402 and died soon after. As it was in this same year that Fadlu’lláh the Hurufí was put to death, it is evident that his doctrines had become widely diffused (from Astarábád to Adrianople) even during his life-time, and that they aroused the fiercest execration of the orthodox. Mr Gibb says that as he had failed to discover any record of later movements on the part of the Hurufís, he was inclined to think that the activity of the sect did not extend much beyond the close of the fifteenth century; and that such organization as it may have possessed was probably destroyed in the persecutions to which it was subjected in the reign of Báyázid. But as a matter of fact their activity continues down to the present day, the Bektáší dervishes being still the representatives and repositories of the Hurufí doctrines.

1 See p. 355 supra.
2 Pp. 197–9 supra. Gibb thinks that Báyázid II (reigned 886–918/1481–1512) is meant, since in his reign, in 897/1492, there was, according to the historian Sa’du’d-Dín, a fierce persecution of “the Qalandars” in consequence of an attempt on the Sulṭán’s life made by one of them.
3 See p. 367 supra, but compare also p. 374.
doctrines. As lately as 1291/1874-5 there was published a Turkish denunciation of the sect entitled "the Revealer of Mysteries and Repeller of Miscreants: a Refutation of the Doctrines and Practices of the Ḥurūfīs and Bektāshīs," by Ishaq Efendi, who is very well informed concerning the matters about which he writes and gives a clear and accurate account of the doctrines which he denounces. He divides his treatise into three chapters, of which the first treats of the origin of Faḍlullāh the Ḥurūfī, and the principles and laws of certain of the Bektāshīs; the second of the blasphemies of Firishta-zāda's Jāvidān; and the third of the blasphemies contained in the other Jāvidāns. He mentions a persecution of the Bektashīs by Sultan Mahmūd in 1241/1825-6, in which the Turkish poet 'Arif Hikmat Bey acted as chief inquisitor; and says that he was moved to the compilation and publication of his work by the impudence of the Bektashīs in daring to print and publish the Ishq-nāma, or "Book of Love," of Firishta-zāda (Abdu'l-Majid ibn Firishta 'Izzu'd-Dīn) in 1288/1871-2. He says that "the books which these persons (i.e. the Bektashīs or Ḥurūfīs) call Jāvidān are six in number, of which one was composed by their original misleader Faḍlu'llāh the Ḥurūfī, while the other five are the works of his Khalifas" (Vice-gerents or Successors). "In these five books," he adds, "their heresies and blasphemies are very evident, and they are wont to teach and study them secretly amongst themselves"; but "Firishta-zāda in his Jāvidān, entitled Ishq-nāma, did in some measure conceal his blasphemies."

"After a while," continues the author, "the evil doctrines of those heretics became known amongst men, and the son of Tīmūr [viz. Mīranshāh] caused Faḍl the Ḥurūfī to be put to death, after which he tied a rope to his legs, had him dragged publicly through the streets and bazaars, and rid this nether world of his vile existence.

"Thereupon his Khalifas (vicars or lieutenants) agreed to disperse themselves through the lands of the Muslims, and devoted themselves to corrupting and misleading the people of Islam. He of those Khalifas who bore the title of al-'Ālī al-Ā'Lā (the High, the Supreme') came to the monastery of Hájjī Bektāsh in Anatolia and there lived in seclusion,
secretly teaching the Jāwidān to the inmates of the monastery, with the assurance that it represented the doctrine of Ḥājjī Bektāsh the saint (wali). The inmates of the monastery, being ignorant and foolish, accepted the Jāwidān, notwithstanding that its obvious purport was the denial of all divine obligations and the pandering to the lusts of the flesh; named it 'the secret'; and enjoined the utmost reticence concerning it, to such a degree that if anyone enters their order and afterwards reveals 'the secret,' they consider his life as forfeit. By this their so-called 'secret' are meant certain blasphemous passages in the Jāwidān, hinted at by detached letters like alif (ا), waw (و), jīm (ج), and zayn (ژ), for the interpreting of which symbols they have compiled a treatise entitled 'the Key of Life' (Miṣťāhu'l-Hayāt). This they name 'the Secret,' and should one possess it he understands the Jāwidān, which without this aid is unintelligible. They were thus careful to conceal their secret for fear lest the doctors of religion ('ulamā') should obtain some inkling of its nature and should suppress it; and thus, since 800/1397-8, they have succeeded in secretly seducing many."

The author then goes on to expose and denounce the different tricks and stratagems by which they strive to win men, both Muslims and non-Muslims, to their heresies, and adds:

"From all this it is plain that these people [the Bektāshīs] are not really Shi'ites, but are essentially a polytheistic sect [Mushrikān], who, though unable to win over to themselves the Jews and Christians, however much they affirm their doctrines, do attract some of those Muslims who are partial to the Shi'ite doctrine. So when I questioned certain Bektāshī neophytes, they declared themselves to be of the Ja'farī [i.e. the Imāmī or Shi'a] sect, and knew nothing of the mysteries of the Jāwidān, imagining themselves to be of the Shi'a. But when I enquired of a learned Persian traveller named Mīrzā Šafā his opinion concerning the Bektāshīs, he replied, 'I have associated much with them, and have carefully investigated their religion, and they deny [the necessity of] actions prescribed by the Holy Law.' He thus decisively declared their infidelity. We take refuge with God from their ignorance!"

During the Easter Vacation of 1897 I had the opportunity of examining with some care two Hurūfī manuscripts belonging to the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris¹, which I described in the J.R.A.S. for 1898 (pp. 61-94) in an article

¹ They bear the class-marks Ancien Fonds Persan 24, and Suppl. Persan 107.
entitled "Some Notes on the Literature and Doctrines of the Ḫurūfī Sect." One of these MSS., dated 970/1562–3, contains the Istiwdándma of Amīr Ghiyathu’d-Dīn, a mathnawi poem in Persian on Alexander the Great’s quest after the Water of Life, and a glossary of the dialect words occurring in the Jávidánd-i-Kabīr. The other, dated 895/1489–90, contains the Mahabbat-náma, of which there is reason to believe that Fāḍlu’llḥām himself was the author.

Nine years later, in the J.R.A.S. for 1907, I published another article on this subject entitled "Further Notes on the Literature of the Hurufis and their connection with the Bektāshī Order of Dervishes," in which I described 43 Ḫurūfī MSS. recently acquired by the British Museum, the Cambridge University Library, and myself. Concerning the manner in which these MSS. were obtained I then wrote as follows:

"The connection of the Ḫurūfīs with the Bektāshīs first became known to me in the following manner. About three years after the publication of the article to which I have referred above, a certain dealer in Oriental manuscripts in London, a native of Baghdad, from whom I had already purchased a number of MSS., invited me to furnish him with a list of my desiderata, in order that he might submit the same to his correspondents in the East. I did so, and mentioned in my list the Jávidánd-náma or any other Ḫurūfī books. Shortly afterwards (in Feb.–March, 1901) he forwarded to me a parcel of manuscripts in which was included a copy of this work (now in the British Museum, marked Or. 5957) besides some other books of the sort in question. The prices set on these MSS. were high, but some half-dozen were secured by the Cambridge University Library, while five or six more were purchased by the British Museum, and now bear the class-marks Or. 5957–Or. 5961.

"The comparatively high prices realized by these MSS. seem to have stimulated the search for other similar ones, and gradually, as the supply not only continued but increased, it became clear that these Ḫurūfī books existed in considerable quantities, and were still widely read and copied in the East, especially in Turkey. Prices consequently fell rapidly, and latterly few of these MSS. have fetched more than £2 or £3 in the limited market where the demand for them existed. Nor
was it long before we discovered that it was from the Bektáši dervishes that they were, in almost all cases, directly or indirectly derived, and that it is amongst the members of this Order that the Ḥurúfī doctrines flourish at the present day."

Amongst the MSS. described in this article are two or three treatises dealing with the biography and teachings of Hájjí Bektáš, from whom the Order in question derives its name, and who died in 738/1337-8\(^1\), two years before the birth of Faḍlu'lláh the Ḥurúfī. This latter date, with five others connected with the early history of the sect, is recorded on the fly-leaf of one of the British Museum MSS. (Or. 6381) as follows:

3. Martyrdom of Faḍlu'lláh, 796/1393-4, aged 56 lunar years.
5. Death of Tímúr’s son Míránsháh (whom the Ḥurúfíṣ called “Antichrist,” Dajjá́l, and “the King of Snakes,” Má-rán-sháh), who slew Faḍlu'lláh, 803/1400-1.

From a verse on the same page it would appear that Faḍlu’lláh performed the pilgrimage to Mecca in 775/1373-4. On a page of another of these MSS. in the British Museum (Or. 6380, f. 24) is inscribed a curious document which appears to be Faḍlu’lláh’s last Will and Testament. From this, of which the text and translation are printed in full in the article in question\(^2\), it would appear that he was put to death at Shírwán. The article concludes with a complete index of all the books and persons mentioned in it. The titles of most of the books, whether Persian or Turkish, end in náma; e.g. Adam-náma (“the Book of Adam”), Ākhirat-

---

\(^1\) The authority for this date is Mu'allim Nájí (Esámt, p. 106). By a curious coincidence this date is yielded by the sum of the letters composing the word Bektášiyya, the name of the order.

náma ("the Book of the Hereafter"), 'Arsh-náma ("the Book of the Throne"), Bashárat-náma ("the Book of Good Tidings"), etc.

In 1909 there was published in the "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial" Series a volume (vol. ix) containing translations into French of several Ḥurúfí treatises, with explanatory notes, etc., by M. Clément Huart, followed by a study of the Ḥurúfí doctrines (also in French) by Dr Rizá Tevfíq, commonly known in Turkey as "Feylesúf Rizá" or "Rizá the Philosopher," a man remarkable for his attainments in the learning of both East and West, and an adept in all that appertains to the various Dervish Orders of Turkey, especially the Bektáshís. This volume, by far the most important independent work on the subject, is a rich mine of information on the strange and fantastic doctrines of a sect which, though its very name seems to have been unknown in Europe twenty years ago, played a not unimportant part in the history of Western Asia. Its characteristic doctrines, equally ingenious and grotesque, are pretty fully discussed in the books and articles mentioned above, to which such as desire fuller knowledge of them may be referred.
BOOK III.

FROM THE DEATH OF TÍMÚR TO THE RISE OF THE ŠAFAWÍ DYNASTY

CHAPTER VI.

HISTORY OF THE LATER TĪMŪRID PERIOD.

The century which we are now about to consider is in its latter part one of those chaotic and anarchical periods which, in Persian history, commonly follow the death of a great conqueror and empire-builder. It includes the rise of the Uzbek power in Transoxiana; the gradual decay and disruption of the vast empire built up by Tīmūr at so great a cost of blood and suffering; the successive domination of two Turkmân dynasties known as the “Black” and “White Sheep” (Qārāqoyūnlū and Āq-qoyūnlū); and the appearance and triumph of the Ṣafawīs, the greatest of modern Persian dynasties, who may be regarded in a certain sense as the creators, or at least the restorers, of Persian national sentiment in modern times. It begins with the death of Tīmūr in 807/1405, and ends with the Battle of Shurūr, in 907/1501–2, in which Shāh Isma‘īl the Ṣafawī utterly defeated the “White Sheep” Turkmáns, made Tabrīz his capital, and was crowned king of Persia; though it took him some years to extend his sway over the whole country, until, as Stanley Lane-Poole says, “his dominions stretched from the Oxus to the Persian Gulf, from Afghánistán to the Euphrates.”

When examined more closely, this period of a century is seen to fall naturally into two unequal halves, divided by the death of Tīmūr’s third son Shāh-rukh in 850/1446–7. As long as he lived and reigned, he succeeded, in spite of numerous revolts on the part of his kinsmen, in maintaining almost in its integrity the empire conquered by his father, which, however, after his death underwent rapid disintegration at the hands first of the “Black” and then of the “White Sheep”
Turkmáns, and lastly of the Uzbeks, until these in their turn, together with the remnants of the House of Timúr, were swept aside by the victorious Sháh Isma‘íl the Şafawi. But though the House of Timúr was driven out of Persia, it was still destined to play a splendid part in India, where Zahiru’d-Dín Muḥammad Bábur, the great-great-great-grandson of Timúr, driven out by the Uzbeks from his own principality of Farghána, founded the dynasty commonly known in Europe as the “Great Moguls,” which endured there for more than three centuries and finally disappeared in the great Mutiny of 1857. With the “Great Moguls” of India we are not directly concerned in this book, save in so far as they came into relations with the Persian Şafawís; but though the political importance of the later Tímúrids in Persia continually decreased after the death of Sháh-rukh, the courts of their diminished realms continued to be a centre of literary activity, enriched by the presence of numerous celebrated poets and men of letters, while several princes of this House, notably Sultán Abu’l-Ghází Ḥusayn b. Mansúr b. Bayqará, Ulugh Beg, Báysunqur and the great Bábur himself, made notable contributions to literature or science, and Mír ‘Alí Shír Nawá’í, Minister of Sultán Abú’l-Ghází Ḥusayn, was at once a notable poet (especially in the Turki tongue) and a generous patron of men of letters, so that the literary splendour of Herát under the later Tímúrids is comparable to that of Ghazua under Sultán Maḥmúd.

From the political point of view the most important representatives of the dynasties mentioned above were Sháh-rukh of the House of Timúr; Qára Yúsuf of the “Black Sheep” Turkmáns; Úzún Ḥasan of the “White Sheep” Turkmáns; Shaybání Khán of the Uzbeks; and, chief of all, Sháh Isma‘íl the founder of the great Şafawi dynasty. Of Úzún (“Tall” or “Long”) Ḥasan we possess contemporary European accounts in the narratives of Caterino Zeno, Josafa Barbaro and Ambrosio Contarini, ambassadors from Venice.
to this great ruler (whom they variously call “Ussun Cassano” and “Assambei”), whose assistance against the increasingly formidable power of the Ottoman Turks they desired to gain. They successively visited Persia for this purpose between the years A.D. 1471 and 1478, and their narratives, full of interest and life-like touches seldom found in the pages of Persian historians of this period, have been published in English by the Hakluyt Society in a volume entitled Six Narratives of Travel in Persia by Italians in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹

Before considering in greater detail these Turkmán dynasties of the “Black” and “White Sheep,” the history of the House of Tímúr, so far as its connection with Persia is concerned, must be briefly traced. Tímúr had four sons and a daughter. Of his sons the eldest, Jahángír, predeceased his father by thirty years; and the second, Umar Shaykh Mirzá, by ten years. The third, Miránsháh, survived him by three years, but fell into disgrace and appears to have become affected in his reason. The fourth was Sháh-rukh, who practically succeeded his father, and had a long and prosperous reign of forty-three years (807—850/1404—1447). Tímúr’s intention was that Jahángír’s son Pír Muḥammad should succeed him, but he was defeated by his cousin Khalíl Sultán, son of Miránsháh, who succeeded in taking possession of Samarqand and gaining the support of several powerful nobles, and was finally murdered two years after his grandfather’s death by his trusted minister ‘Alí Táz or Pír ‘Alí. Khalíl Sultán, though not without parts, was undone by his infatuation for the courtesan Shád Malak, whose extravagant whims he was ever ready to gratify, to the disgust of his nobles and officers, who, headed by the two Khudá-dáds and Bardí

¹ The three other narratives are the Discourse of Giovan Battista Ramusio on the writings of Giovan Maria Angioletto...in which are narrated the life and deeds of Ussun Cassano; the Travels of a Merchant in Persia (in the time of Sháh Isma‘íl); and the Narrative of Vincentio d’ Allesandri, Venetian Ambassador to Sháh Ṭahmásp.
Beg, presently rose against him, deposed him, and banished him to Kāshghar. Thereupon his uncle Sháh-rukh marched in and took possession, but had sufficient kindliness to re-unite the unhappy Khalil to his beloved Shád Malak, who showed her appreciation of his devotion by stabbing herself with a poniard when he died. The two were buried together in the same tomb at Ray¹. Khalil Sulṭán was not only a generous patron of poets but himself wrote verse, of which several specimens are recorded by Dawlatsháh².

Sháh-rukh, who now succeeded to the throne, was born in 779/1377, and was therefore 28 years of age at the time of his accession. He had been made governor of Khurásán in his twentieth year (799/1396–7), and was already practically absolute in that province and struck coins in his own name. His dominions were successively enlarged by the addition of Mázandarán (809/1406–7), Transoxiana (811/1408–9), Fárs (817/1414–5), Kirmán (819/1416–7) and Ádharbáýján (823/1420). The attempt on his life by Ahmd-i-Lur, alluded to in the last chapter³, was made in 830/1427, and he finally died at Ray in 850/1447, after a reign of 43 years at the age of 72. He waged successful wars against the rulers of the "Black Sheep" dynasty, Qára Yúsuf and his son Iskandar, but on the whole, as Sir John Malcolm says⁴, "he desired not to extend, but to repair, the ravages committed by his father. He rebuilt the walls of the cities of Herát and Merv, and restored almost every town and province in his dominions to prosperity. This Prince also encouraged men of science and learning, and his Court was very splendid. He cultivated the friendship of contemporary monarchs, and we read in the pages of his historian a very curious account of some

¹ This is Sir John Malcolm's version (Hist. of Persia, ed. 1815, vol. i, p. 486), for which his authority is De Guignes. Dawlatsháh, however (p. 354), says that the rebellious nobles cut off Shád Malak's ears and nose, and makes no mention of her reunion with Khalil Sulṭán.


³ See p. 366 supra.

SHÁH-RUKH

Add. 7468 (Brit. Mus.), f. 44
embassies which passed between him and the Emperor of China."

With this estimate of Sháh-rukh’s character the most recent native historian of Persia, Mírzá Muhammad Ḫusayn Khán Zuká’u’l-Mulk, poetically surnamed Furuḡí, is in complete agreement. "After Timúr," he says, "his son Mírzá Sháh-rukh sat in the place of his father. He was a successor who was the exact opposite of his predecessor, a peaceful and placable man, never prone to war and contention, save with seditious rebels and such as sought means to create disturbances in the empire, whom he deemed it necessary to suppress. In brief, the Empire founded by Timúr was refined by the efforts of Mírzá Sháh-rukh, who during a long period busied himself in repairing the devastation wrought by his father, and in informing himself as to the condition of his subjects and compassing their happiness. It is an extraordinary fact that the son of one so hard-hearted should be so kindly, amiable, gracious and friendly to learning, showing favour and courtesy to all, especially to scholars and men of parts. Ogotáy Khán, the son of Chingíz Khán, had a somewhat similar disposition and practice, and in particular he has left on the page of history a great reputation for generosity, so that he has been entitled ‘the Hátim of later days’; and we have met with many anecdotes concerning his liberality and tenderness of heart in the pages of former writers."

Dawlatsháh is equally flattering, and, with his usual exaggeration, goes so far as to say that "from the time of

1 He received an embassy of Khídár Khán from India in 824/1421, and sent one to the Turkish Sulţán Murád (Amurath) II in 839/1435–6. (Munajjim-báshi’s Sahá‘iful-Akhbár, vol. iii, pp. 56–7.) Further mention of the embassies to China and India will be made later on in this chapter.


3 Hátim of the tribe of Tayy was celebrated amongst the old Arabs for his generosity.

Adam until this our day no age, period, cycle or moment can be indicated in which the people enjoyed such peace and tranquillity as they did in his [Sháh-rukh's] days.” He adds that such were the virtues of this Prince that he was credited with miraculous gifts and knowledge of the Unseen. Of the two instances of which Dawlatsháh gives, one rests on the authority of his father, who was one of his familiar attendants. Ultimately, however, according to this writer, Sháh-rukh incurred the Divine displeasure by putting to death three learned and pious men of Iṣfahán whom he suspected of having encouraged his grandson Sultán Muḥammad Bāysunqur in his revolt against him. These cursed him ere they died, and “the doors of Heaven being open, the prayers of those innocent and illustrious victims were answered; the seed of that highly-placed king was cut off, and the sovereignty returned to its original source.” Amongst the many artists, poets and men of learning contemporary with Sháh-rukh Dawlatsháh mentions four in particular as conferring special lustre on his court, namely ‘Abdu'l-Qádir of Marágha the musician (who is mentioned by Munajjim-báshi as one of the eminent victims of the plague which afflicted Herát in 838/1434-5), Yúsuf of Andakán the minstrel, Qiwámú'd-Dín the engineer and architect, and Mawláná Khalíl the painter, who in skill was “second only to Máni” (Manes).

The Turkish historian Munajjim-báshi speaks not less favourably than the writers already cited of Sháh-rukh’s character. “He was,” says he, “a wise, just, prudent and benevolent king, prone to forgive and to do good, devout, temperate and pious, so that alike at home and on the march, nay, even in time

1 P. 340 of my edition.
2 SahdHfuH-Akhbdr, vol. iii, p. 57 (Constantinople, A.H. 1285). This useful history was originally composed in Arabic by Āḥmad-Dedé Efendi ibn Lutfu'lláh, and comes down to 1083/1672. The Turkish translation was made in 1132/1720 by Āḥmad b. Muḥammad Nadím for the Grand Wazír Dámád Ibráhým Pasha.
3 Ibid., p. 58.
of war and battle, he never neglected the morning, noon and evening prayers, while on ‘white days’ and on the first day of each month he used to fast, and on the eve of Fridays, Mondays and Thursdays he used to assemble those who knew the Qur’an by heart and cause them to recite the entire scripture in his presence. During the whole period of his life he never knowingly committed a major sin. He continually sought the society of learned and pious men, on whom he conferred the greatest benefits and favours. He never suffered defeat, but was always favoured by fortune and victorious. To whatever land he went, he first of all used to visit any shrine which might exist there.” His empire, in the words of the same writer, extended “from the confines of China to the frontiers of Rum (Turkey in Asia), and from the remotest parts of Turkistán to the limits of India.”

Of Sháh-rukh’s five sons¹ only one, Ulugh Beg, survived to succeed him. Of the other four Báysunqur, who died of drink (the curse of this family) in 837/1433 at the age of 37, was, perhaps, the most talented², and the greatest patron of art and learning, to whose court flocked poets, artists, scholars, calligraphists, miniature-painters, book-binders and illuminators from ‘Iráq, Fárs, Ádharbáyján, and all parts of Persia. In connection with Persian literature he is chiefly associated with the preface prefixed to the Sháh-náma of Firdawsi in his name and composed for him in 829/1426. The following chronogram of his death is given in the Ḥabíbū’l-Síyār:

سلطان سعید باپسنشر سحمّ، گفتتا که بکو با اهل عالم خبرم،
من رفتیم تاریخ وفات این است، بادا بهجان عمر دراز پدرمّ;

¹ The remaining three sons were Abu’l-Faṭḥ Ibráhím (d. 838/1434–5), who was the patron of the historian Shárafu’d-Dín ‘Alí of Yazd; Suyúrghatmish (d. 830/1426–7); and Muḥammad Jūkí (d. 848/1444–5).

² Ḥabíbū’l-Síyār, vol. iii, part 3, p. 131; Munajjim-báshí’s Šahá-‘ifúl-Akhbár, vol. iii, p. 66. He was especially interested in calligraphy.

B. P.
“In the morning that august prince Bāysunqur said to me,  
Tell tidings of me to the people of the world:  
I am gone, and this is the date of my death—  
May my father’s life be long in the world!”

Shāh-rukh died near Ray on March 13, 1447, and, as stated above, was succeeded, though not peaceably, by his son Ulugh Beg, who had during his father’s life-time been governor of Tūrān or Turkistān. It was during this period, in 824/1421, that he built at Samarqand his celebrated observatory, where, with the collaboration of four eminent men of learning, Šaláhu’d-Dīn Mūsā, called Qāḍī-Zāda-i-Rūmī (“the Turkish Judge’s son”); Mullá ‘Alá’u’d-Dīn ‘Alí Qūshjí, the commentator of the Tajrīd; Ghiyathu’d-Dīn Jamshīd; and Mu’īnu’d-Dīn of Kāshān, he compiled the notable astronomical tables known as the Zīj-i-Ulugh Beg, or Zīj-i-jadīd-i-Sultānī, which were probably completed in 841/1437–8, and concerning which full particulars are given by Rieu.1

Ulugh Beg, as already indicated, did not at once succeed in establishing his supremacy, which was contested by ‘Alá’u’d-Dawla, who seized Herāt and cast Ulugh Beg is murdered by his son ‘Abdu’l-Laţīf  
‘Abdu’l-Laţīf, the son of Ulugh Beg, into prison. Nor did his authority, when established, endure long, for he was killed at the instigation of his son, the above-mentioned ‘Abdu’l-Laţīf, on Ramaḍān 10, 853 (October 27, 1449) by a certain ‘Abbās, the year of this tragic event being given by the chronogram ‘Abbās killed [him]  

‘Abdu’l-Laţīf, not content with the murder of his father, also murdered his brother ‘Abdu’l-‘Azīz, but did not long profit by his crime, for he in turn was murdered in the ensuing year, 854/1450, by a certain Bābā

1 The sum of the letters composing this hemistich gives 837, the date of Bāysunqur’s death.

2 Persian Catalogue, pp. 455–7, where the European editions and translations of this work are enumerated. See also Clements Markham’s History of Persia, p. 224 ad calc.
Husayn, this date, curiously enough, being given by the chronogram *Bbād Husayn killed* [him]. Mîrkhwând, in recording this event, cites the well-known dictum of the poet Niżâmî as to the short-lived prosperity of royal parricides:

"The parricide is unworthy of sovereignty: [Even] if he attains it, he will not survive more than six months."

"This 'Abdu'l-Lâtîf," says the Turkish historian *Munajjim Bâsht*, "was a talented and accomplished man, but very impetuous, blood-thirsty and pitiless, so that men's hearts were turned aside from him. With his death the succession of Ulugh Beg came to an end in Transoxiana."

From this period onwards until its extinction in Persia the House of Tîmûr rapidly declined in power, cohesion and territorial possessions, and even the succession of rulers is somewhat uncertain, or, to be more precise, it is uncertain which should be accounted supreme and which subordinate. Thus Stanley Lane-Poole\(^2\) regards 'Abdu'llâh, the son of Ibrâhîm Sulţân, the son of Shâh-rukh, as the successor of 'Abdu'l-Lâtîf; while Mîrkhwând substitutes Mîrzâ Abu'l-Qâsim Bâbur (not the great Bâbur), the son of Bâysunqur, the son of Shâh-rukh. He died in 861/1456–7, having lost 'Irâq, Fârs and Kîrmân four years previously to Jahânshâh, son of Qârä Yûsuf of the "Black Sheep" Turkmâns, and killed his brother Sulţân Muham-mad, the expelled ruler of Fârs, in battle.

Mîrzâ 'Alâ'u'd-Dawla, another son of Bâysunqur, was acting as governor of Herât at the time of his grandfather Shâh-rukh's death, but, after a certain show of opposition, he made peace with Ulugh Beg and Bâbur, and contented himself with the government of a district extending from Khabûshân in Khurâsân

---

to Astarábád and Dámghán. In 852/1448–9 he was defeated by Ulugh Beg near Herát and driven into Badakhshán and the Plain of Qípcháq. After various vicissitudes, including sundry wars with his brothers and a period of allegiance to Jahán-sháh, the “Black Sheep” Turkmán and enemy of his House, he finally died in 875/1470–1. His son Ibráhím, having escaped from the custody of his uncle Abú'l-Qásim Bábur, fled to Murgháb and there collected a considerable army. He occupied Herát and defeated his cousin Mírzá Sháh Maḥmúd, whom he was preparing to crush at Astarábád when he was suddenly attacked by the redoubtable “Black Sheep” Turkmán Jaháňsháh. Abandoning Herát he fled before the invader, but returned on the withdrawal of the latter, only to suffer defeat at the hands of Sultán Abú Sa'íd. He died in 863/1458–9 on the march from Dámghán to Mashhad, and his cousin and rival, the above-mentioned Mírzá Sháh Mahmúd, was killed in the same year.

Sultán Abú Sa'íd, the grandson of Míránsháh, is described by Mírkhwánd in the Rawdatu's-Šáfá as “supreme amongst the princes of the House of Tímr in high emprise, lofty rank and perfect discernment. He was a friend and patron of scholars, theologians and men of letters, and during the period of his rule the lands of Turkistán, Túrán, Khurásán, Zábulistán, Sístán and Mázandarán attained the zenith of prosperity.” He had in early life been attached to the court of his accomplished kinsman Ulugh Beg, whose son 'Abdu'l-Latíf, after murdering his father as already related, cast Abú Sa'íd into prison, whence, owing to the negligence of the sentries, he escaped to Bukhárá. When 'Abdu'l-Latíf in turn was killed, he marched out from Bukhárá, and, after giving battle to his kinsman Abú Bakr, made himself supreme in Turkistán and Túrán. In 861/1456–7 he captured Herát and put to death Gawhar Shád Kháťún. In 862/1457–8 Jaháňsháh invaded Khurásán and occupied Herát, but afterwards relinquished it to Abú Sa'íd. Ten years later,
in 872/1467–8, when Jahánsháh was defeated and slain by Úzún Hasan, of the rival clan of the “White Sheep” Turkáns, Ábú Saʿíd, hoping to profit by this circumstance, and encouraged by representations from ‘Iráq, Kháls, Kirmán, Ádharbájíyán and other lost provinces, marched westwards against his new rival Úzún Hasan, by whom he was finally defeated and taken prisoner near Mayún. After three days his captor, having decided on his destruction, handed him over to Yádígíár Muhammad, who put him to death to avenge the blood of his grandmother Gawhar Shád Khátún. The philosopher Jalálu’-d-Dín Dáwání, author of the well-known ethical manual entitled Akhláq-i-Jádli, commemorated his death in the following chronogram 1:

Sultan Ábú Sáid khe dr Fer’hsuroy.

Sultán ABÚ SA’ÍD SLAIN BY ÚZÚN ḤASAN 389

By the Venetian travellers of this period, to whom we are indebted for much interesting information and independent chronological details, Ábú Saʿíd is called “Busech” by the Venetians; while Úzún Hasan is called “Ussun Cassano,” “Assimbeo,” or “Assambei” (i.e. Hasan Beg), and Jahánsháh “Giansa.” The towns of ‘Urfa, Isfahán, Kháshán, Qum, Yazd and Kharput appear as “Orphi,” “Spaham” or “Spaan,” “Cassan,” “Como,” “Jex” and “Carpath.” It should be noted also that, apart from such well-known general histories as the Rawdatu’s-Sáfá and Habíbu’s-Síyar, the hitherto unpublished Matla’u’s-Sá’dayn of Kamálu’-d-Dín ‘Abdu’s-Razzáq, a monograph on the reigns of “the two Fortunate Planets,” i.e. the two Ábú Saʿíds (the Íl-khání Mongol, reigned 716/1316—736/1335, and the Tímúrid of whom we

1 Given in the Rawdatu’s-Sáfá. The sum of the letters composing the last four words (40 + 100 + 400 + 30 + 60 + 30 + 9 + 1 + 50 + 1 + 2 + 6 + 60 + 70 + 10 + 4) gives the year of his death 873 (= A.D. 1468–9).
are now speaking), which was completed in 875/1470–1, only two years after the later Abú Sa‘íd’s death, affords a great wealth of material for the history of this period.

Abú Sa‘íd was succeeded by two of his sons, Ahmad and Maḥmúd, who are accounted by Stanley Lane-Poole the last (eighth and ninth) rulers of the House of Tímúr in Persia and Central Asia. Of these the first ruled in Transoxiana with Samarqand for his capital, and the second in Badakhshán, Khatlán, Tirmidh, etc. Both died, the latter by violence at the hands of the Uzbek Shaybání Khán, in the last years of the fifteenth century (899/1493–4 and 905/1499–1500 respectively).

Much more important than the two princes last mentioned, from the literary if not from the political point of view, was Sultán Ḥusayn b. Mansúr b. Bayqará, whose court at Herát was one of the most brilliant centres of letters, art and learning which ever existed in Persia. This prince, originally attached to and protected by Ulugh Beg, was, on the death of this ruler and his son ‘Abdu’l-Latif, cast into prison by Abú Sa‘íd, but escaped, joined Abú’l-Qásím Bábur, and fled to Khwárazm or Khiva. In 862/1457–8 he captured Astarábád, the capital of the province of Gurgán or Jurján (the ancient Hyrcania) and was there crowned, but recognized Abú Sa‘íd as his suzerain and placed himself under his protection. A year later Abú Sa‘íd again compelled him to take refuge in Khwárazm and occupied Astarábad, which, however, he shortly afterwards recovered, together with the rest of the provinces of Gurgán and Mázaridarán. On the death of Abú Sa‘íd, Sultán Ḥusayn captured Herát, and was crowned there on Ramadán 10, 872 (April 3, 1468), which date is regarded by Munajjím-báshi as the beginning of his 38 years’ reign, terminated by his death at the age of seventy years on Monday, 11 Dhu’l-Hijja,911 (May 5, 1506). During the last 20 years of this period he was partly paralysed. His talented minister Mír ‘Alí Shír Náwá’l, who,
like his master, was not only a great patron of men of learning and letters but himself a writer of distinction, both in prose and verse, especially in the Turkí language, died on the 12th of Jumáda ii, 906 (January 3, 1501) at the age of 62. An excellent monograph on his life and literary activities was published by M. Belin in the Journal Asiatique for 1861, and reprinted in the form of a separate pamphlet. Sultán Húsayn, besides his literary tastes, had a great passion for pigeons, fighting-cocks and other birds, and, like so many of his House, was much addicted to wine.

It still remains to mention one of the most notable of all the descendants of Tímúr, namely Zahiru’d-Dín Muḥammad Bábur, who, though he never ruled in Persia, was the founder of a new and splendid Tímúrid empire in India, the representatives of which, commonly known in Europe as the “Great Moguls,” included such noble princes as Humáyún, Akbar, Jahángír, Sháh-Jahán and Awrang-Zib ‘Alamgír, and which, though gradually shorn alike of its glories and its virtues, continued to exist until the great Indian Mutiny in 1857. Until the early part of the eighteenth century their magnificent court at Delhi continued to attract a great number of eminent Persian poets and men of letters during a period when fuller appreciation and more liberal patronage of talent was to be found at Dihlí than at Išfahán.

Of the life of Bábur we possess singularly full and authentic details in the autobiographical memoir generally known as the Bábur-náma, or “Book of Bábur” which he composed in the Turkí or Chaghatáy language. Of the original Turkí text of this remarkable work a printed edition was published by Ilminsky at Kazan in 1857; while a fac-simile of the then newly-discovered Haydarábád codex was edited by Mrs Beveridge

1 Notice biographique et littéraire sur Mir Ali-Chir Néváii, suivie d'extraits tirés des œuvres du même auteur, par M. Belin. It comprises 158 pages.

2 The text comprises 506 pages.
for the trustees of the "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Fund" in 1905. This Turki text has been translated into French by M. Pavet de Courteille, and was published at Paris in 1871. There also exists a Persian translation of the original, known as the Wāqīyat (or Tūzuk)-i-Bābārī, made at the request of the great Emperor Akbar, Bābūr's grandson, by his accomplished general Mīrzā 'Abdu'r-Rahīm Khān-Khánān in 998/1589-90, on which Dr John Leyden and Mr William Erskine's well-known English version, published in London in 1826, is based. Besides this notable and most authoritative work, we have the very valuable and illuminating Memoir of Bābūr's cousin Mīrzā Ḥaydar Dughlāt, now accessible to the English reader in Sir E. Denison Ross's translation, edited, with Preface, Introduction, Commentary, Notes and a Map, by the late Mr Ney Elias, formerly H.B.M. Consul-General for Khurāsān and Sīstān, and published in London in 1898 with the title A History of the Moghuls of Central Asia, being the Ta'rikh-i-Rashidi of Mīrzā Muhammad Ḥaydar Dughlāt. This book, which, as its title implies, has a much larger scope than the Bābūr-nāma, of which the author made use in its compilation, greatly supplements and illuminates the earlier work. Apart from these two works, which are worthy of special notice on account of the high position of their authors and their active participation in the making of the history which they narrate, the historical sources for this period are unusually full and trustworthy.

Of Bābūr's life, which can be studied in detail in the above-mentioned and numerous other works, it is sufficient

1 It contains 382 ff. of text, 107 pp. of Indices, and an English Preface of 10 pages.
2 See Rieu's Pers. Cat., pp. 244 et seqq.
3 See p. 23 of the Introduction to Mr Ney Elias's book.
4 The Bābūr-nāma comes down to the year 936/1529-30, while the Ta'rikh-i-Rashidi ends with the year 948/1541.
5 The best and fullest account I know of is W. Erskine's History of India under the two first Sovereigns of the House of Taimur, Bābār and Humāyūn (2 vols., London, 1854).
to say here that it falls broadly into three periods, of which the first was passed in the little principality of Farghana, where he was born in A.D. 1482 and whence he was expelled by Shaybání Khán and his Uzbeks about 1504. During the second period (A.D. 1504–1525) he ruled over Afgánistán and Badakhshán. Finally he decided on the invasion of India, and the foundation of the “Great Mogul” Dynasty in that country dates from his brilliant victory at Pánípat over Sultán Ibráhím Lódí of Dihlí on April 20, 1526, and the occupation of Ágra and Dihlí and northern India from the Indus to Bengal. This third and shortest period was brought to a close by his death on December 26, 1530, when he was succeeded by his son Humáyún. The narrative of the Bábur-náma extends from Ramadán 899/June 1494 (the year of Bábur’s accession at the early age of twelve to the throne of Farghana) to 936/1529–30, the year preceding his death. There are, however, certain lacunae, to wit the years 915–924 (1509–1518) and 927–931 (1521–1525).

We have, however, overshot the limits of the period dealt with in this chapter; for, so far as Persia is concerned, the House of Tímúr disappears from it before the year 1500. The great empire founded by Tímúr, that ruthless man of blood, was maintained in Persia by his gentler and more enlightened son Sháh-rukh until his death in 850/1447. What follows is mainly a dismal record of fratricidal strife and invasions of Uzbeks and other barbarians, redeemed by brilliant galaxies of poets, artists and men of letters and science whom the lavish bounty and undeniable taste of these truculent and quarrelsome princes continued to attract to their various courts, in particular to Herát. The details of these wars, set out at great length by Mírkhwánd, Khwándamír and ‘Abdu’r-Razzáq, and in English by Erskine¹, are somewhat wearisome, being not so much

¹ History of India under the first two Sovereigns of the House of Taimur, etc. See the preceding foot-note. Vincent A. Smith’s Akbar the Great Mogul, 1542–1605 (Oxford, 1917) forms a worthy continuation.
between different peoples or principles, as between ambitious members of one family. Happily for our present purpose we need not go much beyond Sir John Malcolm's excellent summary of this period of Persian history. "After the death of Ulugh Beg," says he, "we discover a crowd of the descendants of Tīmūr contending for the provinces of his empire; and so great was the respect which men entertained for the blood of the hero that everyone who could boast of it in his veins found adherents who enabled him either to obtain a throne or an honourable grave."

To the literary and artistic gifts and tastes of these princes, on the other hand, that great authority on Persian painting and miniatures, Dr F. R. Martin, bears the following eloquent testimony in his monumental work on The Miniature Painting and Painters of Persia, India and Turkey.

"The Tīmūrids soon began to lead a life compatible with the wealth their fathers and forefathers had amassed during their wars, and tried to squander it as quickly as possible. History constantly repeats itself. The life of these rulers forms a true epic. They recall to mind the old Paladins in the Chansons de Gestes, passing in the space of a short time from the splendours of a throne to a position of the utmost decay. They were, however, the most artistic princes that ever reigned in Persia. If the conquering armies of Tīmūr destroyed many a work of art, his successors brought into being works of art that would otherwise never have been created. Does not Samarqand redeem the loss of many a town destroyed by Tīmūr? What he destroyed was already of itself destined to fall, and Tīmūr simply gave the mortal thrust. He was not the destroyer we are accustomed to consider him, but the master who arranged matters with an iron hand. He formed a link in the chain of natural development, and from his realm arose the Persia of later times, his successors bringing Persian art to its most flourishing

stage. These Tímúrids were no barbarians; indeed everything goes to show that they were highly civilized and refined men, real scholars, loving art for the sake of art alone, and without ostentation. In the intervals between their battles they enjoyed thinking of their libraries and writing poetry, many of them having composed poetry that far excels that of their court poets. Sultán Ḥusayn Mírzá was no bad poet, and his odes, written in Turkí, are far better than those of many celebrated poets. He also wrote in Arabic and competed with the celebrated Jámí. The most refined style of life prevailed, in certain respects calling to mind that of the European princes of the same time, or that of France during the 18th century, although it was far more literary than either.

"Báysunghur, Sháh-rukh, Ulugh Beg and Sultán Ḥusayn Mírzá were bibliophiles not surpassed by the Dukes of Burgundy, or by King René of Anjou, their contemporaries, and were far more illustrious than the celebrated French and Italian book-lovers of the 16th and 17th centuries. Not only did they collect books, but they created them. Báysunqur and Ḥusayn Mírzá were to Persia what William Morris was to England four hundred years later. They created a new style of book, but theirs was infinitely more aristocratic, solid and artistic. The very finest European books and manuscripts cannot, except in a very few isolated instances, bear comparison with those of the Orientals as regards the fineness of their work.

"Báysunqur was the son of Sháh-rukh and grandson to Tamerlane; he died in 837/1433, when 37 years of age, at Astarábád, where he was governor. He was the founder of the most elegant style of book-production in Persia, and well deserves to be remembered as one of the greatest bibliophiles of the world. Under his auspices forty artists were employed in copying manuscripts under the guidance of Mawláná Ja'far of Tabríz, himself a pupil of 'Abdu'lláh son of Mír 'Alí. By paying large salaries and making princely
presents he retained in his service the cleverest masters of the period, who executed the finest work in the production of their splendid volumes. The paper was unsurpassed, the illuminations of extreme delicacy, and the covers are unequalled to the present day. Books from his vast library are now dispersed over the entire world, and wherever found should possess a place of honour.

"It was during the reigns of the Tímúrids and not during that of Sháh ‘Abbás that the finest carpets were produced in Persia. The finest arms and armour, and ivory-work of a minuteness surpassing all examples produced by other countries, were made at their court. All specimens of Persian art that exhibit the most refined taste and workmanship emanate from their time or from the very beginning of the Šafawí dynasty.

"All art produced in the East is the direct result of an impulse given by the monarch. But for Báysunqur and Sultán Ḥusayn Mírzá we should not have had that lovely miniature art their artists created, for it was to adorn and illustrate their own writings that they welcomed artists from all parts of their kingdom. But for Sháh ‘Abbás we should not have had the splendid figured velvet, and but for Sulaymán the Magnificent there would be no magnificent Turkish faience from Izníq, and but for Sultán Aḥmad we should not have had the wonderful manuscripts of the Qur’án, by which their aesthetic tastes are still perpetuated. All real art in the Orient is court art, or is dependent on a Maecenas. It was so in the ‘Abbásid court at Baghdád in the ninth century; it was so in Egypt and Spain; it was so everywhere. This fact must be remembered, as it explains much that would otherwise be incomprehensible.

"That an art so brilliant should entirely disappear with the ruler was not to be expected. The princes died, but the artists survived and entered the service of another. The impulse derived from the Tímúrids was so powerful that it lasted through a great
part of the sixteenth century. It was not only the new rulers of Persia, the Safawís, but also princes whose names are almost unknown to history, who continued the fashion and had manuscripts executed that were more costly than anything of the kind produced in Europe.”

It is necessary to remind the reader, who may be apt to think of far-reaching international relations as in large measure a product of modern times and an outcome of modern facilities of communication, how considerable was the intercourse in the time which we are considering between Asiatic (not merely Muslim) states far removed from one another. The interesting extracts from that valuable but hitherto unpublished history, the Maṭla‘u’s-Sa‘dāyn of ‘Abdu’r-Razzāq of Samarqand, published in French by Quatremere in 1843¹, include the accounts of two embassies from the court of Herát, the one to China, the other to India, narrated in each case by one who had headed or accompanied the mission. The mission to China, described by Ghiyáthu’d-Dín Naqqásh (“the Painter”), left Herát on December 4, 1419, reached Pekin (Khán-bálígh or “Cambaluc”) a year and ten days later, and returned to Herát on September 2, 1422². The mission to India, confided to and narrated by the above-mentioned ‘Abdu’r-Razzáq himself, started on January 13, 1442, and landed once more on Persian soil at Hurmuz in the Persian gulf on April 20, 1444³. The activity and cosmopolitan character of that port are well indicated by the ambassador in the following descriptive paragraph:

“This Hurmuz, which they also call Jarún, is a port on the open sea ‘which has no equal on the face of the earth.’ Thither betake themselves merchants from the seven climes; from Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, Ádharbáýján, Arabian and Persian ‘Iráq, the

provinces of Fārs, Khurāsān, Transoxiana, Turkistān, the Qipchāq Plain, the territories of the Calmucks and all the realm of China and [its capital] Pekin (Khān-bālīgh). Thither coast-dwellers from the confines of China, Java, Bengal, Ceylon and the cities of Zīrbād, Tanāsūrī, Shahr-i-Naw, the Islands of Dīwa-Mahall, as far as Malabar, Abyssinia, and Zanzibar, the ports of Bījanagar, Gulbarga, Gujarāt, and Kanbā'īt (Cambay), the coasts of the Arabian peninsula as far as Aden, Jeddah and Yanbū' bring rare and precious things to which the sun and moon and fertilizing virtue of the clouds have given lustre and beauty, and which can be brought by sea to that country. To that land come travellers from all parts of the world, and whatever they bring they find in that city, without over-much search, the equivalent value thereof in whatever form they desire, whether by sale or exchange. The officials levy a ten per cent. *ad valorem* duty on everything except gold and silver. In that city are many adherents of all manner of diverse religions, including heathens; yet do they not deal otherwise than fairly with any creature, for which reason men call the city Dārī'l-Amān (‘the Abode of Security’). The people of that country combine the winning manner of the people of ‘Irāq with the profound cunning of the Indians.’

Allusion has already been made to the correspondence between Shāh-rukh and his successors and the Ottoman Sultans Muḥammad I (1402-1421), Murād II (1421-1451), Muḥammad II (1451-1481) and Bāyazīd II (1481-1512); but that this correspondence was not confined to princes and politics is shown by letters preserved by Firidūn Bey1 exchanged between Bāyazīd II on the one hand and the poet Jāmī, the philosopher Jalālu’ddīn Dawānī and the theologian Aḥmed Taftāzānī on the other. To the first of these the Ottoman Sultan sent a gift of a thousand and to the second five hundred florins, accompanied by all manner

of gracious and courtly compliments. It was at Constantinople, moreover, that Sultan Husayn’s son, Badī‘u‘z-Zamán, fleeing from the murderous Uzbeks, found a final refuge and a last resting-place.

Having described the waning of the House of Timúr, we must, before tracing the growth of the Ṣafawí power, consider briefly the intermediate Turkmán dynasties of the “Black” and “White Sheep,” who were so much akin in race and character that Josafa Barbaro is probably justified in comparing them to the rival Italian factions of the Guelphs and Ghibellines, or the “Bianchi” and “Neri.” The “Black Sheep” (Qará-qoyúnlú, or “Caracoilu” as Barbaro calls them) came first. In the time of Timúr they were established in the Persian province of Adharbájyán, and a certain chief amongst them, Bayrám Khwája of the Bahárlú tribe, attached himself to the service of Sultan Uways the Jalá‘írí, after whose death he possessed himself of Mawsil (Mosul), Sinjár and Arjísh. In 782/1380–1 he died and was succeeded by his son Qára Muhammad, who similarly attached himself to the service of Sultan Ahmad, the son of the above-mentioned Sultan Uways, and ultimately fell in battle in Syria in 792/1390. He was succeeded by his son Qára Yúsuf, who was the first of the family to attain the position of an independent sovereign with his capital at Tabríz. After repeated conflicts with Timúr, he took refuge with the Ottoman Sultan Báyazíd “the Thunderbolt,” and succeeded in capturing Baghdád, whence, however, he was shortly expelled by Timúr’s grandson Abú Bakr, and fled to Egypt with a thousand of his followers. The Sultan of Egypt, fearing Timúr’s wrath, imprisoned him; but on Timúr’s death he was released, and,

---

1 Concerning the enormous influence exercised by Jámi and Mír ‘Alí Shír Nawá’í on Ottoman literature, especially poetry, see the late Mr E. J. W. Gibb’s History of Ottoman Poetry, vol. ii, pp. 7–11.

2 P. 85 of the Hakluyt volume above mentioned.
having been rejoined by his scattered followers, took Diyár Bakr, and soon afterwards, in 809/1406–7, defeated Abú Bakr at Nakhjuwán, reoccupied Tabrítz, and took possession of the province of Ádharbáýján. Four years later he defeated and put to death near Tabrítz his old master and fellow-captive in Egypt, Sulțán Aḩmad Jalá’íríf. In 822/1419 he captured the three important Persian cities of Sáwa, Qazwín and Sultániyya, and died in the following year at the age of 65, after a reign of 14 years, leaving five sons, of whom two, Iskandar and Jahánsháh, succeeded him on the throne.

Mention has been already made in a previous chapter of the important collection of State Papers connected with the diplomacy of the Ottoman Empire which are contained in the Munshá’át of Firídún Bey.

A good many of these refer to the period we are now considering. Thus we have a letter to Sulţán Báyazíd “the Thunderbolt” from Sulţán Aḩmad Jalá’írí, written in 798/1396, describing his flight before Tímúr’s advancing hordes, and the answer to it; numerous letters which passed between Sulţán Muḥammad I (805–824/1402–1421) and Sháh-rukh, Qára Yúsuf, Iskandar and Sulţán Khalíl of Shírwán; letters between Sulţán Murád II (824–855/1421–1451) and Sháh-rukh; letters between Sulţán Muḥammad II “Fáṭih” (855–886/1451–1481) and Jahánsháh, Ulugh Beg, Báysunqur, Bahman Sháh of India, Ùzún Hasan, and Ḥusayn b. Mansúr b. Bayqará; and later a voluminous correspondence with the Safawí kings Sháh Isma’il and Sháh Táhmasp. These letters are interesting not only for the light they throw on the historical events to which they refer, but as indicating the relations which prevailed between these rulers respectively. Thus, for example, in a letter from Sháh-rukh to the Ottoman Sulţán Muhammad I in 818/1416 the arrogance of tone is very noticeable, both in respect to the comparative poverty of titles accorded and the reproaches addressed to the Sulţán for having put to death his rebellious brothers Sulaymán,

Contemporary State Papers

1 Printed at Constantinople in 1274/1858, pp. 626.
Músá and Ísá, which, though “conformable to Ottoman practice,” is branded as “improper according to the Íl-khání custom”; and in the peremptory demand that Qára Yúsuf shall not be allowed to take refuge in Ottoman territory, should he seek to do so. Sultán Muḥammad’s reply, on the other hand, in not only conciliatory in tone, but even humble. He accords to Sháh-rukh a whole string of high-sounding titles; apologizes for killing his brothers by quoting Sa’dí’s well-known dictum that “ten dervishes can sleep in one blanket, but two kings cannot be contained in a continent”\(^1\); and expresses his fear that if he exasperates Qára Yúsuf by refusing him entry into his dominions, he may endeavour to stir up trouble amongst the neighbouring rulers of the Qaramání, Ḥamídí, Isfandiyáří, Ṭūrghúdí and Dhu’il-Qadarí dynasties, and even with the Sultán of Egypt. In the case of the Ottoman Sultán and the “Black Sheep” Turkmán rulers, Qára Yúsuf and Qára Iskandar, on the other hand, the contrary holds good, the Sultán writing as to inferiors and the Turkmán princes as to a superior. The numerous letters and dispatches contained in this interesting volume would well repay a fuller examination than can here be accorded to them, but reference will be made to them from time to time, as occasion arises\(^2\).

Amír Iskandar Qára-qoyúnlú inaugurated his reign by an attack on Sháh-rukh, in which he was defeated, but soon afterwards he re-occupied Ádharbáýjáñ. In 828/1425 Shamsu’d-Dín, the ruler of Akhlát, and in 830/1427 Sultán Aḥmad the ruler of Kurdistán and ʿIzzu’d-Dín Shír fell victims to his warlike prowess, and the towns of Shírwán and Sultáníyya passed into his hands. In 832/1429 he and his brother Jaháṃsháh, in spite of the valour which they showed, were again defeated by Sháh-rukh. Six

\(^1\) Gulistán, ed. Platts, p. 16.

\(^2\) Firídún Bey’s Collection of State Papers has been used by Professor H. A. Gibbons in his interesting work on the *Foundation of the Ottoman Empire* (Oxford, 1916), but only to a limited extent. It is also enumerated by Hammer-Purgstall amongst his sources.
years later, in 838/1434-5, Sháh-rúkh again advanced against Iskandar as far as Ray, where he was joined by Iskandar's brother Jaháňsháh and his nephew Sháh 'Alí. Iskandar fled, and Sháh-rúkh bestowed his territories on his brother Jaháňsháh as a reward for his submission. Iskandar took refuge in a fortress, but while preparing to resist a siege he was murdered by his son Qubád, at the instigation of his concubine Laylá.

Jaháňsháh, with the support and approval of Sháh-rúkh, now succeeded to the throne vacated by his brother's death in 839/1435-6, and considerably enlarged the realm which he had inherited. In 856/1452 he overran 'Iráq-i-'Ajam, made a massacre of the people of Işfahán, and invaded Fárs and Kirmán. In 862/1457-8 he conquered Khurásán, and in the month of Sha'bán in that year (June–July, 1458), was enthroned at Herát, and remained there for six months, when Sulţán Abú Sa'íd, the great-grandson of Tímúr, prepared to attack him. At the same time news reached him that his son Hasan, who was imprisoned in Ádharbáýján, had escaped and was in rebellion against him, so he was compelled to make peace with Abú Sa'íd and hasten westwards at the average rate of twelve parasangs (some forty-five miles) a day, losing in this forced march 20,000 camels and 10,000 horses. Having subdued and expelled his son Hasan, he dismissed his other son Pír Budáq from the government of Fárs and transferred him to Baghádád, where he also shortly revolted. Jaháňsháh thereupon besieged Baghádád for a whole year, and finally succeeded in killing Pír Budáq and replacing him by another son, Muḥammad Mi'rzá, after which he returned to Ádharbáýján. His realms now extended from the Turkish frontier on the west to the two 'Iráqs, Kirmán and the shores of the Persian Gulf, thus including nearly the whole of Persia except Khurásán and the Caspian provinces. In 871/1466-7 he attacked Hasan Báyandári, better known as Úzún Hasan, intending to conquer his realm of Diyár Bakr, but was surprised

Jaháňsháh

killed by Úzún
Hašan in A.D.
1467
and slain by the latter while tarrying behind his army on a hunting expedition. His two sons were taken prisoners and most of his principal nobles slain. This disaster is commemorated in the following verses:

"The army of Jahánsháh Bahádúr Núyán, notwithstanding all the materials of mastery and strength, on the twelfth of the month of the second Rabí‘ perished, and the date of the year was Hasan Beg slew him."

Of the character of Jahánsháh the Turkish historian Munajjim-báshí, from whom the above sketch of the Qára-qoyúnlu dynasty is taken, gives a most unfavourable account. According to this writer, he was "a dissolute, immoral, blood-thirsty tyrant, a malignant inclined to heresy and atheism, who paid no heed to the Sacred Law, passed his nights until dawn in revelry and vice, and slept like a dog during the day; for which reason he was called 'the Bat.'" He died at the age of 70 after a reign of 32 years, was buried at Tabríz, and was succeeded by Hasan ‘Alí, the son whom he had cast off, and who had at one time been protected by Úzún Hasan. This son, whose mind is said to have been disordered by his captivity, reigned but a short while in Tabríz ere he was driven thence by Úzún Hasan to Hamadán, whither he was pursued and put to death by Úzún Hasan’s son Oghúrlú Muḥammad in 873/1468–9. With him the Dynasty of the "Black Sheep," or Qára-qoyúnlu, came to an end, and was replaced by that of the "White Sheep," or Áq-qoyûnlû.

1 The words Hasan Beg bi-kusht ("Hasan Beg slew") yield in the abjad notation the number 872, and the 12th of Rabí‘ii in that year corresponds with November 10, 1467.

Diyār Bakr was the original centre of activity of the “White Sheep” or Bāyandari Turkmāns, of whose amīrs Bahā’u’d-Dīn Qārā ‘Osmān, known as Qārā Īluk (“the Black Leech”) from his greedy and blood-thirsty character, was the first to achieve fame. Having defeated Qārā Yūsuf of the rival “Black Sheep” Turkmāns, he was driven by the envy of his less capable brothers Ahmad and Pīr ‘Alī to seek service with Qādī Burhān u’d-Dīn at Sīwās. In 800/1397–8 Qārā ‘Osmān killed his host and seized his territory, but retired, on learning that an Ottoman army under Prince Sulaymān was advancing on Sīwās, to Erzinjān. He joined Tīmūr in his campaign against Asia Minor and Syria, and received as a reward for his services the town of Diyār Bakr. Shortly afterwards Qārā Yūsuf, the “Black Sheep” Turkman, escaped from Egypt and made war on Qārā ‘Osmān, but died, as already mentioned, in Dhu’l-Hijja 823 (December 1420), and was succeeded by his son Iskandar, who suffered defeat at the hands of Shāh-rukh in the following year. Qārā ‘Osmān died in 838/1434–5, and was succeeded by his son ‘Alī Beg, who was compelled by a revolt of his brother Ḥamza to take refuge for a time with the Ottoman Sultan Murād II.

‘Alī Beg was succeeded by his son Jahāngīr, who was soon displaced (857/1453) by his more resolute and capable brother Üzūn Hasan (the “Ussun Cassano” or “Assambei” of Josafa Barbaro), who was by far the most powerful and celebrated of the “White Sheep” Dynasty. He was the grandson of “the Black Leech,” and succeeded to the throne at Āmid (Diyār Bakr) in the year mentioned above, which was the year in which the Ottoman Turks

1 A full account of this remarkable warrior-poet is given by the late Mr E. J. W. Gibb in his History of Ottoman Poetry, vol. i, pp. 204–224. Mention of him (under the form “Wurchanadin”) is also made by Schiltberger in ch. ix of his Bondage and Travels, published in English translation by the Hakluyt Society in 1879, and in the same work there are several references to Qārā ‘Osmān (“Otman”).
captured Constantinople. To the fear inspired in Europe, and especially in Italy, by this fresh evidence of Ottoman power and prowess were due the efforts made by successive Venetian ambassadors to Persia to win the support of Úzún Hasan against the Turks, whom it was hoped he might harass on their Eastern frontier and so distract their attention from further conquests in the West. Thus, once again since the Mongol Court at Qára-qorum had attracted emissaries from Rome with a similar object, the “Eastern Question” assumed a new importance, and the good will of Persia began to be assiduously sought after by European Powers. These Venetian ambassadors have left descriptions of their voyages and adventures which shed a welcome side-light on the condition of Persia and the character of Úzún Hasan, of whom Ramusio, in his Preface to Caterino Zeno’s Travels, speaks in the highest terms, even declaring that “amongst all the kings of the East, who existed since the government was taken away from the Persians and transferred to the Greeks, there have been none who equalled the glory of Darius Hystaspes and Ussun Cassano.” “It is to be regretted,” he adds, “that some Eastern kings, great in power and intellect, have not had historians to celebrate their deeds, since among the Sultans of Egypt and among the Kings of Persia there have been men most excellent in war, and worthy not only of being compared with ancient barbarian kings famous in arms but even with the great Greek and Roman commanders in all those things which constitute able generals of armies.”

He further speaks with admiration of “the manner in which this Ussun Cassano, a poor nobleman and the weakest in condition of many brothers,...not possessing more than thirty soldiers, besides a small castle, afterwards raised himself to such grandeur that he had the courage to dispute the empire of all Asia with the Ottoman House, which under Muhammad II (A.D. 1451–1481) was a terror to the

---

1 P. 2 of the Hakluyt Society’s Narrative of Italian Travels in Persia in the xvi and xvii Centuries (1873).
Contarini’s description of Úzún Hasan

East.” Contarini, who was with Úzún Hasan in 1474-5, says that he “always drank wine with his meals,” and “appeared to be a good liver, and took pleasure in inviting us to partake of the dishes which were before him.” “There were constantly present,” he continues, “a number of players and singers, to whom he commanded whatever he wished to be played or sung, and His Majesty appeared to be of a very merry disposition. He was tall and thin, and had a slightly Tartar expression of countenance, with a constant colour on his face. His hand trembled as he drank. He appeared to be seventy years of age. He was fond of amusing himself in a homely manner; but when too far gone was sometimes dangerous. Take him altogether, however, he was a pleasant gentleman.”

No such vivid portrait of this remarkable man is to be found in the pages of any Oriental historian with whom I am acquainted, but the following estimate of his character by Munajjim-bāshi is worth quoting:

“He was a wise, just, brave, pious, religious and devout King, a friend of learned and godly men, charitable and a public benefactor. He built many buildings for pious uses. As has been mentioned, with but a small army he overcame two such mighty kings as Jahánsháh and Abú Sa‘íd; took tribute from Georgia; and ruled over Ádharbáiyján, the two ‘Iráqs, Kirmán, Fárs, Diyár Bakr, Kurtistán and Armenia.”

Concerning his patronage of learned men the same historian remarks on the preceding page: “He adopted Tabríz as his capital, and there assembled from the surrounding lands and provinces many learned men and doctors, who received favours and honours beyond anything which could be expected.”

1 Contarini’s Travels to Tana and Persia in the Hakluyt Society’s translation of 1873, pp. 132-3.
2 He must have looked older than his actual age, which is given by Munajjim-bāshi as only 54 at his death, two years later (A.D. 1477-8).
3 Šahā'īfūl-Akhbār, vol. iii, p. 165.
One of the most celebrated of those men of learning who received honour and rewards at his hands was 'Alí Qūshjī, who passed through his territories on his way home from the pilgrimage to Mecca.

Uzun Hasan, while still a young man and only Prince of Diyār Bakr, married a Christian wife, to wit the beautiful Despina Khátún ("Lady Despina"), daughter of Kalo Joannes¹, the last Christian Emperor of Trebizond, of the noble family of the Comneni. She bore him a son and three daughters, one of whom, named Marta, was given in marriage to Shaykh Haydar, the father of Sháh Isma'il the founder of the Safawi dynasty.

The fullest account of Uzun Hasan's reign to which I have had access is that contained in the Sahd Hiful-Akhbdr of Munajjim-būsh² while another Turkish source from which much information is to be gleaned is the collection of State Papers (Munshā'at) of Firidūn Bey³, though the paucity of dates in the dozen despatches interchanged between Uzun Hasan and Sultan Muḥammad Fātih ("the Conqueror") is a matter for regret. The narratives of the Italian ambassadors and travellers already referred to are also of great value. The accounts of the Qāra-qoyūnlū and Áq-qoyūnlū dynasties given by Mirkhwánd and other Persian historians are for the most part very meagre and inadequate.

The first three or four years of Uzun Hasan's reign (A.D. 1453-1456-7) were chiefly filled by repeated revolts of his brothers, especially Jahángir, against his authority. The scene of these struggles, which were repeatedly composed by Saray Khátún, the mother of the contending brothers, lay for the most part outside Persia, round about

¹ See the Travels of a Merchant in Persia in the already cited volume of the Hakluyt Society, pp. 178-9. He describes "Despina-caton" as "very beautiful, being considered the most beautiful woman of that time, and throughout Persia was spread the fame of her loveliness and grace."
³ Vol. i, pp. 274-286.
Diyár Bakr, Mosul and especially Mardin, which suffered terrible devastation. Jahángír did not hesitate to invoke the help of the rival House of the “Black Sheep” Turkmáns, represented by Jahánsháh. Once during this period Úzún Ḥasan set out on an expedition against Khurásán, but was obliged to turn back to deal with a revolt organized by his brother Jahángír aided by Jahánsháh, who sent one of his generals, Rustam Beg, to his support. The rebels suffered a severe defeat at the hands of Úzún Ḥasan near the Euphrates, in which many of the fugitives were drowned, while five hundred prisoners, including Rustam Beg, were beheaded by Úzún Ḥasan, who, however, at the intercession of his mother, again pardoned his brothers Jahángír and Uways, but took ‘Alí Khán, the son of the former, as a hostage to Erzinján.

After this victory (851/1456-7) Úzún Ḥasan’s power and prestige were greatly increased, and many amírs of Asia Minor and Syria submitted to him. About 864/1459-60 he wrested from the Ayyúbí dynasty the fortress of Ḥiṣn Kayf, where he installed his son Khalílu’lláh Mírzá as governor. In the same year Jahánsháh’s son Ḥasan ‘Alí rebelled against his father and took refuge with Úzún Ḥasan, who, however, after a while drove him away on account of certain heretical opinions ascribed to him. In or before A.D. 1461 Úzún Ḥasan sent his nephew Murád Bey on an embassy to the Ottoman Sultán Muḥammad II “the Conqueror” to request him not to molest his father-in-law Kalo Joannes, Emperor of Trebizond. To this request the Turkish Sultán paid no attention, but attacked and subdued Trebizond (where David Comnenas had recently succeeded his elder brother Kalo Joannes) and carried off this last

1 The “Giansa” of the Venetian travellers.
2 In ‘Abdúr-Raḥmán Bey Sheref’s History, entitled Tārıkẖ-i-Devlet-i-‘Aliyya (p. 161), Úzún Ḥasan is said to have sent his mother Sára Khátün, who is evidently the same as the “Saráy Khátûn” mentioned at the bottom of the preceding page (p. 407).
representative of Byzantine power to Constantinople, where, according to Giovan Maria Angioletto, “he was treated honourably enough, but died before a year was over, in 1462.”

The chronology of the wars waged by Üzún Hasan against the Ottoman Turks is somewhat confused. Munajjim-bâshi speaks of a short contest immediately preceding Üzún Hasan's first invasion of Georgia in 871/1466-7, and of an embassy headed by Khurshíd Beg which he sent to Sultan Muḥammad II “the Conqueror” requesting him not to attack Trebizond, which, as we have seen, had already fallen to the Ottomans in A.D. 1461. On the first of Rabî‘ ii, 872 (Oct. 30, 1467), however, he defeated the “Black Sheep” Turkmáns near Khûy in Ádharbáýjân, and, taking their king Jahánscháh off his guard while he was away from his army on a hunting expedition, cut off his head and sent it to the Timúrid Sultan Abú Sa‘îd, while suffering his body to be buried in the grave of his father Qâra Yúsuf. He then occupied ‘Iráq and Ádharbáýjân and besieged Baghádád. The first despatch from Üzún Hasan to Sultan Muḥammad II recorded by Firídún Bey² refers to this victory. It is couched in very respectful terms (unlike some later despatches), but seems to have received no acknowledgement.

The second despatch from Üzún Hasan to “the Conqueror” (which, unfortunately, is undated) refers to the next important event in his career, namely the defeat of Jahánscháh’s son Ḥasan ‘Alí at Marand. This prince, who, as already mentioned, had taken refuge with him some seven years previously, now attacked him to avenge the death of his father Jahánscháh. Üzún Hasan invoked the help of the Timúrid Abú Sa‘îd, urging the constant loyalty of his own House of the “White Sheep” to the House of Tímúr, and the disloyalty of the rival “Black Sheep.” He also

1 See this part of the Hakluyt Society’s volume above mentioned, p. 74 and note 2 ad calc.
offered, in return for help, to cede ‘Irāq to Abū Sa‘īd, pro-
vided he might keep Ādharbāyjān. Abū Sa‘īd, so far from ac-
cepting this proposal, immediately marched against Úzūn
Ḥasan to avenge Jahānshāh’s death, but was
defeated and captured, together with his sons
Muḥammad and Shāh-rūkh, and handed over to
Yādigār Muḥammad, who killed him to avenge
the death of his grandmother Gawhar Shād
Khāṭūn. When the Venetian Contarini was received by
Úzūn Ḥasan in his palace at “Spaan” (Iṣfahān) on Nov. 6,
1474, he noticed “a painting, representing the decapita-
tion of Soltan Busech (i.e. Abū Sa‘īd), and showing how he was
brought by a rope to execution by Curlumameth (i.e. Úzūn
Ḥasan’s son Oghūrūlu Muḥammad), who had caused the
chamber to be made” Abū Sa‘īd’s body was sent in the
charge of his mother (who had also been captured) to Khur-
āsān with all honour and respect. In the same despatch
in which Úzūn Ḥasan announces to Sultān Muḥammad
“the Conqueror” the defeat and death of Ḥasan ‘Alī and
“some 3000 of his men,” he announces his capture of Ādhar-
bāyjān, ‘Irāq, Fārs and Kirmān, and his intention henceforth
to fix his capital at Tabrīz. This despatch appears to have
been sent by the hands of an ambassador, Sayyid Ṭahmāb
Ṭoghān-oghlu.

The third despatch from Úzūn Ḥasan is still less re-
spectful in its form of address than the preceding one, and
is also undated. It mentions the arrival of an Ottoman
envoy named Amīr Bey, and then proceeds to narrate his
negotiations and conflict with, and victory over the Tīmūrid
Sultān Husayn [b. Mansūr b.] Bayqarā, and the manner in
which he had divided up and assigned his domains. He
also announces his conquest of Khurram-ābād in Lurīstān.

In a fourth despatch, also undated, in which the great
Ottoman conqueror is insultingy addressed as the “most
puissant Amīr...Shamsu’d-Dīn Muḥammad Bey,” while
Shīrāz, which he had recently conquered, is described as

1 P. 131 of the Hakluyt volume already cited.
having become "the Seat of the Throne of Sovereignty and the Station of the Caliphate," he further announces the subjugation of Khúzistán. This at last calls forth a reply which reveals a high degree of exasperation: the Ottoman "Sultán Muḥammad, son of Murád, son of Muḥammad, son of Báyázíd" addresses his arrogant correspondent as "thou," warns him not to be puffed up by temporary good fortune, and threatens to march against him in the ensuing month of Shawwál. About the same time he despatched a letter to his son, Prince Muṣṭafá, governor of Qaramán, ordering him to attack Úzún Ḥasan, whom he describes as "deserving of the gibbet and the rope" ("mustahiqq-i-dár u rasan olán Úzún Hasan"); and to this letter we have Prince Muṣṭafá's reply, describing how, aided by his tutor Gedik Aḥmad Pasha, he defeated Úzún Ḥasan's army near Qonya on Saturday, 14th of Rabī' i, 877 (August 19, 1472), and killed his sons Yúsuf, Zaynal and 'Umar. The two last of this series of documents given by Firídún Bey¹ contain Shaykh Áq Shamsu'd-Din's interpretation of two dreams about Úzún Ḥasan, and are written in Arabic.

The accounts of Úzún Hasan's conflict with the Ottomans given by Caterino Zeno², Giovan Maria Angioletto³, and the author of the Travels of a Merchant in Persia⁴, in conjunction with those of Munajjim-bášīt and 'Abdu'r-Rahmán Sheref Bey, though not rich in chronological details, make the causes and course of the struggle pretty clear. Apart from the growing arrogance of Úzún Hasan, as revealed in the despatches to which reference is made above, the Ottoman Sultan had against his neighbour four principal causes of complaint, to wit: (1) his negotiations with Venice for a conjoined attack on Turkey from both East and West;

¹ Munshâ'át, vol. i, pp. 280–2. The date here given (877/1472) does not accord with that (A.D. 1474) given on the next page (line 26), which seems to be the more correct.


³ Ibid., pp. 74–96.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 180–182.
(2) his attacks on Jahánsghá the “Black Sheep” Turkmán, whom he not only conquered but put to death, and on Sultán Husayn Bayqará the Tímúrid, both of whom were in friendly relations with Sultán Muḥammad Fáṭih; (3) his promise to support the Christian Emperor of Trebizond against Ottoman aggression; and (4) his protection of Pír Aḥmad (the “Pirameto” of Zeno) and other princes of the Qaramán dynasty, who were the ancient and bitter foes of the House of ‘Osman.

The ensuing war, which began in 877/1472–3 and ended in 878/1473–4, presented two phases, in the first of which the victory was to the Persians and in the second to the Turks. The first battle, which took place on the Euphrates near Maláṭya, was lost chiefly through the rashness of Murád Pasha Palaeologus, the young Beyler-bey of Rumelia (the “Asmurat” of Angioletto). Many Turks were drowned in the “whirlpools” of the river, besides those who were killed, and twelve thousand men, “among whom were several persons of note,” were missing when the muster was called in the evening. “Having suffered this defeat,” says Angioletto (who was with the Turkish army), “the Turk became very apprehensive, and determined to lead his army back to his country by the shortest route.” They therefore retired towards Trebizond, in a valley near which place a second great battle was fought towards the end of August, 1474, in which Úzún Ḥasan was decisively defeated and his son Zaynal killed, while much spoil fell into the hands of the victors. Prince Muṣṭafá distinguished himself greatly in this battle. “If Ússun Cassano had remained content with his first victory,” says Angioletto, “the Turk would have gone away ignominiously, and he would not have lost the territories he did.” “This battle,” says ‘Abdu’r-Raḥmán Sheref Bey, “upset the cup of Úzún

1 See ch. vii of G. M. Angioletto’s narrative in the Hakluyt Society’s volume, p. 88.
2 Ta’rikh-i-Devlet-i-‘Alíyya, p. 173.
Hasan's fortune, and for twenty or thirty years assured the safety of the Sultan's eastern frontier.

Uzun Hasan now retired to Tabriz, "where he caused games and rejoicings to be held, not caring much for his reverse, as he had lost none of his dominions." His ease was, however, soon troubled by the rebellion of his son Oghurlu Muhammad, who seized Shiraz, and, on hearing that his father was advancing against him with a great army, fled to Constantinople, where he was received with much honour by the Ottoman Sultan, who promised "to make him king of Persia in the room of his father, who was his enemy." Uzun Hasan, meeting filial ingratitude with cunning, first feigned illness and then caused a rumour of his death to be circulated.

"While thus dissembling," says Angioletto, "a report was spread abroad to Constantinople that Ussun Cassano had fallen dangerously ill from melancholy, on account of the rebellion of his son, and, a rumour of his having got worse having been whispered about, some of his most faithful adherents, as had been arranged, announced his death, while messengers were sent to Ugurlimehemet with letters and tokens, as is customary, giving information of the death of his father, and begging him to return and take possession of the throne before either of his brothers Halul or Jacob could do so. And in order to give greater semblance to the affair, funeral rites were paid, and his death was really believed in throughout the country. Ugurlimehemet having received three different messengers with secret messages, such as are used in affairs of state, thought it safe to go to Tauris. He arrived there in a few days with a small escort, and, on going to the palace to make himself sovereign, was

1 Called "Ugurlimehemet" by Angioletto, and "Ungermanmet" by Zeno.
2 End of ch. ix, p. 96.
3 I.e. Khalil and Ya'qūb, who actually succeeded in turn to the throne.
taken to where his father was in perfect health, who ordered him to be confined, and afterwards put to death, without showing any consideration for his being his son."

For his defeat by the Ottomans Üzün Hasan was in some degree compensated by a victory over the Egyptians, who had taken and ravaged ‘Urfa, and a successful campaign in Georgia, from which he obtained a tribute of 16,000 ducats and the surrender of the city of Tiflis. He finally died in 882/1477-8, and was succeeded by his son Khalil, who, however, had only reigned six months when he was attacked and killed by his brother Ya’qüb near Khúy. This prince reigned for about thirteen years, in the course of which period he killed Shaykh Haydar son of Shaykh Junayd the Ṣafawí (whose growing power and influence caused him alarm) and interned his children (including Isma’îl, the future founder of the Ṣafawí dynasty) at the old Sásánian capital of Ḩistakhr. Munajjim-báshí says that he built the beautiful summer palace of the Ḥasht Bihisht, or “Eight Paradises” (the “Astibisti” of the Venetians) outside Tabriz, but the Italian merchant-traveller² ascribes its construction to Úzün Hasan. Finally, according to the same authority³ (for the fact is not mentioned by Mirkhwánd or Munajjim-báshí), he was poisoned by his wife under the following circumstances.

“He took as his wife a high-born lady, daughter of a Persian noble, but a most licentious woman: having fallen in love with a great lord of the Court, this wicked woman sought means to kill Jacob Sultan her husband, designing to marry her paramour and

1 According to Munajjim-báshí (Ṣahâ’if ‘ul-Akhbâr, vol. iii, p. 165) Khalîl put to death his brother Maqṣûd, and thereby alienated and alarmed his other brothers.


3 Ibid., pp. 183-4.
make him king, as, being closely related to Jacob, he would become so by right in default of children. Having arranged matters with him, she prepared an insidious poison for her husband, who, having gone into a perfumed bath, as was his custom, with his young son, aged eight or nine years, remained there from the twenty-second hour until sunset. On coming out he went into the harem, which was close to the bath, where he was met by his wicked wife with a cup and a gold vase containing the poison, which she had got ready while he was in the bath, knowing that it was his custom to have something to drink on coming out of the bath. She caressed him more than usual to effect her wicked purpose; but not having sufficient command over her countenance, became very pale, which excited the suspicion of Jacob, who had already began to distrust her from some of her proceedings. He then commanded her to taste it first, which, although she knew it was certain death, she could not escape and drank some; she then handed the gold cup to her husband Jacob, who, with his son, drank the rest. The poison was so powerful that by midnight they were all dead. The next morning the news was circulated of the sudden death of Jacob Sultan, his son and wife. The great lords, hearing of their king's decease, had quarrels among themselves, so that for five or six years all Persia was in a state of civil war, first one and then another of the nobles becoming Sultan. At last a youth named Alumut, aged fourteen years, was raised to the throne, which he held till the succession of Sheikh Ismail Sultan.

Munajjim-bâshi describes Ya'qûb as "disposed to drink and a merry life, and very fond of poetry." "Many poets," he adds, "gathered at his court from all quarters, and composed resonant qaṣīdas in his praise." He was succeeded by his son Báysunqur, who reigned a year and eight months, when he was replaced by his cousin Rustam, the son of Maqṣūd.

1 Munajjim-bâshi merely says (vol. iii, p. 166) that Ya'qûb died in Muḥarram, 896 (Nov.–Dec. 1490).
He marched against Bādī’u’z-Zamán the Timurid, but ere a battle had taken place in Khurášán was compelled to turn his attention to Isfahán, the governor of which city had revolted against his authority. On his approach the governor fled to Qum, but was pursued and killed, and his severed head brought to Rustam. In the same year, 898/1492–3, he sent an expedition against Shírvarán, which celebrated its success in the Timúrian fashion by building pyramids of skulls. From these same Shírwánís, however, Báysunqur raised an army for the invasion of Ádharábáyján, whereupon Rustam released Sulṭán ‘Alí and the other Šafáwí prisoners at Ištakhr and sent them to avenge the death of their father, Shaykh Haydar, who had been slain by Báysunqur’s father Ya’qúb. Sulṭán ‘Alí and his followers were hospitably received at Tabríz by Rustam, and proceeded thence to Ahar, where they defeated and killed Báysunqur. Rustam, relieved of this anxiety, now grew jealous of Sulṭán ‘Alí’s increasing power and influence, and determined to destroy him. He sent one of his generals with 4000 horsemen after him, and a fierce battle ensued, wherein the Šafáwís, though only 700 in number, fought valiantly—“like lions,” says Angioletto—but were eventually defeated and Sulṭán ‘Alí slain, after nominating his young brother Ismá’īl as his successor. He and his brother Ibráhím fled to Gírán and Mázandarán, and remained in hiding for some time at Láhiján and Lishta-Nishá, whence Ib ráhím presently made his way in disguise to his mother at Ardábíl. Ismá’īl remained in Gírán, protected by its governor Káır Kiýá Mírzá ‘Alí, and an active and successful Shi‘ite propaganda was carried on amongst the inhabitants, amongst whom the number of “Šúfís of Láhiján” or “Red-heads”

1 See p. 101 of the Hakluyt volume already so often cited. Caterino Zeno (Ibid., p. 46) says that the Šafáwí troops, though few, performed prodigies of valour, and there was not one who was not dead or mortally wounded. The Venetians throughout confuse Sulṭán ‘Alí with his father Shaykh Haydar (“Sechaidare,” “Sechaidar”).
(Qizil-bāsh), as they were called\(^1\), continued steadily to increase.

In 905/1499–1500 Isma‘īl, then only thirteen years of age\(^2\), marched forth on his career of conquest with the nine tribes which owed him allegiance, to wit the Ustájílú, Shámlú, Takalú, Rúmlú, Wársáq, Dhu‘l-Qadar, Afshár, Qájr, and the Šúfís of Qára-bágh; and, after formally visiting the tombs of his illustrious ancestors at Ardabíl, and seeking the blessing of his aged mother, advanced by way of Qára-bágh, Gúkcha Deñíz and Erzinján on Shírwán. By this time news had spread abroad that the “Shaykh’s son” was about to claim his rights, and his disciples flocked to his standard from Syria, Diyár Bakr and Síwás, so that he now found himself at the head of 7000 men. Crossing the river Kur he attacked Farrukh Yasár, the king of Shírwán and slayer of his father, near Gulistán in the neighbourhood of Shamákhá, killed him, completely routed his army, and occupied Shírwán, where he possessed himself of the royal treasure. He passed the winter at Maḥmúd-ábád near that place, and appointed the Amír Shamsu‘d-Dín Zakariyyá his first Wazír, the theologian Shamsu‘d-Dín Gílání his Chancellor (Šadr), and Ḥusayn Beg Shámlú and Abdál Beg his counsellors.

At this juncture, in 907/1501–2, when he had taken Bákú and was besieging the fortress of Gulistán, news reached him that Alwand Beg, son of Yúsuf Beg of the “White Sheep” Turkmán dynasty, had advanced against him to Nakhjuwán, whither he at once turned his victorious banners. A great battle took place at Shúrúr, near Nakhjuwán, between the “White Sheep” Turkmáns, commanded by Amír ‘Osmán (‘Uthmán) of Mawṣíl (Mosul), and the Šafawí army, commanded by Pírí Beg

\(^1\) Munajjim-báshi, p. 181. The red caps from which they derived their second name are here said to have been first given by Shaykh Ḥaydar to his followers when he attacked Shírwán.

\(^2\) According to Munajjim-báshi he was born in Rajab 892 (June–July, 1487).
Qájár. The Turkmáns were utterly defeated and their general captured and put to death. Alwand Beg fled to Diyar Bakr, and Isma‘íl occupied Tabríz, where he was crowned King. In the following year, 908/1502–3, he invaded ‘Iráq and routed Murád Beg, the last ruler of the “White Sheep” dynasty, who fled to Shíaráz, which, together with Kázarún, Kirmán and Yazd, submitted to the victorious Sháh Isma‘íl Şafawí in the course of the next year or two. He spent the winter of A.D. 1504–5 at Isfahan, destined to become the glorious capital of the dynasty of which he had by now so truly and firmly laid the foundations, and here he received an ambassador from the Ottoman Sultán Báyazíd II. The fuller history of the origin, development and decline of this great and truly national dynasty will form the subject of the next volume.

The relations between the Tímúrids and the Şafawís, first between Bábúr and Sháh Isma‘íl and later between Humáyún and Sháh Tháhmásp, will also be more fully considered in the next volume. On the whole these relations were singularly friendly, in spite of the difference of doctrine which contributed so much to isolate Persia from her Sunní neighbours after the rise of the Şafawí power and the definite adoption of the Shi‘a creed as the national faith. Bábúr and Sháh Isma‘íl were united by a common fear and hatred of Sháy-bání Khán and his terrible Uzbeks, at whose hands the House of Tímúr suffered so much during its last days in Khurásán and Transoxiana. The years 1501–7 were marked by a series of triumphs on the part of Sháy-bání Khán, who successively seized Samarqand, Farghána, Táshkand, Khwárazzm, and finally Khurásán. Sultán Husayn, of whose brilliant court at Herát we have already spoken, died in 1506, and the weakness and lack of unity of his sons and younger kinsmen made them an easy prey to Sháy-bání Khán, who, in the course of 1507, succeeded in defeating and killing all of them with the exception of Sultán Husayn’s son Badi‘u’z-Zamán, who fled for protection first to Sháh
Isma'îl and later to the Ottoman court at Constantinople, where he died. In 1510, however, Shâh Isma'îl marched into Khurâsân against the Uzbeks and utterly defeated them at the battle of Merv. Shaybâni Khán was amongst the slain. His body was dismembered and his limbs distributed amongst different cities; his skull, set in gold, was made into a drinking-cup for Shâh Isma'îl; the skin of his head, stuffed with straw, was sent to the Ottoman Sultan Bâyazîd at Constantinople; and one of his hands constituted the gruesome credentials of an envoy sent to one of his vassals, the ruler of Mâzan- darân. Bábur's sister, Khân-zâda Begum, who had fallen into the hands of the Uzbeks ten years before, was delivered from her long captivity by Shâh Isma'îl, and was sent with all honour to her brother, who in his Memoirs gives an interesting account of their meeting. Friendly embassies were interchanged between the two monarchs (for Bábur had already in 1508 formally assumed the title of Pádishâh or Emperor), and as Bábur's final abandonment of Transoxiana a year or two later, followed in 1526–9 by his successful invasion of India, which thenceforth became the seat of his government, removed all likelihood of friction between him and the Persians, the friendship thus formed was fairly stable, and was renewed in the next generation by Shâh Tâhmâsp's hospitality to Humâyûn when he was temporarily expelled from his kingdom and driven into exile. Indeed the complaisance shown by Bábur towards the strong religious views of Shâh Isma'îl at one time considerably impaired his popularity amongst his subjects beyond the Oxus, who then, as now, were remarkable for their extreme devotion to the Sunní doctrine, which Shâh Isma'îl relentlessly persecuted. Nor were the relations between Persia and India confined to their rulers, for during the

---

1 See W. Erskine's History of India, etc., vol. i, pp. 303-4.
2 Ed. Ilminsky, p. 11.
whole Safawí period, and even beyond it, we shall, in a subsequent volume, meet with a whole series of Persian poets, including some of the most eminent of later days, who emigrated from their own country to India to seek their fortune at the splendid court of the so-called Mogul Emperors, where, until the final extinction of the dynasty in the Indian Mutiny, Persian continued to hold the position not only of the language of diplomacy but of polite intercourse.
CHAPTER VII.

PROSE WRITERS OF THE LATER TÍMÚRID PERIOD.

The literary and artistic wealth of the period now under review has been already summarily indicated in the preceding chapter, and it will be our business in this chapter to discuss in greater detail the work of some of its most eminent representatives in the world of letters. To attempt to treat, even in the briefest manner, of all its notable poets and men of learning would be impossible in any moderate compass. Thus the Habíbís-Síyar, a history specially valuable on account of the biographies of notable writers and poets added as an appendix to each reign or historical period, enumerates no less than 211 persons of this class who flourished during the Tímúrid period, of whom all save 23, who belong to the reign of Tímúr himself, represent the period now engaging our attention\(^1\). The city of Herát during the reign of Sultán Abú'l-Gházi Ḥusayn (A.H. 878-912 = A.D. 1473-1506) may be regarded as the culminating point of this brilliant period, and it derives an additional importance from the great influence which it exercised on the development of Ottoman Turkish literature, a fact duly

\(^1\) These biographical notices all occur in vol. iii, part 3, on the following pages of the Bombay lithographed edition of 1857: pp. 85-92 (reign of Tímúr); pp. 142-150 (reign of Sháh-rukh); pp. 151-161 (reign of Ulugh Beg); pp. 171-174 (reign of Abúl-Qásim Bábur); pp. 196-201 (reign of Abú Sa'íd); pp. 334-350 (reign of Sultán Abúl-Gházi Ḥusayn b. Bayqará). To these must be added some of those persons who flourished contemporaneously under the patronage of the Turkmáns of the “White Sheep” (Aq-goyúntá) and early Šafawís (vol. iii, part 4, pp. 110-118), who raise the total number of separate biographical notices to 274.
emphasized and fully illustrated by the late Mr E. J. W. Gibb in the second volume of his monumental *History of Ottoman Poetry*.

“This school,” he says (pp. 7–8), speaking of what he denotes as “the Second Period,” “which cultivated chiefly lyric and romantic poetry, and which was distinguished by its love of artifice, reached its meridian in the latter half of the fifteenth century at the brilliant court of the scholarly and accomplished Sultán Husayn [ibn] Bayqará of Herát. Here its spirit and substance were gathered up and summarized in their manifold works by the two greatest men of letters of the day, the poet Jámi and the statesman Mîr ‘Alí Shîr Nawá’î. As these two illustrious writers were the guiding stars of the Ottoman poets during the whole of the Second Period (a.d. 1450–1600), it will be well to look for a moment at their work.”

After a brief account of these two eminent men, and an admirable characterization of the school which they represent, Mr Gibb (pp. 12–13) summarizes its chief features as “subjectivity, artificialness, and conventionality, combined with an ever-increasing deftness of craftsmanship and brilliance of artistry.” “This all-absorbing passion for rhetoric,” he adds, “was the most fatal pitfall on the path of these old poets; and many an otherwise sublime passage is degraded by the obtrusion of some infantile conceit, and many a verse, beautiful in all else, disfigured by the presence of some extravagant simile or grotesque metaphor.”

The high esteem in which the poet Jámi was held in Turkey and at the Ottoman Court is proved by two Persian letters addressed to him by Sultán Báyázíd II (a.d. 1481–1512) and printed in the *Munshá’dat* of Firídún Bey¹. The first, which is in a highly complimentary strain, was, as we learn from Jámi’s answer, written “for no special reason and without the intervention of any demand, out of pure grace and

¹ Constantinople, Jumáda ii, 1274 (Feb. 1858), vol. i, pp. 361–364.
favour, and sincere virtue and gratitude." In his second letter Sultan Bayazid expresses his gratification at receiving the poet's letter and informs him that he is sending a gift of one thousand florins, which gift is gratefully acknowledged by the poet in a second letter sent by the hand of a certain darwish named Muḥammad Badakhshi, who, with some others, was setting out on the pilgrimage to Mecca. Unfortunately none of these four letters are dated. Two other Persian scholars, the philosopher Jalālu’d-Dīn Dawānī and the theologian Farīdu’d-Dīn Aḥmad-i-Taftāzānī, were similarly honoured by the same Sultan, but in the last case Taftāzānī took the initiative (October 25, 1505), while the Sultan's answer was not written until July 13, 1507. The great influence exerted on Ottoman poetry by Jāmī's illustrious patron, the Minister Mīr 'Alī Shīr Nawa’ī, who was equally distinguished in prose and poetry, both in Eastern Turkish and Persian, is emphasized by Mr E. J. W. Gibb; who also describes how the eminent Ottoman jurisconsult Mu’ayyad-zādā ‘Abdu’r-Rahmān Chelebī (afterwards in the reign of Sultan Bayazid II famous as a generous patron of letters and collector of books) being compelled in A.D. 1476-7 to flee from his country, spent seven years at Shiráz studying with the above-mentioned philosopher Jalālu’d-Dīn Dawānī. It was, in short, during this period which we are now considering that Persia began to exercise over Ottoman Turkish literature the profound influence which in the next period she extended to India.

From these general considerations we must now pass to a more particular examination of the most eminent prose

---

1 "The Ottoman florin was a gold coin of the approximate value of 9 shillings." Gibb's *Ottoman Poetry*, vol. ii, p. 26, *ad calc.*


writers of this period, deferring the consideration of the poets to another chapter.

**HISTORIANS AND BIOGRAPHERS.**

In this, as in the preceding period, history and biography are well represented, and at least nine or ten writers on these subjects deserve at any rate a brief mention. Speaking generally they are distinctly inferior in quality to their predecessors in the Mongol period, for, while their style is often almost as florid as, though less ingenious than, that of *Waṣṣāf-i-Ḥaḍrat*, they fall far short of him in wealth of detail, breadth of treatment, and citation of documents of historic value, while they compare even more unfavourably with the great historical writers 'Alá‘u’d-Dín Ṭārḫa ‘Aṭā Malik-i-Juwaynī and Rashīdu’d-Dín Faḍlu’llāh. We shall now consider them briefly in chronological order.

**(1) Ḥāfiz Abrū.**

Almost all that is known about this historian, whose name is more familiar than his works, which remain unpublished and are very rare even in manuscript, is contained in Rieu's *Persian Catalogues*. His proper name (though otherwise given elsewhere, as we shall presently see) is generally assumed to have been Khwāja Nūru’d-Dín Luṭfu’llāh. He was born in Herāt, but in what year is not recorded, and educated in Hamadān. After the death of Tímūr, who showed him marked favour, he attached himself to the court of his son and successor Sháh-rukh, and of his grandson Prince Báysunqrūf, for whom he wrote his great history. This history, generally known as *Zubdatu’t-Tawārikh* ("the Cream of Histories")

1 See pp. 421–424 for his geography, and pp. 16–18 of the Supplement for his history. A long and careful account of three MSS. of the latter is also given by Baron Victor Rosen in his *Collections Scientifiques* (Manuscrits persans), vol. iii, pp. 52–111.

2 Or Khwāf, according to Faṣḥī. See p. 426 infra.
but called by Faṣḥī of Khwāf Majmaʿūt-Tawārikh as-Sultānt ("the Royal Compendium of Histories"), was concluded in A.H. 829 or 830 (A.D. 1426 or 1427), only three or four years before the author's death. It comprised four volumes, of which, unfortunately, the third and fourth, dealing with the post-Muhammadan Persian dynasties down to the date of composition, appear to be lost. Manuscripts of the first and second volumes exist at St Petersburg and are fully described by Baron V. Rosen; a copy of vol. i, formerly in the collection of the Comte de Gobineau, is now in the British Museum and is numbered Or. 2774; and I myself possess a very fine copy of vol. ii (containing the history of Muhammad and the Caliphate down to its extinction) dated Friday, 15 Shaʿbān, 829 (June 22, 1426), and copied in Herāt in the very year of the work's completion.

Besides this history, Ḥāfiz Abrū also compiled a great geographical work, of which the first volume is represented by a manuscript (Or. 1577) in the British Museum (fully described by Rieu), and another in St Petersburg. From this work, composed in 820–823/1417–1420 for Shāh-rukh Rieu has succeeded in gleaning many particulars of the author's life, and especially of his very extensive travels. He accompanied Tīmūr in several of his campaigns, and was with him at the taking of Aleppo and Damascus in 803/1400–1401. When Shāh-rukh succeeded to the throne he settled down in Herāt to a life of letters not later than 818/1415–1416, but died at Zanjān while returning with the royal cavalcade from Adharbayjān, and is buried there.

The following short obituary notice of him occurs in the rare Mujmal ("Compendium") of Faṣḥī of Khwāf under the year 833/1429–1430, in which (contrary to most authorities, who give the following year) his death is placed by this writer:

---

1 See Rieu's Pers. Cat., p. 422a. 2 See Rosen, loc. cit., p. 53.
3 See the first foot-note on the preceding page.
6 See Rieu's Persian Cat., p. 422, and the chronogram there cited.
"Death of Mawláná Shihábu'd-Dín ʿAbdu'lláh of Khwáfí, known as Ḥáfiz Abrú, the compiler of the Royal Compendium of Histories, on Sunday the 3rd of Shawwál, at Sarjam, at the time of the return of His Supreme and Imperial Majesty from Ádharbáýján. He is buried at Zanján near the tomb of the Divine Doctor Akhú Abí'il-Faraj-i-Zanjání."

Free use was made of the Zubdátut-Tawáríkh by the author's younger contemporary ʿAbdu'r-Rázzaq of Samarqand, of whom we shall shortly have to speak, and half of the geographical work mentioned above consists of a historical summary of post-Muhammadan Persian history, which becomes very detailed in the latter part, down to Ramaḍán 822 (October, 1419). The author's style, so far as can be judged from vol. ii of the Zubdátut-Tawáríkh (the only portion of his work to which I have access) is very simple and direct, and it is greatly to be desired that his works, so far as they are available, should be published.

(2) Faṣḥí of Khwáf. This notable historian and biographer is known to us only by one book, the Mujinal, or "Compendium" of History and Biography, of which, so far as I know, only three manuscripts exist. Of these three MSS. one, belonging to the Institut des Langues Orientales du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères de St Pétersbourg is described by Baron V. Rosen, whose description is supplementary to the fuller and earlier one of Dorn. One of the two others belonged to the late Colonel Raverty, the Pushtú scholar, from whose widow it was purchased in 1907 by the trustees of the "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial." The third was given to me by my excellent friend Mr Guy le Strange, who bought it from the late Sir Albert Houtum-

1 The discrepancy between the name and birthplace as given here and elsewhere has been already noticed on p. 424 supra.
2 See Jámí's Nafahátu'l-Uns, ed. Nassau Lees, p. 166, where he is called Akhí Faraj-i-Zanjání, and is said to have died in 457/1065.
3 Collections Scientifiques de l'Institut... Manuscrits persans, pp. 111-113.
Schindler. It is much more modern than the Raverty MS., but is accurate and well-written, and has a lacuna of only ten years (A.H. 834–844 = A.D. 1430–1440) instead of the hundred and twenty-two (A.H. 718–840 = A.D. 1318–1437) which are wanting in the other.

In 1915 the expatriated Belgian professors of oriental languages temporarily resident in Cambridge brought out at the University Press there a number of the *Museum*, to which, at their kind invitation, I contributed an article of thirty pages on this interesting work, with numerous extracts, based on the two English manuscripts, both of which were then in my keeping. The *Mujmal*, as I there pointed out, consists of an Introduction, two Discourses, and a Conclusion. The Introduction epitomizes the history of the world from its creation to the birth of the Prophet Muhammad. The first Discourse continues the history down to the *hijra*, or flight of the Prophet from Mecca to al-Madina. The second Discourse, which is by far the largest and most important part of the book, contains the history of the years A.H. 1–845 (A.D. 622–1442). The Conclusion, which is unfortunately missing in all known manuscripts, contains an account of the city of Herat, the author's birth-place and home, and its history in pre-Muhammadan times.

All that we know of the author, Faṣḥī of Khwāf, is derived from this book, and I have found no mention of him elsewhere. Rosen says that he was born in 777/1375–6, but I have not been able to verify this statement from the *Mujmal*. In 807/1404–5 he was employed with three other persons whom he names on business connected with the Treasury. In 818/1415–6 he accompanied Sháh-rukh to Shíráz to subdue the rebellious activities of the latter's nephew Prince Bayqará. In 825/1422 he was sent to Kirman on business connected with the Treasury. In 827/1424 he returned thence to Bádghís. In 828/1424–5 he obtained favourable notice and State employment from Prince Báysunqur.
Under the year 841/1437-8 he cites some verses by Shihábu'd-Dín 'Azízu'lláh of Khwáf commemorating the birth of a son on the 24th of Dhu'l-Hijja (June 18, 1438). In 842/1438-9 he mentions the birth of his grandson Mughíthu'd-Dín Abú Nasr Muḥammad ibn Muhámmad on the 10th of Dhu'l-Qa'da (April 24, 1439). In 843/1439-40 he had the misfortune to offend and to be imprisoned by Gáwhar Shád Aqa, and he was again imprisoned in 845/1441-2, with which year the chronicle ends (though the date 849/1445 is mentioned in a verse with which one of the MSS. concludes), and it was apparently in that year, on the 15th of Dhu'l-Hijja (April 26, 1442), that he presented his book to Sháh-rukh.

The detailed account of Fašíhí's Mujmal which I published in the Cambridge number of the Muséon to which reference has been already made absolves me from the necessity of enlarging on its contents in this place. Its two chief features are a great simplicity of style and a special attention to matters of literary interest. It is arranged in the form of a chronicle the events of each year, including the deaths of eminent persons of all sorts, being grouped together under that year, and in the necrological part it is remarkable how large is the proportion of poets and men of letters, more especially, of course, of such as belonged to Khurásán and Transoxiana. Moreover it is evident that Fašíhí drew his information to a large extent from sources other than those employed by later and better known biographers and historians, which fact gives a special value to his work.

(3) Kamálu'd-Dín 'Abdu'r-Razzáq of Samarqand.

Though born at Herát in 816/1413, 'Abdu'r-Razzáq is called "of Samarqand," which was the native place of his father Mawláná Jalálú'd-Dín Isháq, a judge and chaplain in

1 See pp. 57-8 of my article in the Muséon.
2 The Habíbu's-Siyar gives the date of his birth as the 12th of Sha'bán in this year (Nov. 7, 1413).
Sháh-rukh’s army. At the age of 25, in 841/1437–8, after his father’s death, ‘Abdu’r-Razzáq attracted the notice of that monarch by a grammatical treatise which he had composed and dedicated to him. Four years later, in 845/1441–2, he was sent to India on a special mission to the king of Bijnáñagar, which lasted three years, and of which he gives a detailed narrative in his history. In 850/1446–7 he was sent on a mission to the king of Bijnáñagar, which lasted three years, and of which he gives a detailed account in his history.

Four of bimarqand years later, in 845/1441–2, he was sent to India on a special mission to the king of Bijnáñagar, which lasted three years, and of which he gives a detailed narrative in his history.

In 850/1446–7 he was sent on a mission to the king of Bijnáñagar, which lasted three years, and of which he gives a detailed account in his history. In 850/1446–7 he was sent on a mission to the king of Bijnáñagar, which lasted three years, and of which he gives a detailed account in his history.
made to the curious coincidence, noticed by the author of the *Maṭlaʿuʾis-Saʿdāyν*, that the date of the death of the last great Mongol ruler of Persia, Abū Saʿīd, corresponds almost exactly with the birth of Timūr, the founder of the next great Tartar Empire in Central Asia1.

Manuscripts of the *Maṭlaʿuʾis-Saʿdāyν*, though not very common, are to be found in most large collections, and, so far as I have seen, are generally above the average in point of excellence and accuracy2. The work, though based to a considerable extent on the *Zubdatuʿt-Tawārikh* of Ḥāfiz Abrú, is of great importance, and a critical edition of it is much needed, for it deals in a very detailed manner with a very important period of Persian history, and is the work of one who wrote at first hand and took an active part in many of the events which he describes.

(4) *Muʿīnuʾd-Dīn Muḥammad of Isfīzār.*

Muʿīnuʾd-Dīn-i-Isfīzārī is chiefly notable on account of his monograph on the history of Herāt entitled *Rawdatuʿl-Jannāt fi Taʾrikhī Madīnati Herāt*, written for Sultan Ḥusayn Abūʾl-Ghāzī, and carried down to the year 875/1470–1; but he was also skilled in the epistolary style (ṭarassul) of the Court and of Diplomacy, on which he compiled a manual, and was besides something of a poet3. Three MSS of the History of Herāt are preserved in the British Museum4; another, belonging to Mr A. G. Ellis, copied in 1073/1663, has been generously placed at my disposal by the owner; and yet another, belonging to the late Sir A. Houtum-Schindler, came into my possession in Jan.

1 See p. 159 supra.
2 There is a MS. of the work in 2 vols. (Or. 267 and 268) in the Cambridge University Library, and a much better one (Dd. 3. 5), dated 989/1582, in the Library of Christ's College, Cambridge.
3 *Habībuʿs-Siyar*, vol. iii, part 3, p. 342.
4 See Rieu's *Pers. Cat.*, pp. 206–7, and his *Supplement*, p. 64.
A detailed account of this important work, written in French by the late M. Barbier de Meynard, was published in the *Journal Asiatique*, 5th Series, vol. xvi, pp. 461-520. It is divided into 26 Rawḍas or “Gardens,” of which i–vi treat of the city of Herat, its environs, topography and excellence, and its earlier rulers in Muḥammadan times; vii–viii of the Kurt dynasty and its overthrow by Tīmūr; and the remainder of the history of Tīmūr and his successors down to the second accession of Sultān Ḥusayn Abū’l-Ghāzī. The name of the month of Šafar (شفر), in which the book was completed, yields by the abjad computation the date of completion, 875 (August, 1470). The author enumerates amongst his sources the histories of Abū Ishāq Aḥmad b. Yá-Sín, Shaykh ‘Abdu’r-Raḥmán Fāmī, and Sayfī of Herat, as well as the Kurt- nämā, or “Book of the Kurt Dynasty” of Rabī’ of Būshanj. He also cites the above-mentioned Matlā’u’s-Ṣā’dayn in at least one place (in Rawḍa xiii).


Mīrkhwānḍ’s voluminous general history, the Rawḍatu’s-Ṣafā, is perhaps the best-known work of this sort in Persia, and has attracted a quite undue amount of attention. It has been published in lithographed editions at Bombay (1271/1854–5) and Tīhhrān (1270–4/1854–8), while a Turkish translation was printed at Constantinople in 1258/1842. A number of separate portions, dealing with particular dynasties, have been printed, with or without translations, in Europe; and of an English translation of the earlier portion by Mr Rehatsek three or four volumes were published under the auspices of the Royal Asiatic Society. These, it must be admitted with regret, are of no great value, for, apart from the fact that any student desirous of acquainting himself with the ideas of the Muslims as to the prophets, patriarchs and
kings of olden time would prefer to seek his information from earlier and more trustworthy sources, the translation itself is both inaccurate and singularly uncouth, nor is it to be desired that English readers should form their ideas even of the verbose and florid style of Mírkhwánd from a rendering which is needlessly grotesque. The esteem in which this history is still held in Persia, however, is sufficiently shown by the fact that one of the greatest Persian writers of modern times, Rídá-qlí Khán Lálábáshí, poetically surnamed Hidáyat, thought it worth while to add a Supplement bringing the narrative down to his own time, a few years after the middle of the nineteenth century. This Supplement is a valuable source of information for the history of modern Persia, including the rise of the Bábí religion and the civil wars and persecutions connected therewith, but its consideration naturally belongs to a later period.

Of Mírkhwánd's life not much is recorded, even by his admiring grandson Khwándamír, the author of the Habíbu's-Siyar. His father Sayyid Burhánu'd-Dín, a native of Bukhárá, migrated to Balkh, where he died. Mírkhwánd spent most of his life at Herát under the protection and patronage of that Maecenas of the age Mír 'Alí Shír Nawá', and died there, after a long illness, on the 2nd of Dhu'l-Qa'dá, 903 (June 22, 1498) at the age of sixty-six. Of the seven books into which the historical part of the Rawdatu's-Šafá is divided, the first contains the history of the patriarchs, prophets, and pre-Muhammadan kings of Persia; the second, that of the Prophet Muhammad and the Four Orthodox Caliphs; the third, that of the Twelve Imáms and the Umayyad and 'Abbásid Caliphs; the fourth, that of the post-Muhammadan dynasties of Persia down to the irruption of Tímúr; the fifth, that of the Mongols and

1 See Habíbu's-Siyar, part 3, vol. iii, p. 339; Rieu's Pers. Cat., pp. 87-8; S. de Sacy's Notice sur Mirkhond in his Ménóire sur les Antiquités de la Perse, and other references given by Rieu.
Tartars down to Tímúr; the sixth, that of Tímúr and his successors to 873/1468–9; while the seventh, which has been continued by another hand (probably the author’s grandson Khwáñdamír) to a period several years later than Mírkhwáñ’s death, is wholly devoted to the life and reign of his patron Abu’l-Gházi Sultán Húsayn, who died in 912/1506–7. The two last books (vi and vii), which deal with the author’s own time, are naturally of much greater worth and authority than the earlier portions, and it is a pity that the attention of students of this history has not been more concentrated on them. The style employed by Mírkhwáñ is much more florid and bombastic than that of the preceding historians mentioned in this chapter, and in this respect is typical of much that was written about this time. This style, imported into India by Bábur, continued to flourish at the court of the “Great Moguls” and gave rise to the prevalent idea that this floridity and bombast are essentially Persian, which is far from the truth, for both in earlier and later times many notable works were written with a simplicity and sobriety which leave little to be desired. It was under Tartar, Turkish, Indian, and other non-Íránían patronage that this inflated rhetoric especially flourished, and the Ottoman Turks in particular developed it to a very high degree. Sir Charles Eliot in his Turkey in Europe (new edition, 1908, p. 106) has described it in words so admirable that I cannot refrain from quoting them here:

“The combination of dignity and fatuity which this style affords is unrivalled. There is something contagious in its ineffable complacency, unruffled by the most palpable facts. Everything is sublime, everybody magnanimous and prosperous. We move among the cardinal virtues and their appropriate rewards (may God increase them!), and, secure in the shadow of the ever-victorious Caliph, are only dimly conscious of the existence of tributary European powers and ungrateful Christian subjects. Can any Western poet transport his readers into a more enchanted land?”
(6) Khwándamír.

One is much tempted to include amongst the historians of this epoch Mírkhwánd’s grandson Khwándamír, on the threefold ground that he also was one of the many writers and artists who owed his success in large measure to the enlightened patronage of Mír ‘Alí Shír Nawá’il; that he belonged not merely to the same circle as Mírkhwánd, but was his disciple as well as his grandson; and lastly, that his first work, the Khulášatü’l-Akhbár, or “Quintessence of Histories,” was not only in essence an abridgement of the Rawdatu’s-Safá, but was actually written in 905/1499-1500, two years before the end of the period with which this chapter deals. His greater work, however, the Ḥabíbu’s-Siyar, so often cited in this and the preceding chapter, was not written until 929/1523, and he lived until 941/1534-5, so that he really belongs more properly to the next period, and may be more appropriately considered in connection with the founder of the Šáfawí dynasty, Sháh Isma’il, with a long account of whose reign the Ḥabíbu’s-Siyar concludes.

Biographical Works.

After the historians come the biographers, of whose works five or six deserve notice, to wit Dawlatsháh’s “Memoirs of the Poets” (Tadhkiratu’sh-Shu’árá); Mír ‘Alí Shír Nawá’il’s Majálisu’n-Nafá’ís (which, however, is in the Turkí, not the Persian language); Jámi’s “Lives of the Saints” (Nafahátu’l-Uns); Abu’l-Ghází Sulţán Ḥusayn’s “Assemblies of Lovers” (Majálisu’l-‘Ushqáq); Ḥusayn Wá’íz-i-Káshífí’s “Mausoleum of Martyrs” (Rawdatu’sh-Shuhádá) and the Rashahát of his son ‘Alí. Each of these works will be briefly considered here; but as Nawá’il, Jámi, and Ḥusayn Wá’íz-i-Káshífí are more celebrated in other capacities than as biographers, their lives will be more appropriately sketched when we come to speak of writers belonging to other categories.
(1) Jámi’s Nafahátu’l-UNS and Baháristán.

Mullá Núru’d-Dín ‘Abdu’r-‘Rahmán Jámi, who derives his last and best-known name, which he uses in his poems as his takhallus or nom-de-guerre, from the town of Jám in Khurásán where he was born on November 7, 1414, was equally remarkable for the quality and the quantity of his literary work. He is often described (wrongly, in my opinion, for reasons which will be given later) as “the last great classical poet of Persia,” and it is as a mystical poet of remarkable grace and fertility of imagination that he is chiefly known. Like his great predecessor of the thirteenth century, Shaykh Farídu’d-Dín ‘Aṭṭár, who even excelled him in fecundity, though he fell short of him in grace, he composed, besides his numerous poems, a great Biography of Mystic Saints entitled Nafahátu’l-UNS, or “Breaths of Fellowship.” This book, of which a good edition was printed at Calcutta in 1859, with an excellent notice of the author by W. Nassau Lees, comprises 740 pages, contains the lives of 611 Şúfí saints, male and female, and is one of the most useful and easily available sources of information on this subject. It was written in 881/1476, and contains, besides the biographical notices, which are arranged more or less in chronological order, and conclude with the poets Háfiz, Kamál of Khujand, Maghríbí, and others who flourished at the end of Tímúr’s and beginning of Sháh-rukh’s reign, an Introduction of 34 pages dealing, in nine sections, with various matters connected with the doctrine, practice and history of the Şúfís or Muhammadian mystics.

The book is written in the simple and direct style suitable to such a work; and indeed Jámi’s taste was too good and his sincerity too great to allow him to fall into the verbosity and bombast which mar so many books of this period.

1 Sha’bán 23, A.H. 817.
Another of Jámi’s prose works, the Baháristán, or “Spring-land,” of which the form seems to have been suggested by Sa‘dí’s Gulistán or “Rose-garden,” contains some biographical matter in chapter i, dealing with the sayings of the saints, and chapter vii, on poetry and poets. This work, however, is designed rather to yield amusement and instruction than accurate biographical information. In style it is distinctly more ornate than the Nafahátíl-Uns. An English translation was published by the so-called “Káma-Shastra Society.”

(2) Dawlatsháh’s Tadkhiratu’sh-Shu’ará.

Amír Dawlatsháh, son of ‘Alá’u’d-Dawla Bakhtísháh Ghází of Samarqand, is the author of the best known “Memoirs of the Poets” existing in Persian, and is chiefly responsible, through his interpreter to the West, Von Hammer¹, for the perspective in which the Persian poets stand in European eyes. His “Memoirs” are divided into seven Tabaqát or Generations, each containing accounts of some twenty more or less contemporary poets and the princes under whose patronage they flourished. There is also an Introduction on the art of Poetry, and a Conclusion dealing with seven poets contemporary with the author and the virtues and accomplishments of his royal patron Abu’l-Ghází Sulṭán Husayn. This is an entertaining but inaccurate work, containing a good selection of verses and a quantity of historical errors which have in some cases misled even such good and careful scholars as Rieu. The book was lithographed in Bombay in 1887 and published by me from a selection of the best available manuscripts in 1901 as the first volume of my short-lived “Persian Historical Texts Series.” A Turkish version by Sulaymán Fahmí was also published in Constantinople in 1259/1843 under the title of Safínatu’sh-Shu’ará.

¹ Geschichte der schönen Redekünste Persiens, mit einen Blüthenlese aus zweihundert persischen Dichtern (Vienna, 1818).
The oldest account of Dawlatshah is that given by his contemporary Mir 'Ali Shír Nawá'i in his *Majálisu'n-Nafá'ís*, which will be mentioned directly. A notice is devoted to him in chapter vi of that work, dealing with "sundry gentlemen and noblemen of Khurásan and other places whose ingenuity and talent impelled them to write poetry, but who, by reason of their high estate and exalted rank, did not persevere therein." He is there described as "a wholly excellent youth, unassuming and of good parts," who relinquished worldly pomp and power for a life of seclusion and study, and "composed a Corpus Poetarum on the very same subject which is treated in this manual." After praising this work, Nawá'i adds that news had recently been received of his death, which the *Mir'átu's-Šafá*, according to Rieu¹, places in 900/1494-5. This does not agree with the statement of Nawá'i, who wrote in 896/1490-1, unless the report of Dawlatsháh's death which reached him was false. Dawlatsháh's "Memoir" was composed in 892/1487, when he was about fifty years of age. Of the living contemporary poets whom he mentions Jámi is by far the most eminent, and I believe that the notion prevalent amongst Persian students in Europe that he is "the last great classical poet of Persia" arises ultimately from the fact that, directly or indirectly, they derive their ideas from Dawlatsháh.²

(3) Mir 'Alí Shír Nawá'i's *Majálisu'n-Nafá'ís*.

Of Mir 'Alí Shír Nawá'i, the patron of a whole circle of poets, writers and artists, and himself a poet of no mean order, something has been said already, and more remains to be said. For the moment we are only concerned with his biographical work, the *Majálisu'n-Nafá'ís*, written in the Eastern Turkí or

---

² Of the meagre information about Dawlatsháh which can be deduced from his book, an epitome will be found in my edition of his "Memoirs," p. 15 of the Preface.
Chaghatay dialect of Turkish which he did so much to popularize and refine. This work, of which I possess a fine manuscript, transcribed in 937/1530-1 at Samarqand, was composed in 896/1490-1, and comprises an Introduction and eight books.

Book i treats of poets who died while the author was still young and whom he never had the good fortune to meet, of whom the first and most important is Qāsimu’l-Anwār, who actually died in 835/1431-2, nine years before ‘Alī Shīr was born. Other celebrated poets mentioned in this chapter are Ādharī of Ḥisfarā’īn, Kātibī, Khayālī, Bisāṭī, Šibak, Qudsi, Tūsī, Bābā-Sawdā’ī, Badakhshī, Tālib of Jájarm, ‘Arifi, Masīhib, Ṣāhī of Sabzawār, etc.

Book ii treats of poets whom the author had known personally, but who were dead at the time his book was written. Of these the first and most celebrated is Sharafu’d-Dīn ‘Alī of Yazd, the author of the well-known history of Tīmūr known as the Zafar-nāma.

Book iii treats of poets who were flourishing when the author wrote and with whom he was personally acquainted, such as Amīr Shaykhum Suhaylī, Sayfī, Āṣafī, Bannā’ī and Ahlī of Tūrshīz.

Book iv treats of eminent and pious men who, though not primarily poets, wrote occasional verses, such as Ḥusayn Wā’īz-i-Kāshīfī, the historian Mīrkhwānd, etc.

Book v treats of Princes and members of the Royal Family in Khurasān and elsewhere who wrote occasional verses.

Book vi treats of scholars, poets and wits, not natives of Khurasān, who shewed poetic talent.

Book vii treats of Kings and Princes who have either composed verses, or cited the verses of others so appropriately as to entitle them to rank with poets. Amongst the rulers mentioned in this chapter are Tīmūr himself, Shāh-rukh, Khalīl Sultān, Ulugh Beg, Bāysunqur Mīrzā, ‘Abdu’l-Laṭif Mīrzā, and other Princes of the reigning house of Tīmūr.
Book viii treats of the virtues and talents of the reigning King Abul-Ghazi Sultan Husayn ibn Bayqara, to the political events of whose reign, as M. Belin observes in the monograph on Mir ‘Ali Shir which will be mentioned immediately, Mirkhwând devotes the seventh book of his Rawdatu’s-Safâ.

The monograph mentioned in the last sentence, which contains the best account of Mir ‘Ali Shir and his works with which I am acquainted, was published in the Journal Asiatique for 1861 and also as a tirage-à-part comprising 158 pages. It is entitled Notice biographique et litteraire sur Mir Ali-Chir Nevâî, suivie d’extraits tirées des œuvres du même auteur, par M. Belin, Secrétaire-Interprète de l’Ambassade de France à Constantinople. The extracts from the Majalisu’n-Nafâ’is (or “Galerie des Poètes” as Belin translates it) include the text and translations of the Introduction and Book vii. These suffice to give an adequate idea of the style and scope of the work, which, apart from the fact that it is written in Turkî instead of in Persian, differs from Dawlatshâh’s Memoirs in being much smaller in extent, and in dealing only with contemporary poets. It is worth noting that while, as we have already seen, Nawâ’î exercised a great influence over the development of Ottoman Turkish poetry, the Ottoman poets seem to have been entirely unknown to, or at least ignored by, him.

(4) Abul-Ghazi Sultan Husayn’s Majalisu’l-‘Ushshâq.

But for the principle embodied in the well-known Arabic saying, “the Words of Kings are the Kings of Words,” and the fact that another royal biographer, Sâm Mirzâ the Şafawi, has described it as supplying adequate proof of its author’s literary gifts, this book, “the Conferences of Lovers,” compiled by Sultan Husayn in 908–9/1502–3, hardly deserves to be mentioned

1 See p. 433 supra.
as a serious biographical work. Beginning with a flowery Preface, filled with citations from the mystical poets, on "real" (i.e. ideal) and "metaphorical" (i.e. material) love, and the latter considered as a bridge to the former, the author proceeds to give 76 (or in some MSS. 77) articles, each entitled Majlis ("Conference" or " Séance"), and each containing a more or less romantic account of some saintly or royal personage, and, in most cases, of some Platonic love-affair in which he was concerned. As Rieu has pointed out, the first 55 articles follow a chronological order, beginning with the Imam Ja’far aš-Šādiq (d. 151/768), and ending with the author’s contemporary the eminent poet Jámí (d. 898/1492–3). The last notice in the book is devoted to the author himself “Sultán Ḥusayn ibn Sultán Mańšūr ibn Bāyqará ibn ’Umar Shaykh ibn Tímúr Kúrkán.” The title of the book, Majálisu’l-‘Uskshág, is given in the following verse:

The only copy of this book which I have been able to consult is a modern but clearly written manuscript bearing the class-mark Or. 761 recently acquired by the Cambridge University Library, but I am informed that a lithographed edition has been published at Lucknow.

It should be added, however, that the great Bábúr disputes the authorship of this book (Bábur-náma, ed. Ilminsky, p. 221), which he criticizes very harshly, and which he declares was really written by Kamálu’d-Dín Ḥusayn Gázargáhi, one of the pseudo-Šúfis who frequented the society and enjoyed the patronage of Mír ‘Alí Shír Náwá’il. To this point I shall recur in discussing the work in question.

1 According to the well-known saying of the Šúf mystics: “Al-Majázu qanṭaratü’l-Ḥaqiqat” (“the Phenomenal is the Bridge to the Real”).
Husayn Wa'iz-i-Kashifi’s Rawdatu’is-Shuhadá.

Husayn-i-Kashifi, surnamed Wa’iz (“the Preacher”), is better known as the author of that famous but over-estimated work the Anwár-i-Suhayli, of which we shall speak presently; but his “Mausoleum” (or “Garden”) “of Martyrs,” which depicts in a rhetorical manner the persecutions and martyrdoms of the Prophets and Imáms, especially of the Prophet Muhammad’s grandson Husayn, the third Imám of the Shi‘ítes, and the vengeance which overtook their persecutors, though of no great account from a historical point of view, deserves mention in this place. It is fully described by Rieu¹, and has been lithographed at Lahore in 1287/1870-1. It was translated into Turkish by the poet Fu’dúlí of Baghdad², with some additions, about half a century after its original composition.

The Rashahát-i-‘Aynu’l-Hayát, by the son of Husayn-i-Káshifi.

This work, though composed in 909/1503-4 (a date indicated by the first word of its title Rashahát, or “Sprinklings”) and therefore falling just outside the period dealt with in this chapter, had best be considered here, since its author ‘Alí was the son of Husayn-i-Káshifi, the author of the work last mentioned, while it was based on notes taken in Dhu’l-Qa’da 889 (Nov.-Dec. 1484) and Rabi’ ii 893 (March-April, 1488) on the occasion of the writer’s visits to Khwája ‘Ubaydulláh (better known as Khwája Ahrár), the great Naqshbandi Shaykh, whose predecessors, life, teachings, miracles and disciples form its subject-matter. A manuscript of this book is preserved in the British Museum and is fully described by Rieu³, but it is not common, and, so far as I know, has never been published in its original form, though

a Turkish translation was printed at Constantinople in 1236/1820-1.

RELIGION, MYSTICISM AND PHILOSOPHY.

Less numerous and important in this period than the histories and biographies above enumerated are the works belonging to the above categories, but there are one or two of each class which deserve at least a brief notice.

(1) Ḥusayn-i-Kāshifi's Mawāhib-i-'Aliyya.

Ḥusayn-i-Kāshifi, who has been already mentioned as the author of the Rawḍatu'sh-Shuhadā, also compiled for Mīr ʿAlī Shīr a Persian Commentary on the Qurʿān, which, in allusion to his patron’s name, he entitled Mawāhib-i-'Aliyya. His original plan had been to write in four volumes a much larger and more detailed Commentary, entitled Jawāhiru't-Tafsir li-Tuhfati'l-Amīr (“Gems of Exegesis for a Gift to the Amīr”), but after finishing the first volume he resolved to moderate his ambitions and write a much smaller, simpler and more concise work on the same subject, to wit the Mawāhib, or “Gifts,” which he completed in 899/1493-4, eleven years before his death. Manuscripts of this book are not rare, but it is not often heard of, much less studied, at the present day in Persia. In India, however, I am informed that it is still widely read, and that it has been published there, though I have never seen a printed or lithographed edition.

(2) Akhlāq-i-Jalālī and (3) Akhlāq-i-Muḥsinī.

Of the older manuals of Ethics in Persian, the two best known and most popular after the Akhlāq-i-Nāṣirī (written about the middle of the thirteenth century of the Christian era by the celebrated astronomer Naṣīru'd-Dīn-i-Ṭūsī1) are the Akhlāq-i-Jalālī (properly entitled Lawāmiʿu'l-

---

1 See Rieu’s Persian Cat., pp. 9-11.
Ishrāq fi Makārimī’l-Akhlaq) composed by the philosopher Jalālū’d-Dīn Dawānī between A.D. 1467 and 1477, and dedicated to Úzún Hasan of the Āq-qoyūnlū or “White Sheep” dynasty; and the Akhlāq-i-Muḥṣint compiled by the already mentioned Ḥusayn-i-Kāshīfī, “the Preacher,” in 900/1494–5, and dedicated to Abu’l-Ghazi Sulṭān Ḥusayn ibn Bayqarā. All three books are available in printed or lithographed editions, which are enumerated by Rieu, and of that last mentioned both the text (A.D. 1823 and 1850) and the translation (A.D. 1851) have been printed at Hertford, for this book was, like its author’s other work the Anwār-i-Suhaylī, formerly popular (especially as a textbook for examinations) amongst Anglo-Indian officials.

It is to Metaphysics and Mysticism rather than to Ethics that the Persian genius turns, and none of these three books can be regarded as having any great value, except incidentally, as throwing light on Persian customs, institutions and ways of thought. The Akhlāq-i-Jalālī is much the most florid in style, and used formerly to be regularly prescribed in the second or advanced part of Persian in the Oriental (formerly Indian) Languages Tripos at Cambridge, on account of its supposed difficulty, which, however, lies rather in the form than the substance. Aristotle, as interpreted by Avicenna (Abu ‘Alí ibn Sīnā), has in the main determined the form and arrangement of Muhammadan Philosophy, which is primarily divided into “Practical Philosophy” (Hikmat-i-‘Amal) and “Theoretical Philosophy” (Hikmat-i-Nazari). Of these two main divisions each is subdivided into three branches: the Theoretical into Mathematics (Riyādiyyāt), Physical Science (Ṭab‘iyyāt), and Metaphysics (Mā fawqāt-Ṭab‘at or Mā ba’dāt-Ṭab‘at); and the Practical into Ethics (Tahdhibu’l-Akhlaq), Economics (Tadbiru’l-Manzil), and Politics (Siyāsatu’l-Mudun). It is with the three branches of the second division that the works now under consideration deal. The two which belong to this period have both been translated into English and
printed, the Akhlāq-i-Jalālī by W. F. Thompson (London, 1839) under the title of "Practical Philosophy of the Muhammadan People"; and the Akhlāq-i-Muḥsinī (Hertford, 1851) by H. G. Keene. The English reader who desires to acquaint himself with their contents can, therefore, easily do so, and no further description of them is required in this place.

As regards their authors, Jalālu’d-Dīn-i-Dawānī was born in 830/1426-7 at the village of Dawān (from which he derives his nisba) in the province of Fārs near Kāzarūn, where his father was Qādī or judge. He himself held the same office in the province and was also a professor at the Dārūl-Aytām or Orphans' College at Shīrāz, where he passed most of his life. He died and was buried at his native place in 908/1502-3. His fame even during his life-time spread far beyond the confines of his native land, and, as we have seen, received recognition even at the distant Ottoman Court. In spite of his fame, he seems to have left but little behind him besides his work on Ethics, except some Quatrains, written and commented by himself, and an explanation of one of the odes of Ḥāfīz.

To Ḥusayn-i-Kāshīfī we shall recur later.

(4) The Jawāhir-ul-Asrār, (5) the Lawd’ih,
and (6) the Ashi‘atu’l-Lama‘át.

Of the rich mystical literature of this period the major portion, which is in verse, will be discussed when we come to speak of the poets. Of the prose portion the three books mentioned above may be taken as typical. Two are commentaries on earlier texts, while the third is an independent work.

The Jawāhir-ul-Asrār wa Jawāhir-ul-Anwār ("Gems of Mysteries and Manifestations of Lights") is a commentary on the great Mystical Mathnawī of Mawlānā

---

1 See Rieu's Persian Cat., pp. 442-3.
2 See p. 423 supra.
Jalálú'd-Dín Rúmí by Kamálú'd-Dín Husayn b. ʻHasan of Khabárāzim, the author or translator of several other works, who was killed by the Uzbeks some time between 835 and 840 (A.D. 1432-37). He was the pupil of a somewhat celebrated Šúfí Shaykh, Khabárāza Abú'l-Wafá, had assiduously studied the Mathnawi from his youth upwards, and had already written a briefer commentary on it entitled Kunuzul-ʻHaqqīq ("Treasures of Truths"). The Jawahirul-ʻAsrār, the later and fuller commentary, has been lithographed in India. There is a manuscript of the first half in the British Museum, and one of the second Book (or Daftar) in the Cambridge University Library, besides a lithographed Indian edition. The most important part of the work is the Introduction, which deals with the history, terminology and doctrines of the Šúfís.

The two other works mentioned above are from the fertile pen of the great poet and mystic Mullá Núru'd-Dín ʻAbdu'r-Rahmán Jámí.

The Ashi'atul-Lama'át, or "Rays of the 'Flashes,'" is a running commentary on the Lama'át of ʻIráqi, which has been already discussed in a previous chapter.

Apart from manuscripts, which are not very common, the text has been published in Persia in an undated volume containing this and several other mystical treatises. Of the genesis of the work Jámí speaks thus in his Preface:

"It is represented that at the time when the learned, practising, gnostic lover, the author of excellent prose and admirable verse, that cup-bearer of the bowl of generosity to men of high aspirations, Fakhrú'd-Dín Ibrāhím of Hamadán, commonly known as ʻIráqi, attained to the society of that Exemplar of learned seekers after Truth and that Model of Unitarian Gnostics Abú'l-Maʿālī ʻSadru'l-ʻHaqq Wał'l-Millat wa'd-Dín Muḥammad of Qúnya"
(may God most High sanctify their secrets!), and heard from him the truths contained in the *Fusūṣūl-i-Hikam*¹, he compiled a short manual, which, inasmuch as it comprised several "flashes" from the lightnings of these truths, he entitled *Lama'āt*. Therein, in pleasant phrases and with charming allusions, he flung together jewels of verse and prose and mingled aphorisms Arabic and Persian, from which the signs of learning and wisdom were apparent, and in which the lights of taste and ecstasy were manifest, such as might awaken the sleeper, render him who is awakened cognizant of the mysteries, kindle the fire of Love and put in motion the chain of longing.

"But since the author [‘Iraqī] had become the target of the tongues of ‘the vilifiers of sundry men of good repute,' and had suffered at the hands of ‘certain ill-conditioned wanderers from the path,' the blindly orthodox have imposed on him the stigma of repudiation, and withdrawn from him the skirt of acceptance. This humble writer also, in view of this rejection and repudiation, abstained from preoccupying himself therewith; until the most illustrious of the ‘Brethren of Purity' in this country, and the most glorious of the friends of constancy (may God cause him to walk in the ways of His adept servants!), whose auspicious name has been enunciated in the course of this prayer in the best form of enigma and allusion between God and His servants, requested me to collate and correct the text thereof; which request could only be met with obedience. When I entered on this business, and ran over the details of its component parts, I saw in every leaf thereof a ‘Flash' from the lights of Truths, and perceived in every page a gust of the declaration of Divine Wisdom. The heart was attracted to the understanding of its subtleties, and the mind was troubled at the difficulty of comprehending its purport. Manuscripts of the text differed, and some of them appeared to be perverted from the path of accuracy. In certain cases of concision and passages of difficulty reference was made to the commentaries on it; but neither was any difficulty solved thereby, nor in any of them was any concise statement properly amplified. As a necessary consequence, this thought passed through a heart disposed to the understanding of subtleties, and this wish established itself in a mind regardful of the essence of truths, that, to correct its sentences and elucidate its hints, a commentary should be compiled gleaned from the sayings of the elders of the Path and leaders in the Truth, especially


² These two half-verses are from a quatrain generally ascribed to ‘Umar Khayyām. See E. H. Whinfield’s edition and versified translation, No. 199, pp. 134–5.
those two great Shaykhs Muḥyī’-Dīn Muḥammad ibnu’l-‘Arabī and his disciple and pupil Ṣadru’d-Dīn Muḥammad of Qūnya and their followers (may God most High sanctify their secrets!). So, in consequence of these promptings, the mind decided on undertaking this difficult task, which it brought to a conclusion, by the assistance of God’s Grace, in the shortest time. And since most of the statements which are included in this commentary are of the kind which have shone forth upon the heart from the consideration of the luminous words of the text, it is proper that it should be named ‘Rays of the “Flashes,”’ and should be represented to the eyes of students by this description. It is hoped of such as regard justly, though not of scoffers characterized by obstinacy, that when they take this manual into their consideration, and devote their thoughts to its perusal, wherever they see aught of goodness and perfection they will account it the gift of God (Glory be to Him and exalted is He!), whilst wherever they find any fault or defect they will attribute it to the impotence and shortcomings of humanity; and that they will not specially make the humble author a target for the arrows of reproach, nor cast themselves into the vortex of evil-seeking and evil-saying. We ask aid from God, to whom be glory!"

This Introduction is followed by a long dissertation on various points in the philosophy of the Mystics, together with questions and answers designed to elucidate special difficulties, after which the running commentary on the text follows. The book ends with the following Perso-Arabic chronogram, in which the word tammamtuḥu (تَمَّ الْتَّمَتُّ، “I completed it”) gives the date of completion as 885 (A.D. 1480–81):

باِنِمَاتِ هُسَنِي اسْتَهِجَ جَامِي اسْمِرَ،
بِتَسوِي‌ی‌اَیۡنَ شِرِّحَ تَوْفی‌یَنَفَتَ،
وَ إِذَا قَالَ تَمَّ التَّمَتُّهُ فَامَ بِٰۡدَا,
مَحَی’ اللَّهُ آنَاَبَ آتَاهُهُ،
مَعَلِّیَ بِرَلَّاتِ أَمَامِهِ،
بَیَا قَالَ تَأْرِیخَ إِتَامِهِ.

The Lawd’ih—a word which also, like Lamaʾát, means “Flashes” or “Effulgences” of Light—is a mystical treatise in prose mixed with quatrains comprising thirty sections called “Flashes.” It has been published in fac-simile with a Preface, translation and appendices,
by Mr E. H. Whinfield, who has made such valuable contributions to our knowledge of Persian mysticism, aided by that great scholar Mírzá Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdu’l-Wahhāb of Qazwín. This little volume, the sixteenth in the New Series of the Oriental Translation Fund, was published in 1906 under the auspices of the Royal Asiatic Society, and, since it is easily accessible to English readers, any lengthy account of it would be superfluous. One of the most beautiful things in it, in my opinion, is the prayer which follows the Exordium and precedes the Preface, and which runs as follows:

"My God, my God! Save us from preoccupation with trifles, and show us the realities of things as they are! Withdraw from the eyes of our understanding the veil of heedlessness, and show us everything as it truly is! Display not to us Not-Being in the guise of Being, and place not a veil of Not-Being over the Beauty of Being. Make these phenomenal forms a Mirror of the Effulgences of Thy Beauty, not a cause of veiling and remoteness, and cause these phantasmal pictures to become the means of our knowledge and vision, not a cause of ignorance and blindness. All our deprivation and banishment is from ourselves: leave us not with ourselves, but grant us deliverance from ourselves, and vouchsafe us knowledge of Thyself!"
Literature of the Hurufi Sect.

In the account of the Ḥurūfī heresy given in the last chapter (pp. 365-375 supra) incidental mention has been made of the principal books emanating from or connected with that strange sect. From the purely literary point of view most of these (with the exception of a few poems like the Iskandar-nāma published and translated by M. Cl. Huart in vol. ix of the "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial" Series) are of little merit, though to the student of religion and the psychologist they are deeply interesting. To the uninitiated reader Fadlu'llah's Jāwidān-nāma, whatever esoteric mysteries it may contain, is a series of disconnected and almost unintelligible ravings, and the only one of his extant writings which strikes anything approaching a human note is a letter addressed to one of his disciples on the eve of his execution. From this letter it appears that Fadlu'llah was put to death at Shīrwān, which, in allusion to the scene of the Imám Ḥusayn's martyrdom, he speaks of as "my Karbala."

In Persia, as already observed, the sect does not seem to have played an important rôle, or to have long survived the death of its founder and his immediate successor. In Turkey, whither it soon spread, it was far otherwise. There, in spite of several severe persecutions recorded by the Turkish historians, it counted many adherents, amongst the most famous of whom was the poet Nasimi (Nesimi), who was skinned alive for his heterodoxy in 820/1417-8, in the city of Aleppo. An admirable account of him and the Ḥurūfī sect is given by the late Mr. E. J. W. Gibb, and also of his chief disciple, the Turkish poet Rafi'ī, author of the

1 This refers only to the Persian Ḥurūfī writings, for, as already indicated (p. 369, n. 1 supra), Mr. Gibb regards Nesimi as "the first true poet of the Western Turks."

2 See my second paper on the Ḥurūfīs in the J.R.A.S. for July, 1907, pp. 9 and 10 of the tirage-à-part, where both text and translation are given.

Here it may be observed that the titles of nearly all Ḫurūfī works are compounded with the word -nāma, "book." Thus in Persian we have the Ādam-nāma ("Book of Adam," or "Book of Man"), the 'Arsh-nāma ("Book of God's Throne"), Hidāyat-nāma ("Book of Guidance"), Istiwa-nāma, Kursī-nāma, Maḥabbat-nāma, etc., and in Turkish, besides the above-mentioned Bashrārat-nāma ("Book of Good Tidings"), the Ākhirat-nāma, Faḍilat-nāma, Faqr-nāma, Fayḍ-nāma, Ganj-nāma, Haqīqat-nāma, 'Ishq-nāma, and many others, of which the titles will be found in the Index appended to my second article on the Ḫurūfī Literature in the J. R. A. S. for July, 1907, where short descriptions of 45 Ḫurūfī MSS. are given. The list of works in that Index is undoubtedly far from complete, yet even these have for the most part received only the most cursory examination, so that there is plenty of scope for further research in this field. Ordinary curiosity about the sect and its history and literature will, however, be amply satisfied by what has been already published about it in English and French: to wit, my account of the Jáwīdān-i-Kabīr¹ and my two papers in the J. R. A. S. (for 1898 and 1907); the chapter in Mr E. J. W. Gibb's History of Ottoman Poetry; and vol. ix of the Gibb Memorial Series, published in 1909, entitled Textes Persans relatifs à la secte des Houroufis, publiés, traduits et annotés par M. Clément Huart, suivis d'une Étude sur la Religion des Houroufis, par le Docteur Rizā Tēvṣīq, connu sous le nom de Fēylesouf Rizā.

Ishāq Efendi's refutation of the Ḫurūfis, written in Turkish in 1288/1871-2, and published in 1291/1874, under the title of the Revealer of Mysteries and Repeller of Miscreants², though very violent in tone, is fairly accurate in substance, and is the result of careful though prejudiced investigations. After a very brief doxology it begins as follows:

¹ See my Catalogue of the Persian MSS. in the Cambridge University Library, pp. 69-86.
² Kāshīfu‘l-Asrār wa Dāfi‘u‘l-Ashrār.
“Be it known that of all those sects which devote themselves to the misleading of the Muslims, the Bektáshís are the chief offenders, and that although it is evident both from their deeds and words that they are not truly Muslims, yet in the year 1288/1871-2 they made this fact perfectly plain. The books called by these people Jáwídán (‘Eternal’) are six in number, of which one was composed by their original misleader Faḍlulláh the Ḥurúfi, while the other five are the works of his Khalifas (successors). And since in these five books their heresies and blasphemies are very evident, they are accustomed to teach and study them secretly among themselves; but as Firishta-záda in his Jáwídán, entitled ‘Ishq-náma (‘the Book of Love’), did in some degree veil his blasphemies, and as consequently in the year above-mentioned (1288/1871-2) his followers made so bold as to print and publish it, it has beyond question become a matter of urgent necessity that a treatise should be compiled to warn the faithful as to the true nature and blasphemous character of the doctrines contained in their books. Therefore, relying on God, I have ventured to write such a treatise, comprising three chapters, viz.:

“Chapter I.—Setting forth the origin of Faḍl the Ḥurúfi, and the principles and rules of certain of the Bektáshís.

“Chapter II.—Setting forth the blasphemies of Firishta-záda’s Jáwídán.

“Chapter III.—Setting forth the blasphemies contained in the other Jáwídáns.”

After a brief account of the Carmathians and other early heretics, and of Faḍlulláh of Astarábád, the founder of the Ḥurúfi sect, the author describes how “the son of Tímúr” (Mírán-sháh) caused him to be put to death, “after which he tied a rope to his legs, dragged him publicly through the streets and bàzsárs, and removed his foul existence from this nether world.” Thereupon his nine Khalifas or “Vicars” dispersed through the lands of Islám, and he who was entitled al-‘Alīyyu’l-‘A’lá (“the High, the Supreme”)1 came to the monastery of Ḥájjí Bektásh in Anatolia, and, having won the confidence of its inmates, began secretly to teach the doctrines of the Jáwídán, pretending that they represented the esoteric doctrine of Ḥájjí Bektásh, and naming them “the Secret,” to divulge which was death. For the understanding of certain obscure symbols and passages in

---

1 He died in 822/1419.
the *Jāvidān*, a key entitled "the Key of Life" (*Miftāhul-Ḥayāt*)¹ was compiled. "Should one possess this," adds the author, "he will understand the *Jāvidān*, which, without this aid, is incomprehensible."

In spite of all their precautions, however, several severe persecutions of the Ḥurūfīs and Bektāshīs took place in Turkey, one of the latest of which was in 1240/1824-5, in the reign of Sulṭān Maḥmūd, who killed many of them, destroyed their monasteries, and made over their property to the Naqshbandī order of dervishes. Many of their surviving Shaykhs and ordinary members took refuge amongst the Naqshbandī, Qādirī, Rusafī and Saḍī orders of dervishes, and cautiously carried on their propaganda in these new environments. The order, however, speedily revived, and is still widely spread in Turkey, to which country rather than to Persia the later history of the Ḥurūfī sect belongs. Of the continued existence of the sect in Persia there appears to be no evidence, though doubtless many of their doctrines and ideas are still current amongst the dervish "gnostics" (*‘urafṣī*) of that unforgetting land, while some of their peculiar views and terminology have been assimilated by such later heretical sects as the Bábīs, who will be discussed in the concluding volume of this work.

*The Turki literature of this period, especially the Bābur-nāma.*

The principle has been repeatedly laid down in this book that the literary history of a people in the wider sense should not be confined to what they wrote in their own language, and for this reason Arabic books written by Persians have been included in our survey. The case for saying something about the considerable Turki

¹ Three MSS. of this "Key" are described in my second paper on the *Literature of the Ḥurūfīs*, viz. Or. 5957 of the British Museum; Or. 488 of the Cambridge University Library; and a MS. of my own, B. 15.
literature produced at the Tímúrid courts, especially at Herat during the reign of Sultán Abul’-Ghazi Ḥusayn (A.H. 878–912 = A.D. 1473–1506), is not quite so strong, because those who produced it were for the most part, if not wholly, of Turkish race; though since in Transoxiana and Turkistán the two languages flourished (and, indeed, still flourish) side by side, the number of bilinguals must always have been considerable. The Persian, as being the more polished idiom, was more generally used, even by princes of the House of Tímur like Ulugh Beg, Bāysunqur, Mīrzā Ḥaydar Dughlát and Sultán Ḥusayn himself, for literary purposes; but the great Mīr ‘Alí Shīr Nawā’i, who did more than any other man to raise the Chaghatáy Turki to the dignity of a literary language, actually maintained its superiority to Persian in a treatise entitled Muhākamatul-Lughatayn ("the Arbitration between the two languages"). Of some of Mīr ‘Alí Shīr’s numerous works something has been already said, and those who desire fuller information can find it in M. Belin’s monograph in the Journal Asiatique for 1861, already mentioned, and in another monograph of his on the Mahbūbu’l-Qulūb1 ("Hearts’ Darling") published in the same periodical in 1866 under the title of Caractères, Maximes et Pensées de Mīr Alī Chīr Névāīī. Dawlatsháh also in the Conclusion (Khātima) of his Memoirs of the Poets mentions several other eminent Turki poets amongst his contemporaries, while numerous other works in this tongue, both in prose and verse, will be found mentioned in Rieu’s Catalogue of the Turkish Manuscripts in the British Museum. Yet, save to the student of Turkish in its wider sense, it is doubtful if the interest of this literature would be commensurate with the trouble of learning this particular dialect of Turki, were it not for the sake of reading in its original form that unique work, the Bābur-nāma, or Memoirs of the Emperor Bābur, of which at any rate the French or the English

1 The text of this has been printed (I think at Constantinople) in 189/1872-3.
translation should be read by every student of Persian or Indian history. Enthusiastic as are the praises lavished on this most remarkable book, "singular in its own nature, and perfectly so if we consider the circumstances of the writer," by Erskine, Pavet de Courteille, and all others who have worked at it, no one who has perused its pages will deem them exaggerated. It is impossible to better the description of it given by Elphinstone, who describes it as containing "a minute account of the life of a great Tartar monarch, along with a natural effusion of his opinions and feelings free from disguise and reserve, and no less free from all affectation of extreme frankness and candour. The style is plain and manly, as well as lively and picturesque; it presents his countrymen and contemporaries in their appearance, manners, pursuits and actions as clearly as in a mirror. In this respect it is almost the only specimen of real history in Asia; for the ordinary writers, though they give pompous accounts of the deeds and ceremonies of the great, are apt to omit the lives and manners even of that class; while everything beneath their level is left entirely out of sight. In Baber the figures, dress, tastes and habits of each individual introduced are described with such minuteness and reality that we seem to live among them, and to know their persons as well as we do their characters. His descriptions of the countries he visited, their scenery, climate, productions, and works of art and industry are more full and accurate than will, perhaps, be found in equal space in any modern traveller; and, considering the circumstances in which they were compiled, are truly surprising."

The book is, indeed, extraordinarily frank and intimate,

1 Pavet de Courteille's French translation was made directly from the original Turki, and is therefore preferable to Leyden and Erskine's English translation, which was made from the Persian version.
2 History of India, vol. i, pp. 522-525.
3 P. ii of the Preface to his translation.
4 Vol. ii of his History of India, pp. 117-119.
being such a diary as a man writes for his own private delectation rather than for the perusal of even his most confidential friends, much less subjects; and probably no king at any rate ever wrote, or at any rate suffered to be circulated, such Confessions. While recording fully the many great historical events in which he took part, he does not hesitate to mention when he shaved for the first time\(^1\) at the age of 23 in the year 909/1503-4; when he saw the star Canopus for the first time\(^2\); how he was first induced to taste wine\(^3\) at Herát in 912/1506-7; and when he made his first attempt to write Turkí verse\(^4\). He describes his unhappy marriage with 'Á'ishá Sultán Begum\(^5\), his reckless and unrestrained passion for Bábúr\(^6\), his drinking-bouts\(^7\), his favourite vintage\(^8\), and how on one occasion he refrained from exceeding at a drinking-party in order to form an impartial opinion as to the effects of drunkenness on others\(^9\). Mention has already been made of the value of his geographical observations, but his notes on the fauna and flora of Central Asia and India are of nearly equal interest, while his impartial and acute delineations of the characters and personal peculiarities of his royal kinsmen and most notable contemporaries are of the highest interest and value. From our present point of view, however, no portion of his Memoirs is more interesting than that which he devotes to a series of literary portraits of the leading poets, writers and artists\(^10\) who conferred such distinction on the court of Sultán Abú'l-Ghází Husayn, beginning with that monarch himself and his eminent and accomplished minister Mír 'Álí Shír Náwá'í\(^11\). As the whole of it may be read in French in the first volume of Pavet de

---

\(^1\) Bábúr-náma, ed. Ilminsky, p. 146.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 153.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 107.
\(^4\) Ibid., pp. 62-63.
\(^5\) Ibid., p. 6.
\(^6\) Ibid., pp. 221-231.
\(^7\) Ibid., p. 239.
\(^8\) Ibid., p. 62.
\(^9\) Ibid., pp. 291, 293, 305.
\(^10\) Ibid., p. 304.
\(^11\) Ibid., pp. 203-214.
Courteille's translation (pp. 364-415), it will be sufficient here to summarize a few of the more interesting passages.

Having spoken of Sultan Husayn's birth, death, family and personal appearance, Bâbur mentions the predilection for the Shi'ite doctrine which he showed at the beginning of his reign, but which was checked by Mir 'Alî Shîr. Chronic rheumatism prevented him from saying his prayers, but is no explanation of his neglect to keep the fast. After he had reigned six or seven years he took to drink, "and during the forty years for which he reigned over Khurâsân, there was not a day whereon he did not drink after the morning prayer though he never drank in the early morning." His sons, soldiers and subjects imitated his example, and were for the most part dissolute and self-indulgent. He was, however, of proved valour, a very skilful swordsman, and wrote moderately good poetry in the Turkî language under the nom de guerre of Hasan. His kingdom of Khurâsân extended eastwards to Balkh, westwards to Bistâm and Dâmghân, northwards to Khwârazm (Khiva), and southwards to Qandahâr and Sîstân. "His was a wonderful age," says Bâbur a little further on; "Khurâsân, and especially Herât, were filled with men of talent and incomparable artists. Whoever undertook any task, his aim and ambition was to perform it to perfection."

Mûr 'Alî Shîr Nawâ'î is next discussed, and a high tribute is paid to his poetical talent, alike in romantic and lyric verse and in the quatrains, but his epistolary style is rated lower. Though he wrote chiefly in Turkî, he has also a Persian Dîwân, in which he uses the pen-name of Fânî. He was a great patron of art as well as of letters, and the fame attained by the painters Bihzâd and Shâh Muza'far was largely due to his encouragement. He was devout, orthodox, and attentive to his religious duties, and was an enthusiastic chess-player. In this last respect he was excelled by Mûr Murtâdî the philosopher, who, when he found two good
players, would play a game with one while he held on to the skirt of the other to prevent him from going away until he had played a game with him also. He was a batchelor, without domestic ties, and very free and easy with his intimates. Thus on one occasion while engaged in playing chess he stretched out his foot and accidentally kicked the poet Banná’î, whereupon he jestingly exclaimed, “A plague on Herât! If you stretch out your feet, you kick the back-side of a poet.” “And so you do if you draw in your feet”, retorted Banná’î.

Shaykhum Beg, who assumed the pen-name of Suhaylî, was another of Sultan Ḥusayn’s amîrs who had some poetical talent, but was criticized for an undue partiality for terrifying words and ideas. Thus on one occasion he recited the following verse in the presence of Jámi:

"In the night of grief the whirl-wind of my sighs displaced the world; The dragon of my tear-torrent engulfed the habitable quarter [of the globe]."

"Do you want to write poetry or to frighten your fellow-creatures?" Jámi enquired.

"Kamálü’d-Dîn Ḥusayn Gázargáhî," says Bâbur a little further on, “although he was not a Ṣûfî, posed as such. Pretended Ṣûfîs of this type were wont to gather round ‘Alî Shîr Beg and indulge in their ecstasies and religious music. This man’s principles were better than most of them, and to this fact he probably owed the consideration which he enjoyed, for otherwise he had no special talent worth mentioning. He wrote a book entitled Majâlisû’l-'Ushshâq ("Lovers’ Meetings") of which he ascribed the authorship to Ḥusayn

---

1 *I.e.* "sit on your heels" in the Persian fashion.

2 Ed. Ilminsky, p. 221.
Mírzá. It is a miserable production, mostly lies, and insipid and impertinent lies to boot, some of which raise a suspicion of heresy. Thus he attributes carnal loves to many prophets and saints, inventing for each one of them a paramour. Another astonishing piece of folly is that while describing the book in the preface as the work of Sultán Ḥusayn Mírzá himself, over every one of his own verses and sonnets occurring in the course of the book he puts ‘by the author.’

Of Jámi, by far the greatest poet of the time, Bábur refrains from uttering any criticism, because, he says, “he stands too high to need any praise,” wherefore he only mentions his name “for luck and for a blessing.” He praises the Arabic scholarship and theological attainments of the Shaykhulu’-Īslám Sayfu’d-Dín Aḥmad, son of the celebrated Sa‘du’d-Dín Taftázání, who is said to have regularly attended public prayer for nearly seventy years, and who was finally put to death by Sháh Isma’īl when he took Herát for refusing to conform to the Shi‘ite doctrines and observances so fanatically insisted on by that monarch. A longer notice is devoted to Jámi’s pupil and disciple Mullá ‘Abdu’l-Ghafūr of Lári, who commentated his master’s Nafaḥátul-Uns, and whose partiality for the society of dervishes was such that when he heard of one who had newly arrived he could not rest until he had seen and talked with him. Mention is next made of Mír ‘Aṭá’ulláh of Mashhad, a good Arabic scholar, who also composed in Persian a treatise on rhyme, of which Bábur considers the chief defect to be that the author’s illustrations are all drawn from his own poems, as well as another treatise on rhetorical figures entitled Badāyi’u’s-Ṣandýi’.

Amongst the poets, besides those already noticed, of whom he makes mention are Āṣafi, Banná’i, Sayfī of Bukhárá

(the author of a useful treatise on Prosody\(^1\)), Hátilí (Jámi’s nephew) also known as ‘Abdu’lláh-i-Mathna\(\text{\textsuperscript{wi-gü}}, \) Mír Ḥusayn Mu’ammadı, Muḥammad of Badakhshán, Yúṣuf Baḍí, Áhí, Muḥammad Şáliḥ, Sháh Ḥusayn Kámí, Áhí and Hiláli, the last of whom Bábur criticizes very severely for the subject-matter and treatment of his poem “The Prince and the Beggar” (\textit{Sháh u Darwísh} or \textit{Sháh u Gadá}). Of the many calligraphists at the court he mentions only Sultán ‘Álí of Mashhad, who copied manuscripts both for Sultán Ḥusayn and for Mír ‘Álí Shír; and of the miniature-painters Bihzád and Sháh Muẓaffar, who was also a poet. His criticism on Bihzád’s portraits is that though he drew bearded faces well, he was less successful with beardless boys and girls, where he had a tendency to exaggerate the chin\(^2\). Yet in another place\(^3\), in speaking of Shaybání Khán’s proceedings after he had captured Herát in 913/1507–8, he denounces his action in attempting to improve and touch up Bihzád’s paintings. In conclusion Bábur mentions a number of musicians, minstrels and composers.

The materials for a literary history of this period, especially of its poets, are therefore singularly copious and authoritative, for besides Bábur’s incidental notices of which we have just spoken, we have the voluminous \textit{Memoirs of the Poets} compiled by Dawlatsháh in 892/1487, and Mír ‘Álí Shír’s Turkí \textit{Majálisu’n-Nafá’is}, completed about four years later, of the contents of which some account has been given above\(^4\). As a pendant to these is the later work of another royal author, Sám Mírzá, son of Sháh Isma’íl the Şafáwí, who was born in 923/1517 and put to death in 984/1576–7, and

\(^1\) Published with English translation and explanations by Blochmann at Calcutta.
\(^3\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 262.
\(^4\) \textit{Pp. 437–439 supra}. 
who in 957/1550 wrote his *Tuhfa-i-Samir*, a somewhat rare book which will be considered in the subsequent volume. In addition to these are the copious biographical notices contained in Khwándamir's *Habíbu's-Siyar*. Of all these, however, Bābur is the most amusing and the most instructive, because he possesses both humour and a critical faculty lacking in the other biographers, who, by indiscriminate eulogies, deprive their appreciations of all real value.

1 See Rieu's *Persian Catalogue*, pp. 367-368, and the references there given. There is also a ms. (Or. 648) in the Cambridge University Library.
CHAPTER VIII

POETS OF THE LATER TĪMŪRID PERIOD

As already indicated in more than one place, the characteristic of the art which prevailed under the Tīmūrids, whether literary or pictorial, was an extreme elaboration and preciosity little in accordance with modern European taste, though very similar on its literary side to that evolved by John Lyly and the Euphuists in England nearly a century after Jámi's reputation had reached its zenith in Persia. In England this florid, artificial style enjoyed but a brief popularity; in Persia it has flourished intermittently for a long period, especially under Tartar and Turkish patronage, but not continuously nor in all parts of the country, so that it is easy to point out fine specimens of simple, strong, natural Persian prose and verse both before and after the period now under consideration. During this period, however, the prevailing literary style in Persia was very ornate and artificial, and as it unfortunately happened that at no time was Persian literary influence greater in the adjoining lands of Turkey, India and Transoxiana, this style became stereotyped throughout Western and Central Asia, and has come to be regarded by many persons, especially those who have pursued their linguistic studies in India, as typically Persian. Still it is a fact that not only the Persians, Turks and Indians, but even the Arabs, whose natural tendency is to a chaster and more simple style, and who seldom quite forget their adage that "the best speech is that which is brief and to the point," tend to regard form as more important than ideas.

1 Lyly was born in 1553-4 and wrote his Euphues, the Anatomy of Wit in 1578. Jámi composed his Nafahat-e'Uns in 1478, and compiled his first Diwān in the following year.

2 خَبَرُ التَّكْلَامِ مَا قَلْطَ وَ دَلَّ
in literary composition, to care less what a writer says than how he says it, and to prefer conventionality to originality. Most instructive are the remarks of that great and original historian Ibn Khaldún, who was not only contemporary with Tímúr but came into personal relations with him when Damascus surrendered to him at the end of A.D. 14001. These remarks, with other observations germane to this subject, I have given in a previous volume2 to which the reader is referred. In particular the student of Persian poetry, especially of the later more ornate writers, may be recommended to read that curious work, “the Lovers’ Companion” (Anisu’l-Ushshaq), composed in 826/1423 by Sharafu’d-Dīn Rámí at Marāgha in Ādhabā’yjān, of which a French translation by M. Cl. Huart was published in Paris in 1875, and of which I have given a brief account in a previous volume3.

It must not be supposed, however, that all the poets who will be mentioned in this chapter, or even all who flourished at the court of Sultān Ḥusayn at Herāt, employ this inflated and ornate style, which, indeed, is more noticeable in prose-writers, including even historians, who ought to know better than to fill ten pages with what could very well be set forth in one. The earlier poets of whom we shall immediately speak, like Sháh Ni’matu’lláh and Qásimu’l-Anwár, are free from this blemish, for so we must regard it; and so also, as a rule, is Jāmí, who is universally and justly regarded not only as the chief ornament of the court of Herāt, but as one of the greatest Persian poets of all time. It is the ornate prose-writers and minor poets and versifiers of the later part of this period who are the chief offenders in this respect. The passion for the riddle and acrostic (mu’ammá) which prevailed amongst the latter is very characteristic,

1 See Part i of the Baron McGuckin de Slane’s translation in Notices et Extraits, pp. v and lxxxv–xcii.
3 Ibid., pp. 83–84.
while the methods of the former are well illustrated by Ḥusayn Wā'īz-i-Kāshīfī's Anwār-i-Suhaylī, where, for example, a squeaking mouse is described as "raising its outcry to the aetherial sphere." In a previous volume I have shown 1 by parallel extracts from the Book of Kalīla and Dimna as rendered into Arabic by Ḥusayn ibnul-Muqaffā in the eighth century, and into Persian by Nizāmu’d-Dīn Abū’l-Ma‘ālī Nāṣru’lī in the twelfth and Ḥusayn Wā’īz at the end of the sixteenth centuries how the last-named writer set himself to "write up" and improve upon the work of his predecessors.

I. Sayyid Ni‘matu’līlāh of Kīrmān.

Though Ḥamī is unquestionably the greatest poet of the period which we are now considering, it seems better to adhere to chronological sequence and to begin with the earliest, Sayyid (or Shāh) Ni‘matu’līlāh of Kīrmān, who died at an advanced age in the spring of 1431 (Rajab 22, 834), and was buried at the charming village of Māhān near Kīrmān, of which some malicious wit has said:

بيشِت روى زمين است خطْه ماهان,
بشرت آتكه تکانش لهد در دوزخ;

"Māhān an Earthly Paradise would be, I wot right well, If you could clear its people out and shake them into hell."

The site of his grave is marked by a fine monastery inhabited by dervishes of the Shāh Ni‘matu’līlāh order which he founded; for he was a great saint and mystic as well as a poet, and his verses abound in dark apocalyptic sayings concerning the "Mischief of the Last Days" (Fitna-i-Ākhiru’z-Zamān), the Advent of the Mahdi, and other similar matters. I visited this shrine in September, 1888, shortly before I left Kīrmān, and was very hospitably entertained by its acolytes.

As usual, the best account of Ni'matu'llah is that given by Rieu in his Persian Catalogue, where the substance of the information given by the ordinary biographical works is supplemented by details drawn from a rare contemporary monograph existing in the British Museum and from the history of Yazd and its most notable men known as the Jāmi'i-Mufidī. His full name was Amīr Nūru'd-Dīn Ni'matu'llah, his father's name was Mir 'Abdu 'llāh, and he claimed descent from the Fifth Imām of the Shi'a, Muhammad Bāqir, the great-grandson of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. He was born at Aleppo in 730/1329-30 or in the following year, but spent most of his youth in 'Irāq. At the age of 24 he visited Mecca, where he resided for seven years, and became one of the chief disciples of Shaykh 'Abdu'llah al-Yāfī, a well-known mystical and historical writer, who died in 768/1366-7. His later life was passed in Samarkand, Herāt, Yazd and finally, as already mentioned, at Māhān near Kirmān, where he spent the last twenty-five years of his life, and where he died on Rajab 22, 834 (April 5, 1431) aged more than a hundred years. The historian 'Abdu'r-Razzāq of Samarkand visited his grave in 845/1441-2.

Ni'matu'llah was the king of dervishes (the title "Shāh" is always prefixed to his name) and the friend of kings. He enjoyed the special favour of Shāh-rukh, while Aḥmad Shāh Bahmani, King of the Deccan, deemed himself fortunate in persuading to come to his court one of his grandsons. Two other grandsons with their father followed him thither, while several of Shāh Ni'matu'llah's descendants who remained in Persia intermarried with the Royal Šafawī House. According to Rieu, Ni'matu'llah left more than 500 Ṣūfī tracts besides his Diwān of verse, but the latter is his chief work, and it alone need be considered here. The only complete copy at my disposal is the lithographed edition

1 Pp. 634-635.  
2 Add. 16,837, ff. 339-355.  
3 Pers. Cat. p. 635.
published at Tihrān in 1276/1860, but numerous selections from it are contained in the various biographies and anthologies in which he is mentioned. His fame, however, is that of a saint and mystic rather than a poet, and his verse strikes one on the whole as monotonous and mediocre, similar in style and subject-matter to that of Maghrībi, and altogether lacking the consuming ardour and brilliant illustration of Shams-i-Tabrīz. His most characteristic poems, though few in number, are those couched in the prophetic strain, and these still exercise a certain influence, and are appealed to by other Persians than those who belong to the order of dervishes which he founded. The Bābīs, for example, used to tell me in Kirmān that the date of the Bāb’s “Manifestation” (1260/1844) was foretold in the following poem. When I visited the saint’s shrine I took the trouble to obtain from one of the dervishes a copy of the poem in question from the oldest and most trustworthy manuscript in their possession, and I found that there the date was given as 274 instead of 1260 (س, ر, غ, د = 70 + 200 + 4 instead of 1000 + 200 + 60), while in Ridá-qulí Khán’s Majma‘ul-Fuṣaḥā, where the same poem is quoted, the date becomes 1204 (غ + ر + د = 1000 + 200 + 4). In the last-named work the poem is thus entitled:

“Declaration of sundry mysteries and revelations by way of allegories.”

(1)

| بعضاً من روایات و مکاشفات بر سبیل کتابات
| می‌بینم، در قدرت گردنگار می‌بینم
| حالت روزگار می‌بینم
| نه چو پیرار و پار می‌بینم
| از نجوم این سخن نمی‌گویم
| عین و را دال چون گذشت از سال

فسنده و کارزار می‌بینیم،
بی‌حد و بی‌شار می‌بینیم،
غصه‌ی در دیار می‌بینم،
از بین و یار می‌بینم،
در میان و خنک می‌بینم،
خواجرا بندوار می‌بینم،
در دریم، شیر عیار می‌بینم،
گشت‌های غمخوار و خوارمی‌بینم،
دی‌گری را دوچار می‌بینم،
سیرا دلفار می‌بینم،
هر یکی‌را دوبار می‌بینم،
خصوص و چر و دار می‌بینم،
مانده در رهگذر می‌بینم،
از صغار و کبار می‌بینم،
جورِ ترک و تتارمی‌بینم،
جای جمعی شار می‌بینم،
بی ببار و ثمار می‌بینم،
در جد کوه‌سار می‌بینم،
حالاً اختیار می‌بینم،
شادی غم‌گزار می‌بینم،
خوری وصل یار می‌بینم،
عالمی چون نکار می‌بینم،
عدل اورا حصار می‌بینم،
همه‌را کام یار می‌بینم،
خجل و شیرم‌سار می‌بینم،
در خراسان و مصر و شاهر و عراق،
ظلمت طلیع ظالیان دیار،
قصهٔ بس عجب می‌شونم،
چگاه و آشوب و فتوه و بیداد،
غاره و قتل و لشکر بیمار،
بندرو شهوش زهی بینم،
سکه‌نوزنده بر بی‌زد،
دوستان عزیز هر قومی،
هر یک از حاکمان هفت اقلیم،
مایرا رو سیاه می‌بینم،
نصب و عزل بتهجی و عمال،
ترک و ناجی‌کارا به‌دیدیک،
تاجر از دست دزد بی‌هیاره،
مکر و تسویه و جیله، بیمار،
حال هنده خراب می‌بایم،
بقعه، خیر سخت گشت‌خرباب،
بعضی اشجار بلوستان جهنم،
اندکی امن اگر بود آن یه،
همدمی و قناعت و خنجی،
گرچه می‌بینم اینه غم‌ها،
غیر‌مغزور‌انهکه من درین تشوشی،
بعد امانت و خند سال دگر،
این جهنم چو مصر می‌گنرم،
هفت باش و وزیر و سلطان،
عاصبان از امام معصومه.
The text here given is that copied for me at Māhān on August 9, 1888. Of the 50 verses which it contains only 24 are given in the Majma‘ul-Fuṣahā, which only adds one or
two new verses, but in some cases adopts a different order, besides supplying a few variants. The poem is not to be found at all in the lithographed edition.

(Translation)

"I see the Power of the Maker; I see the state of the time.
The state of this year is of another sort; not like last year and the year before do I see it.
These words I speak not from the stars; rather I see them from the Creator.1
When 'ayn,rá and dāl (=274) have passed of the years I see wonderful doings.
In Khurásán, Egypt, Syria and 'Iráq I see sedition and strife.
I see the darkness of the tyranny of the lands' oppressors boundless and beyond computation.
I hear a very strange story; I see vexation in the land.
War, strife, mischief and injustice I see on the right and on the left.
Looting, slaughter and many armies I see in the midst and around.
I see the servant like the master; I see the master like the servant.
They impress a new superscription on the face of the gold; I see his dirhams of short weight.
I see the dear friends of every people grown sorrowful and abased.
Each of the rulers of the Seven Climes I see involved with another.
I see the face of the moon darkened; I see the heart of the sun transfixed.
The appointment and dismissal of officials and agents, each one I see twice repeated.
In Turk and Tájík2 towards one another I see enmity and strife.
I see the merchant left friendless on the road at the hands of the thief.
I see from small and great much cunning, guile and trickery.
I find the condition of the Indian ruined; I see the oppression of Turks and Tartars.
I see the Holy Place fearfully desolated, the abode of a number of evil men.

1 I.e. these predictions are not based on astrological predictions but inspired by revelation from God.
2 Tájík, a term originally applied to the Arabs (Tájík, Tásf) who garrisoned the towns of Khurásán and Transoxiana, was later and is still applied to the Persian settled population as opposed to the nomads of Turkish stock.
Some of the trees of the Garden of the World I see springless and fruitless.
If there be a little security, that too I see within the borders of the mountains.
A companion, contentment and a [quiet] corner I now see as most to be desired.
Although I see all these sorrows, I see the [final] joy of the sorrowful. Grieve not, for in this trouble I see the harvest of union with the Friend.

After this year and a few years more\(^1\) I see a world like a [fair] picture. I behold this world like Egypt; I see Justice as its stronghold.
My king and his ministers are seven; all of these I see triumphant.

On the palm of the hand of the Cup-bearer of Unity I see the pleasant wine.
The friendly foe-destroying warrior I see as the comrade and friend of the friend.
I see the swords of those whose hearts are hard as iron rusted, blunt and of no account.
The beauty of the Law and the splendour of Isláam, each one I see doubled\(^2\).

I see the wolf and the sheep, the lion and the gazelle, dwelling together in the meadow.
I see the treasure of Chosroes and the coin of Alexander all put to good use.
I see the roguish Turk drunk, I see his enemy with the headache born of wine.
I see Ni'matu'llh seated in a corner apart from all. When the fifth winter has passed I see in the sixth a pleasant spring.
The vicar of the Mahdí will appear, yea, I see him plainly.
I see a king perfect in knowledge; I see a leader endowed with dignity. I see the servants of His High Majesty all wearing crowns.
For forty years, O my brother, I see the cycle of that Prince continue. When his cycle ends victoriously, I see his son as a memorial of him.
I see a king perfect in knowledge, a ruler of noble family.
After him will be the Imám himself, whom I see as the pivot of the world.
I read ‘\textit{M. H. M. D.}’: I see the name of that famous one\(^3\).

\(^1\) The variants in the \textit{Majma'u'l-Fusahá} give a slightly different meaning, \textit{viz.} “After that year for several years more.”
\(^2\) Or, if the variant be adopted, “strong and firmly established.”
\(^3\) \textit{i.e.} Muḥammad.
I see his aspect and attributes like the Prophet: I see knowledge and clemency as his distinctive signs.

I see again 'the White Hand' (long may it endure!) conjoined with Dhu'l-Fiqr.

I see the Mahdi of the time and the Jesus of the age both royally riding forth.

I smell the rose-garden of the Law, I see the flower of Religion in blossom.”

These “apocalyptic” poems, however, though they have attracted most attention in Persia, constitute but a small fraction of the whole. Most of Ni‘matu’llâh’s verses illustrate the doctrine of *Wahdatul-Wujûd* (Pantheism), while a certain proportion (in which again the Bâbîs see an allusion to their founder) use the favourite illustration of the “Point” (*Nuqta*), of which the circle is only a manifestation; just as the letter *alif* is, in the world of calligraphy, a manifestation of the diacritical “point,” which shares with the mathematical “point” the same title. A few specimens will suffice for the purpose of illustration.

(2)

پادشاه و گدا یکیست یکیست،
بی نوا و نوا یکیست یکیست،
دُرَد و دَرَد و دوا یکیست یکیست,
دَرَد یکی نیست در همه عالیه,
جمه یکی نیست خدا یکیست یکیست,
آینه صد هزار می بینه,
روی آن یکیست یکیست یکیست,
همتلا و بلا یکیست پیکست,
مبتلای بلای بالاترین,
قطره و بحر وموج و جوهرچار,
پیشکی نزد ما یکیست یکیست,
نعیت الله یکیست در عالیه,
طلبش کن ببا یکیست یکیست,

"King and beggar are one, are one; foodless and food are one, are one. We are stricken with grief and drain the dregs; dregs and sorrow and cure are one.

1 Alluding to the miracle of Moses, when he drew forth his hand "white as snow."

2 The famous sword of ‘Alí ibn Abí Tâlib.
In all the world there is naught but One; talk not of 'Two,' for God is One.

Mirrors a hundred thousand I see, but the face of that Giver of Life is one.

We are plagued with the plague of one tall and fair, but we the plagued and the plague are one.

Drop, wave and sea and the elements four without a doubt in our eyes are one.

Ni'matu'llah is one in all the world: come, seek him out, he is one, is one."

("The Point appeared in the circle and was not; nay, that Point produced the circle."

The Point in its revolution becomes a circle in the eyes of him who measured the circle.

Its beginning and end joined together when the Point measured the completion of the circle.

When the circle was completed, the compass put its head and feet together and rested.

We are all without Being, without Being; we are without Being and Thou art Existent.

I called the whole world His dream: I looked again, and lo, His dream was Himself.

Sweeter than the sayings of our Sayyid Ni'matu'llah has heard no other words."

1 Cf. l. 710 of the Gulshan-i-Ráz (Whinfield's edition).
"Know that the Named is one and the Names a hundred thousand, That Being is one, but its aspects are a hundred thousand. Its Form is the Glass, and its Meaning the Wine, Although both are one substance in our eyes. Perceive in two one unit and two units\(^1\); Search it out well, for I have told you a good bit. Without His Being all the world is non-existant, Of His Being and Bounty the world is a sign. The world arises from the diffusion of His universal Being; Whatever thou seest is from His universal Bounty. His Ipseity is essential, while our Ipseity Is but casual: be annihilated, then, from this annihilation! The Ipseity of the world is the veil of the world: Nay, the world itself is the veil of the world. This veil is eternal, O my soul, O my Friend of God, and O my Proof! I tell thee the state of the world in its entirety, So that thou may'st know the state of the world, and so farewell!"

The lithographed edition of Ni'matu'lláh's poems contains approximately some 14,000 verses, including a number of quatrains, and from the following verse it would appear

\(^1\) *I.e.* \(1 \times 2 = 2\).
that his literary activities continued until he had reached a very advanced age:

\[\text{نوُود و هَفَت سَال عَمْر خوَشی بَنَد دَ رَا دَاد حَنی پَاینده،}\]

"The Living and Eternal [God] hath vouchsafed to this servant ninety and seven years of pleasant life."

2. Qāsimū'l-Anwār.

The next poet of this epoch who claims our attention was like the last a Sayyid and a mystic. The main facts concerning his life are thus summarized by Rieu. "He was born in Sarāb (Sarāw) in the district of Tabrīz in 757/1356, and had for religious instructors Shaykh Ṣadrū'd-Dīn Ardabīlī, an ancestor of the Šafawīs, and after him Shaykh Ṣadrū'd-Dīn Yamanī, a disciple of Shaykh Awhādū'd-Dīn Kirmānī. After staying some time in Gīlān he went to Khurāsān and settled in Herāt, where he lived during the reigns of Tīmūr and Shāh-rukh. There disciples flocked to him in such numbers and he acquired so great an influence as to give umbrage to the sovereign. *Abdu'r-Razzāq relates in the *Maṭla'ū's-Sa'dayn that in 830/1426–7, Shāh-rukh having been stabbed in the mosque of Herāt by a certain Aḥmad-i-Lūr, Sayyid Qāsim was charged by Mīrzā Báysunqur with having harboured the intended assassin, and was obliged to leave Herāt and repair to Samarqand, where he found a protector in Mīrzā Ulugh Beg. He returned, however, some years later to Khurāsān, and took up his abode in Kharjird, a town in the district of Jām, where he died in 837/1433–4."

The intimacy of Qāsimū'l-Anwār's relations with Shaykh Ṣadrū'd-Dīn of Ardabīl, the ancestor of the Šafawī kings

---

2 See above pp. 365–366, where I have endeavoured to show that this attempt was instigated by the Ḥurūfī sect.
3 A pretty but probably fictitious anecdote about this event is given by Ouseley in his *Notices of the Persian Poets* (London, 1846), pp. 101–103.
of Persia, is abundantly confirmed by an unpublished Persian work on the genealogy of that dynasty entitled *Silsilatu'n-Nasab-i-Safawiyya*, of which I possess a manuscript from the library of the late Sir Albert Houtum Schindler. In this MS. (ff. 27b—28b) the poet is mentioned as one of the Shaykh’s most enthusiastic disciples, and an account is given of the rigid discipline whereby he attained in the great Mosque of Ardabil to that vision wherein he beheld himself distributing the light to his fellow-disciples, whereby he earned the title of *Qásimu'l-Anwár* (“the Apportioner of the Lights”). On the death of Shaykh Šafí, the father of Shaykh Šadru’d-Din, he composed the following verses:

(1)

صرِ ولایت که نقدٌ شیخ صُفى است،
غرب نود سال بود هر این راه،
جانش بوقتی رحیل عطسه زد و گفت:
یا ملك الموت قد وصلت إلى الله,
حالته اورا ملك جو دید عجب ماند،
گفت که یا شیخ الف برحمک اللہ,
سخته قاسمی ز فرقت خواجه,
صر کن اندر فراق صبرک اللہ.

“The chief representative of saintship, who is actually Shaykh Šafí, was for nearly ninety years the guide on this road. His soul at the moment of its departure sneezed and exclaimed, ‘O Angel of Death, I have attained unto God!’ When the Angel saw his condition he was amazed and cried, ‘O Shaykh, a thousand times may God have mercy upon thee!’ Thou art utterly consumed, O Qásimú, by separation from the Master; Be patient in separation: may God give thee patience!”

1 These verses also occur in one of my MSS. of the poems of Qásimu'l-Anwár.
2 For sneezing as a sign of life (here, apparently, of Eternal Life) see Sir J. G. Frazer’s *Folk-lore in the Old Testament*, vol. i, pp. 6 and 9.
Jámi', in the notice which he consecrates to Qásimu'l-Anwár in the *Nafahátu'l-Uns*, alludes to the suspicions which fell upon him in connection with the attempt on Sháh-rukh's life in 830/1426-7 and which led to his banishment, and also observes that opinions differed as to his character, but that most of his disciples with whom he was personally acquainted had abandoned the observances of Islám, for which they expressed contempt, and had adopted a kind of communism. There is therefore good reason to suspect that Qásimu'l-Anwár was at any rate something of an antinomian, even if he had not some quasi-political relation with the Shí'ité partisans of the still uncrowned Šafawís, or with the still more irreconcilable Ḥurúfí heretics.

The literary work of Qásimu'l-Anwár consists of an unpublished *Díván* of lyrical and some *mathnawi* poetry, of which I possess two good manuscripts, one dated 861/1456-7, only 24 years after the author's death. Several of these poems are in Turkish and others in some dialect of Persian. The poems are followed in this older manuscript by two treatises, written wholly or partly in prose, entitled respectively *Anísu'l-Árifín* ("the Gnostics' Familiar") and the *Anísu'l-Áshiqín* ("Lovers' Familiar"), or *Risála-i-Amána* ("Treatise of the Trust"). There is also a poem beginning:

الا ای شاه باز قدس لاهوت، مقیّد مانده، در دام ناسوت،

in which there is supposed to be a reference to Tímúr's death, though it is so vague as to be capable of application to any public calamity.

The poetry of Qásimu'l-Anwár, so far as a foreigner may venture to judge it, is only of average merit, and is generally of the same mystical character as that of Maghribí and other kindred poets. Of its general type the two following *ghazals* may serve as fair specimens.

---

1 Ed. Nassau Lees, pp. 689-693.
"Of thy favour, Cup-bearer, fill me up that clear and crystalline bowl,
That spirit of holy sanctity, that high and exalted soul!
What day thou givest a cup of wine to settle our whole affair
Bestow, I pray, of your charity a draught on yon Preacher rare!
Would'st thou that the motes of the universe may with thee in the
dance be whirled?
Then toss aside in thy dance's stride thy tresses tangled and curled!
O chiding mentor, get thee hence: desist and cease thy strain,
For never windy talk can drive from our heads this passion and
pain.
‘Lose thyself,’ thou didst say, ‘that thou to thyself the way may'st
gain!’
But this riddle dark and inscrutable I cannot solve or explain.
Whenever I cast my life away, a hundred I win in its place:
Who can limit the miracles of Christ and His healing grace?
Qásím ne'er of his own free will would play the lover's part,
But what can one do when the matter lies with the Lord of the Soul
and Heart?"

1 One MS. has پا as a variant.
Ere ever cloistered cell was built, or Somnath's ancient fane
We dwelt with Thee in every phase of life on Being's plane.
'Twixt us all talk of Messenger and Message falls away:
What need of Messenger when Thou dost bide with me for aye?
Can I oppose the Loved One's will, when ever with the Friend
I hold communion sweet in moods and musings without end?
From mention of all 'others' let thy tongue be cleansed and freed,
Since those in whom the Spirit works of 'others' take no heed.
Sober to tread the mystic Path no obligation's thine:
Each atom in the Universe intoxicates like wine.
O Zealot, press me not, I pray, in language harsh and rude,
For unto those of goodly kind allowed are all things good.
O Qásím, silence! to the steed of speech apply the rein,
That Love's High Priest may speak of things that neither fade nor wane.

1 *I.e.* presumably of Prophet and Revelation.
2 *I.e.* other than God.
3 Qur'an, xxiv, 26.
4 Qur'an, xviii, 44.
The following ode is interesting as showing traces of Ḥurūfī ideas:

(4)

*In six days* runs God's Word, while Seven Marks the divisions of the Heaven.
Then at the last *He mounts His Throne*; Nay, Thrones, to which no limit's known.
Each mote's a Throne, to put it plain,
Where He in some new Name doth reign:

Know this, and so to Truth attain!

'Fie, fie!' the zealot answers back
Whate'er I say. I cry 'Alack!'

1 One ms. has ز عشق طامات
2 That God created the heavens in six days and then ascended (or settled Himself) on His Throne is mentioned repeatedly in the Qur'ān, e.g. v. 52; x, 3; xxv, 60, etc. The number of the heavens, not mentioned in these verses, is given as seven in ii, 27 etc. The numbers 7, 14 and 28 have great significance in the Ḥurūfī doctrine.
3 This is the characteristic pantheistic interpretation of the Ḥurūfīs.
‘Who from the Prophet’s cup drinks free
God’s Wine, escapes calamity,
And over-boldness to dispense
With proper forms of reverence! ’
O drunk with fancies, cease to bawl,
Nor plague us with thy drunken brawl!
To glory in thine ignorance
Is but thy blindness to enhance.
O Qásímí, what canst thou find
In jurists blind with leaders blind?
Repeat a Fātīha², I pray,
That so this plague may pass away!’

Although the traces of Ḥurūfí influence in this poem are unmistakeable, it cannot on such evidence alone be proved that Qásimu’l-Anwár was actually a member of that sect, though his association with an admitted disciple of Faḍlulláh of Astarábád and the suspicion which he thereby incurred³ afford strong corroboration of this conjecture. But his saints and heroes were many, and we find in his poems encomiums of theologians like al-Ghazzáli, mystics like Shaykh Aḥmad-i-Jám, Báyazíd of Bistám, and Khwája ‘Abdu’l-láh Anšári, and theosophic poets like Shaykh Farídu’d-Dín ‘Aṭṭár and Mawláná Jalál’ud-Dín Rúmí, whose works he bids his readers bind together in one volume:

دوئی بندار و دریک جلد چن جمع ‘همه اقوال مولانا و عطّار’

It is indeed likely that one of his half-Turkish poems with the refrain Chelebí, bizi onutma (“O Chelebí, forget us not!”) may be addressed to the “Chelebí Efendi,” or hereditary superior of the Mawláwi or Meleví order of darwishes, of Qonya in Asiatic Turkey. Of these Turkish or half-Turkish poems there are only two or three, nor are they of a high quality. The poems in some Persian dialect (probably that of Gílán) are more numerous and more

¹ I take these four lines to embody the orthodox objection to mystical antinomianism, while the succeeding lines embody the poet’s dislike of the orthodox.
² The opening chapter of the Qur’án.
³ See p. 366 supra.
interesting, though our knowledge of these dialects in their mediæval forms is insufficient as a rule to enable us fully to interpret them. The text of one, based on the two MSS., is here given as a specimen.

(5)

قبله جان مین توثیق کیلی فرحته زئگ و بوی،
مئه سیبیر مکرم ت سرو ریاض آزو،
گیل نه فرضته و دل و جان سرفته؟
گیل که بوکه با چنین حوروش و فرشهخو،
می دل و دین تنی فدی خوا بیا که وس خوشی،
قبله توثیق کجا روم شهر بیها و گو بکو،
تی سر زبل مشکبو آنچه بین حدن ز جور،
شرح دهم اگر بود با تو ماجل مو بمو،
اینهرا اگر رسید عکس جمال تو دمی،
کی رسید آنکه باشدبا تو همیشه رو برو،
دوت بعمازه گفتیم روز نما ترا بغم،
نویت دیگ ر آن چرم قضه دوش بارگو،
گفتمش ای مراود جان وعده وصل کرده؟
گفت که آن حکایتا وا مطلب که آن بشو،
گفتمش ای عزیز من خوارش شدم ز عشقی تو،
گفت که نا نه خوار بین خاور میره لاوه لو،
گفتمش عاشقی توام چیست دواي درد من،
گفت تو گوشی این سخن بی تو و وا بسر نشو،
قاسمی از فراق و غیر گیرشت و بیخبر زخود،
گم شده؟ فراق را از کمر تو وا و جو،
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"Thou art the Qibla of my soul, O Gil\(^1\) with the colour and fragrance of an angel,
The Moon of the Heaven of Nobility, the Cypress of the Gardens of Desire.

Thou art not a Gil but an angel, compounded of heart and soul,
How should any Gil be thus Hûrf-like and of such angelic temper?
May my heart and faith be thy sacrifice! Take them if thou wilt\(^2\), for thou art very fair:

Thou art the Qibla: why should I wander from city to city, from street to street?
The tyranny which thy musky tresses have wrought upon me
I will explain to thee hair by hair, if opportunity offers.
If the reflection of thy beauty reaches the mirror for a moment
How [much the more] should it reach him who is ever face to face with thee?

Last night thou didst signify to me by hints, 'Tomorrow I will not leave thee in sorrow\(^3\):

Once again of thy clemency repeat the tale of yesterday!
I said to her, 'O Desire of the Soul, thou didst give me a promise of union!'
She said, 'Seek not to recall those stories, for that has gone by!'
I said to her, 'O my Dear, I have been brought low by thy love!'
She said, 'No, regard not as low one who has spoken with me lip to lip\(^2\)!

I said, 'I am thy lover: what is the cure for my pain?'
She said, 'Thou speakest this word being beside thyself, and it will yield no result.'

Qásimí, through separation and grief, is lost and heedless of himself:
Of thy clemency seek to win back him who is lost in separation!"

---

\(^1\) This term is applied to a native of the Caspian province of Gilán.
Riḍá-qulí Khán in his *Farhang-i-Anjuman-árá-yi Násirí* says (s.v.) that it is also pronounced *Gayl* (*Gél*), in proof of which he cites the following quatrain by Qásimu’l-Anwár in which it rhymes with *mayl* and *sayl*:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ای جانِ جبانِ جبانِ جان دلبر گیل} \\
\text{می دل همه روح دارتی دیمی میل} \\
\text{سیلاپ سرکش قاسم از ابر غمت} \\
\text{اندی بشو که ببرد گیلانا سیل}
\end{align*}\]

\(^2\) These words are entirely in dialect, and the sense given is only conjectural.

\(^3\) Meaning doubtful.
That Qasimu'l-Anwár was familiar with Gilán and other regions bordering on the Caspian Sea is confirmed by other poems in which he mentions Astará, Láhiján, Ardabil and other places in that part of Persia. Further facts about him might undoubtedly be deduced from an attentive examination of his poems, but space only permits me to give two more extracts from them, both taken from his mathnawi poem the Anisul-'Arifin, in the prose preface to which he gives his full name as ‘‘Alí b. Naṣîr b. Hárún b. Abu’l-Qásim al-Ḥusaynî at-Tabrízí, better known as Qásimî.” The first extract is an allegory of the sinner who clings to his sin because it is sweet to him.

(6)

بود زنگی زاده بی دین و داد
غول غفلت داده عمرشا را بباد
داشت در خم چند من دوشاب دزد
از قضا موشی دران اعتاد و مرد
موشرا بگرفت و بیرون کرد زود
موش مشوبون از حریصی مره بود
نزد قاضی رفت زنگی با ملال
موشرا بگرفت و گفت از سوء حال
کرد بر دوشاب او حکم حرام
مرد قاضی در میان خاص و عام
این سخن نشید زنگی سقط
کفت قاضی را که کردی بس غفلت
من چشیدم بود شیرینم بکام
چون بود شیرین چرا باشد حرام
گر شدی دوشاب من تلخ آنگی
من حرامش گفتیمی بی شبه
A negro, lacking reason, faith and taste,
Whose life the demon Folly had laid waste
Had in a jar some treacle set aside,
And by mischance a mouse fell in and died.
He seized the mouse and plucked it out with speed—
That cursed mouse, whose death was caused by greed.
Then to the Qāḍī sped the unwilling wight,
Taking the mouse, and told of Fortune's spite.
The Judge before the folk, refined and rude,
Condemned the treacle as unfit for food.
The luckless negro scouted this award,
Saying, 'You make a great mistake, my Lord!'
I tasted it, and found it sweet and good;
If sweet, it cannot be unfit for food.
Had this my treacle bitter been, then sure
Unlawful had I held it and impure.'
The mind perverted of this black accursed
Bitter and sweet confounded and reversed.
Sin seemeth sweet and service sour, alack!
To thee whose face is as a negro's black.
To passion's palate falsehood seemeth sweet;
Bitter is truth to natures incomplete.
When men are sick and biliously inclined
The taste of sugar alum calls to mind.
Sick for this world all hearts, both young and old,
Jaundiced for love of silver and of gold.
O captive in the snare of worldly joys,
Perish not mouse-like for the sweet that cloys!
Though bitter seems God's discipline to thee
This bitter drug is thy sure remedy.
This bitter drug will cause thine ill's surcease,
And give the patient healing, rest and peace."

The second extract is of greater interest, for it describes
a meeting between Shaykh Ṣafiyyu'd-Dín, the ancestor of
the Ṣafawis, who take their name from him, and the famous
Shaykh Sa'dí of Shíráz. Some independent corroboration
of this interview, or at least of its possibility, is afforded by
the previously-quoted Siṣīlātu'n-Nasab-i-Ṣafawīyya, which
gives the date of Ṣafiyyu'd-Dín's birth as "in the last days
of the 'Abbásid Caliphs in A.H. 650" (A.D. 1252-3), at which
time, the author adds, Shams-i-Tabrīz had been dead five
years, Shaykh Muḥyī'd-Dín ibn'u'l-'Arabī twelve years, and
Shaykh Najmu'd-Dín Kubrā thirty-two years; while of eminent
contemporary saints and poets, Jalālu'd-Dín Rúmí
died when he was twenty-two and Sa'dī when he was forty-
one years of age. He was also contemporary with Amīr
ʿAbdu'lláh of Shíráz, Shaykh Najību'd-Dín Buzghūsh,
'Alá'u'd-Dín Simnání, and Mahmūd Shabistari. A page or
two further on we read how Ṣafiyyu'd-Dín went to Shíráz
to seek guidance from the above Shaykh Najību'd-Dín
Buzghūsh, but found on his arrival that this saintly personage

1 See p. 474 supra. The passage here referred to occurs on f. 9 of
the MS.
2 See pp. 146-150 supra.
SA'DÍ

Add. 7468 (Brit. Mus.), f. 19

To face p. 434
had passed away. This, no doubt, is the occasion to which
the following passage in the Anisul-'Arifin refers.

The MS. has which I have ventured to emend as in
the text.
From this passage, which is hardly worth translating in full, we learn that, while at Shíráz, Shaykh Ṣafíyyu‘d-Dín, whose reputation had made Ardabil (or Ardawil) famous, became acquainted with the great Sa‘dí, who was so much impressed by his sanctity and holy enthusiasm that he offered to add to his Diwán some poems in his praise. This offer, however, Ṣafíyyu‘d-Dín declined, on the ground that he was too much preoccupied with “the Beloved” to concern himself with anything else; a refusal which evidently caused poor Sa‘dí some chagrin, as he “wept bitterly,” while paying tribute to the Shaykh’s exalted motives.

Between the subjects of the last two biographies, who, if not very remarkable poets, had at least a certain character and individuality, and the great Jámi, in whom culminated
the literary talent of this period, there intervene a number of minor poets amongst whom it is difficult to make a selection, but of whom half a dozen or more deserve at least a brief mention. Little, as a rule, is known of their lives or personal characteristics, though most of them are noticed in the numerous biographical works of the period, and for convenience they may best be arranged in chronological order, according to the dates of their death.

Kātibī of Nišāpūr.

Kātibī of Nišāpūr (or of Turshīz), who died in 838/1434–5, comes first in sequence and perhaps in merit. Mīr ‘Alī Shīr Nawā’ī, in his Majālisīn-Nafā‘īs, classes him amongst the poets who were living in his time but whom he had never had the honour of meeting, and writes of him:

“He was incomparable in his time, and introduced wonderful ideas into whatever kind of verse he attempted, especially his qaṣīdas, even inventing new artifices, which were entirely successful. So also his mathnawīs, such as ‘Love and Beauty’ (Husn u ‘Ishq), ‘Regarder and Regarded’ (Nāzīr u Manzūr), ‘Bahram and Gul-andām,’ which illustrate such artifices as the double metre (dhu‘l-bahrayn), the double rhyme (dhu‘l-qāfiyatayn) and various kinds of word-plays. His Diwān of ghazals (odes) and qaṣīdas (elegies) is, however, more celebrated and better. Towards the end of his life he attempted an imitation of the Khamsa (Quintet), in which he advanced great pretensions; probably for this reason he failed to complete it. In my humble opinion his poetical talent was such that had he enjoyed the patronage of a ruler, like our own most fortunate Sovereign, capable of appreciating good verse, and had his life endured longer, he would have captured the hearts of all with his effusions, but through his ill-fortune he did not survive into either of the two reigns here mentioned.”

Mīr ‘Alī Shīr then quotes a verse each from a qaṣīda and a ghazal of his, and finally the two following verses

1 Dawlatshāh, however, implies that these were separate poems entitled Majma‘ul-Bahrayn, Dhu‘l-Qāfiyatayn, and Dah-nāma-i-Tajnisat.

2 Probably Sultān Abū Sa‘īd and Abūl-Ghāzī Ḥusayn are meant.
which Khwándamír\(^1\) adduces as a proof that he perished in the outbreak of plague at Astarábad to which he alludes\(^2\):

\[
\text{ز آتش قبر وبا گروید نا گاهان خرباب،}
\]
\[
\text{استرابادی صه خاکش بود خوشبوتر ز مُشک،}
\]
\[
\text{اندرو از بیرون و یک مه چک باقی نبایند،}
\]
\[
\text{آتش اند گمشده چون افتد نه تر ماند نه خیاک،}
\]

"That Astarábad whose dust was more fragrant than musk
Was suddenly made desolate by the fiery wrath of the pestilence.
No one, old or young, survived therein:
When fire falls on the forest neither moist nor dry remains."

Dawlatsháh consecrates ten pages of his *Memoirs of the Poets*\(^3\) to Kátíbi, who, according to him, was born at a village between Turshíz and Níshápúr, whence he is sometimes called Turshízí and sometimes Níshápúrí. He learned the art of calligraphy from the poet Símí\(^4\), who, however, became jealous of him, so that he left Níshápúr for Herát. Finding his talent unappreciated at the court there, he went to Astarábad and Shírwán, where he attached himself for a time to Amír Shaykh Ibráhím, from whom he received large sums of money which he dissipated in a short while, so that he was reduced to the state of penury depicted in the following verses:

\[
\text{مطبخی را دی طلب گردید که بغرائی برد،}
\]
\[
\text{تا شود زآن آش کار ما و میمان ساخته،}
\]
\[
\text{گفت لحم و دنبه گر یافته که خواهد داد آرد،}
\]
\[
\text{گفتی آگو آسیای چرخ گردان ساخته،}
\]

\(^1\) *Habibu’s-Siyar*, vol. iii, part 3, p. 149.
\(^2\) These verses are also given by Dawlatsháh (pp. 389-390 of my edition), who merely says that he composed them “on the plague and the fierceness of the pestilence.”
\(^3\) Pp. 381-391 of my edition.
\(^4\) Símí’s life is given by Dawlatsháh, pp. 412-417.
"Yesterday I called my cook and bade him bake for me a pie
That my guest's needs and mine own might eke be satisfied thereby.
'If,' said he, 'I get the meat and get the fat, who'll give the meal?'
'He,' I answered, 'who the millstone of the heavens made to wheel.'"

Katibi next proceeded to Adharbayjian, and composed a qaṣida in praise of the Turkman ruler Iskandar ibn Qara Yúsuf. As this potentate failed to appreciate his efforts or to reward him for them, he wrote a very coarse lampoon on him and departed to Isfahán, where he seems to have undergone a kind of conversion at the hands of Śa’īnu’d-Dīn Tarīqa, to have renounced the adulation of princes and attendance at courts, and to have adopted the outlook of the Śūfī mystics. Dawlatsháh¹ quotes one of his poems (also occurring, with two additional verses, in a manuscript of mine) which reflects this change of heart, but is more conspicuous for piety than for literary merit. From Isfahán he went to Rasht and thence once more to Astarábád, where, as we have seen, he died.

Jámí, a better judge than Dawlatsháh, is more guarded in his praise of Katibi, of whom he says in the seventh chapter of his Baháristán that he had many original ideas which he expressed in an original way, but that his verse was unequal and uneven—"cats and camels" (shutrur gurba). I possess a good manuscript of his Diván (hitherto, so far as I know, unpublished) dated 923/1517 and containing nearly 3000 verses, odes, fragments and quatrains. As usual the fragments are the most personal, and therefore, from the biographical point of view, the most interesting, though unfortunately ignorance of the persons and circumstances to which they refer often render a full appreciation impossible. Of these fragments my MS. contains 105 (ff. 104⁵⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻{- P. 384 of my edition.}
feature of interest. The first is remarkable only on account of the ingenious rhyme and alliteration:

"O heart, if thou wouldst ride on the road of honour, swiftly gallop the steed of ambition into the arena of contentment. That thy heart may become acquainted with the mystery of everything that is, cast the cash of thy being in full at the feet of the mystics. If the substance of thy soul be diminished when thou siftest the dust of poverty, suffer not dust from this road [to settle] on thy heart, but sift again.

And if thou knowest rightly the occasions for sitting and rising¹, sit if thou wilt in Armenia, or rise up if thou wilt in Abkház.

The alliterations tás tíz, ráz ríz, bás bíz, and Abkház khtz are very ingenious, though otherwise the lines are not remarkable. The reference in the following fragment may be to the poet Sálmán of Sáwa himself², or possibly to Kátibi's contemporary 'Árifi of Herát, who, as Mír 'Alí Shír tells us in his Majálisu'n-Nafá'ís, was called by his admirers "the second Sálmán."

¹ By the "rules of sitting and rising" the Persians understand the laws of etiquette.
² See pp. 260-271 supra.
Those people who advance a claim on behalf of Salmán, why do they take objection to my verse?

The verse of me the illuminated and then Salmán's poetry...—I say nothing; all men can see [the difference for themselves]!

In the following squib the Kamál referred to may be Kamál of Khujand, but is more probably Kátibí's contemporary Kamálu'd-Dín Ghiyáth al-Fársí of Shíráz, while Khusraw and Hasan are presumably the two eminent poets of Dihlí already noticed:

"If Hasan stole ideas from Khusraw, one cannot prevent him,
For Khusraw is a master, nay, more than the masters!
And if Kamál stole Hasan's ideas from his Díwán
One can say nothing to him: a thief has fallen on a thief!"

The two following pleasant quips, which help to explain Kátibí's unpopularity with his colleagues, are addressed to a contemporary poet named Badr ("Full Moon"). Dawlatsháh, who accords him a brief notice, tells us that this Badr was for many years the principal poet of Shíráwán, where, as we have seen, Kátibí established himself for a time. Dawlatsháh gives the first of the two following fragments as a specimen of the literary duels which took place between these two, and adds that though some critics prefer Badr's poetry to Kátibí's, the people of Samarqand hold a contrary opinion.

1 See Dawlatsháh, pp. 418-420 of my edition.
2 See pp. 108-110 supra.
4 Dawlatsháh has the better variant: "I will tear thee asunder with my index finger."
I have the title Kātīb, O Badr, but Muḥammad is the name which came to me from heaven;

Muḥammad became my name, and thou art Badr; with my finger
I will tear thine asunder."

Yesterday I said to the ill-conditioned little Badr, 'Thou art no poet!
He who is of the poets, him should one encourage.'

'In every city,' he replied, 'I have hung up a poem:
One who produces such poetry ought [himself] to be hung!'

The following, on the other hand, is a tribute to the skill shown by Abū Ishāq (Bushāq) of Shirāz in the gastronomic poems contained in his Dīwān-i-Ąfīma:

'Sheikh Bushāq (may his luxury endure!) dished up hot the idea of foods:
He spread a table of luxuries: all are invited to his table.'

The following satire on a poet named Shams-i-‘Alā is imitated, and indeed partly borrowed, from a well-known poem by ‘Ubayd-i-Zākání:

'Roft ʿAhr az Ǧahan Shams ʿAla,'

'Ankē gū dīn Shārī ʿAmdī'

'âu brēt w Māned āz ū dīwān ʿĀdhī'

'Ḥer Nīmandī gū bīkāri ʿAmdī'

1 The allusion is to the Prophet Muḥammad's miracle of cleaving the full moon (Badr) asunder with his finger. "Thine" means "thy name."

2 Probably alludes to the common belief that the classical Muʿallaqāt of the Arabs were so called because they were "suspended" on the door of the Kaʿba at Mecca. Badr means that he has produced a prize poem in every city.

3 See pp. 344-351 supra.

4 See pp. 230-257 supra.
“Shams-i-‘Alá hath at length departed from the world, he who now and again used to be taken into account.
He hath departed and left behind him a Diwán of verse; even that would not be left if it were of any use!”

In the following he accuses the poet Símí, who taught him calligraphy, of plagiarism:

Meaning: Shams-i-‘Alá departed; he used to be taken into account.
Meaning: He has departed and left behind him a Diwan of verse.

“When Símí saw the tasteful poems of Kátíbi in the city of Níshápúr, he went to Mashhad and produced them in his own name: he ate the salt and stole the salt-cellar!”

Here is another denunciation of plagiarists:

No house which is made of old bricks stands on so firm a foundation as a new house.

Here is a gentle hint to one of his royal patrons to see that he gets his full allowance of wine at the banquet:

He is no poet who, when he produces verses, brings together images from the poems of the masters; no house which is made of old bricks stands on so firm a foundation as a new house.

He is said to have composed 3000 verses of poetry in one night. He had also so voracious an appetite that on one occasion he ate twelve maunds of food and fruit without suffering any evil effects.

1 Dawlatsháh (pp. 412-417) consecrates an article to him, in which he mentions his migration from Níshápúr to Mashhad. Besides being a notable penman, poet and maker of acrostics, he was an expert in gilding, illumination, and all arts connected with books, and gave instruction in these subjects. He is said to have composed 3000 verses of poetry in one night. He had also so voracious an appetite that on one occasion he ate twelve maunds of food and fruit without suffering any evil effects.
O Prince, thou art he on account of the weight of whose love the back of the arch of the Placeless is bowed even as the vault of Heaven!

Our share of favour is not lacking out of thy abounding liberality, but the wine they bring is of short measure, like the life of thine enemy."

Finally here is an epigram addressed to his pen:

"Alack at the hands of my pitch-stained pen, which showed forth my secret to foe and friend!

I said, 'I will cut its tongue that it may become dumb': I did so, and it waxed more eloquent than before."

There are references to other places, such as Sárfí in Mázandarán, and to other individuals whom I cannot identify, such as Khwája Naẓám, ‘Abdu’r-Rahmán, a poet named Amín, and Shápúr, Jamshíd and Ardashír, who were perhaps Zoroastrians, since the first two of the three are mentioned in connection with wine. The last seems to have been a rebel against the king of Shírwán, who, having got him into his power, hesitated between killing and blinding him; whereon the poet advises the latter course in these verses:

The nibs of the reed-pen (qalam) are cut to make it write better.
"O king, do not kill the rebel Ardashir, although he hath broken the support of Shîrwân;
Thou didst ask, 'Shall I kill him, or apply the needle to his eyes?'
It is not good to kill; blind the devil!"

'Arifi of Herât.

The next poet of whom something must be said is 'Arifi of Herât, whose best-known work is the mystical and allegorical poem properly entitled Ḥâl-nâma ("the Book of Ecstasy"), but more commonly known, from its subject, as Gîy u Chawgân ("the Ball and the Polo-stick"), which was written in 842/1438–9 in the space of a fortnight, and for which the author received as a reward from his royal patron a horse and the sum of one thousand dinârs. As he was, according to his own statement, over fifty years old at the time, he must have been born about 791/1389, the year in which the great Ḥâfîz died. His own death appears to have taken place in 853/1449.

As already mentioned, he was called by his admirers "the second Salmán," partly because his style was deemed similar to that of the earlier poet, and partly, as Mîr 'Alî Shîr informs us in his Majâlisu'n-Nafâ'îs, because both poets suffered from weak and inflamed eyes. This is proved in the case of 'Arifi by the following verse:

"The white salve on the red lid of my eye is exactly like powdered salt on roast meat."

Though almost all the biographers (except the modern Ridâ-quîlî Khán in his Majma'ū'l-Fuşâhâ) make mention of 'Arîfî, the particulars which they give about him are very

1 See Rieu's Persian Catalogue, pp. 639–640, and his Persian Supplement, p. 185.
2 P. 490 supra.
meagre. His Hāl-nāma, which Jámi calls "one of his best poems," comprises only some 500 verses. It has not, I think, been printed, but I have looked at a pretty and fairly good manuscript of it in the Cambridge University Library, transcribed in 952/1546, and found it, I regret to confess, laboured and insipid. The following passage, describing the king's polo-pony, includes some of the specimen verses given both by Jámi and Mīr 'Alī Shīr, and may therefore be assumed to be a favourable sample:

"The King of the denizens of earth Muḥammad, whose throne is the sun and his cushion the moon, That King for whom, when he lifts his polo-stick, the moon becomes the ball and heaven the playing-field. At what time he throws his leg over the saddle he raises the dust from the terrestrial sphere. When his spur excites his horse, thou wouldst say that fire mingled with wind. When the King's polo-pony is at the gallop it snatches away the ball from the steed of heaven. If he did not restrain it in its leaping, it would overshoot the goal of heaven. When it is drenched in perspiration it is like rain with lightning in the midst. Fire flies from its hoof, while the whirlwind clings to its tail."

The whole poem is filled with these ingenious and often far-fetched similes and metaphors drawn from the game of polo, but to most European readers they will seem tasteless and artificial, and the resulting product hardly worthy to be called poetry in the sense in which we understand the word.

Of the poets who died in the second half of the ninth century of the hijra (fifteenth of the Christian era) it is difficult to decide which are of sufficient importance to deserve mention in a work like this, until we come to the last and greatest of them, Jámi, whose claim to be regarded as one of the most notable poets of Persia is indisputable. That there is no lack of them, so far as numbers go, will be evident to anyone who consults the contemporary biographers. Thus Dawlatsháh gives notices of some two score of this period, while Mír ‘Alí Shír Nawá’í in his Majálisu’n-Nafá’ís (composed in the Turki language) mentions forty-six in the first chapter (Majlis) of his work, wherein he treats of those poets who were still living in his time, though he had never met them. Some of these poets are familiar by name to students of Persian literature, and most of them have produced graceful verses, but few if any attain a degree of excellence which would preserve their names from oblivion but for their association with princes and rulers who gloried not only in the quality but in the quantity of the men of letters who frequented their courts and enjoyed their patronage. Dawlatsháh, implicitly recognizing this fact, often makes a brief notice of some minor poet the peg on which to hang a much fuller account of his royal patron. Thus in his notice of Sháh Ni‘matu’l-láh, who really has claims to distinction as a mystic if not as a poet, he concludes by enumerating\(^1\) the chief Shaykhs, men of learning, poets and artists who added lustre to the court of Sháh-rúkh. Of the poets he mentions Shaykh Ádharí of Isfará’in (d. 866/1461–2), Bábá Sawdá’í of Abíward (d. 853/1449–50),

\(^1\) P. 340 of my edition.
Mawláná 'Alí Shiháb of Turshíz, Amír Sháhí of Sabzawár (d. 857/1453), Káltíbi of Turshíz (d. 839/1435–6), and Nasími, "the fame of whose writings and diwáns," he adds, "is celebrated throughout the habitable quarter of the world."

"There were," he concludes, "four talented artists at the court of Sháh-rúkh who in their own time had no peer, Khwája 'Abdu'l-Qádir of Marágha in the art of music and roundels (adwár), Yúsuf of Andakán in singing and minstrelsy, Ustad Qiwwamú'd-Dín in geometry, design and architecture, and Mawláná Khalíl the painter, who was second only to Mání." Yet the verses of these poets, for the most part unpublished till this day and very rare even in manuscript, were probably but little known even in their own time outside Khurasán, and we may consider ourselves fortunate if we can individualize them by some special personal characteristic or incident in their lives, such as that Ádharí visited Sháh Ní'matu'lláh, became a mystic and renounced the flattery of kings, and made a journey to India; or that Sháhí was a descendant of the Sarbadárí rulers of Sabzawár and a Shi'a, which latter fact has won for him a long and laudatory notice in the Majálisu'll-Má'mínín ("Assemblies of true believers," i.e. Shi'ites) of Núru'lláh ibn Sayyid Sharíf al-Mar'áshí of Shúshtár. "Scholars are agreed," says Dawlatsháh, with his usual exaggeration, "that in the verse of Amír Sháhí are combined the ardour of Khusraw, the grace of Hasan, the delicacy of Kamál, and the clarity of Háfiz." That he entertained no mean opinion of himself is shown by the following verses which he extemporized when assigned a lower place at the reception of some prince than that to which he considered himself entitled:

1 It is commonly believed by the Persians that Mání (Manes), the founder of Manichæanism, claimed that his skill in painting was the miraculous proof of his divine mission.
3 Composed about 993/1585. See Rieu's Persian Cat., pp. 337–8.
4 P. 426 of my edition.
5 Ibid., p. 427.
"O king, the revolution of heaven's wheel in a thousand years will not show forth one like me, unique in a hundred accomplishments. If thou makest me to sit below everybody and nobody. Herein is a subtle point; so much I know. Thy court is an ocean, and in the ocean, without dispute, the pearl is at the bottom and the rubbish at the top."

What, again, is to be thought of such a verse as this of Qudsi of Herat in which he alludes to the slobbering mouth with which he was afflicted as the result of some paralytic affection of the face?1

"Notwithstanding such a mouth as I have I utter verse from which water2 drips."

Such ingenuities are very characteristic of the time and place of which we are speaking, and therefore deserve notice, but they do not constitute what we understand by poetry. The following passage from Dawlatshah3 gives a good idea of what the courts of these Tīmūrid princes were like.

"Now the auspicious birth of Prince Bāysunghur took place in the year 802/1399-1400. He possessed a perfect comeliness and favourable fortune and prosperity. Alike in talent and in the encouragement of talent he was famous throughout the world. Calligraphy and poetry were highly esteemed in his time, and scholars and men of talent, attracted by his renown, flocked from all regions and quarters to enter his service. It is said that forty calligraphers were busy copying in his library, of which scribes the chief was Mawlānā Ja‘far of Tabrīz.

2 Āb means water, but also lustre, temper (of steel), water (of diamonds), splendour, and the like.
He showed favour to men of talent, loved poets, strove after refinement and luxury, and entertained witty courtiers and boon-companions. Of the kings of all times since Khusraw Parviz² none lived so joyous and splendid a life as Baysunghur Sultán. He composed and appreciated good verse both in Turki and Persian, and wrote six different hands. This verse is by him:

Báysunghur hath become the beggar in thy street:
The king is the beggar in the street of the fair.

"It is related that, in the time of Sultán Baysunghur, Khwája Yúsuf of Andakán had no peer in song and minstrelsy throughout the Seven Climes. His notes, sweet as David's song, lacerated the soul, while his 'Royal Mode'³ sprinkled salt on wounded hearts. On several occasions Sultán Ibráhím the son of Sháh-rukh sent from Shíráz to ask for Khwája Yúsuf from Baysunghur Sultán, who, however, raised difficulties. Finally he sent a hundred thousand dinars in cash in order that Mirzá Báysunghur might send Khwája Yúsuf for him, but Baysunghur answered his brother in this verse:

We will not sell our Yúsuf [Joseph]: keep thy black silver!"

"Between Ulugh Beg Kúrkán, Baysunghur Bahádur and Ibráhím Sultán there passed many pleasant sayings and much correspondence which transcend the scope of this Memoir, but faithless Fortune and the cruel Sphere laid hands on the life of that joyous prince in the days of his youth, nor did the ministers of Fate and Destiny take pity on his immaturity. One night, by the decree of the Lord of lords, through excess of wine he was overwhelmed by the deep sleep of death, of which the inhabitants of Herát supposed apoplexy to be the cause.

They say that death is a strange sleep: that heavy sleep overtook us.'

"So the Prince, half-drunken, staggered to the bed of earth, whence he shall rise up bemused on the Resurrection Morning, with others drugged with the Wine of Death, to seek from the cup-bearers of 'and their Lord shall give them to drink pure wine'³ the purification of the

¹ The Sásánian, contemporary with the Prophet Muḥammad (seventh century after Christ).
² Ahang-i-Khusrawání, the name of one of the modes or airs of Persian music.
³ Qur'án, lxxvi, 21.
headache-healing wine of 'a full bumper'. It is our firm hope that the All-Merciful Judge will overlook his sin, which naught but the dew of His Mercy can wash away. This tragic catastrophe of Báysunghur Sultán took place in the metropolis of Herát in the White Garden in the year 837/1433-4, his age being then thirty-five years. The poets who were attached to the service of Báysunghur Bahádur during the reign of Sháh-rukh Sultán were Bábá Sawdá‘í, Mawlání Yúsuf Amrí, Amír Sháhí of Sbzawár, Mawláná Kátibí of Turshíz, and Amír Yamínú’d-Dín...The poets composed elegies on Sultán Báysunghur's death, but Amír Sháhí surpassed them all in this quatrain:

\[
\text{The age lamented much in mourning for thee; the red anemone poured forth all the blood of its eyes into its skirt; The rose rent the collar of its crimson mantle; the dove clothed its neck in black felt.}
\]

Dawlatsháh, in spite of all his faults, of which inaccuracy and an intolerable floridity of style are the worst, does succeed in depicting better than many contemporary historians and biographers the strange mixture of murder, drunkenness, love of Art and literary taste which characterized the courts of these Tímúrid princes, and it may not be amiss to add to the preceding extracts the portrait of one of the most accomplished of them, Ulugh Beg, with which he concludes his notice of the poet 'Išmat of Bukhárá, the master of Bisáti and Khayáli, and the contemporary of Rustam of Khúriyán, Táhir of Abáward, and Barandaq of Bukhárá. After mentioning that 'Išmat died in 829/1425-6 he continues:

"Now as to the late Sultán of blessed memory Ulugh Beg Kúrkán, he was learned, just, masterful and energetic, and attained a high degree in the science of Astronomy, while in Rhetoric he could split hairs. In his reign the status of men of learning reached its highest

zenith, and in his period the rank of scholars was at its greatest. In the science of Geometry he was an expositor of subtleties, and on questions of Cosmography an elucidator of the Almagest. Scholars and philosophers are agreed that in Islāmic times, nay, from the days of [Alexander] 'the Two-horned' until now no monarch like unto Mfrrā Ulugh Beg Kūrkān in philosophy and science has ever sat on a royal throne. He had the most complete knowledge of the mathematical sciences, so that he recorded observations of the stars with the cooperation of the greatest scientists of his age, such as Qādir-zāda-i-Rūmī and Mawlānā Ghiyāthu’d-Dīn Jamshīd. These two great scholars, however, died before completing their work, and the Sulṭān, devoting all his energies to this task, completed the observations and produced the Zīj-i-Sulṭānī (‘Royal Almanac’), to which he himself prefixed an exordium. These tables are today in use and highly esteemed by philosophers, some of whom prefer them to the Zīj-i-Ikhānī of Naṣīru’d-Dīn of Ţūs.

"He further constructed a fine college in Samarqand, the like of which in beauty, rank and worth is not to be found throughout the seven climes, and in which at the present time more than a hundred students are domiciled and provided for. During the reign of his father Shāh-rukh he exercised absolute sway over Samarqand and Transoxiana...."

"It is related that Mfrrā Ulugh Beg's intelligence and power of memory were such that a record was kept of every animal which he overthrew in the chase, with the place and date of the hunting, recording the day, the locality, and the nature of the quarry. By chance this book was mislaid, and seek as they might they could not find it, so that the librarians were filled with apprehension. 'Be not troubled,' said Ulugh Beg, 'for I remember all these particulars from beginning to end.' So he summoned the scribes and repeated the dates and circumstances, all of which the scribes took down until the record was completed. After a while by chance the original record turned up. They collated the two copies, and found divergences only in four or five places.

"Many such marvels are related of the genius and intelligence of this prince. Thus the learned Shaykh Ādharī (the poet) relates as follows:

1 His proper name was Šalāhu’d-Dīn Mūsā.
2 Concerning this important work, probably completed about 841/1437–8, see Rieu's Persian Catalogue and the references there given, especially to the partial text and translation published by Sédillot (Paris, 1847 and 1853).
“In the year 800/1397-8, when I was in Qarā-bāgh with my maternal uncle, who was story-teller to the great Amīr, the Lord of the Fortunate Conjunction, Timūr Kūrkān, I became attached to the service of Ulūgh Beg Mīrāz ā in the days of his childhood, and for several years was that Prince’s playmate in childish games and used to tell him tales and stories, while he, after the fashion of children, became familiar and intimate with me. In the year 852/1448-9, when the above-mentioned Prince conquered Khurāsān and halted at Isfardā’in, I arose, after the grey dawn of age had been kindled from the evening of youth, and hastened to wait upon him. When he saw me from afar off in the garb of the religious mendicants and men of God, after saluting me and enquiring after my health, he said, “O darwīsh, thou seest to be my ancient companion and friend. Art thou not the nephew of our story-teller?” I was amazed at the quick apprehension and clear memory of the King, and replied, that I was. He spoke of Qarā-bāgh, the wars in Georgia and the marvels of that country, while I answered to the best of my recollection.’

“Many similar instances are related of this Prince’s keenness of memory, but more than this much exceeds the scope of these Memoirs.”

A year after the meeting described above (in 853/1449-1450) the talented Ulūgh Beg was murdered by his unnatural son ‘Abdu’l-Latif, who was himself murdered seven months later.

Husayn Wā’īz-i-Kāshīfī.

Almost all the literary achievements of the latest period treated in this volume centre round that great and liberal patron of the arts the Minister Mīr ‘Alī Shīr Nawā’ī, as they culminate in the brilliant and many-sided poet Jāmī, with some account of whom we shall conclude. First, however, a few more words must be added about Mīr Alī Shīr and also about Ḥusayn Wā’īz-i-Kāshīfī, agreeably to a promise given in the preceding chapter, where something was said about their more solid prose work. Of the latter a notice is given by Khwāndamīr in his Habtū’l-Siyar, of which the substance

---

1 The turning grey of black hair is often poetically described by the Persians as the dawn coming up out of the night.

is as follows. His full name was Kamálu'd-Dín Ḥusayn, and, as his title Wá‘ız implies, he was by profession a preacher. He had a fine and melodious voice and a considerable knowledge of theology and traditions. Every Friday morning he used to preach in the Dáru’s-Siyádat-i-Sultáni at Herát, and afterwards used to officiate in the Mosque of Mír ‘Alí Shír. On Tuesday he used to preach in the Royal College, and on Wednesday at the tomb of Khwája Abu’l-Walíd Ahmad. In the latter part of his life he also sometimes preached on Thursday in the chapel of Sultán Ahmad Mírzá. He was skilled in astronomy as well as in the art of literary composition, and could hold his own with his compeers in other branches of learning. His son Fakhru’l-Dín ‘Alí, who succeeded him as a preacher, was something of a poet and composed the romantic muthnawí known as Mahmüd and Ayáz. The father, however, does not seem to have written poetry, but preferred to display his skill in fine writing, chiefly in the well-known Anwár-i-Suhaylí, or “Lights of Canopus.” This florid and verbose rendering of the famous Book of Kalíla and Dimna, thanks to the reputation which it enjoys in India, has attracted an undue amount of attention amongst English students of Persian: it was for many years one of the text-books prescribed for candidates for the India Civil Service, and is one of the lengthiest Persian texts which ever issued from an English printing-press¹. The way in which this wordy and bombastic writer has embroidered and expanded not only the original Arabic version of Ibnu’l-Muqaffá‘, but even the earlier Persian version, may be appreciated by the English reader who will refer to vol. ii of my Literary History of Persia, pp. 350–353. The other works of Ḥusayn Wá‘ız have been already mentioned²; except an epistolary manual entitled Makhzanu’l-Inshá which I have not seen. He died in 910/1504–5, nineteen years before Khwándamír’s notice of his life was written.

¹ Messrs Austin of Hertford, 1805.
² Pp. 441, 442 supra.
CH. VIII]

MIR ‘ALĪ SHĪR NAWĀ’Ī

The importance and influence of Mír ‘Alí Shír, both as a writer and a patron of literary men, was, as pointed out in the last chapter, immense, and he may without exaggeration be described as the Mæcenas of his time and country. He was the friend and patron of Jámí, who dedicated many of his works to him, and on whose death in 898/1492 he composed an elegy of which Khwándamír quotes the opening lines, and his name occurs in connection with a large proportion of the scholars and poets noticed by the last-named writer in the section which he devotes in the Ḥabíbul’s-Síyar¹ to the men of letters of Sulṭán Ḥusayn’s time. Bábur, who is much more critical and much less addicted to indiscriminate praise than biographers like Dawlatsháh and Khwándamír, speaks in the highest terms of Mír ‘Alí Shír², and says that he knows of no such generous and successful patron of talent. Apart from the numerous writers and poets whom he encouraged and patronized, the painters Bihzád and Sháh Muẓaffar and the incomparable musicians Qul-Muḥammad, Shaykhí Ná’í and Ḥusayn ‘Údí owed their success to him. He himself was a successful musician, composer and painter, and unrivalled as a poet in the Turki language, in which he produced four Dīwáns of lyric poetry and six long mathnawís, five in imitation of Nízámí’s Khamsa (“Quintet”), and one in imitation of ‘Aṭṭár’s Mantigu’-Ṭayr (“Speech of the Birds”) entitled Lisánu’-Ṭayr (“the Language of the Birds”). In Persian poetry, which he wrote under the pen-name of Fání, he was, according to Bábur, less successful, for though some of his verses were not bad, most were weak and poor. His prosody also was lacking in accuracy, and in the treatise entitled Mízánu’l-Awzán (“the Measure of Metres”) which he wrote on that subject Bábur asserts

that he made erroneous statements about four of the twenty-four quatrains which he discussed.

It is on his Turkish rather than on his Persian poetry, therefore, that Mir 'Alí Shír's claims to literary fame are based, though his munificent patronage of all literature and art entitles him to honourable mention in any history of Persian literature. Such as desire further particulars of his life and work will find them in the admirable monograph published by M. Belin in the Journal Asiatique for 1861 under the title of Notice biographique et littéraire sur Mir Ali-Chir Névâiî, suivie d'extraits tirés des œuvres du même auteur. He was born at Herát in 844/1440-1 and died and was buried there on the 12th of Jumáda ii, 906 (January 3, 1501). His life, for a statesman in so troublous a land and time, was singularly peaceful, and throughout it he enjoyed the friendship and confidence of Sultán Abu'l-Ghází Ḥusayn, his school-fellow in childhood and his sovereign in maturer age. For public life and political power he cared little, and would willingly have renounced them in favour of spiritual contemplation and literary leisure, nor did he ever take to himself a wife. He was even admitted by the illustrious Jámí into the Naqshbandí order of darwishes. His zeal for good works was unfailing, and he is stated to have founded, or restored, and endowed no fewer than 370 mosques, colleges, rest-houses and other pious and charitable institutions in Khurásán alone. He was a prolific writer, and Belin enumerates 29 of his works, composed at various dates between the accession of Sultán Ḥusayn and his death. The latest of these was his Muhákmátu'l-Lughátayn, or "Judgement between the two Languages," in which he endeavours to establish the superiority of the Turki over the Persian tongue. This was written in 905/1499-1500, only the year before his death.

1 Also published separately as a pamphlet of 158 pages.
2 He succeeded to the throne of Herát on the death of Abú Sa'id in Ramadán 873 (March-April, 1469).
3 Belin, op. cit., p. 19.
4 Ibid., pp. 59-64.
Mulla Núru’d-Dín ‘Abdu’r-Rahmán Jámi, who was born at the little town of Jám in Khurásán on Sha’bán 23, 817 (November 7, 1414), and died at Herát on Muharram 18, 898 (November 9, 1492), was one of the most remarkable geniuses whom Persia ever produced, for he was at once a great poet, a great scholar, and a great mystic. Besides his poetry, which, apart from minor productions, consisted of three Dīwāns of lyrical poetry and seven romantic or didactic mathnawīs, he wrote on the exegesis of the Qur’ān, the evidence of the Divine Mission of the Prophet Muḥammad, traditions of the Saints, Mysticism, Arabic grammar, Rhyme, Prosody, Music, acrostics (mu’ammā) and other matters. In the Tuhfa-i-Sámi forty-six of his works are enumerated, and I do not think this list is exhaustive. He was held in the highest honour by his contemporaries, not only by his fellow-countrymen, but, as we have seen, even by the Ottoman Sulṭán, who vainly endeavoured to induce him to visit his court. By his most illustrious contemporaries he was regarded as so eminent as to be beyond praise and so well known as to need no detailed biography. Thus Bābur, after observing that “in exoteric and esoteric learning there was none equal to him in that time,” says that he is “too exalted for there to be any need for praising him,” and that he only introduces his name “for luck and for a blessing.” Sám Mírzá, the son of Sháh Isma’īl the Šafawi, places him first in the fifth section (Ṣahīfa) of his Tuhfa-i-Sámi, and says “by reason of the extreme elevation of his genius...there is no need to describe his condition or set forth any account of him, since the rays of his virtues have reached from the East to the uttermost parts of the

1 See pp. 422-3 supra.
3 Cambridge MS. Or. 648, pp. 93-100.
West, while the bountiful table of his excellencies is spread from shore to shore.” Dawlatsháh, who puts him first, before Mír ‘Alí Shír, in the concluding section of his Memoirs, which deals with living contemporary poets, speaks in a similar strain. Mír ‘Alí Shír, besides the brief notice of him at the beginning of his Majálisu’n-Náfá’ís, has devoted an entire work, the Khamsatul-Mutahayyirín (“Quintet of the Astonished”) to his praises. This work, fully described by Belin, is so entitled because it is divided into five parts, a preface, three chapters and an epilogue, which treat respectively (1) of the origin, birth and life of Jámi, and of the author’s acquaintance with him; (2) of events and conversations between the author and Jámi indicating the degree of their intimacy; (3) of the correspondence between them preserved in Jámi’s works; (4) of the works composed by Jámi at the author’s suggestion and instigation; (5) of the books and treatises read by the author under Jámi’s direction, with an account of his death and funeral, which was celebrated with extraordinary pomp, and attended by many members of the Royal Family, noblemen, divines and scholars, besides a vast concourse of the common people. But the most valuable biography of him is probably that written by his most eminent disciple, ‘Abdu’l-Ghafúr of Lár, who died on Sha‘bán 5, 912 (December 21, 1506) and was buried beside his master.

All the essential facts of Jámi’s life, however, are given in the excellent Biographical Sketch (pp. 1–20) prefixed by Captain Nassau Lees to his edition of the Nafahátul-Uns, a sketch only marred by a violent and uncalled-for attack on Mysticism. The details are far fuller and better vouched for than, for instance, in the case of Ḥáfíz. Jámi himself

4 Published at Calcutta in 1859.
has recorded the date of his birth and the double reason for which he adopted the pen-name by which he is known, and he has also recorded the dates when most of his poems and other works were composed, for the most part during the last fourteen or fifteen years of his long life. These dates, as well as the texts of the poems, rest on an unusually firm foundation, for there exists at St Petersburg, in the Institut des Langues Orientales du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, an autograph manuscript of the poet's Kulliyát, or Complete Works, which has been described in great detail by the late Baron Victor Rosen, and which has finally settled several doubtful points of chronology. For further details of his life and character there is no lack of contemporary evidence. Even as a boy he showed remarkable quickness and ability, and, as he grew older and pursued his studies under more famous masters, he rapidly assimilated such knowledge as they were able to impart, and often finished by being able to confute them in argument. Of his scholarship Nassau Lees writes as follows:

"Considering Jâmi, not as a poet, but simply as a scholar, it cannot be denied that he was a man of remarkable genius and great erudition; and it is to be regretted that he does not seem to have been free from self-conceit, supercilious hauteur, and contempt for the literati of his day, so commonly the characteristic of the votaries of his peculiar philosophy. He was extremely reluctant to admit that he was indebted to any of his masters for his acquirements. 'I have found,' said he, 'no master with whom I have read superior to myself. On the contrary I have invariably found that in argument I could defeat them all. I acknowledge, therefore, the obligations of a pupil to his master to none of them; for if I am a pupil of anyone it is of my own father, who taught me the language.'"

More pleasing, though possibly due to the same motives, was his refusal to flatter or humble himself before the rich and powerful, a rare virtue amongst the poets of that day, which led his biographer 'Alí the son of Ḥusayn Wā'īz al-Kāshīfī to

\[1\] Collections Scientifiques de l'Institut etc. Les Manuscrits Persans, pp. 215–259.
remark that to no one more than Jàmí did the following lines of Nizámí apply:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{چون بعید جوانی از بَرَتو،} & \quad \text{بدر مُس نرفت‌م از در تو} \\
\text{همرا بَر دَر فرستادی} & \quad \text{من نهی خواستیرتو میدادی}
\end{align*}
\]

"Since in my youth I ne'er forsook Thy gate
To seek elsewhere the favours of the great,
Thou in return didst send them all to me:
I sought it not; it was a boon from Thee."

To his spiritual teachers, on the other hand, and to those who guided him in the mystic's path Jàmí showed the greatest veneration and rendered the most ungrudging homage; a fact abundantly illustrated by Nassau Lees in his *Biographical Sketch*.²

But though, or perhaps because, he refused to flatter or fawn on the great, few Persian poets have enjoyed during their lives such profound and widespread respect, or have lived so long without being exposed to such disagreeable experiences or discouraging vicissitudes of fortune as fell to the lot of even the greatest of them, such as Firdawsí, Nášir-i-Khusraw, Anwarí, Sa'ádi or Ḥáfíz. The only unpleasant incident recorded as having befallen Jàmí, and one from which he easily and speedily extricated himself, occurred at Baghdád when he was returning from the Pilgrimage in 877-8/1472³. A garbled citation from one of his poems, the *Silsilatu'dh-Dhahab*, or "Chain of Gold," was employed by some ill-disposed persons to convict him of hostility to the House of 'Alí, in spite of a remarkable poem⁴ in praise of al-Ḥusayn, 'Alí's son, which he had composed a little while before when he visited the scene of his martyrdom at Karbalá. In a crowded meeting presided over by the chief doctors of Baghdád, Jàmí easily succeeded in refuting the accusation and turning the tables on his detractors, adding that "if he had any fears at all in writing

---

1 Nassau Lees's *Biographical Sketch*, p. 5.
2 Pp. 5-11.  
this book they were that...the people of Khurásán might accuse him of Shi'a tendencies, but that it never occurred to him to imagine that on account of it he should fall into trouble at the hands of the Shi'a." The incident, however, rankled in his mind, and is commemorated in a rather bitter poem beginning:

"O cupbearer, unseal the [wine-]jar by the brink of the Shaṭṭ, and wash from my memory the unpleasantness of the Baghdaḍís. Seal my lips with the wine-cup, for not one of the people of this land is worth discussion. Expect not faithfulness or generosity from the unworthy; seek not for the virtues of men from the disposition of devils."

Notwithstanding his piety and mysticism, Jámí had a sharp tongue and was ready at repartee. Thus on one occasion he was repeating with fervour the line:

"So constantly art thou in my stricken soul and sleepless eye That whosoever should appear from afar, I should think that it was thou."

An irreverent bystander interrupted him with the question, "Suppose it were an ass?" "I should think that it was thou," replied Jámí.

2 The *Shaṭṭu'li'-Arab* is the name given to the united streams of the Tigris and Euphrates
On another occasion Jámí composed the following verses on a contemporary poet named Ságharí who had accused his fellow-poets of plagiarizing his ideas:

"Ságharí was saying, 'Wherever the plagiarists have seen a fine idea in my poetry they have stolen it.'

I have noticed that most of his poems are devoid of ideas: whoever said that the ideas had been stolen spoke the truth."

When Ságharí angrily reproached Jámí for this verse, he said, "It is not my fault. What I wrote was shá'írí (‘a certain poet,’ شاعری), not Ságharí (ساغری), but some mischief-maker has altered the dots over the letters to annoy you!"

Amongst the chronograms which commemorate the date of Jámí’s death the two best known are

\[\text{وَمَّنْ ذَخَّلَ كَانَ آمَنًا (Qur‘án, iii, 91: } 6 + 40 + 50 + 4 + 600 + 30 + 5 + 20 + 1 + 50 + 1 + 40 + 50 + 1 = 898) \text{“And whosoever entereth it is safe”;} \]

and

\[\text{دَوْدَ اَزَ خَرَاسَانَ بِرَ أَمَد (Khurásán) gives } 600 + 200 + 1 + 60 + 1 + 50 = 912; \text{ smoke (dǔd) gives } 4 + 6 + 4 = 14; \text{ } 912 - 14 = 898. \]

We pass now to a consideration of Jámí’s numerous works, which fall primarily into two categories, prose and poetry. Of his chief prose works, the

\[\text{Nafahátul-Uns (Biographies of Šúfí saints, composed in 883/1478), the Shawáhidü’n-Nubuwát (“Evidences of Prophethood,” composed in 885/1480), the commentary on 'Iráqí’s Lamá’át (known as Ashí‘atu’l-Lamá’át, composed in 886/1481), and the Lawá’ík (“Flashes”) mention has been already} \]

1 Nassau Lees, op. cit., p. 19.
made. Of these the second only, so far as I know, remains unpublished. I possess a fine old manuscript of it, on which the following table of contents is based.

Preface (Muqaddama). On the meaning of Nabi (Prophet) and Rasúl (Apostle), and other matter connected therewith.

First chapter (Rukn). On the signs and evidences which preceded the birth of His Holiness the Prophet.

Second chapter. Setting forth what took place from the time of his birth until [the beginning of] his mission.

Third chapter. Setting forth what took place from [the beginning of] his mission until the Flight.

Fourth chapter. Setting forth what took place from the Flight until his death.

Fifth chapter. Setting forth what has, or is known to have, no special connection with any one of these periods, and that whereof the significance became apparent only after his death.

Sixth chapter. Setting forth the signs and evidences which became apparent through his Noble Companions and the Imáms of his House (may God be well pleased with them!).

Seventh chapter. Setting forth the evidences which were manifested through the Followers [of the Companions] and the Followers of the Followers, down to the generation of the [first] Śúfis1.

Conclusion (Khátima). On the punishment of his enemies.

This book is written in a very simple style, and would, if published, constitute an admirable introduction to the beliefs of the Muslims about their Prophet.

Three other mystical works which I have not had an opportunity of reading are the Lawámi ("Gleams"), a Commentary on the celebrated Fuṣúṣul-Hikam of the great

1 On this classification (Companions; Followers; Followers of the Followers; Śúfis) compare the Nafahátu'l-Uns (ed. Nassau Lees), p. 31.
mystic Shaykh Muḥyīʾ-ḏīn ibnul-ʿArabī (composed in 896/1491), and a Commentary on the Ṣūṣūṣ of his disciple Shaykh Ṣadrūʾ-ḏīn al-Qunaywī. This is entitled Naḍwil-Ṣūṣūṣ, and is one of Jámiʾs earliest works, for it was composed in 863/1458-59.

Of Jámiʾs minor works I have noted some two dozen, included by Sám Mīrzā in the list of forty-six which he gives in his Tuhfa-i-Sāmi, but this latter number is more than doubled by the Mīratul-Khayal1, which states that Jámi left behind him some ninety works. These minor works include commentaries on portions of the Qurʾān, e.g. the Sūratul- ʿFātiḥa; commentaries on Forty Traditions and on the Traditions of Abú Dharr; theological tracts on the Divine Unity (Risāla-i-Tahliliyya and Lā Ilāha illa ʿllāh), the Rites of the Pilgrimage (Manāsik-i-Hajj) and the like; monographs on the lives or sayings of various eminent mystics, such as Jalāluʾ-ḏīn Rūmī, Khwāja Pārsā and ʿAbduʾllāh Ansārī; tracts on Ṣūfī ethics and practice (e.g. the Ṭarīq-i-Ṣūfiyān and Taḥqiq-i-Madhhab-i-Ṣūfiyān); and commentaries on Arabic and Persian mystical verses, such as the Tāʾiyya and Mīmiyya (or Khamriyya) of ʿUmar ibnul-Fārīd, the opening verses of the Mathnawi (also known as the Nay-nāma, or “Reed-book” from its subject), a couplet of Amīr Khusraw of Dihlī, and a commentary of some of his own quatrains. Besides all these Jámi wrote treatises on prosody, rhyme2 and music, a commentary on the Miftahul-Ghayb, and another for his son Ḍiyāʾuʾ-ḏīn3 on the well-known Arabic grammar of Ibnul-Ḥājib known as the Kāfiya. There is also a collection of Jámiʾs letters (Munshāʾāt), and five treatises on the Muʾammā, or Acrostic, which was so popular at this period.

1 Cited by Nassau Lees, loc. cit., p. 19.
2 Published by Blochmann at the end of his Persian Prosody (Calcutta, 1872).
3 This book, commonly called Sharḥ-i-Mullā Jámi, is properly entitled, in allusion to the son’s name, al-Fawāʾidʾ-Ḍiyāʾiyya, and is well known and widely used in the East.
Last, but not least, amongst Jâmi’s prose works is the Bahârîstân, or “Spring land,” a book similar in character and arrangement to the more celebrated Gulistân of Sa’dî, composed in 892/1487. It comprises eight chapters (each called Rawda, “Garden”), the first containing anecdotes about Saints and Sûffs; the second sayings of Philosophers and Wise Men; the third on the Justice of Kings; the fourth on Generosity; the fifth on Love; the sixth on Jokes and Witticisms; the seventh on Poets; and the eighth on dumb animals. The work is written in mixed prose and verse, the proportion of verse being very considerable. The text, accompanied by a German translation by Schlechta-Wssehrd, was published at Vienna in 1846. There are also several Constantinople printed editions of the text, a complete English translation published in 1887 by the Kama Shastra Society, and an English version of the sixth book entitled “Persian Wit and Humour” by C. E. Wilson. The curious reader can therefore easily acquaint himself more fully with the contents of this book, even if he does not read Persian, and it is therefore superfluous to describe it more fully in this place.

It is as a poet, however, that Jâmi is best known, and it is of his poetical works that we must now speak. These comprise seven mathnawi poems, known collectively as the Sab’a (“Septet”) or Haft Awrang (“Seven Thrones,” one of the names by which the constellation of the Great Bear is known in Persia), and three separate Divâns, or collections of lyrical poetry, known respectively as the Fâtihatu’sh-Shabûb (“Opening of Youth”), compiled in 884/1479-1480; the Wâsi’tatu’l-Iqd

1 This chapter contains 53 “witticisms,” many of them very coarse, and hardly any of them sufficiently amusing to raise a smile.

2 Particulars of some three dozen are given, but the notices given by Jâmi of his own contemporaries are very brief.

3 I possess that printed at the Akhtar Press in 1294/1877. See also Ethê’s India Office Persian Catalogue, col. 771-2.
The *Haft Awrang* comprises the seven following poems:


2. *Salámân wa Absál*, published by Forbes Falconer in 1850, and translated into English in 1856. This edition contains 1131 verses. Another English prose abridged translation by Edward FitzGerald was published in London in 1856 (pp. xvi + 84).

3. *Tuhfatul-Ahrdr* ("the Gift of the Noble"), composed in 886/1481, was published by Forbes Falconer in 1848, and contains 1710 verses.

4. *Subhatu'l-Abrdr* ("the Rosary of the Pious") has been twice printed (1811 and 1848) and once lithographed (1818) at Calcutta.

5. *Yúsuf u Zulaykhá*, composed in 888/1483, the best known and most popular of these seven poems, was published with a German verse-translation by Rosenzweig (Vienna, 1824). There is an English translation by R. T. H. Griffith (London, 1881), and another in very mediocre verse by A. Rogers (London, 1892).

6. *Laylá wa Majnún*, composed in 889/1484, has been translated into French by Chézy (Paris, 1805) and into German by Hartmann (Leipzig, 1807).

7. *Khirad-náma-i-Sikandarí* ("the Book of Wisdom of Alexander") has received the least attention of the seven poems, and, so far as I can ascertain, has never been published or translated.

I. *The Chain of Gold.*

Of the *Silsilatu'dh-Dhahab*, or "Chain of Gold," I possess a good manuscript transcribed in 997/1588-9. This poem discusses various philosophical, ethical and religious subjects with illustrative anecdotes and comprises some 7200 couplets.
A certain incoherence and scrappiness, combined with a
not very pleasing metre, seem to have rendered it less
popular than the remaining poems of the "Septet," and
hence probably its comparative rarity. It is dedicated to
Sultan Husayn, "whose justice bound the hands of the
Sphere from aggression":

and there follows a most elaborate and artificial acrostic on
this Prince's name, full of the most far-fetched conceits.

As a specimen of the poem we may take the following
anecdote concerning the distress of a poet who composed
a brilliant panegyric on a king, which no one applauded
save an ignorant fellow who had no acquaintance with the
forms of poetry.

(قصده گریستن آن شاعر که قصیده غرا در حضرت پادشاه خواند
و هیچ چس تحسین او نکرد جز چهل جاهل که با سالیپ سخن
عازف نبود)

شاعری در سخنوئی ساحر
در فن مدح گسترش ماهر
پر شاهی لوا مسح افزایش
پر صنایع قصیده پرداخت
مدح شاهان بعقل و شرعت رواست
زانکه شاهد و شاه چهل خداست
هست عابد بنفس صاحب دل
مدخت ظل ببدم صاحب ظل
برد روزی یکی نکو خوانندا
که رساند بعرض شاه آنرا
نظمرا حسن صوت می‌باید
تا از آن حسن آن بی‌رنگ‌اید؛
پای تا سر قصیده‌ها بر خوانند;
حرف حرفش بسی‌ع شاه رساند.
در سخن واجبست حسن بیان;
حیثی از آن گفت رُتْلِ آلِقرآن;
خوانندن‌چون با آخر انجامید;
وز ادای سخن بی‌ارامید.
داشت شاعر باهل مجلس گوش;
قصه بتهسین یا گنبد خروش;
آن هنرمند میکنند جانی;
کش ستایش کند هندانی.
همچ کش در نزد زبان نکشاد;
داد تحسین آن قصیده نداد;
نگ‌بان شهره بچهل و غزیر;
بانک زد از حیرت مجلس دور;
بارک الله فلان نکو گفتی;
گوهر می‌دح شاه نکو سفته;
مرد شاعر چو سوی او نکهست;
دست بر روی نباد و زار گریست;
گفت بشکست اربین حديث باشت;
بلهک تحسین این خیب‌تر کشت;
ترک تحسین پادشاه و گدا;
روی بخت مرا نکرد سیاه;
وه افرینی که این مغفل گرد
روس عیش مرا مبتل گرد
هرچه از بوستان بیخبردیست
گرچه شاخقبول بیشان رست
شعر کافی قبول خاطر عام
خاص داند که ست باشد و خام
میل هر کس بسوی جنس وی است
آنچه پختست جنس خام کی است
زاغ خواند نفیس ناخوش زاغ
چه شناسد صفر بیلبی باغ
چغد سازد بکنچ ویرانه
کی پنیر ی ز قصر شه خانه
نیست چون دیده سخت بینش
عمر می آیدم ز تحسینش
هیچنین رافضی بآن دغیل
چون صند مدع و آفرینی على
آید از مدع ا و علی را عار
و آفرینش بود علی را بار
گر تو گوئی که میل دل هرگز
نیست خالی ز نسبت جایز
رافضی به دنی علی علیست
میل چون از مناسب خالیست
باز گویی حکایتی در یاب
کرز تمام درآن رس بجواب
“A bard whose verse with magic charm was filled,
Who in all arts of eulogy was skilled,
Did for some king a flag of honour raise,
And wrought a poem filled with arts of praise.
Reason and Law the praise of kings approve;
Kings are the shadow of the Lord above.
The shadow’s praise doth to the wise accord
With praises rendered to the shadow’s Lord.
A skilful rhapsodist the bard one day
Brought in his verse before the King to lay.
Melodious verse melodious voice doth need
That so its beauty may increase indeed.
From end to end these praises of the King
Unto his ears the rhapsodist did bring.
A fine delivery is speech’s need:
The Book God bids melodiously to read.¹
When to the end he had declaimed the piece
And from reciting it at length did cease,
The poet strained his ears to hear the pause
Swiftly curtailed by thunders of applause.
The man of talent travaileth with pain
Hoping the critic’s well-earned praise to gain,
Yet no one breathed a word or showed a sign
Of recognition of those verses fine,
Till one renowned for ignorance and pride,
Standing beyond the cultured circle, cried,
‘God bless thee! Well thou singest, well dost string
‘Fair pearls of speech to please our Lord the King!’
The poet gazed on him with saddened eye.
Covered his face, and sore began to cry.
‘By this,’ he wailed, ‘my back is snapped in twain:
‘The praise of this lewd fellow me hath slain!
‘That King and beggar grudged my praises due
‘My fortune’s face with black did not imbrue,
‘But this fool-fellow’s baseless ill-judged praise
‘Hath changed to woe the pleasure of my days!’
In folly’s garden every flower and fruit,
Though fair of branch and bud, is foul of root.
‘Verse which accordeth with the vulgar mood
‘Is known to men of taste as weak and crude.
‘Like seeks for like; this is the common law;
‘How can the ripe foregather with the raw?

¹ Qur‘án lxxiii, 4: “and chant the Qur‘án with a well-measured recitation.”
The crow repeats the crow's unlovely wail,
And scorns the warbling of the nightingale.
The owl to some forsaken nook doth cling,
Nor home desires in palace of the King.
He hath no eye to judge the worth of verse,
So from his praise I suffer shame and worse!

E'en so the Ṣafīdī fulfilled with fraud,
When occupied with 'All's praise and laud,
Shame comes to 'All from his shameless praise,
Which praise on him a grievous burden lays.

If thou shouldst say, 'A heart's devotion ne'er
Can be devoid of some relation fair;
'All so high, the Ṣafīdī so mean,
Doth no relationship subsist between?'

Another anecdote I pray thee hear,
Ponder it well, and rend an answer clear.

The *Silsilatu'dh-Dhahab* is divided into three books or *daftars*, whereof the first ends with an *I'tiqād-nāma*, or Confession of Faith, which exhibits Jámi, in spite of his mysticism, as a thoroughly orthodox Sunnī. This is sufficiently shown by the sectional headings, which run as follows: Necessary Existence; Unity of God; the Attributes of God, *viz.* Life, Knowledge, Will, Power, Hearing, Seeing, Speech; Divine Actions; existence of the Angels; belief in all the Prophets; superiority of Muḥammad over all other prophets; finality of Muḥammad's mission; the Prophet's Law; his Night-Ascent to Heaven; his miracles; God's Scriptures; eternal pre-existence of God's Word; superiority of the people of Muḥammad over all other peoples; unlawfulness of regarding as infidels any of the

---

1 Literally "Rejector" (*i.e.* of the first three orthodox Caliphs), a term of vituperation applied by the Sunnīs to the Shī'ā.

2 The following lines, which are a continuation of these, are entitled: "Story of that Ṣafīdī who begged a certain scholar to describe 'All, and how that scholar enquired, 'Which 'All shall I describe, the 'All in whom I believe, or the 'All in whom you believe?'

3 This important dogma, hotly repudiated by the Mu'tazila, was one of the test-beliefs of what ultimately became the orthodox doctrine of Islām.
"people of the Qibla"; the Angels of the Tomb, Munkir and Nakir; the two blasts of the trumpet; the distribution of the books kept by the recording angels; the Balance; the Bridge of Şirāt; the fifty stations of ʿAraşāt; indicating that the infidels shall remain in Hell-fire for ever, while sinners shall escape therefrom by the intercession of the virtuous and the pious; Paradise and its degrees.

The second book of the "Chain of Gold" consists chiefly of dissertations on the different kinds and phases of Love, "metaphorical" and "real," and anecdotes of saints and lovers. The third contains for the most part anecdotes of kings, and towards the end several about physicians. Amongst the latter it is interesting to find two borrowed from the fourth Discourse of the Chahār Maqāla of Niẓámī-i-ʿArūḍī of Samarqand, one related by Avicenna concerning a certain physician at the Sámánid Court who healed a maidservant by psychical treatment, and the other describing how Avicenna himself cured a prince of the House of Buwayh of melancholic delusions. These are followed by a disquisition on the two opposite kinds of poetry, the one "a comfort to the soul" and the other "a diminution of the heart"; and an interesting dissertation on poets of old time who rewarded their royal patrons by immortalizing their names, which would otherwise have passed into oblivion. The poets of whom mention is here made are Rúdaki, ʿUnṣūrī, Sanāʿī, Niẓámī, Muʿīzzi, Anwari, Khāqānī, Zahīr, Saʿdī, Kamāl and Salmān of Sāwa. Another anecdote from the Chahār Maqāla about one of ʿUnṣūrī's happy improvisations is also introduced in this place. The book ends somewhat abruptly with a short conclusion which, one cannot help feeling, would have seemed almost equally appropriate at any other point in the text. In a word, the "Chain of Gold" could bear the withdrawal of many of its component

---

1 *I.e.* those who turn towards Mecca when they pray.  
2 See my translation of the Chahār Maqāla, Anecdotes xxxiii (pp. 113-115) and xxxvii (pp. 125-128).  
links without suffering much detriment. It contains some excellent matter, but is too long, and lacks artistic unity of conception.

2. *Salamán and Absál*.

The character and scope of the curious allegorical poem of *Salamán and Absál* may be readily apprehended by the English reader from Edward FitzGerald’s rather free and somewhat abridged translation. His rendering in blank verse is generally graceful and sometimes eloquent; but the employment of the metre of *Hiawatha* for the illustrative anecdotes (which, as is generally the case in poems of this class, frequently interrupt the continuity of the text) is a less happy experiment. The story is of the slenderest kind, the *dramatis personae* being a King of Greece, a Wise Man who is his constant mentor and adviser, his beautiful and dearly beloved son Salámán, Absál the fair nurse of the boy, and Zuhra (the planet Venus), representing the heavenly Beauty which finally expels the memory of Absál from Salámán’s mind. Amongst the somewhat grotesque features of the story are the birth of Salámán without a mother to bear him (the poet’s misogyny holding marriage in abhorrence, though he was himself married), and the seniority by some twenty years of the charming Absál over her nursling, whom, when he reached maturity, she entangles in an attachment highly distasteful to the king and the sage. The latter, by a kind of mesmeric power, compels Salámán in the earthly paradise whither he has fled with Absál to build and kindle a great pyre of brushwood, into which the two lovers cast themselves, with the result that, while poor Absál is burned to ashes, Salámán emerges unhurt, purified from all earthly desires, and fit to receive the crown and throne which his father hastens to confer upon him. The allegory, transparent enough without commentary, is fully explained in the Epilogue

1 Pp. 71-5 of FitzGerald’s translation; ll. 1076-1120 of the original in Forbes Falconer’s edition.
As FitzGerald's work has a special interest in the eyes of all amateurs of Persian literature, I here give an extract of his translation with the corresponding passage of the original. The passage selected describes the arrival of the lovers, in the course of their flight from the King's reproaches, in the enchanted island where they spend their joyous days of dalliance.

1 Pp. 48-49 of the translation, ll. 802-824 of the text.
گوئیا باغ ارم چون در نهفته؛
غنچه پیدایش آن‌جا شکفت؛
با بهشت عدن بی روز حساب؛
بر گرفت از روى خوشی آن‌جا نگاب؛
چون سلامان دید لطف بی‌شمارا؛
از سفر کوتاه سرد اندهشدرا؛
با دل فارغ ز هر امید و ب이며.
گشت با اسال در بهشه مقيم؛
هر دو شادان همچو جان و تن بی‌ب‌ب.
هر دو خرمش چون گل و سوسن بی‌بی;
صحبتی ز آویشن اغیار دور؛
راحتی ز آمیزش تیمارس دور؛
nی ملامت پیشه با ایشان بجنگ؛
nی نفاق اندیشه با ایشان دو رنگ؛
گل در آغوش و خراش خار نی؛
گنج در پهلو و زخمی مار نی؛
هر زمان در مرغزاري کرده خواب؛
هر نفس از چشم‌های ساری خوردآب؛
کاه با بلبل بگفتار آمدند؛
کاه با طوطی شکرخوار آمدند؛
کاه با طاووس در جولانگری;
کاه در رفتار با خبک دری؛
قضه کوته‌ها دل بر از عیش و طرب؛
هر دو میبرند روز خود بشب;
خود چه زان بیتر که باشد با تو یار;
در میان و عیب جوابان بر صنار؛
FitzGerald's translation (pp. 48-49).

“When they had sailed their Vessel for a Moon
And marr’d their Beauty with the wind o’ th’ Sea,
Suddenly in mid Sea revealed itself
An Isle, beyond Description beautiful;
An Isle that all was Garden; not a Bird
Of Note or Plume in all the World but there;
There as in Bridal Retinue array’d
The Pheasant in his Crown, the Dove in her Collar;
And those who tuned their Bills among the Trees
That Arm in Arm from Fingers paralyz’d
With any Breath of Air Fruit moist and dry
Down scattered in Profusion at their Feet,
Where Fountains of Sweet Water ran, and round
Sunshine and Shadow chequer-chased the Ground.
Here Iram Garden seemed in Secresy
Blowing the Rosebud of its Revelation;
Or Paradise, forgetful of the Day
Of Audit, lifted from her Face the Veil.

Sáláman saw the Isle, and thought no more
Of Further—there with Absál he sat down,
Absál and He together side by side
Rejoicing like the Lily and the Rose,
Together like the Body and the Soul.
Under its Trees in one another’s Arms
They slept—they drank its Fountains hand in hand—
Sought Sugar with the Parrot—or in sport
Paraded with the Peacock—raced the Partridge—
Or fell a-talking with the Nightingale.
There was the Rose without a Thorn,
What sweeter than your Mistress at your side
In such a Solitude, and none to chide!”

3. The Gift of the Free.

The Tuhfatul-Ahrdr, or “Gift of the Free,” is a didactic and moral poem of theological and ethical contents comprising, besides doxologies, eulogies of the Prophet, and Supplications to God (Munáját), twenty Maqálat or Discourses, of which the last

1 See note on p. 527.
is addressed to the poet's little son Yūsuf Diyā'ū'd-Dīn, who was then only four years of age, while his father was sixty. Each discourse is, as a rule, followed by one or more illustrative anecdotes. In a short prose preface prefixed to the poem Jámi implies that it was inspired by the Makhzanu'l-Asrār ("Treasury of Mysteries") of Nizámí and the Matla'u'l-Anwár ("Dayspring of Lights") of Amír Khusraw of Dihlí. The poem is on the whole dull and monotonous, and cannot be regarded as a favourable specimen of Jámi's work. As a specimen I give a prose translation of part of the author's above-mentioned address to his son, the original of which can be consulted by those who desire it in Forbes Falconer's printed text.

Twentieth Discourse,
giving counsel to my precious son.
(May he be nurtured on the Herb of Beauty in the Garden of Childhood, and may he find his way to the Limit of Perfection in the School of Eloquence!)

(1615)
"O New Moon to the night of my hope, to whose Image the eye of my fortune is a pledge!
The Crescent Moon arises after thirty days, while thou didst show thy face after sixty years.
Thy years are four at the time of reckoning: may thy four be forty and thy forty four!
May each forty [years] of thine be quadraginta, wherein, by knowledge and ecstasy, thou mayst explore the degrees of Perfection!
Thy name is the Yūsuf [Joseph] of the Egypt of Faith: may thy title be the Light (Diyā) of the Empire and of Religion!
With the pen which inditeth wisdom I write this Book of Wisdom for thee.
Although thou hast not at present understanding of advice, when thou attainest the age of understanding put it into practice.

2 I.e., I suppose, "may thy four years increase to forty years, yea, to four times forty!"
3 Chilla (Arabic Arba'in), a period of fasting and religious exercises lasting forty days practised by darwishes and seekers after occult powers. See my Year amongst the Persians, p. 148.
Until the hair of thy face becomes a veil, set not thy foot outside the house into the market and the street. Be the enchainer of thine own feet; be the [willing] prisoner of thine own apartments (haram). Never carry thy goods from the companionship of thy house-fellows to the doors of strangers. The sight of a stranger is not auspicious, especially if his age exceed thine. If they set thee to work at school and place the tables of the alphabet in thy lap, Do not sit beside every low-born [school-fellow]: separate thyself from all and sit alone. Although the letter alif (א) is not by itself of crooked stature, see how crooked it becomes [in combination] as lam-alif (ל). When thou placest thy slate in thy lap lift not up thy finger like an alif therefrom. Modestly hang thy head like the letter dal (ד); fix thine eyes upon it like the letter sād (ס). Smiling now at this one, now at that one, show not thy teeth like the letter sin (ס). Divide not thy heart with errant thoughts; be like the letter mim (מ) too narrow-mouthed for speech. Hearken not vainly to every kind of tittle-tattle, so that thou mayst not suffer the pain of a box on the ear. Take heed of right behaviour during the teacher's lessons, lest thou become the little drum of the school-room. Although the [master's] slaps impart virtue, yet is it better if thou dost not bring the affair to slapping!" Excellent as this paternal advice (and there is much more of it) may be, it does not constitute what we should regard as suitable material for poetry, while here again the many fanciful conceits about the ethical lessons to be learned from the shapes of the letters of the alphabet make it difficult to produce a tolerable translation even in prose.

4. The Rosary of the Pious.

The Subhatu'l-Abrár, or "Rosary of the Pious" is a didactic poem of theological, mystical and ethical contents very similar to the last, equally lacking in coherence and even less attractive in

1 Young boys in the East are almost as carefully secluded as girls
2 By being beaten with the sticks.
form and matter. The following story of Abraham and the aged Fire-Worshipper, which also occurs in Sa’di’s Bûstân, and is the subject of some very lengthy reflections in Forbes’s Persian Grammar, where it is quoted amongst the extracts, may serve as a specimen.

\begin{quote}
كرد از معبد خود عزم رحیل،
میهمان شد بسر خوان خلیل,
چون خلیل آن خلخش در دین دید,
بر سر خوان خودش نپندید,
چونکه دیدش ز خدا بیگانه
چهره پر دود ز آتشخانه
گفت با واهب روزی بگرو,
با ازین مائده بر خیز و برو
پیر بر خاست که ای نیک نیاد,
دنی خودرا بشکمر نتوان داد,
با لبی خشک و دهانی ناخورد,
روی از آن مرحله در راه آورد
آمد از عالم بالا به خلیل
وحی کات در حضور اختاک جميل,
گرچه آن پیر نه بر دین تو بود,
منعش از طمعه نه آتی این تو بود
عمرباو بیشتر از هفتادست,
که درین معبد کفر آباد است,
روزیش وا نگرفتم روزی
که نداری دل دین اندوزی
\end{quote}

\footnote{1 See Graf’s edition (Vienna, 1858), pp. 142-3, ll. 37-54.}

\footnote{2 Pp. 152-4 and 164-70.}
One from a heathen temple took the road
And lodged as guest in Abraham's abode,
Who, seeing that his practice did accord
Ill with true faith, dismissed him from his board.
Beholding him a stranger to God's Grace,
The Fire-fane's smoke apparent in his face,
Bade him confess the Lord who doth bestow
Men's daily bread, or leave the board and go.
The aged man arose, and 'Friend,' quoth he,
'Can Faith the vassal of the Belly be?'
With lips athirst and mouth unfilled with food
He turned away his face and took the road.
To Abraham a message from the skies
Came, saying, 'O most fair in qualities!
'Although that stranger held an alien creed,
'Food to forbid him was no righteous deed.
'For more than threescore years and ten, in fine,
'He offered worship at a heathen shrine,
'Yet ne'er did I his sustenance withhold,
'Saying, "Thy heart is dead to faith and cold."
'What harm were it if from thine ample store
'Some morsels thou shouldst give him, less or more?'
Abraham called him back, and did accord
A place to him at his most bounteous board.
'This flood of grace,' the aged man enquired,
'After that first rebuff what thought inspired?'
He told the message which his act had banned,
And told him too of that stern reprimand.
'To one,' the old man said, 'who thus can take
'To task his servant for a stranger's sake
'Can I endure a stranger to remain,
'Or fail his love and friendship to attain?'
Unto the Source of Good he then addressed
His homage, and his faith in God professed.'

The story and the moral are admirable, but most Persian scholars will, I think, prefer Sa'di's older to Jāmī's later version.

5. Yūsuf and Zulaykhā.

The fifth of the "Seven Thrones," the Romance of Yūsuf (Joseph) and Zulaykhā (Potiphar's wife), is by far the most celebrated and popular, and is also the most accessible both in the original and in translation. The entire text, with German metrical translation and notes by Vincenz Edlem von Rosenzweig, was published in a fine folio volume at Vienna in 1824, and there are several Oriental editions of the text. I have already alluded to the late Mr A. Rogers' English rhymed translation (1892) which cannot be described as happy; R. T. H. Griffith's earlier translation (1881) I have not seen. Of two fine passages on the nature of Beauty and its essential desire to manifest itself, and on love of the creature considered as the bridge leading to love of the Creator I have published translations, originally in a lecture on

---

1 See Ethé's India Office Persian Catalogue, col. 746-747.
2 This latter passage is practically a commentary on the well-known Ṣūfī aphorism, "the Phenomenal is the Bridge to the Real."
Sufiism contributed to the *Religious Systems of the World*¹ and again in part in vol. i of my *Literary History of Persia* (pp. 439 and 442).

The story itself, based on the *Sūratu Yūsuf* (*Qur'ān* xii), which describes it as “the most beautiful of stories,” is one of the most popular themes of romantic poetry in Persia and Turkey, and engaged the attention of the great Firdawsi after he had finished the *Shāh-nāma*, and after him of a whole series of Persian poets. Of the Turkish renderings of the tale a pretty complete list will be found in a footnote in the second volume of Gibb’s *History of Ottoman Poetry*². But of all these renderings of the well-known tale Jāmi’s deservedly holds the highest place, and on it his reputation largely rests. The text of the following translation, which unfortunately is a very inadequate representation of the original, occurs on p. 81 of von Rosenzweig’s edition, ll. 19–42.

“This speech from Bāzigha³ when Joseph heard
From his sweet mouth came forth this living word:
‘That Master-craftsman’s work am I,’ said he;
‘One single drop contents me from His Sea.
‘One dot is Heaven from His Pen of Power,
‘And from His Beauty’s garth this world a flower.
‘The Sun’s a gleam from out His Wisdom’s Light,
‘The Earth’s a bubble on His Sea of Might.
‘Each mundane atom He a Mirror made,
‘And His Reflection in each one displayed.
‘His Beauty from all faults and flaws is free,
‘Hid ’neath the Veil of what no eye can see.
‘Discerning eyes in all that’s dowered with Grace
‘See naught, when well they look, except His Face⁴.
‘Beside the Prototype the Shadow’s dim;
‘See His Reflection, haste thee unto Him.
‘If from the Prototype you stand bereft,
‘When fades the Shadow, naught to you is left.

¹ Published by Swan Sonnenschein in 1892, pp. 314–332.
³ A lady who, like Zulaykhá, falls in love with Joseph, but is turned by his exhortations from love of the creature to love of the Creator.
Nor will the Shadow long remain with thee;
The Rose's colour hath no constancy.
Look to the Source, if permanence you claim;
Go to the Root, if constancy's your aim.
Can that which is, and soon is not again,
Make throb the heart, or twinge the vital vein?"


Of the last two of Jámi's "Seven Thrones," the Romance of Laylá and Majnún and the Book of Wisdom of Alexander, copies are rare, but I have been able to examine them cursorily in a fine manuscript, transcribed in 937/1530-1, belonging to Trinity College, Cambridge, and have selected the following passages as typical. The first two are from the Laylá and Majnún.

1 It bears the class-mark R. 13.8.
2 Ff. 68b-69b.

"When the Dawn of Eternity whispered of Love, Love cast the Fire of Longing into the Pen. The Pen raised its head from the Tablet of Not-Being, and drew a hundred pictures of wondrous aspect. The Heavens are the offspring of Love: the Elements fell to Earth through Love. Without Love is no token of Good or Evil: that thing which is not of Love is indeed non-existent. This lofty azure Roof which revolveth through the days and nights Is the Lotus of the Garden of Love, and the Ball [which lies] in the curve of Love's Polo-stick. That Magnetism which is inherent in the Stone, and which fastens its grasp so firmly on the Iron, Is a Love precipitated in Iron Resolve which hath appeared from within the Stone. Behold the Stone, how in this resting-place it becomes without weight through longing for its opponent: Judge therefrom of those who suffer sorrow in the attraction of the love of those dear to the heart. Although Love is painful, it is the consolation of pure bosoms. Without the blessing of Love how shall a man escape from the sorrow of the inverted Wheel [of Heaven]?
"
Concerning the cause of the versification of this Book, and the reason of the arrangement of this Address.

"When I withdrew the Veil from this Mystery, and prepared this strange Song,  
The Parrot of my Genius became an eater of sugar from the Story of Joseph and Zulaykhá.  
In this outpouring of sugar there sprang from my Pen sweet verses mingled with sugar."
Therefrom tumult fell upon the World, and a gladness in the hearts of lovers.
It was a Fountain of Graciousness, but therefrom my thirst was not appeased.
The Bird of my Heart desired to sing another song on another topic. When under fortunate auspices I cast lots, [the lot] fell on an account of Majnún's plight.
Although aforetime two Masters, raised high above the Realm of Verse,
Unloosed their tongues in the enunciation of subtleties, and therein did full justice to speech;
That one
That one pouring forth pearls like a Treasure (ganj) from Ganja,
That one scattering sugar like a Parrot in India;
That one smiting the ears of [unjustified] pretension, and this one unveiling the bride of the Ideal;
That one with his verse engraving an inscription on the rock, and this one giving colour [to the tale] by his exquisite art;
That one raising his standard to the Zenith of Glory, and this one preparing the spells of Magic;
I also bound my girdle behind me, and seated myself on my dromedary fleet as the wind,
And wherever their Pegasus attained, through their inspiring minds
I also urged onwards my camel in humility, and brought myself within the range of their dust.
Though I fall behind their reckoning, yet their dust upon my face sufficeth me.

The following anecdote from the *Khirad-náma-i-Sikandari*, or "Book of Wisdom of Alexander," is taken from the same manuscript as the last two extracts:

(حکایت آن خاده گوش بر افسانه غوک نباد و نقدرا بامید نسیه)

(کنون میدهند دور چرخ می‌باید وضرب المثل قصه غوک و خاد)

1 *I.e.*, Nizámí of Ganja.
2 Amfr Khusraw of Dihl.
3 *Rakhsh*, the name of Rustam's celebrated charger.
4 R. 13.8 of Trinity College, Cambridge, f. 171a.
یکی خاد مرغ هواهی شکار؛
فرؤ ماند از ضعف پیری ز کار؛
ز بال و پرش زور پرپروا رفت؛
نصید غرض چنگش از شار رفت؛
ز بی قوتیش خاست از جان نفیش؛
وطن ساخت گردید یکی آبگیر;
پس از مدتی کرد آنها دردنگا;
در افتاد غوگیش ناگه چنگا;
بر آورد فرباد بیچاره غوک;
که ای سورر از دست تو گشت سوک;
مکن یکزمان در هلاخمر شبتاب;
زمام شتاب از هلاکم بتاب;
نیبر من بجز طمعه طبع کوب;
نه در کام نیکر نه در معده خوب;
تنبر نیست جز پوستی ناگوار;
آن که قناعت کند گوشت خوار;
اگر لب کشایی بازدیم;
فرستی بدل معدة شادیم;
بهر لحظه ز آتشین سحر و فسون;
بتو ماهگیرا شوم رهمنون;
در آپ روان پرورش یافت;
ز والن نعمت خورش یافت;
تنین او همه گوشت سرتا بدن;
از پوست دور استخوان نیز کمی
سبت آبکرگون وز شکر سیر ناب،
بچشان چو عکس کواکب در آب،
چو در شب سپهر از نشار درم،
همه پشت و پهلوی او پر درم،
نه در طبیع اهل خرد رد چو من،
یکی لقبه از وی به از صد چو من،
بتلّقین سوگندها لب ضداد،
ز منقار او غوک بهرون فتاد.
بیاک جستن افتاد در آبگیر،
بحرمان دگر بار شد خاد اسر،
گرنه باخاک تباهی نشست،
نه غوکست بینه به ما ماهی بشست،
منیر همچون آن خاد حرمان زده،
ره خرمشی بر دل و جان زده،
ز فکر سخن رفته از دل حضور،
ز نقاشان فکر سخن پر قصور،
بدستم ز محرومی بختی من،
نه جمعیت دل نه لطف سخن.
بیا ساقی ساغری می‌بیار،
فلک‌وار دور پیایی بیار،
از آن می‌که آسایش دل دهد،
خلصایی ز آبیش گل دهد.
بیا مطربا عود بنهاده گوش،
بیک گوشهمال آور اندر خروش،
خروشی که درا بهوش اورد،
بدانا پیام سروش آورد.
Story of the Kite which lent an ear to the Frog's talk, and in hope of credit let slip the cash from its hand.

"The cycle of heaven now bids me indite
For example the tale of the frog and the kite.
A kite, wont to prey on the birds of the air,
By the weakness of age was reduced to despair.
For soaring its pinions no longer avail;
For hunting the strength of its talons doth fail.
From the depth of its soul bitter wailing arose;
An abode by the shore of a lakelet it chose.
Now when in that place it had dwelt for a spell
On a sudden a frog in its clutches there fell.
The miserable frog made a piteous appeal:
'To woe thou hast turned,' it lamented, 'my weal!'
'O haste not to seek my destruction,' it cried;
'Turn the steed of intent from my murder aside!
An unsavoury morsel I yield at the best,
'Neither sweet to the palate not good to digest.
'My body is nothing save ill-flavoured skin:
'What eater of meat can find pleasure therein?
'Unclose then thy beak, leave me free to depart,
'And tidings of gladness convey to my heart!
'Then by magic and spells evermore at thy wish
'I will guide thee to toothsome and savoury fish,
'In the river's clear streamlets long nurtured and bred,
'And with various food-stuffs abundantly fed,
'From the head to the tail flesh and fatness alone,
'With scarcely a skin and with hardly a bone!
'Their bellies like silver, their backs bright of blee,
'Their eyes like reflections of stars in the sea.
'With silvery scales back and sides are alight
'As with God's starry largesse the heavens by night.
'Far better, all persons of taste will agree,
'Is a mouthful of such than a hundred like me.'

The kite, by an oath confirmation to seek,
Relaxed its control: the frog fell from its beak;
With one leap it returned to its watery lair;
And the kite once again was the slave of despair
Its seat in the dust of destruction it took,
Neither frog in its talons nor fish on its hook.
That kite disappointed is like unto me,
Whose soul has been turned from the pathway of glee.
Composure has quitted my heart at the thought
Of finding expression for thoughts so distraught.
In my hands, through my lack of good fortune, I find
Neither graces of speech nor composure of mind.
O cupbearer, come, pass the bowl, I entreat,
And like heaven, I pray thee, the cycle repeat!
That wine I desire which to peace giveth birth,
And frees us from all the defilements of earth.
O minstrel, approach, that the listening lute
At the touch of thy fingers may cease to be mute.
The heart of the heedless shall wake at its cry,
And the message of angels descend from the sky.

As the Sab'a ("Septet") of Jámi was admittedly inspired
by and modelled on the Khamsa ("Quintet") of Niẓámí,
some comparison of their respective styles and
methods may fairly be demanded. As I con-
sider that in questions of literary taste it is very
difficult for a foreigner to judge, I requested
my Persian colleague, Mírzá Bihríz, son of the distinguished
physician and writer Mírzá Abu'l-Faḍl of Sáwa, a young
man of great promise and ability, well read in both Arabic
and Persian literature, to write a short essay on this point,
and I here reproduce in English the gist of his opinions.

Jámi's verses, writes Mírzá Bihríz, rival, and perhaps
even excel, those of Niẓámí in poetical form, sweetness and
simplicity, being unlaboured and altogether free from artificiality; but they fall far short of them in strength (matánat), poetic imagination and eloquence. To appreciate
and enjoy Niẓámí a profound knowledge of the Persian
language is required, while Jámi can be read with pleasure
by all, whence his greater fame and popularity, especially
in India, Turkey and other lands where Persian literature
is an exotic. Moreover Niẓámí was a man of far-reaching
attainments, not only in the language and history of his
country, but in the sciences, especially the mathematical
sciences, of his time, so that often he cannot be understood
except by a reader similarly gifted. Such an one, however,
will find in him depths and subtleties for which he would seek in vain in Jámi’s poetry.

In one only of his “Five Poems” does Nizámí challenge comparison with his great predecessor Firdawsí, to wit in his “Alexander Book” (Sikandar-náma), which, alike in metre and subject-matter, resembles the corresponding portion of the Sháh-náma, but, in the judgement of most critics, falls short of it. But here Nizámí was apparently more hampered than Firdawsí by the fanaticism of a less tolerant age, as he hints in the following lines:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{جبان ز آتش پرستی شد چنان گرهم;} \\
\text{که بادا زین مسلمانی ترا چرهم;} \\
\text{مسلمانی چه ما او گهر نام است;} \\
\text{گر آن گبر مسلمانی که از است;} \\
\text{نظامی بر سر افسانه شهر باز;} \\
\text{که مرغ پندرادا تلم شم آند آواز.}
\end{align*}
\]

“The world was so warmed by Fire-worship
That thou mayst well be ashamed of thy Muhammadanism.
We are Musulmáns, while he is called a Guebre (gabr):
If that be heathenism (gabr), what is Muhammadanism?
Return, O Nizámí, to the tenour of thy tale,
For harsh are the notes of the bird of admonition!”

Jámi, though a mystic, was essentially an orthodox Muhammadan, and shows little of the enthusiasm for pre-Islamic Persia which inspired Firdawsí, and, in a lesser degree, Nizámí. Of his indebtedness to the latter he makes no secret, and, indeed, follows his footsteps with extraordinary closeness, though here and there he introduces topics and dissertations entirely his own. Not only does he imitate Nizámí in the titles, metres and subdivisions of his poems, but even in minute

1 This matter is discussed at length by Shibli in his Shi’rul-Ajam, vol. i, pp. 323–356.
2 E.g. his curious explanation of and commentary on the letters of the Bismílláh near the beginning of the Tuhfatul-Ahrdr.
personal details. Thus each poet addresses himself and gives advice to a seven-year-old son, the only difference being that while Nizámí encourages his son to study Medicine, Já mí recommends Theology. The parallelism is especially apparent in the sections dealing with the "cause of the versification of the tale" of Laylá and Majnún in the respective versions of the two poets, but lack of space compels me to omit the illustrations of this given by Mírzá Bihruz in his essay. Such critical comparison of the works of the great Persian poets is very important and has hitherto been too much neglected, but the necessary preliminary work of a historical, biographical and bibliographical character is all that I have been able to attempt in this and the preceding volumes on the literary history of Persia.

Of Já mí's lyric poetry, embodied, as already mentioned in three separate Diwáns, it is impossible to give an adequate account in this volume, which has already exceeded in bulk the limits I had assigned to it.

In Europe German scholars alone have done much work in this field, notably von Rosenzweig, Rückert and Wickerhauser in his Blütenkranz. Having regard to the eminence of Já mí in this field also, and to the abundance of his output, a separate monograph would be required to do adequate justice to the subject, which deserves fuller study not only on account of Já mí's own merit as a lyric poet, but also by reason of the profound influence which,

1 See pp. 515-6 supra.
2 Biographische Notizen über Mewlana Abdurrahman Dschami nebst Übersetzungsproben aus seinen Diwanen von Vinzenz Edlem von Rosenzweig (Vienna, 1840). The pages of this volume are, unfortunately, unnumbered.
3 His work extends over 33 years (1844-1876). It began in the Z. f. d. Kunde d. Morgenlandes, vols. v, pp. 281-336, and vi, pp. 189-227; and was continued in the Z. D. M. G., vols. ii, pp. 26-51; iv, pp. 44-61; v, pp. 308-329; vi, pp. 491-504; xxiv, pp. 563-590; xxv, pp. 95-112; xxvi, pp. 461-464; and xxix, pp. 191-198.
4 Leipzig, 1855 and Vienna, 1858.
as already indicated, he exercised over his successors, not only in Persia, but also in Turkey. I hope that it may be possible to recur to his lyric poetry in my next volume, when I come to trace the development of the ghazal in later times, but for the moment I must content myself with a few specimens selected after a cursory perusal of the edition of his first *Dīwān* printed at Constantinople in 1284/1867-8, and based, as stated in the colophon, on an autograph manuscript. I have also at hand a much fuller text of the same *Dīwān* lithographed at Lucknow in 1298/1881, which contains many poems omitted in the Turkish edition, and comprises 568 as against 182 pages.

(1)

Ye man氨 nadda jamālā kī ḥulīl mā bāda
ba'da हरज ् जान न्येदप त्या नूदा
mī nāma ār ġdaji ām ām dēm ām ām to ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām ām1

See pp. 421-3 supra.

2 Unfortunately no indication of the whereabouts of this MS. is forthcoming. The texts here given have been emended in some places from the Indian lithographed edition, which often gives a more correct reading.
"O Thou whose Beauty doth appear in all that appeareth, may a thousand holy spirits be Thy sacrifice!
Like the flute I make complaint of my separation from Thee every moment, and this is the more strange since I am not parted from Thee for a single instant. It is Love alone which reveals itself in the two worlds, sometimes through the raiment of the King, and sometimes through the garment of the beggar.
One sound reaches thine ear in two ways; now thou callest it 'Echo' and now 'Voice.'
Arise, O cupbearer, and graciously pour out a draught of that grief-dispelling wine for the sorrow-stricken lovers!
Of that special wine which, when it delivers me from myself, leaves in the eye of contemplation naught but God.
O Jámi, the road of guidance to God is naught but Love: [this] we tell you, and 'Peace be upon him who followeth right guidance.'"

The following is evidently inspired by and modelled on the well-known ode of Ḥáfiz composed in the same metre and rhyme:

The following is evidently inspired by and modelled on the well-known ode of Ḥáfiz composed in the same metre and rhyme:

1 This line is an obvious reminiscence of the opening line of the Mathnawi.
2 It is the first ghazal in the Dīwān of Ḥáfiz.
O Breeze of Morning, visit the hills of Nejd for me and kiss them, for the fragrance of the Friend comes from those pure camping-grounds.

When the longing for union increases, what occasion for blame is there if Majnûn follows the litters in the hope of [finding amongst them] Laylá’s howdah?

My heart is filled with love for the Friend, who is not heedless thereof, for they say ‘Hearts have a road to hearts.’

Behold, Salmá hath arrived from the road, while I am in such case through bodily weakness; take, then, O comrade, my spirit as a gift from me and accept it.

O cloud-like\(^1\) eye, do not shed the rain of regret in her path, for it is better that her horse’s hoof should be far removed from the plague of such mire.

In my heart were knotted a hundred difficulties through separation from her; when I saw her form all difficulties were solved forthwith.

Jámi‘ suffers vexations from the harshness of this grievous cycle, but fear of the wearisomeness of penitents did not prolong them.\(^3\)

---

\(^{1}\) I.e. weeping.
می شکی تیغ که سازی دل مارا بدو نیبر
تیغ بگذار که یک غمزه تمامست اینجا؛
پیش ارباب خرد شرح مکن مشکل عشق;
نکته، خاص مگو مجلس عامست اینجا؛
جامی از عشق تو نشست و نه می دید و نه جام;
بزم عشقست چه جای می و جامست اینجا؛

"Here is the border of the garden, the brink of the stream, and the lip of the goblet: arise, O cup-bearer, for here abstinence is a crime.
If the elder of the monastery is intoxicated with the delights of music, give me the wine-tavern, for here this state endureth continually!
Thou didst touch the lip of the goblet with thy lip, and I the drunkard know not which is here thy ruby lip and which the wine.
Not my heart alone is bound in thy black tresses: wherever there is a birdlike heart it is here caught in the snare.
Thou dost draw the sword to divide my heart in twain; lay aside the sword, for here one glance is sufficient.
Do not explain the difficulties of Love to the reasonable; utter not a private matter, for here is a public assembly.
Jámí is intoxicated with thy love, though he has seen neither wine nor goblet: here is the Banquet of Love: what place is there for wine or goblet?"

(4)

خوبان هزار و از همه مقصود من چیست؟
صد پاره گر گند بتیمر سخن یکیست،
خوش مجمیست انجمن نیکوان ولی،
ماهى گزارست روته این انجمن یکیست؛
خواهید په ره قدمش تحفه دگر;
لیکن مقصر خزاد جان در بدن یکیست؛
گشت در حان ضعیف که بی ناله و فغان؛
ظاهر نبی شود که دربن بیهره یکیست؛
The fair ones are a thousand, but of them all my desire is one; my speech is one, though they cut me into a hundred pieces with the sword.

The assembly of the beautiful is a pleasant meeting-place, but the Moon whence this assembly derives its lustre is one.

For each pace of her advance we desire a different present, but we fall short [of this our desire], for the soul in the body is [only] one.

I have grown so thin that, but for my lamentation and wailing, it would not appear that there was anyone in this shirt.

Where the charming ruby [lips] of Shírín are glowing, rubies and pebbles are alike in the eyes of [Farhád] the Tunneller.

It was thou of all the fair ones who didst shatter my name and fame; yea, of a hundred Abrahams the breaker of idols is but one.

O Jámi, close thy mouth from speech in this garden, for there the song of the nightingale and the shriek of the raven are one!"

This poem bears a great similarity, both in form and ideas, to an ode of unknown authorship of which I printed the opening lines with a verse translation in my Year amongst the Persians¹. The fourth couplet appears to have been inspired by the well-known Arabic verses of al-Mutanabbi²:

¹ p. 501.
² Ed. Dieterici, p. 5.
35–2
On the day of parting passion wore away my body with sorrow, while separation effected a divorce between my eyelids and sleep. [I am only] a spirit permeating [a body] like a splinter [in leanness], no longer visible when the wind blows the garment away from it. Thin enough is my body, for indeed I am a man whom thou wouldst not see if I did not speak to thee."

This is not an isolated instance of the influence of Arabian poetry on Jámi's Persian verse. Thus the line:

بودم آن روز من از طالب‌ها، دَرُّ حَشَان

"I was of the company of dreg-drainers on that day"

When there was [as yet] no trace of the vine or of the vine-planter"

is, as Mírzá Bihrúz has pointed out to me, almost certainly inspired by the celebrated couplet of the great Egyptian mystic ‘Umar ibnu'l-Fārīd:

شَرَبْتُ عَلَى ذَخْرِ الْحَيْبِ مَدَامَةً،
سَكَرُنَا بِهَا مَنْ قَبْلَ أَنْ يُصْلَنِّ الْكَرْيَ:

"We drained a draught of wine to the memory of the Friend: We were intoxicated therewith ere ever the Vine was created."

Of the great Persian lyrical poets who preceded Jámi the influence of Sa'dí and Háfiz is most noticeable; and in the verses sometimes known collectively as the *Nay-náma*, or "Book of the Reed," he has skilfully imitated the style and lucidly developed the idea of the Prologue to Jalálu'd-Dín Rumi's great Mystical *Mathnawi*. To conclude and epitomize in one sentence this wholly inadequate account of one who, though I decline to regard him as the last great classical poet of Persia, was certainly one of the most talented, versatile and prolific. In Jámi the mystical and pantheistic thought of Persia may be said to find its most complete and vivid expression; while, though he may have been equalled or even surpassed by others in each of the numerous realms of literature which he cultivated, no other Persian poet or writer has been so successful in so many different fields, and the enthusiastic admiration of his most eminent contemporaries is justified by his prolific and many-sided genius.

2 See p. 514 supra.
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Chingiz Khán or Qâ’dân (xii-xiii.), 11, 12, 15, 16, 40, 43, 65, 73, 74, 103, 159, 180, 182, 185, 203, 250, 285, 364, 383
Chingiz-nâma (or Sháhînshâh-nâma of Ahmad of Tabriz, xiv), 103
Chosroes (generic name for Sásánian king, Arabic Kísrá, Persian Khosrâw, q.v.)
Chronograms, 58, 282, 283, 385, 486, 387, 512. This list is not exhausitve
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*Durwân-i-At‘îma* (by Bushâq of Shiráz, *q.v*.), 346-51

_Durwân-i-Nasâb* (source used by author of *Târîkh-i-Guzîda*), 88

Diyâr Bakr (formerly Amid), 84, 92, 192, 400, 402, 404, 406, 407, 408, 417, 418

Diyâ’u’d-Dîn (Jâmi’s son), 514

Dîzful, 83, 191

Dolmetsch (suggested Turkish etymology), 9 n.

Dominican archbishop of Sultânîyya (xiv), 54

Doqûz Khâtûn (wife of Hûlgâd Khân, xiii), 18, 52 n.

Dorn, Bernard —, 210 n., 426

Drink, indulgence in — by Tartars, 24, 200, 391, 406; laws against —, 53, 58, 277-8

Dughlat, Mîrzâ Haydar — (cousin of Bâbur and author of *Târîkh-i-Rashîdî*, *q.v*.), 392, 453

Dulâfî (clan or family of Qâzîwân), 54

Dur-duzd, Mawvlâna ‘Allî — (poet parodied by Bushâq and Mahmûd Qârlî), 350, 352

Ebu’z-Ziyâ Tevfiq (Abû’d-Diyâ Tawfîq) *Bey* (Turkish man of letters and printer, xix-xx), 231

Edward King of England. — I, 11, 19; — II, 11, 12, 49


“Elephant,” “Year of the —” 89

Eleutherius, Pope —, 102

Elia, N. — (d. 1897), 170 n., 364 n., 392 n.

Elliot, Sir Charles —, 433

Elliot, Sir H. — (History of India), 107, 110

Ellis, A. G. —, 174, 179 n., 430

Elphinston (History of India), 454

Emessa. See Hîmîs

England, English, 6, 43, 44, 102, 107, 395

Era, Il-khânî —, 45; others employed by different peoples, 89

Erdmann, Dr Franz von —, 224, 225, 226

Erskine, W. — (historian of India), 364 n., 392 n., 393 and n., 419 n., 454

Er-Ţoghîrîl (ancestor of the Ottoman Sultânî), 205

Erzeroum, 158, 196, 199

Erzinjân, 188, 196, 404, 408. See also *Arzanjân*

Ethé, Dr Hermann — (d. June 7, 1917), 68 n., 103, 302 n., 515 n., 531 n.

Euclid, 18

Euphrates (*Fârâst*), 42, 69, 81, 84, 379, 408, 412, 511 n.

Euphuists, 461

Europe, Europeans, 89, 395

Eve (*Hawwûds*), 334, 335

Evil Eye (rue or pepper burned for protection against —), 229 n.

Facetiae (*Hasâliyyât*) of *Ubayyî-d-i-Zâkânî, *q.v*., 231, 238

Abû’l-Fa’dîl of Sâwâ, Mîrzâ — (physician and writer, xix), 540

_Fâdilât-nâmâ* (Hûrûfî work), 450


_Fâhâlawiyât* (poems in dialect), 352

_Fâhihatu’l-Khulafa* (by Ahmad ibn ‘Arabsâh, *q.v*., xiv), 356

*Fakhri, Kitâbul-* — (xiv), 4-5

Fakhri-i-Banâkati (historian and poet, xiv), 100-103

Fakhri-i-Jurjânî (poet, xi), 65


Fakhru’l-Mulk Shamsu’d-Dawla (patron of the poet Imâmî, xiii), 117, 118 and n.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>512-15</td>
<td>Falconer, Forbes —, 516, 523 n., 527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Fāfīn (Persian takhallus of Mir ‘Alī Shir Nawāyī, g.v.), 505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Faqq-nāma (Hurūfī work), 450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Farāb, 175, 186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Fāraju’l-lāh (son of the Ṣāḥib-Dīwān Shamsu’d-Dīn Muḥammad-i-Juwaynī, xix), 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Abu’l-Faraj, Gregorius — b. Ahrūn (physician and historian). See Bar Hebraeus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Akhū Abī’l-Faraj of Zanjān (saint, xi), 426 and n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Farghāna, 380, 393, 418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Farḥād, 328, 329, 547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Farḥādīj, 178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Farhang-i-Anjuman-ard-yi-Nāšīrī (Persian lexicon by Rīdā-qul Khān, xix), 481 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Ibu’n-Fārid, ‘Umar— (Egyptian mystical poet, xii-xiii), 133, 514, 548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Farīd-i-Aḥwāl (“Squinting Farīd,” poet, xiv), 154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Farīdu’d-Dīn. — ‘Aṭṭār (mystical poet, xiii), 88, 344, 359, 352, 435, 479, 595; Qāḍī — (envoy of Bāyazīd “the Thunder-bolt” to Tīmūr), 205; — Ahmad b. Sa’du’d-Dīn at-Taftazānī. See under Ahmad Farmān-Khānd (daughter of Rashīdu’d-Dīn Fadlu’l-lāh, xiv), 84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Farrākh (ode of Ḥāfīz addressed to —), 301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Farrākh Yāsār (king of Shīrūnwan, c. A.D. 1500), 417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Farrākhī (poet, xi), 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Fārsīn-nāma-i-Nāshīrī, 162, 165 n., 168 n., 274 n., 275 n., 357 and n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Fārāb, 175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Fārūyūmād, 212, 215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Fāsā (in Fārā), 168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Fāṣḥī of Khwāf (author of the rare Muṣānād, or Compendium of history and biography), 28 n., 29, 40 n., 67 n., 112 and n., 150 and n., 151-2, 174 and n., 195 n., 210 and n., 211, 214-15, 224, 230, 282 n., 283, 354 n., 365, 424 n., 425, 426-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Fath-ābād, Garden of —, 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Fātalism (Ḥāfīz charged with —), 301 and n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Fath-‘Alī Sultan b. Imām-qul Khān, 318-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Fāṭihātush-Shabadā (Jāmi’s first Diwān, compiled in A.D. 1479-80), 515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Fāṭimid Caliphs, 92, 154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>FawdHdu’ (Arabic grammar compiled by Jāmi for the use of his son), 514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Fayd-nāma (Turkish Hurūfī work), 450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Ferté, M. —, 231, 235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Filwūghāshān (clan or family of Qazwīn), 94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Flott-Hughes (collector of Oriental MSS.), 225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Firdu’s-nīyey (by Salmān-i-Sawāji, xiv), 261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Firdawsi, 65, 69, 95, 104, 108, 224, 259, 316 n., 348, 350, 385, 510, 532, 541. See also Shāh-nāma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Fire-arms, invention of —, 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Fire-worshippers. See Gabr, Guebre, Magian, Zoroastrian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Firiddūn bey (Ahmad Firidūn Tawqi’, Turkish writer and official, compiler of a great collection of State Papers known as Munshi’d, xvi), 203-6, 398 and n., 400, 401 and n., 407, 409-11, 422-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>Firishta, Muhammad Qasīm — of Astarābād (historian of India), 256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Fīrūzābād (in Fārs), 357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>-Fīrūzābādī, Abū Tāhir Muhammad — (lexicographer, xiv-xv), 357-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Fīrūz-Kūh, 175, 193, 368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Fish supporting the earth (māhī or samaḏ), 113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>FitzGerald, Edward —, 304, 516, 523, 524, 526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>FitzWilliam Museum, Cambridge, 162, 360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Fleischer, 156, 328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Florence, 292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Florin, Turkish —, 423 and n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Flügel, 88 n., 367 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Forbes, Duncan —, 529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>“Four” (i.e. the Four Elements), 248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
France, French, 6, 9, 10, 395
Franciscan envoys to Mongol court, 19
Franks, 73, 74, 101, 200, 205. See also Europeans
Frazer, Sir J. G. —, 474
Friesland, 6
Fudull (Fuzull), Turkish poet of Bagh-
dād, xvi), 441
Furūghī (Muhammad Husayn Khān
Zuhd’ull-Mulk, contemporary Per-
sian poet and historian), 383
Fusūsul-Fuduli: Hikam (by Shaykh Mu-
ḥiyīd-Dīn ibnu’l-Arabi, q.v.), 63, 127, 446, 513
Gabr (Guebre), 38, 39, 541. See also
Magians, Zoroastrians
Ganja, 122, 326 n., 535, 536
Ganj-nāma (Turkish Hürüß book),
450
Gantin, M. Jules — (editor of Ta’rīkh-
i-Guzdā), 94
Garm-sîr, 52
Gawhar Shād Khātūn (or — Āqā, xv),
388, 389, 410, 428
Gaykhátu (Mongol Il-khan, a.d. 1291–
95), 31, 37–9, 43, 163
Gayl (Gêl, Gîl), 480, 481
Gedik Ahmad Pasha (tutor to the
Ottoman Prince Mustafâ, xvi), 411
Gêl. See above under Gayl
Genoa, 201
Geoffrey de Langley (English envoy
to Ghâzân’s court), 44
Georgia, Georgians, 9, 85, 160, 188,
190, 192, 197, 199, 362, 406, 409,
414, 503
German, Germany, 6, 542; German
Emperor, 107 n.
Gharîjstân, 175
Ghaza (Egypt), 19
Ghâzân (Mongol Il-khan, A.D. 1295–
1304), 17, 27, 40–46, 47, 48, 69,
70, 72, 73, 74, 76, 82, 83, 84,
101, 104 n., 163, 176, 275, 361
Ghâznâniyya (suburb of Tabriz), 46,
70
Ghâzân-nâma (by Ahmad of Tabriz,
xiv), 103
Abu’l-Ghâzi Sultân Husayn b. Man-
șûr b. Bayqarâ (Timûrid prince,
xv–xvi), 380, 390–1, 395, 396, 399, 400, 410, 412, 418, 421–2,
430–1, 433, 434, 436, 439–40,
443, 453, 455–9, 487 n., 505, 506,
517
Ghazna, House of —, 73, 74, 91, 380
— Ghazzâlî, Shaykh Muhammad — (xi–
xii), 479; Shaykh Ahmad —,
135 n.
Ghibelines, 399
Ghiyâthu’d-Dîn. — Muhammad
Sâm (king of Ghûr, d. A.D. 1202),
174, 179; — Kurt ruler of Herât
(d. A.D. 1329), 55, 57, 176–7,
179; — Pir’Alî Kurt (grandson
of the preceding), 57, 179, 186; —
(Muhammad b. Rashîду’d-Dîn
Fadlullâh (minister and patron of
the poet Háfiz, xiv), 286–7; Amîr — (Hürüß poet), 373; —
Naqqâsh (xv), 397
Ghûch Husayn b. Amîr Chûbân (xiv),
170
Ghûlâm ’Alî Khân Äzed (author of
the Khâzânâ-i-Amîra, xviii), 289
Ghûr, 152, 175, 176; kings of —,
91, 179
Ghûrî, Amîr — (Sarbadâr, xiv), 180
“Giamsa,” 389. See Jahânsâh
Gîbb, E. J. W. — (Turkish scholar,
d. 1901), 156, 210 n., 354, 368 n.,
369, 379, 392, 399 n., 409 n., 422,
423, 426, 441 n., 449, 450, 532
Gibbon (author of the Decline and
Fall), 202–3
Gîbbons, Professor H. A. —, 198,
401 n.
Gîlân, Gîl, 49, 416, 429, 473, 479,
481, 482. See also Caspian pro-
vinces, Gayl
Gîrd-i-Kûh (stronghold of the Assas-
sins), 368
Gobineau, le Comte de —, 103, 425
de Goeje, 88 n., 99 n.
Gog, 16
Golden Horde, 57, 354
Gomez de Salazar (member of Spanish
mission to Timûr, xv), 199
Gonzalez de Clavijo (Spanish ambas-
sador to Timûr), 199–201. See
Clavijo
Gothland, 6
Gottwaldt, 88 n.
Government service to be avoided, 28
Graf (editor of Sa’dî’s Bûstânî), 16 n.,
529 n.
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Greece, Greek, 3, 89, 405
Gregory X, Pope —, 19
Griffith, R. T. H. — (translator of Jami's Viswva Zulaykha), 516, 531
Gúdarz (rebel at Sirján, xiv), 192
Guebre (gabr), 38, 39, 541. See also Magians, Zoroastrians
Guelphs, 399
de Guignes, 382 n.
Guillaume d'Ada (archbishop of Sultáníyya, xiv), 54 n.
Gujarat, 398
Gulistan, 417
Gulüstan (of Sa'd), 16 n., 401 n., 426, 515
Gulistán (place in Caucasia), 417
*Gulshan-i-Rdz ("Rose-garden of Mystery"), 146-9, 300, 471 n.
Gurgán, 190, 355, 390. See also Astarabád, Júran
Gurjistán (Greek, q.v.), 188
*Guy u Chawgán ("Ball and Pole-stick," a poem by 'Arífi, xv), 495-7
Habib-i-'Údî (favouite of Mírámsháh put to death by Tímúr), 195
Habib, Mirzá — of Iṣafán (xix), 231, 257, 346, 351
Hadíqát-u-Haqíqat (by Saná'í of Ghazna), 141
Hadíthá, 81
Hadíyya Malik (daughter of Ráshíd-dín Faḍlulláh), 84
*Haft Awrang (the Sab'a, Septet, or "Seven Thrones" of Jámí, xv), 515, 516

Haft Birádárán (the "Seven Brothers," the constellation of the Great Bear), 213 n.
*Haft Iqlim (the "Seven Climes," a geographical and biographical work by Amin Ahmad-i-Rázi), 111, 141, 142, 153, 210, 211, 216, 222, 223, 230, 258, 274, 331 n., 345, 362, 363
Haithon (Armenian historian), 25 n.
*Hájí Beg b. Amír Chúbán (xiv), 170
Hájí Khalîfa (Turkish bibliographer, author of the Ashfu'z-Zunún), 88 n., 367 n.
Hakluyt Society, 6 n., 8, 381, 399 n., 404 n., 405 n., 407, 410 n.
Hallaj (wool-carder). See Busháq
(Ábú Išáq) of Shíráz, who followed this trade
Hál-náma ("the Book of Estacy") of 'Arífi, 495-7. See also Guy u Chawgán
"Halul," 413. See Khalíl, of which this is an Italian corruption
Hama (in Syria), 197
Hamadán, 25, 39, 69, 85, 125, 193, 403, 424
Hamdu'Uah (Abu 'Arífi, xv), 403, 404
Hamdulláh Mustawfí of Qazwín (historian and geographer), 56, 87-100, 224, 231 n.
Hamídí dynasty, 401
von Hammer, 68, 150, 347 n., 436
Hammer-Purgstall, 147, 401 n.
Hamza b. Qará 'Osmán ("Uthmán) Aq-qoyunlú (xv), 404
Hánafí. — sect. 46, 50, 97, 98; clan or family of Qazwín, 94
Hanfál sect, 301 n.
Haqíqát-náma (Turkish Hürúfi book), 450
Haqqí-yaqtín (by Mahmúd Shabístari, xiv), 149-150
Haramayn, Sultánúl-. — (title assumed by Egyptian rulers, xiv), 205
Harqadaq (Mongol general, xiv), 48
Hartmann, 516
Hárun. — ar-Rashíd ("Abbásid Caliph, ix), 21; Sharafud-Dín — b. Shamsud-Dín Muhammad Şahib-Diwán (xiii), 20-31
Hasan. The Imám — b. 'Alí b. Abi Talib (vii), 90, 91; Shaykh b. Yusuf Qalír or Ilkání (II-Khání) called Buzurg ("the Great," d. A.D. 1350), 54, 55, 59, 60, 170-2;
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Khwaja — Mawlana 365, — Hajji 562
Hatifi Haydar Hatim-Ta'i, Hasht Hazarasp Herat, Hiddyat-ndma Hiawatha, Haydayat Hims Hindus, Hindushah (poet, xiii), 22
Ibn Hishám (biographer of the Prophet), 88

Hijj Kayf (fortress), 408
Hit, 8
Horn, Dr Paul, 107 n.
Houtum-Schindler, Sir Albert — (d. 316), 80, 100 n., 150 n., 163, 210 n., 350, 426, 430, 474
Howarth, Sir Henry — (History of the Mongols), 13-14, 15, 18 n., 19 n., 21, 25 n., 26 n., 34 n., 41 n., 42 n., 44, 45, 58 n., 60, 61 n., 177 n.
Huwart, M. Clément — 365, 375, 449, 450, 452
Hulagü (Mongol Il-Khan, xiii), 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 39, 40, 48, 59, 60, 66, 69, 74, 162, 171, 175, 250, 251
Hulájü (Mongol prince put to death by Arghón, xil), 33
Hulwání (clan or family of Qazwin), 94
Humám, Humánú'd-Dín — son of Rashídú'd-Dín Fadlú'Alláh (xiii), 84; Mawláná — (contemporary of above-mentioned Rashíd), 25; — or Humámí, of Tabrız (poet, xiii-xiv), 152-4; 339, 352
Humayrâ ("A'isha, the Prophet's wife, so called), 320
Humáyûn ("Great Mogul" Emperor of India, xvi), 394, 393, 418, 419
Humáyûn wa Humáyun (poem by Khwájâ of Kírmán), 226
Hungary, Hungarians, 6, 9
Hurmuz, 47, 193, 238, 285, 290, 397
Hurr b. Yazíd-Riáhí, 87
Hurúfísect (xiv), 190, 365-75, 449-52, 475, 478, 479
Husayn, The Imlám — b. 'Ali Tálib (vii), 256, 441, 449, 510; — b. Mansúr al-Hallaj (mythic, x), 195 and n.; — b. Amr Chábán (xiv), 54; Amfr — (general of Abu Sa'id the Mongol, xiv), 52; — Ag-Bughá b. Ayyakán-i-Jalá'ír (or Iklâmí (father of Shaykh Hasan-i-Buzurg, q.v., xiv), 171; — b. Uways-i-Jalâ'ír (killed A.D. 1382), 172; Sultán — (Timúr's rival), 185; Shaykh — Jûrî (xiv), 178-9; Abu'll-Ghází Sultán — b. Mansúr b. Bayqarár (Timúrid prince, xv), see supra, s.v. Abu'll-Ghází; — Kiyâ (Hurúfí correspondent, xiv), 368; — Beg Shámúlú (counselor of Sháh Isma'íl the Safawí, A.D. 1500), 417; — Wá'tiz-i-Káshífi (man of letters, xvi), 434, 438, 441-3, 463, 503-4; — 'Udí (musician to Mir 'Ali Shír Nawa'll, xv), 565
INDEX 563

Heusayn, Amir — of Khurásán (questioner of Mahmúd-i-Shábishtari, xiv), 147

'Husn u 'Ishq (“Beauty and Love,” a poem by Káthibí, xv), 487

Hyde, Thomas — (xviii), 303

Hyrcania, 390. See Astarábd, Gurgán, Jurján

Ibn 'u-l-Áthír (Arab historian, xiii), 6, 12, 58, 144 n.

Ibhráímí. Shaykh Shádru'd-Dín — al-Ájamí (xiii), 40; Shaykh Ibhráímím al-Juvání (xiii), 40 n.; Khvájá — b. Rashídú'd-Dín Fád-lláh (xiv), 52, 71, 83, 84, 86; Mirzá — Sultan b. Sháh-rúkh (xv), 364, 387, 500; — b. 'Alá'ú'd-Dawla b. Báyúsunqur (xv), 388; Sultan — Lódi of Díhlí (xvi), 393; — (brother of Sháh Ismá'íl-i-Sáfawí, A.D. 1500), 416; Amir Shaykh — of Shírúán (xv), 438

Iconium, 63, 127. See also Qonya

Idájí, Sultan — (put to death, A.D. 1291), 33

Idol-temples destroyed in Persia by Gházán (A.D. 1295), 40

'Ijá'd-l-Fitiḥ, 349 and n.

Iftikhári, clan or family of Qazwín, 93

Iftikhárú'd-Dín, Malik 'Ábad — Muḥammad b. Abú Naṣr (xiii), 93, 115

Ij (place in Fárs), 356, 357

Ikhíyá'ú'd-Dín, castle of — 366

Iláci or Ilónchí, Thomas — (Mongol envoy to Edward II in A.D. 1307), 11 and n., 49

Il-Khánís. This title is properly applied to the Mongol successors of Húlágú Khán, whose history is contained in ch. i (1-61), but it is also sometimes applied to the dynasty founded by Shaykh Husán-i-Buzurg, more correctly called Jalá'l-ír or Ilání (170-3). The references to the former are: 15, 17, 18, 20, 27, 44, 45, 49, 59, 58, 71, 74, 83, 87, 91, 172, 205; to the latter: 160, 161, 170-3, 208, 260, 261, 262, 401. On the forms Il-Khání and Ilání see especially 171; but it is to be noted that in the received text of Háfiz (ed. Rosenzweig-Schwan- nau, vol. iii, p. 8) the former title is applied to the grandson of Shaykh Hasan-i-Buzurg

Ilmínsky (editor of the Bábür-náma), 391

‘Imádú'd-Dín. — Fáqíh (“the Jurist-consult,” poet of Kírmán, xiv), 159, 209, 211, 258-9, 280, 281, 325, 348, 350, 352; — Nasími (Nesími, the Turkish Hurúfi poet, xiv-xv), 368. See Nasími

Imám, the Twelve — (vii-ix), 91. See also under 'Ali, Hasan, Husayn, etc.

Imám-qíl Khán, 318

‘Imárát-i-Túqší (Isháhán), 368

Ináí (old Turkish name), 150, 151 and n.

‘Inbá (of Ibhán-l-Áhjár, xiv-xv), 367


Indian hemp (Báng, Hāshíkh), 150 and n., 151 and n.

Indian Mutiny, 183 n., 386, 391, 420

Índus, 4, 175, 195, 194, 393

Íñjú, Shaykh Abú Isháq — (xiv), 163, 164-5, 166, 225, 226, 230, 231, 233 n., 235, 237, 274, 275, 300, 357

“Ínstitutes” (Tuzukát) of Timúr, 183, 202, 361 n.

Iouldouchí, Thomas —, 11, 49. See above s.v. Ildáci

Irám, 525

Iranchín (Mongol officer, xiv), 52, 53

'Iráq, 20, 21, 100, 168, 173, 191, 204, 225, 317, 325, 364, 388, 385, 387, 389, 393, 398, 402, 409, 416, 418, 440, 466, 468


Ireland, Irish, 44, 102, 107

Irín (place near Ray), 265

Ishá. Sultan — (governor of Márdán, xiv), 192; — brother of the Ottoman Sultan Muḥammad I, 401. See also Jesus

Isén-búqa (Mongol officer, xiv), 52

Isháhán, 15, 22, 37, 81, 82, 119, 141, 160, 161, 165, 168, 169, 181, 188, 190, 208, 274, 331, 344, 360, 364, 368, 384, 389, 402, 419, 416, 489

Isfandíyáí dynasty, 401

Isfáráín, 186, 497, 503
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Isfizar, 175, 176

Ishag Efendi (author of the Kashiufi'-
Ardix, xiv), 371, 450

Abu Ishaq. — b. Sultan Uways b. 
Shah Shu'ayb Muzaффar (slain by 
Timur, A.D. 1393), 169; Shaykh 
— Injii (xiv); see above s.v. Injii; 
— Ahmad b. Ya-Sin (historian of 
Herat), 174, 431; — of Shiraz 
gastronomic poet, xiv; see above 
s.v. Bushaq; — Ibrahim (saint of 
Kazurun), 226

'Isfah-nama (Persian Hurufi book by 
Firishta-zada, q.v.), 371, 450-451

Iskandar. — b. 'Umar Shyakh Mirza 
(Timurid, xv), 344, 345, 366; — b. 
Qara Yusuf Aq-qoyunlu (xv), 382, 400, 401, 402, 404, 489. See 
also Alexander the Great

Iskandar-nama (Hurufi poem), 449

Islam, 4, 8, 11, 17, 31, 32, 40, 43-44, 
46, 48, 49, 73, 78, 93

Isma'il, Shah — Safawi (A.D. 1500),
315, 316, 379, 380, 381, 400, 407, 
414, 415, 416, 417-19, 434, 458, 
459, 507

Isma'il 'Ali (Indian copyist, xix), 154

Isma'il sect. 53, 73, 74, 154. See also 
Assassins

'Isnat of Bukhara (poet, xv), 353, 
53, 501

Istahbanat (in Farsi), 331

Istakhri (in Farsi), 414, 416

Lisivud-nama (Persian Hurufi poem), 
373, 450

Lishtehratel-Akhbar (one of the sources 
of the Ta'rikh-i-Guzida), 89

Italy, Italians, 381, 395, 399, 405, 
414. See also Venetians

Iyas b. Mu'awiya, 255

Iznik, 369

'Issat Malik (wife of Shaykh Hasan-
i-Kuchak, xiv), 60

Izzu'd-Din. — Muzaффar (minister 
responsible for introducing paper 
money into Persia, A.D. 1294), 38; 
— 'Umar-i-Marghni (minister, 
xxi-xii and ancestor of Kurb 
dynasty), 172, 175; Malik — (ruler 
of Luristan, xiv), 187, 192, 368; 
— Shir (xv), 401

Jacob, 413, 414, 415. See Ya'qub

Jafar. — b. Abi Tahlib-Tayyar (vii), 
144 and n. — Sa'diq (Imam, viii), 
440; — of Tabriz (calligraphist, 
xv), 395, 499

Jahangir. — b. Timur (xiv), 381; 
— (Mogul Emperor of Dhill, xvii), 
273, 319, 391; — b. 'Ali, Beg b. 
Qara 'Osmann ('Uthman Aq-qoy-
unlu (xv), 404, 407, 408

Jahan-guz, Ta'rikh-i. — (by 'Ala-
u'd-Din 'Ata Malik-i-Juwayni, 
xiii); see under Ta'rikh

Jahah Khatun (satirized by 'Ubayd-i-
Zakani, xiv), 233 n.

Jahan-nama (one of the sources of 
the Nuskhatul-Qu/b), 99

Jahanshah b. Qara Yusuf Qara-
yunlu (xv), 387-9, 400-3, 406, 
408-10, 412

Jalai'r family and dynasty, 54, 59, 60, 
160, 161, 166, 170-3, 187, 191, 
260, 284, 320, 399. See also Il-
khanii (Ilkani)

Jalal. — 'Adudi (poet, xiv), 159, 
344, 359, 352; Khwaja — [or 
Jalalud-Din] b. Rashidudd-Din 
Fa'dullllah (xv), 82, 84; — i-
Khwairi (poet), 65; — i-Tabb 
(poet), 65, 159, 344, 359, 352

Jalalud-Din. — Mankobirni Khwai-
rzmshah (xii), 12, 66; — Sim-
nani (minister to Arghun, put to 
death in A.D. 1289), 31; — Kay-
Qubad b. 'Ala'u'd-Din Kay-Qubad 
Seljuq of Rumi (xiii), 83; Khwaja — 
b. Rashidudd-Din Fa'dullllah (xiv), 
82, 84; Mawalana — Rumi (author 
of the Mathnawi, q.v.), 105, 106, 
111, 139, 140, 155, 217, 302, 344, 
350, 445, 479, 484, 514, 548; 
— Mansur-i-Muzaффar, 163 (see also 
infra, s.v. Mansur); Mawlana — 
b. Husam of Herat (contemporary 
of 'Ubayd-i-Zaikan), 257; Khwaja 
— (patron of Hafiz), 292; 
Dawain (philosopher, xv), 389, 
398, 423, 442-2; Mawlana — 
Ishaq of Samargand (xiv-xv), 428

Jam (town in Khurasan), 175, 435, 
473, 507

Jam-i-Sam (poem by Awhad of Maragha, 
xiv), 141

Jami, Mullai Nuru'd-Din 'Abdul-
Rahman (poet, xv), 124, 125, 132, 
133 n., 139 n., 140, 141 n., 258, 
261, 273, 283, 320, 321 n., 331, 
347 n., 395, 398, 399 n., 422-3, 
426 n., 434, 435-6; 437, 440, 
445-8, 457, 459, 461 n., 463-475, 
486, 496-497, 503, 505, 506, 507- 
548
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428-30; — Husayn Gázar-gáhi (pseudo-Súfí and poetaster, alleged to be the real author of the Majáísú'L-Ushsháq, q.v.), 440, 457-8; — Husayn b. Ḥasan of Khvárazm (author of a commentary on the Mathnawi entitled Jawáhir'l-Asrár, xv), 445. Kamál-náma (by Khwájú of Kirmán, xiv), 226

“Káma-Shastra Society,” 436
Kámí, Sháh Husayn — (poet contemporary with Bábúr), 459
Karán Beg (xvi), 318
Kambá'il (Cambay), 398
Kanzu'l-Ishtíhá (the "Treasure of Appetite" by Busháq of Shirz, xv), 346-50
Karají, clan or family of Qazvín, 94
Karbalá, 42, 44, 191, 256, 449, 510
Karduchín (wife of Amír Chubáín, xiv), 55
Karín Khán-i-Zand (xviii), 311
Karit, Kerait (a people akin to the Mongols), 11, 18 n.
Ká'r-kiyá Mírzá 'Alí (governor of Gilán, A.D. 1500), 416
Karkúk, 192
Ká'r-náma (of Rábl'í of Búshánj, xiv), 151-2
Kash, 183, 194
Káshán, 81, 118, 389
Kashí (near Euphrates), 42
Kashfa'-Zunún (of Hájí Khalífa), 367 n.
Káshghar, 382
Kášhífe'l-Asrá (refutation of Hurúfí heresies by Isháq Efendi), 371, 450-2
Kashmir, language of —, 43; beauties of —, 283
-Káshká (of -Zamakhshárl), 272
Kátiíbí (poet of Náshpúr or Turshíz, xv), 352, 353, 438, 487-95, 498, 501
Ká'ús, Kay — (legendary king of Persia), 152
Kawthár (stream or fountain in Paradise), 134
Káyání dynasty of Persia, 90
Kayfí (name of a place), 82
Kayyí, clan or family of Qazvín, 94
Kazán, 391
Kázarún, 226, 418, 444
Keene, H. G. — (translator of Akhláq-i-Muhsíní), 444
Kéralí, Kerit, 11, 18 n.

“Key of Life” (Mistáhú'l-Hayádt), 372
Khabís, 81
Khádíthád (obscene poems of Sa'dí), 232 n.
Khabúshán, 387
Kháfúja (Arab tribe), 162, 231
Ibn Khálidún (historian, xiv), 462
Khálídí clan or family of Qazvín, 94
Khálil — Sultan of Shírván (xv), 400; — Sultan b. Míránsháh (Timúrid prince, xv), 381, 382, 438; Mawláná — Naqqásh ("the painter"), 384, 498
Khálílí, clan or family of Qazvín, 94
Khájjú'lláh Mírzá b. Úzún Hasan (Aq-qoyúnlú, xv), 408, 413, 414
Kháláqu'l-Ma'ání ("Creator of [new] Ideas"), 327 n. See above under Kamálú'd-Dín Isma'íl
Ibn Khallíkán (biographer, xiii), 64
Khamríyya (the "Wine-poem" of 'Umar b. al-Fárid, q.v.), 514
Khánsmá ("Quintet") of Niżámí of Ganja, 226, 505, 541; — of Khwájú of Kirmán, 225-6; — tu'l-Mutahayyirín of Mír 'Ali Shír Nawí', 508
Khán-báilgh ("Cambaluc," Pekín), 397, 398
Khánqáhín, 163
Khán-záda Bégm (Bábur's sister), 419
Kháqání (poet, xii), 65, 224, 532
Khárdánda (original name of Uljáýtí changed to Khudá-banda, q.v.), 46-7
Kharjúríd, 473
Kharpút, 389
Khátá (Cathay), 75, 228, 356
Khatímátu'l-Hayádt (Jámi's last Dí-ván, compiled in A.D. 1490-1), 516
Khálík, 390
Kháyáfí (poet of Bukhárá), 352, 438, 501
Kháysár, 152, 174, 175, 176
Khází in al-Bağhdádí, Abú Tálib 'Ali — (historian), 88
-Khárazjí (author of al-'Uqádál-Lúl'í'dáyúa, a history of Yaman), 357
Khíd, 134, 259, 291
Khíd Khán (xv), 383 n.
*Khírá-md-náma-i-Síkandarí (by Jámi), 516, 536-40
Khíva, 190. See Khwárazm
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Khizâna-i-‘Amira (biography of poets by Mr. Ghulâm ‘Ali Khân Azd, xviii), 289
Khudâ-banda (Úljáytû, A.D. 1305–16), 46–51, 83, 176, 215. See also Úljáytû
Khudâ-dâd (leader of revolt against Khalîl Sultân, xv), 381
Khujand, 206, 209, 326, 324, 327
Khûlât-â'în-â'khâbâr (by Khwândâmîr, xv–xvi), 434
Ibn Khurâdâbhîhî (geographer), 99
Khurram-âbâd (Luristân), 187, 419
Khurshîd Beg (ambassador from Úzûn Hasan to the Ottoman Sultân Muḥammad II), 409
Khurshid-î Khwârau I (vii), see Nûshirvân; — II (— Parviz, vii), 267, 329, 500; Amir — of Dihlî (poet, xiii), 106, 107, 108–10, 293, 325, 491, 408, 514, 527, 536 n. See also Chosroès, Khîs, Sâsânîans
Khutan, 33, 266
Khîyû, 109, 414
Khûzistân, 82, 83, 193, 411
Khwâf, 113, 211, 424 n., 428. This place is chiefly mentioned in connection with Fâṣîhû, q.v.
Khvâjû (poet of Kirmân, xiv), 159, 209, 211, 222–9, 293–5, 296, 348, 350, 352
Khwândâmîr (historian and biographer, xvi), 17, 49, 171, 273, 283, 361, 393, 433, 434, 488, 503, 504, 505. See also Habîb ‘-Sîyâr, Khûlât-â'în-â'khâbâr
Khvâr, 81
Khvârâz (Khîva), 12, 190, 354, 356, 368, 390, 418, 456
Khvârâz-šâhs, 68, 73, 74, 92, 180
Kichik, 53
Kieff, 10
Kikshik, 53
-Kînâsâ, 254
Kînjîk, 53
Kîs, 120, 121, 285, 467, 469. See also Chosroès, Khurshid, Nûshirvân, Sâsânîans
Kîlîb-i-Yamînî (History of Sultân Mahmûd of Ghaznî), 88
Kîlîbîl-‘Ayyâd wal-‘Atâr (by Râshîd-ûd-Dîn Fâshlû’l-làh, xiii-xiv), 75, 79
Kîlîbîl-Mutârîf (Ibn Qutayba), 88
Kîlîbîl-Tânibîl wal-‘Isrâf (-Mas’ûdî), 99 n.
Kîyû, clan or family of Qazwîn, 94
Kostî (Zoroastrian girdle), 342 n.
Kublâ Khân. See Qûbilày
-Kûbrâ (treatise on Logic by al-Jurjânî, xiv-xv), 355
Kûkîh-i-‘Ulamà ("Street of the Learned" in the Râb’î-Rashîd at Tabrîz), 86
Kûk-i-Chahîl Mâgûn (mountain near Shirîz), 167
Kunhûl-Murđ (by Sharafûd-Dîn ‘Alî Yazdî), 363
Kunhûl-Hâqîq (commentary on the Mathnawi), 445
Kur, River —, 417
Kurdîstân, 190, 491, 466
Kursî-nâmâ (Persian "Horâfi" work), 450
Kurt (dynasty of Herât), 41, 50, 55, 57, 60, 160, 161, 163, 173–80, 185, 208, 211, 354, 431
Kurt-nâmâ of Râbû’l-Bushanî, 174, 431
Kushtî (Zoroastrian girdle), 342 n.
Kûthû, Mehmûd — (historian of Mu’âẓzfâr dynasty, xv), 162, 166, 360
Kuyûk Khân (Mongol Emperor, xiii), 8
Lâhijân, 416, 482
Lâhîjî, ‘Abdu’r-‘Raâmân — (commentator of Gulshân-i-Râdz), 148
Lâlî-bâshî. See Ridâ-qiûl Khân *Lama’d (of ‘Irâqî), 127, 132–9, 444–7, 512
Landauer (editor of Shâh-nâmâ), 89
Landauer (editor of Shâh-nâmâ), 89
Landauer (editor of Shâh-nâmâ), 89
Lane-Poole, 178, 379, 387, 390
Langlès, Professor —, 184
Lâr —, 285
Lârânda, 155
Lâ’îf-i-‘Rashîdîyya (dedicated by the author Mahmûd b. Iyâs to Râshîd-ûd-Dîn Fâshlû’l-làh), 84–5
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Laṭf’i-f-námâ, 361
Laṭf’i-ul-Haqûq (by Rashídû’d-Dîn Fâdûl’l-lâh), 76
Laṭîfâ-i-Ghaybîyya (critical essay on Hâfîz), 300, 315, 316
Laṭîfî (Turkish biographer of poets), 369
Latin, 9, 10, 11, 43, 62
*Lawdîh (by Jâmî), 444, 447-8, 512
Lawdîmî (commentary by Jâmî on the Fusûsî’t-Hikâm), 513
Lawdînî’l-İshrâq (by Jalâlû’d-Dîn Dawânî), 443. See Akhlaq-i-Jalâlî
Laylâ (concubine of Qubâd b. Iskandar Qârá-qoyûnlû), 402
*Laylâ wa Majnûn (of Amîr Khusrâw, xiii), 109-10; — (of Jâmî, xv), 516, 523-5, 545
*Leaf, Walter — (translations from Hâfîz), 303-6, 308, 309
Leyden (in Holland), 367; Dr John —, 393, 454
Lieggnitz, Battle of — (April 9, 1241), 6
Lîsânî’l-Çhayâ (“Tongue of the Unseen,” Hâfîz so entitled), 311
Lîsânî’l-Tayr (“Language of the Birds,” poem by Mîr ‘Alî Shîr Nawa’î), 505
Lîshta-Nîshâ (in Gîlân), 416
Literary History of Persia, by the author of this volume (vol. i from the earliest times to A.D. 1000, vol. ii from A.D. 1000 to 1365, published by Fisher Unwin in 1902 and 1906 respectively), 5 n., 6 n., 15 n., 17 n. and passim
Llandudno Junction, 231 n.
Locksley Hall (Tennyson), 218 n.
Lîdî, Sultan Ibrâhîm — of Dîhilî (xvi), 393
Lombardy, 102
Lowe, W. H. — (translator of Hâfîz), 299
Lûbâb’u’l-Abâb (by Muḥammad ‘Awfî, xiii), 65
Lur, Lurîstân, 37, 68, 92, 187, 189, 191, 410
Lutfî ‘Ali Beg (author of the Ātash-kâda, q.v.), 274
Lutfûl-lâh b. Şâdru’d-Dîn ‘Irâqî (xiv), 165
Lyly, John — (the Euphuist), 461
Lyons, 8
Ma’dâdhî (satirized by Kamâl of Khujuand), 329
McCarthy, Justin —, 303
-Madîna, 55, 111, 127, 167, 427
Magas, Mûlûb —, 315-6
Maghrîb (Morocco), 84, 331
Maghrîbî (mystical poet of Tabriz, xiv-xv), 159, 211, 330-44, 345, 435, 485, 475
Magians, 234, 278 and n., 300, 342 and n. See also Gabriel Guebre, Zoroastrian, Zunnâr
Mâh (the Moon), 113 and n.
Mahabbat-nâmâ. — (Persian Hu-râfî work), 373, 450; — ī-Shâhî-dînu (by ‘Imâdû’d-Dîn Kirmânî, A.D. 1322), 259
Mâhân (near Kirmânî), 345, 463, 464, 467
Mahbûb’u’l-Qulûb (“Hearts’ Darling,” by Mîr ‘Alî Shîr Nawa’î), 453
Mahdî. Advent of the expected —, 463, 465, 469, 470; pretended —, 50, 54; Sultân — b. Shâh Shu’Ja’ Muzaffârî (xiv), 169; Ibn — (physician, xiii), 85
Mâhî (the Fish), 113
Mâhmûd. Sultan — of Ghazna (x-xii), 256, 353, 380; Shâh Bahâmani (of the Deccan, patron of Hâfîz), xiv), 285, 287 n., 290; Sultân — II (Ottoman, xix), 371, 452; — b. Mubârizû’d-Dîn Muzaffârî (xiv), 165, 166-7, 360; — Injû (xiv), 274; — b. Abû Sa’îd (Timûrid, xv), 390; Mîrzâ Shâh — (Timûrid, xv), 388; Amîr — b. Rashîdû’d-Dîn Fâdûl’l-lâh (xiii-xiv), 81, 84, 85; — b. Ilâyîs (rewarded for dedicating a book to Rashîdû’d-Dîn, xiii-xiv), 84; Khwâja — of Sâwâ (envoy to India, xiii-xiv), 85; — Qârî of Yazd (parodist, xv), 257, 351-3; — Kûbî (historian of Muzaffârsî), 350 n.; Mawlânâ — (correspondent of Hu-rûfsî, xiv), 368
Mâhmûd-âbâd (near Shîfwân), 417
Mâhmûd u Ayâz (poem by Fakhru’d-Dîn ‘All), 504
Majâdisu’l-Mînînû (by Sayyid Nûru’llâh of Shûshtâr, xvi), 44 n., 224, 498
*Majâdisu’n-Nâfisî (by Mîr ‘Alî Shîr Nawa’î), 434, 437-9, 459, 487, 499, 495, 497, 499 n., 508
Majâdisu’l-Usbâshâq (ascribed by Bâbur to Kamâlû’d-Dîn Husayn Gâzargâhî, but generally attributed
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Mawdhib-i-Iláhi (of Mu’inu’d-Din Yazdí, xiv), 359, 360
Mawṣíl, 82, 192, 399, 408, 417
Mayána, 389
Maybud, 163
May-khána (of ‘Abdu’n-Nabí, xvii), 273
Mázdarán, 27, 51, 52, 152, 160, 166, 187, 190, 193, 194, 388, 390, 416, 419, 494
Mecca, 32, 51, 71, 111, 127, 177, 326, 357, 358, 374, 407, 423, 427, 494, 492 n.
Meninskí (Latin renderings of Háfíz, 1680), 393
Mercury (the planet), 121 and n.
Merv (Marw), 175, 382, 419
Mesopotamia, 56
Mevlevi (Mawlání dervishes, 479 de Meynard, Barbier — 94
Michael Palaeologus (xiii), 18
Mifsádú’l-Ghayb (Jámi’l commentary on)—, 514
Mifsádú’l-Hayyát (key to the Jáwi-dán-i-Kábir, q.v.), 372, 453
Mifsádú’l-Ulúm (as-Sakkáki, xiii), 272 n.
Mifsádú’l-Tafsír (of Rashídú’d-Dín Fadlulláh, xiii-xiv), 76
Mímtiya (or Khwarizíyya, poem of ‘Umar ibnu’l-Fárid), 514
Minúchíhr Sháh (killed in A.D. 1422), 489
Míránsíyá (d. A.D. 1400), 71, 180, 186, 190, 194–5, 321, 332, 367, 371 n., 374, 381, 388, 451
Mírátu’d-Khayád, 514
Mírátu’d-Sáfá, 437
Mírkhwánd (historian, xv), 17, 58, 361, 387, 388, 393, 407, 414, 431–3, 434, 438, 439; See also Rawjátu’s-Sáfá
Místáb (of al-Mutarríz, xii), 273
*Místábú’l-Arun (by Awadhú’d-Dín of Kírmán, xiv), 140–1
Ibn Mískawayhi (historian), 88
Mír b. Qára Yúsusf (xiv), 192
*Mízánú’l-Awán (treatise on prosody by Mr ‘Ali Shír Nawáví), 505
Moguls or Moghúls (‘Great —’ of Díhil, xvi-xix), 187, 183, 184, 319, 364, 389, 391, 393, 420, 433; See also Akbar, Bábúr, Hómáyún
Mohi, Jules — (edition of Sháh-níma), 89 n.
Mongols (or Tartars), 4–17, 32, 37, 39–45, 48, 49, 60, 62, 67, 71–4, 77, 87, 92–9, 101, 108, 111, 159, 162, 170, 178, 185, 186, 190, 265, 269, 250, 405; Mongolian language, 31, 93, 111
Moravia, 6
Morris, William —, 395
Mosallá, 283. See Musállá
Moscow, 192
Moses, 89, 114, 267 and n.
Mu’áyñán, or Mu’áyñáníyán, a clan or family of Qazwín, 94
Mu‘allaqd (the seven —), 492 n.
Mu’amíd (acrostic), 462, 507, 514
Mu‘ammál Mawlání Muhammad — (architect, xv), 311; Mr Husayn — (poet, xv or xvi), 459
Mu‘áwíya (Umýyad Caliph, vii), 90, 250
Mu‘ayyad-záda, ‘Abdu’r-Rahmán Chélebí (xv), 423
Mubárízu’d-Dín Muhammad (ancestor of Muqaffírs, xiv), 162–6, 225, 275 n., 277–8, 357, 360
*Mufáasal of -Zamakhshári, 357
Mufid of Yazd (author of the Jámi’l-Mufídí, xvii), 390
Mughíthú’d-Dín (grandson of Fáshí of Khwáf, q.v., xv), 428
Muhadhdhib (7 Jewish notable who perished in massacre about A.D. 1291), 35, 36 n.
Muhákkamú’l-Lughátíyún (composed in A.D. 1500 by Mr ‘Ali Shír Nawáví), 453, 506
Muhammad, The Prophet (vi-vii), 32, 49, 51, 73, 74, 76, 89, 90, 95, 101, 144 n., 231 n., 320 n., 424, 427, 441, 492 n., 507, 513, 521; — Báqír (fifth Imán of the Shí‘a), viii), 464; Shamsú’d-Dín — b. Qays of Ray (xiii), ser Mu’éom and Shams-i-Qays; Shamsú’d-Dín — Juwayni (xiii), see Sáhib-Diwán; — Sámus (Ghúrí captain, defender of Heráf, put to death in A.D. 1307), 50; — Sháh (last Mongol Il-khán, put to death in
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Shaykh — ibnul-'Arabi (xiii), 63, 127, 128, 132, 139, 331, 446 n., 447, 484, 514
Mu’ta (near Ahar), 27
Mu’in-i-Isfahāri (author of a history of Herat), 173, 430-1
Mu’inu’d-Din. — Parwāna (xiv), 85, 106, 115, 127; — of Yazd (historian of the Muzaferis), 159, 161-2, 170, 359-60; — of Kāshān (astronomer, xv), 386
Muir, Sir William — (author of Life of Mahomet), 144 n.
Mu’izz (panegyrist of the Seljuqs), 522
Mu’izzu’d-Din. — b. Ghiyāthu’d-Din Kurt (xiv), 57, 177, 178, 179, 211-14, 354; — Jahāngīr b. Shāh Yahya Muzaferis (xiv), 169
*Mu’jam fi Ḥadhīrī Muḥāki’t-’Ajām (history of the ancient kings of Persia by Faddullāh al-Ḥusaynī, xiii-xiv), 68
— Mu’jam fi Ma’āyīrī Ashfārī’t-’Ajām (work on Persian prosody by Shams-i-Qays, xiii), 16 n.
Mujir of Baylāqān (poet, xii), 65
*Mujmal of Fāṣīḥī of Kūwāf (A.D. 1442), 426-8. See Fāṣḥī
Mukhāyjat-nāmah (mock-heroic poem by Mahmud Qārī of Yazd, xv), 352
Mukhtar, clan or family of Qazwīn, 94
Mukhtaṣar. — (of Taftazānī, xiv), 354; — u’d-Duwal (of Bar-Hebraeus, q.v.), 18, 64; — fi Tā’rikhī’l-Bashar, see Abū’l-Fidā
Ibn Mūlam (assassin of the Imām ‘Alī, A.D. 661), 256 n.
Mulk s. 125, 174
Mulk-i-Tawādīf (Parthianssocalled), 90
Mu‘minān, clan or family of Qazwīn, 94
*Muṣnajjim-baḥšī (by this title, “the Astronomer in chief,” Darwish, or Dervish, Ahmad, author of the history entitled Sahl-i’l-Ākhbār, is generally known), 383 n., 384 and n.; 387, 390, 403, 407, 409, 411, 414, 415, 417 n.
Mināstu’l-Ābr (by ‘Imād of Kirmān, A.D. 1304), 259
Munkir (name of one of the angels who conducts the “Questioning of the Tomb”), 522
Ibnul-Muqaffa’, ‘Abdullāh — (xii), 463, 504
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Mūqān, 39
Ibn Muqla (calligraphist), 84
Murād II (Ottoman Sultan, A.D. 1421-51), 383 n., 398, 400, 404
Murād Bey (nephew and envoy of Üzün Hasan, A.D. 1461), 408, 418
Murād Pāshā Palaeologus (xv), 412
Murghāb. 175, 388
Murtād, Mīr — (philosopher and chess-player), 456-7
Mūsā. — (the last Mongol ruler of Persia, d. A.D. 1337), 17, 59; — the Kurd (pretended Mahdi, xiv), 50; — (brother of Sultan Muhammad I, put to death about A.D. 1416), 401
Musafir, Darwish — (Hūrfi correspondent, xiv), 368
Muṣallāl (“the Oratory,” near Shirāz), 238, 284, 291
Muston, le —, 112 n., 366 n., 427, 428, 465, 467, 469 n.
Mūsh (town in Armenia), 188, 192
"Mush u Girbara (“the Mouse and the Cat,” poem by ‘Ubayd-i-Zākānī”), 230, 241-4
Mū斯塔fā, Prince — (son of Sultan Muhammad II, campaign against Üzün Hasan, A.D. 1472-4), 411-12
-Mustakfī (titular Caliph at Cairo, xiv), 164 n.
-Musta'lı (Fātimid Caliph, A.D. 1094-1101), 154
-Mustansır (Fātimid Caliph, A.D. 1035-94), 154
-Musta’sim (the last ‘Abbasid Caliph, killed by the Mongols in A.D. 1258), 74
Mustawfi, clan or family of Qazwin, 94; Amin Naṣr — (resident in Qazwin when it was sacked by the Mongols in A.D. 1220), 96. See also Ḥamdūllāh, Ta‘rīkh-i-Guzida.
Mustawfīl-Māmalik (“Chancellor of the Exchequer”), 20
Mū’ta, Battle of — (A.D. 629), 144 n.
-Mutardi (titular Caliph at Cairo, A.D. 1352-62), 164 n.
-Mutanabbī (Arabic poet, x), 547
-Muṭarrīzī (grammian, xiii), 272 n.
-Muṭawwall of ‘Tāftażānī, xiv), 354
Muṭazila (sect), 541 n.
Mutiny, Indian — (A.D. 1857), 183 n., 380, 391, 420
Muwaṭṭa’ī-Dawla ‘Alī (grandfather of Rasnidu’-Dīn Fadlu’llāh), 69
Mūy-dīrāz (“long-haired,” nick-name of the Sāhib-‘Dīwān’s grandfather), 20. See under Juwayni
Mużaffar, House of — (xiv), 60, 139, 160-70, 172, 173, 186, 188, 189, 190, 191, 193, 206, 208, 225, 258, 275, 284, 355, 356, 357; — (governor of Qazwin when it was sacked by the Mongols in A.D. 1220), 96-7; Shāh — (artist, xv-xvi), 456, 459, 505
Mużaffari, clan or family of Qazwin, 94
Nādir Shāh (A.D. 1736-47), 371 n.
Najafűth-t-'Uns (written by Jámi in A.D. 1476), 124, 139 n., 140, 141 n., 273, 283, 321, 331 n., 426 n., 434-5, 458, 461 n., 475, 505, 513, 513
Nā‘in, 331
Najāshī (envoy of Sultan Bāyazid to Timūr), 205
Najībū-‘Dīn. — Kakhāl (“the oculist,” xiii, creature of Sa‘dūd-Dawla, q.v.), 32; Shaykh — Buzghush (xiv), 484
Najmi (poet parodied by BUSHAQ), 350
Najīmu’d-Dīn Kurbā (xiii), 484
Nakhirwān, 59, 165, 166, 187, 188, 400, 417
Nakfr, 522. See above under Munkir
Napoléon I (compared with Timūr), 182
Nāqān’-Nūsūs (composed by Jámi in A.D. 1438), 514
Najību’l-‘Askāfī, Sayyid Tājū’-Dīn —, 71
Nāqshbandī, order of dervishes, 441, 452, 506
Nārin Buqā, Amfr — (xiv), 57
Nasā (in Khurāṣān), 354
Nāṣā’, Shīhābū’-Dīn — (biographer of Jalālū’-Dīn Khwārazmshāh, xiii), 12
Nashāt (acrostic on the name —), 124
Nasfī (or Neshfī, Turkish poet put to death for heresy in A.D. 1417), 368, 369 and n., 449, 408
Nāṣīr. Ah-Malik al. — (Muhammad, Sultan of Egypt, A.D. 1293-1340), 49, 51, 53, 54, 172; (Faras), A.D. 1308-1412), 196, 197, 199; — i-Khusraw (Persian poet and traveller, xi), 65, 154, 510; — of Bukhārā (Persian poet), 352
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Naishrú’d-Din Túsi (astronomer and philosopher, xiii), 17, 18, 48, 67, 442, 502

Abú Naṣr. Hasan Beg Bahádúr Khán (xv), 103; - i-Faráhí (poet and author of the well-known rhymed vocabulary entitled Nişábūri-Síbyán), 350

*Nassau Lees, Captain W. — (editor of the Nafaḥatú’l-ʿUns, q.v.), 433, 506-9, 510 n.

Náḥúsá (place), 81

Nawái. — See Mir ‘Alí Shir

Nawrúz, Festival of the —, 324 n.; — (son of Rashídú’d-Din Faq-
lu’llah, xiv), 28; Amīr — (Gházá́n Khán’s general, xiii), 40, 41, 176

Nawrúz u Gui (poem by Khwájá of
Kírmán, xiii-xiv), 225, 226

Naw-Shahr, 30, 31, 59

Nayná-náma (“Book of the Reed-flute,”
by Jámí), 514, 548

Nayriz (in Fárs), 356

Nayyir of Kírmán (poet parodied by
Maḥmúd Qári of Yazd), 352

Násir u Mówzár (poem by Kátíbí of
Nísháhpúr, xv), 487

Nebuchadnezzar, 89, 250

Ndj (or Najal), 544

Neri, 399

Nesímí. — See above Nasímí

Nestorians, 11, 102

Nicholson, Dr R. A. — 88, 95

Nicolas III, Pope — (sends envoys
to Mongols in A.D. 1278), 19

Nicolas (Uljayútd said to have been
baptized under this name), 46

Nísháhpúr, 193

Nísháhpúr (harper of Khusrav Parwáž), 267 and n.

Níkúdarís, 25, 177

Níṯmúštluá́lh, Sayyid or Sháh — of
Kírmán (xiv-xv), 345, 359, 354,
333, 463-73, 497, 498

Nísháhpúr, 125-15, 178, 487, 488, 493

Nísháhpúriyán (clan or family of Qás-
win), 94

Nízám. Khwájá — (unidentified),
494; — i-Shámí (biographer of Timúr,
xiv-xv), 159, 183, 197, 203, 361-2, 363, 365

Nízámí. — (poet of Ganja, xii), 65,
224, 226, 326 n., 348, 350, 387,
505, 510, 522, 527, 536, 540-42;
— i-ʿArúfí of Sanarqánd (author of
the Chahár Maqála, q.v., xii),
65, 522

Nízámú’d-Dín. — Awliyá (Saint,
d. A.D. 1324), 108; — Maḥmúd Qári of Yazd (parodist),
211, 351-3; Abúl-Maʿáli Naṣ-
ru’lláh (translator into Persian of the
Book of Kalila and Dimna, xii), 463

Nízámú’l-Mulk (minister to the Seljúqs
Alp Arslán and Maliksháh, xi), 89

* nibhí’t-Tawáříkh (historical manual
by al-Baydawi, xiii), 63, 88, 100

Nízár (b. -Mustániš, Fátímíd prince,
xii), 154

Nízárí of Qúshtán (poet, xiii-xiv),
154-5

Nogáy (Mongol prince, xiii), 25

Northampton visited by Mongol envoy
in A.D. 1307, 11

North Sea, 6

Númán, Sháh —, son of the poet
Hájí (buried at Burhánpúr in
India), 289

Nuqta ("Point"), 470, 471

*Núrú’d-Dín. — b. Shamsú’d-Din
Muḥammad (author of the Gházá-
náma, composed in A.D. 1361),
103; - Raṣád (xiii), 115; Shaykh
— "Abdú’-Rahmán of Isfáráin
(xiv), 177, 191; Mullá — "Abdú’-
Rahmán, see Jámí; Khwájá —
Lutfu’l-láh, 424, see Háfiz Abrú
Nímu’l-láh, Sayyid — of Shústar
(author of Majálísu’l-Mú’mínín,
q.v.), 44 n., 498

Núshírwán (Sásánian king of Persia,
vii), 114, 119, 121 n., 250. — See also
Chosroes, Kísrá, Sásánians

Núsratú’d-Dín. — Aḥmad b. Yúsuf
(Atábek of Lur-i-Buzurg, xiii-xiv),
68; Amīr — Sitáy (governor of
Máswil, xiii-xiv), 82

-Núṣús (of Shaykh Ṣádru’d-Dín al-
Qunyawí), 514

*Nusháṭí’l-Abbád (history by Fírúdún
Bey, xvi), 204

*Nusháṭí’l-Quláib (geography by Ham-
du’lláh Mustawfí of Qazwín, xiv),
63 n., 87, 93 n., 98-100

Odoric of Pordenone, Friar — (xiv),
61

Oghurlu Muḥammad b. Úzúmn Hasan
Báyandar (xv), the “Curlu-
mameth” or “Ugurîmehemet”
of the Venetians, 403, 410, 413

Oghuz (legendary ancestor of the
Turks), 73
INDEX

Ogotá (son and successor of Chingiz Khán, A.D. 1277-41), 74, 383
d’Ohsson’s Histoire des Mongols (Amsterdam, 1834-5), 5, 11 n., 12, 13, 15, 26 n., 49, 50, 53 n., 54 n., 58 n., 60, 112 n.
Omar. See ‘Umar
Omayyads. See Umayyads
Ong Khán, 11 n. See Prester John
Oriental Translation Fund, 448
Orphi, 389. See ‘Urfa
Osmán, Amir — (xvi), 417. See also ’Uthman
Ottoman (‘Osmání) Turks, 4, 5, 107, 156, 164 n., 196, 198-9, 201, 204, 381, 398, 400-1, 404-5, 409, 410-14, 419-23, 433, 439, 444, 507. See also Turks, and under the names of the several Ottoman Sultans
Ouseley, Sir Gore —, 152 n., 263, 273, 292, 328 n., 473 n.
Oxus (Amú, Jayhán), 4, 175, 190, 194, 379, 419
Paez de Santa Maria, Fray Alonzo — (xv), 199
Paladins, 394
Palaeologus, Michael — (xiii), 18
Palmer, Professor E. H. —, 300, 305 n.
Pálu (place), 82
Pánipít, Battle of — (April 20, 1526), 393
Pan-Thuranian movement, 14, 15
Paper currency. See Chao
Paris, 102, 237
Pársá, Khwája — (mystic), 514
Parthians (Máliku’t-Jawá’if), 90 and n.
Parwiz, Khusrú (Sásánian king, vii), 121 n., 267 n.
Paydái (India), 108
Pavet de Courteille, 392, 454, 455, 505 n.
Payne, 303
“Pehlevi-musulman,” 267
Pekin (Khán-báligh, Cambaluc), 397, 398
Pen, the — (Qalání), 220 n.
Persian Gulf, 3, 285, 379, 402
“Persian Historical Texts Series,” 436
Peruse, François de — (archbishop of Sultámiyya, A.D. 1322), 54
Petits de la Croix, 363
Petrograd, 112 n., 216 n. See also St Petersburg
Pharaoh, 89
Philip le Bel, 49
Pian de Carpine, Friar John of —, 8, 9
Prester Ahmad (of the Qaramán dynasty, xv), 412
Prester ‘Ali, Ghiyáthu’d-Dín — Kurt (xiv), 179, 180; — (minister and murderer of Khalíl Sultán b. Mírásháh b. Timúr, xv), 381; — (brother of Bahu’ú’d-Dín Qará ‘Osmán of the “White Sheep” Turkmans, xiv), 404
“Pirímeto.” See Prester Ahmad above
Pirí Beg Qájár (commander of Sháh Ismá’íl’s army at the Battle of Shuríd), 417-8
Pirí Búdáq b. Jahángír (of the “Black Sheep” Turkmans, xv), 402
Pirí Pasha (connected with Hurrúsfs), 368
Pirí Sultán (son of Rashídú’d-Dín Fadlü’lláh), 84, 85
Píshdádí (legendary) kings of Persia, 90
Plato, 18, 125
Pcocke, 64 n.
“Point.” See Nuqta
Poland, 6, 10, 102
Popes, 8, 9, 10, 19, 101, 102
Portugal, 102
Potiphar’s wife, 531. See Zulaykhá
Pretz and Poetry of Modern Persia (by E. G. Browne), 15
Prester John, 11, 19 n.
Price’s Chronological Retrospect, 196 and n., 366 n.
Printing, Invention of — ascribed to Chinese, 14, 102-3
Prostitutes, Ábú Sa’íd’s legislation against — (A.D. 1318-19), 53
Pulí-Fásá (in Fárs), 168
Púrí-Bahá’í-Jámi’ (poet, xiii), 111–15, 177
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— (envoy of Timür), 167, 282.
— Nāʾi (courier of Mirānschāh, put to death by Timür in A.D. 1399), 195
Qutluğ Turkān Āghā (sister of Timür, d. A.D. 1382), 186

Rabá-bnāma (of Sultān Walad or Veled, xiii), 156
Rabban Šawmā (member of Arghun’s mission to Europe in A.D. 1267-8), 31
Rabī‘i-Rashfāl (or Rashidiyya, q.v.), 71, 75, 77, 82, 84, 86
Rabī‘f (poet of Būshanj, xiv), 150-2, 174, 431
Radloff, 156
Ráfdís (Ráfís), 234, 519, 521 and n. See Shī’ā
Ráfī‘i. — author of a work entitled Tādwin, 93; — clan or family of Qazwín, 94
Ráfī‘f (or Ráfī‘i, Turkish Ḥurūfī poet, xvi), 369, 449
Ráfī‘u’d-Dīn-i-Abhari (poet, xiii-xiv), 154
Rafī‘i, 163
Rahba (Rahbat) in Syria, 51, 81
Rakhsh (Rustam’s war-horse), 535, 536 n.
Ramusio, Giovan Battista — 381 n., 405
Rāṣaḏi, Nūrū’d-Dīn (— xiii), 115
Rāshidu’d-Dīn.— Fadlullāh (statesman, physician and historian, put to death by Abū Sa‘īd the Mongol II-Khán in A.D. 1318), 17, 31, 41, 43, 46-7, 48, 49, 50, 51-2, 56, 67, 68-87, 89, 94, 100, 101, 194, 328 n., 424; — Watwāt (poet, xiii), 65
Rashidiyya (quarter of Tabrīz), 70, 328. See also above under Rabī‘i-Rashfāl
Rash, 480
Raverty, the late Colonel –’s manuscripts, 67 n., 150 n., 210 n., 426, 427
Rawḍatul’-Anwār (poem by Khvājū of Kirmān composed in A.D. 1342), 226
*Rawḍatul’-Fannāt (history of Herāt to A.D. 1473 by Mu‘īn of Ishfārāz), 173-4, 179 n.

Rawḍatu’s-Safā (general history by Mirkhwānd, q.v.), 161, 174, 388, 389, 431-3: 434, 439
Rawḍatul’-Shawwādā (by Husayn Wā’iz-i-Kāshīfī, xv), 434, 441, 442
*Rawḍatul Uli’l-Ardāb (composed in A.D. 1317 by Fakhru’d-Dīn Banākātī), 100-103
Rawḍu’r-Riyāḥin (by Yāftī), 88 n.
Rawna, 192
Ray (Rahges), 16, 27, 187, 190, 193, 194, 199, 265, 382, 386, 402
“Red Heads,” 416. See also Qızıl-bāsh
Refī‘i. See Ráfī‘i supra
Rehatsek, 431
Religious Systems of the World (1892), 532 n.
Renaissance, 5
René of Anjou, King — 395
Revisky (translator of Hāfīz), 303
Rhages. See Ray supra
Ridā-qulī Khān Lala-bāshī, poetically named Hiṭīyat (Persian statesman, writer and poet, xix), 140, 141, 222-3, 272, 432, 465, 481 n., 492. See also Farhang-i-Anju-man-ārā-yi-Nāsirī, Riyāḍu’l-‘Arīfīn and Majma’ul-Fuṣāḥā
Ridā Tawfīq (Rīzā Tevfīq, called “Feylesūf Rīzā,” contemporary Turkish scholar and politician), 103, 375, 450
Rījālū’l-Ghayb (“Men of the Unseen World”), 276 n.
Rīsāla-i-Andānā (by Qāsimu’l-Anwār, xiv-xv), 475
*Rīsāla-i-Dīgūsh (by ’Ubayd-i-Zaḵānī, xiv), 232, 235, 252-4
Rīsāla-i-Qushayriyya, 88
Rīsāla-i-Ṣād Pand (by ’Ubayd-i-Zaḵānī, A.D. 1350), 232, 235
Rīsāla-i-Shahkīd (by Maḥmūd Shabistārī, xiv), 149
Rīsāla-i-Sulṭānīyya (by Rashidu’d-Dīn Fadlullāh, A.D. 1307), 76
Rīsāla-i-Tāhḥīliyya (by Jāmī, xv), 514
Rīsh-nāma (the “Book of the Beard,” by ’Ubayd-i-Zaḵānī, xiv), 235, 237, 251
Abi-Sakkâl | 91
Sa'id-Qirdn | 323
Sa'id-Diwdn | 573
Sa'ib | 489
SahCVifu | 459
Safinatu' | 491
Saffari | 522
Saf-i-Nidl | 397
Safawl | 437
Saldmdn | 317
Salgharid | 192
Salihiyya cemetery (Damascus), 118
Sâlihim. — (or Selim) “the Grim” (Ottoman Sultan, xvi), 107 and n.; — (Persian poet), 292
Sâli Noyan, 174
Sâlijuqs. — (See Seljuqs
Sâlijuq-nâma (of Zahiri of Nishápûr), 89
Salma (woman’s name), 544, 545
Salmân of Sáwa (poet, xiv), 60, 159, 171, 173, 211, 230, 233, 234, 260–71, 291, 293, 296–8, 325, 348, 350, 352, 409, 491, 512
Salmâs, 188
Sâm. — (legendary hero of Persia, grandson of Rustam), 316 n.; — Mîrzá (Safawi prince, xvi, author of the Tuhfa-i-Sâmi, q.v.), 439, 459, 507, 514
Sâmâk (the Fish which supports the Earth), 113 and n.
Sâmânid dynasty (x), 91, 522
Sanâ’î (poet, xii), 65, 261, 343, 344, 352, 522
Sanguinetii, 64 n.
San Lucar, 201
Santa Maria, 199
Sarâb, Sarâi, Sarâw, Sarây, 53 n., 122, 321, 473
Saracen, 9
Sarakhs, 186, 354
Sarandib (Ceylon), 122
Saraw-rûd, 70
Sarây-Khâtûn (or Sâra Khâtûn, mother of Uzân Hasan, xv), 407, 408 n.
Sarbadâr dynasty of Sabzawâr (xiv), 60, 160, 161, 178–80, 208, 210, 211, 216, 498
Sarfî-Mûr (by -Sharîf-Jurjâni, xiv, xv), 355
Sâri (Mázandârân), 494
Sarjâm (near Zanjân), 426
Sâsânian kings of Persia (iii–vii), 3, 14, 68, 74, 90, 119, 120, 121, 250, 267, 414, 500 n.
Sâti Beg (daughter of Úljâytû, and queen in A.D. 1339), 51, 53, 55, 59, 170
Sâvinj (Sevinj), Amfr — (d. A.D. 1318), 52
Sâvinj (Sevinj), Qutlugh Æghâ (niece of Timûr, xiv), 179
Sâwa, 55, 400
Sâwânîh (by Shaykh Aḩmad Ghazâlî), 135 and n.
Sawdâ’î, Bâbâ — (poet, xv), 438
Sawmá, Rabban — (one of envoys sent by Arghún to Europe in A.D. 1287-8), 31
Sayfí. — of Herát (historian), 174, 176, 431; — of Bukhárá (poet, xv), 438, 458
Sayfú'd-Dín. — of Isfarang (poet, xiii-xiv), 154; Sháh — (praised by Busháq), 350; Amír — Mahmúd (father of Amír Khusraw, xiii), 108
Sayyids, heretical — (xiv), 190
Sayyíd-i-Sharíf-i-Jurjání (xiv), 159, 166, 189-90, 355
Schefe r, M. Charles —, 89 n.
Schiltberger, Johann — (xiv-xv), 404 n.
Schlechta-Wesuhrd, 216, 515
Scotland, Scotch, 43, 102
“Sechaidar,” “Sechaidare” (Italian corruption of Shaykh Haydar, q.v.), 416 n.
Sédilí, 502 n.
Seljúqs, 73, 74, 83, 91-2, 111
Seven Heavens, 248 and n.
“Seven Lean Years,” 325 n.
“Seven Years’ Campaign” of Timúr, 196
Seville, 199
Sevín. — See Savíñj
Shábarán, 83
Shabístar, 146
Shabístarí, Shaykh Mahmúd — (mystical poet, xiii-xiv), 146-50, 300, 484
Shád Malak (the beloved of Khalíl Sultán, xv), 381-2
Shafíthá, 81
Sháfatí (sect), 46, 50, 70, 97, 98, 356
Sháh u Gáddá ("the King and the Beggar," poem by Hilálí), 459
Sháh Jahán. — Qára-Khitaí (ruler of Kírmán, A.D. 1301-3), 48; — Timúr (descendant of Abáqá, xiv), 60; — (Mogul Emperor, A.D. 1628-59), 184, 391
Sháh-náma (of Firdawsí, xi), 65, 89, 95, 104, 111, 316 n., 352, 385, 532, 541
Sháh Shu’á (Muáfári, xiv), 163, 164, 165, 166-7, 169, 172, 186, 206, 258, 264, 276 n., 278, 279, 280, 281-2, 290, 299, 355, 357, 360
Sháhí. Amír — (poet of Sabzawár, xv), 352, 438, 498, 501; — Khátún (daughter of Kashídú’d-Dín Faḍl-ulláh, xiii-xiv), 84
Sháhísháh-náma (or Chingíz-náma) of Ahmad of Tabríz (A.D. 1337), 103
Shahri-Naw, 398
Shahr-i-Sabz — (Kash, near Samarqand) 194
Shákh-í-Nabát (alleged sweetheart of Hádíz), 487
Shám (Damascuus, a word-play on the name), 122
Shamákhí, 83, 417
Shamans, 44
Shamí. — See Shemí
Shámlí (one of the nine tribes who supported Sháh Ismá’íl the Safawí), 417
Shams. — i-Qáys (prosodist, xiii), 16; — i-Tábríz (mystic, xiii), 139, 343, 465, 484; i-Tabási (poet), 65; Amír — (connected with Húrifís, xiv), 368; — i-Áal (poet satirized by Kátilí, xv), 492-3
Shamsú’d-Dín. — Muhammad-i-Juwayní, entitled Sáhib-Diwán, q.v.; — (grandfather of the preceding, xiii), entitled Bushúrg ("the Great") and Múy-diríz ("the Long-haired"), 20; Mawlánu — (xiii), 22; — b. Ruknú’d-Din-i-Kurt (xiii), 57, 174, 175; — Muhammad-i-Kurt (xiv), 177-8; Qádí — Muhammad b. Hasan (xiii-xiv), 81; — Muhammad-i-Abarqúhí (xiii-xiv), 86; Sayyíd — (connected with Húrifís, xiv), 368; — (ruler of Akh lát in A.D. 1425), 401; Amír — Zakariyáy (first Prime Minister of Sháh Ismá’íl the Safawí, A.D. 1500), 417; — Gilání (first Chancellor of Sháh Ismá’íl, A.D. 1500), 417
Shanb-i-Ghazání, 81
Sháptúr. — I (Sásánian king, iii), 93; — (unidentified, xv), 494
— Shaqíqun. — Nu'mániyyá (biographies of Ottoman divines), 369
Sharafú’d-Dín. — Háfrú-u-Juwayní (poet and patron of poets), 20-1; — Hasan Mustawfí (xiii-xiv), 82; Mawlánu — i-Tabási (xiii-xiv),
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86; — 'Ali Yazdi (biographer of Timūr, xv), 159, 181, 183, 189, 190, 191, 195, 197, 198, 201, 202, 203, 356, 301, 362-5, 385, 438, see also Zafar-nāma; — Muṣafār b. Muṣafārzūd-Dīn A.D. 1325-53, 163; — Rāmī (author of the Anīsīl-ʿUshkhdāq, A.D. 1423), 462
Sharafīyya College (in Taft of Yazd), 304
Shāsh (or Chāch, the modern Tāshkand), 110, 320 and n.
Shaṭṭuʾl-ʿArab, 511 and n.
Shawādkhīdūn-Nubvawa (“Evidences of Prophecy,”) composed by Jamī in A.D. 1480, 512-13
Shaybānī Khān the Uzbek (xv-xvi), 380, 390, 393, 418-19, 449
Shaykhī b. Rashidūd-Dīn Fadlūllāh (xiii-xiv), 84
Shaykhī ʿNaʿī (musician, xv-xvi), 505
Shaykhum Suḥāyli, ʿAmīr — (poet, xv), 438, 457
Shemī (Turkish commentator of Ḥāfīz), 299
Shīhāb, Mawlānā ʿʿAlī — of Turshīz (poet, xv), 498
Shīhābūd-Dīn. — ʿNaṣāʾī (biographer of Jalālūd-Dīn Mankbīrī, xiii), 12; — Suhravardī (Šāfīi, doctor of Baghdad, xiii-xiv), 1, 70, 139; ʿAmīr — (governor of Baghdad, xiii-xiv), 82; — b. Rashidūd-Dīn Fadlūllāh (xiii-xiv), 84; — Haydar (satirized by ʿUbayy-i-Zākānī, xiv), 238; Shaykh — Qalandar (satirized by ʿUbayy-i-Zākānī, xiv), 257; Shaykh — ʿAbdūllāh (or ʿAzīzuḷḷāh) of Khwāf, 426, 428. See also Ḥāfīz Abrū
Shīrā, Shīrītes. 42, 44, 50, 51, 178, 224, 255, 256, 301, 315, 372, 416, 418, 441, 456, 458, 464, 475, 498, 511, 521 n. See also Rāfīdīs
Shīrāz-nāma (composed in A.D. 1343 by Shaykh Fakhrūd-Dīn), 360-1
Shirin (the beloved of Khusrāw Parwīz), 329, 547
Shirīz-i-ʿAjām (by Shībīl Nuʿmānī, q.v.), 108, 109, 201, 205, 273, 292 n.
Shirwān, 374, 401, 416, 417, 449, 488, 494, 495
Shīrūnshāh (xiii-xiv), 83, 225
Shirzād, clan or family of Qazwīn, 94
Shujāʿ, ʿṢājid —. See above under Šāh Shuṭāi
Shūrū, Battle of — (A.D. 1502), 379, 417-18
Shū shaltar, 166, 168, 189, 191
Shiba (poet, xv), 438
Shīhān. See Jaxartes
Silesia, 636
*Silsilatuʿd-Dhahab (the “Chain of Gold,”) composed by Jamī in A.D. 1485), 510, 516-23
Silsilatuʿn-Nasabı-Šafawīyya (a rare work on the Genealogy of the Šafawī kings of Persia), 474, 484
Simāk (the star Arcturus), 113
Simī (poet and calligraphist, xv), 488, 493
Simnān, 55, 81, 190
Simūrg, 316
Sinai, Mount —, 114
Sind, 83
Sindbād-nāma (Turki translation of —), 94
Sīnār (place near Mawsīl), 82, 399
Sinope, 205
Siraj-ud-Dīn of Dīzful, Khwājā — (government auditor, xiii-xiv), 83
Sirāf, Bridge of —, 532
Stratuʿ-ʿNābī ("Biography of the Prophet," probably Ibn Hishām's), 88 and n.
Sirjān, 160, 190, 192
Sīsān, 86, 91, 160, 175, 177, 181, 186, 187, 193, 388, 393, 456
Siwās, 83, 192, 195, 204, 205, 206, 404, 417
Siyāh-pūsh Kāfīrī, 403
Siyyar-ul-Mulk ("Biographies of the Kings"), 89. The work here intended is the Siyāsāt-nāma, q.v.
Siyyāsāt-nāma (by the Nizāmuʾl-Mulk, xii), 88-9
Siyyavush, 317-18
de Slane, Baron McGuckin —, 64 n., 462 n.
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Smith, Vincent A. — (historian of Akbar's reign), 393 n.
Smyrna, 199
Solivero, of Barcelona (Spanish envoy at Ghásán's court about A.D. 1300), 44
Solomon, 317 n.
Sonnáth, 477.
"Sortes Vergilianae," 311
"Spaan," "Spaham" (Italian corruptions of Īsfahán, q.v.), 389, 410
Spain, Spaniards, Spanish, 4, 44, 199-201, 396
Sprenger (Catalogue of the Library of the King of Oude), 125 and n., 155 and n.
Subhamus (by Dr Thuluck), 147
Stewart, Major Charles — (translator of Mafzít-at-Timuri, 1830), 184
le Strange, Guy —, 63 n., 70 n., 80, 93 n., 99, 100, 155 n., 304, 336 n., 426
Strassburg or Strasbourg, 107 n.
*Subḥātu'l-Ābrār (the "Rosary of the Pious," by Jámi, xvi), 516, 528-31
-Subkí (scholar and lecturer at Damascus, xiv), 357
Subutáy (Mongol general, xiii), 25, 96, 97
Súdí (Turkish commentator of Háfiz), 209, 302
Suflísm, Suflí, 85, 92, 319 n., 417, 435
Suhaylī. See Anwār-i —, Shaykh
Sulaymán. — Khán (one of the last puppet Il-kháns of Persia, xiv), 60; Sultán — "the Magnificent" (Qánuš, A.D. 1520-66), 396; Prince — (brother of Sultán Muḥammad I, killed in A.D. 1410), 400, 404; — Fahmi (translator of Dawlatsháh's "Memoirs of the Poets" into Turkish), 436
Abú Sulaymán Dá'dūd. See Banákatí
Sulaymán Küh, 193
Sultán 'Ali. — (elder brother of Sháh Isma'il the Šāhawí), 416; — (calligraphist of Mashhad, xvi), 459
Sultán Veled (or Walad, son of Maw-láná Jalálú'd-Dín Rúmí and author of the Rabáb-nâma, xiii), 155-6
Sultáníyá, 48, 51, 53, 54, 55, 61, 67, 70, 81, 166, 187, 190, 192, 400, 401
Sunnís, 50, 178, 238, 256, 301, 315, 418, 419, 521
Sunqur Báwarchí (governor of Baṣra, xiii-xiv), 86
Surghátmísh Qará-Khítá'í (ruler of Kirmán, xiii), 163
Surdí (Turkish commentator of Háfiz), 299
Sús, 81
Śīvāru'l-Aqālī̀n (geographical work by Abú Zayd Aḥmad b. Sahl al-Balkhí), 99
Suyurghátmísh (son of Sháh-rukh, died A.D. 1426-7), 385 n.
-Śuyúṭí, 'Abdu'r- Raḥmán Jalálú'd-Dín — (historian and polymath, xv), 164 n.
Súzáni (poet and satirist, xiii), 257
Swan and Sonnenschein (publishers), 532 n.
Syria, Syrians, 19, 41, 42, 51, 53, 69, 85, 86, 92, 127, 197, 205, 397, 404, 408, 417, 466, 468
Syriac language, 12, 31
Synagogues (destroyed by Ghásán in Persia about A.D. 1295), 40
Ṭabábákán (clan or family of Qazwin), 94
Ṭabaqátu'l-Āštábáh ("Lives of the Physicians" by Ibn Abí Uṣaybi'a, xiii), 63-4
Tabarak, Castle of —, 165
-Ṭabari (the historian Muḥammad Jarir —), 88, 220 n.
Tabaristán, 221
Tabas, 55
Tacitus, 80
Tadwin of -Rádí', 93; — of -Yáfí', 88
Tadhkhíratu'l-Awliyá ("Memoirs of the Saints," by 'Aṭṭár, xiii), 88
Tadhkhíratu'sh-Sn'árád ("Memoirs of the Poets," by Dawlatsháh, q.v.), 434
Tafsí'í (auguries from Háfiz, etc.), 311-19
Taft (near Yazd), 364
Taftázán (in Khurásán), 354
-Taftázání. See Sa'du'd-Dín and Aḥmad b. Sa'du'd-Dín
Ibn Taghríbardí (historian), 58
37-3
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Tibet, Tibetan, 43
Tibydar (of Ahmad b. Abi ‘Abdi’llah, one of the sources of the Nuzhata’il-Qulûb), 99
Tiflis, 188, 192, 414
Tigîn (typical Turkish suffix to names), 120, 121 and n.
Tigris, 223, 234, 251, 264, 284, 285, 511 n.
Tihrián, 300
Tírah, 175
Tírmand, 390
Tongdár (Armenian form of Tâkûdar, q.v.), 25 n.
Toqát (or Tuqát), 127, 205
Tornberg, 88 n.
Toynbee, Arnold —, 151
Transoxiana (Mâ wâr’d’a’n-Nahr), 5, 54, 64, 100, 101, 110, 185, 234, 320, 335 n., 379, 383, 387, 390, 398, 418, 419, 428, 453, 461, 468, 502
Trebizond, 85, 199, 201, 407, 412
Trinity College Library, Cambridge, 533 n., 536 n.
Tugháchar (Mongol general, put to death in A.D. 1295), 35, 36, 37, 39
Tughán-shâh (patron of Azraqi the poet), 347
Tughay-Timūr (xiv), 59, 60, 216
Tughfa-i-Sâmi (Biography of later poets by Sâm Mirzâ the Şâfawi), 490, 507, 514
*Tughfatul’-Ahrâr (poem by Jámi, composed in A.D. 1481), 516, 526–8, 541
Tûmân (Mongol Envoy to Edward II in A.D. 1307), 11
Tûnus, 84
Tuqât (or Toqât), 127, 205
Tûqát-mish (riv. 2 of Timûr, xiv), 189, 190, 192, 321, 328–9, 368 (for Tûqatmish in the later references read Tûqât-mish)
Tûqájâq (niece of Tushkab, a Mongol noble, put to death), 34
Tûqmaq (conspires against Chûbân in A.D. 1319), 52
Tuqtây (xiv), 49
Tûrân, 58. See also Transoxiana, Turkistan
Tûrgâhûdi dynasty, 401
Turkey, 14, 107, 302, 365, 385, 423, 449, 452, 461, 540, 543. See also Ottoman Turks
Turkî (or Eastern Turkish) language and literature, 32, 93, 111, 184, 380, 391, 392, 395, 437–8, 439, 452–8, 505, 506
Turkistan, 5, 262 n., 272, 385, 386, 388, 398, 453. See also Tûrân, Transoxiana
Turkmâns, 85, 173, 173, 192, 379, 399, 418. See also Aq-qoyûnlû and Qara-qoyûnlû
Turks (Eastern), 73, 74, 108, 228, 232, 252, 282, 318, 466, 467, 406, 469
Turk Yurdu (the organ of the Yeni Tûrân or Pan-Turanian party in Turkey), 15
Turner Macan (editor of the Shâh-nâmâ), 88 n.
Turshiz, 186, 467, 488
Tûs (the modern Mashhad), 111, 186, 190, 234
Tûsî (poet, xv), 438
Tûysirkân, 274
Tûzuk-i-Bâbûr (Persian translation of the Bâbûr-nâmâ, q.v.), 392
Tûzuk-i-Timûrî (the so-called “Institutes of Timûr”), 183–4, 202–3
‘Ubayd-i-Zâkánî (poet and satirist, xiv), 159, 259, 211, 230–57, 260, 299, 350, 351, 352, 492
‘Ubayd’ullâh. Khwâja — of Shâsh (xiv, spiritual guide of Kamâl of Khujand), 320; Khwâja — Ahrâr (Shaykh of the Naqshbandi order of dervishes, xiv), 441
“Ugurlimehemet” (Italian corruption of Oghûrlû Muhammed, q.v.), 413
Újân, 52
Ulûjûtû (Mongol Íl-khân, reigned A.D. 1303–16), 46–51, 52, 55, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 76, 83, 163, 170, 171
INDEX


‘Umar. — b. ‘Abi-l-Khattáb (the Caliph, vii), 250, 255; — ‘i-Khay-ýam (the astronomer-poet, xi-xii), 65, 119, 121, 227, 334 n., 446 n.; — b. al-Fárid (Egyptian mystical poet, xii-xiii), 514, 548; — ‘i-Sultániyya (connected with Hurúfs, xiv), 368; — Shaykh, Mirzá b. Miránsháh (xiv-xv), 362, 381; b. Uzún Hasan (killed in A.D. 1472), 411

Umayyad Caliphs (vii–viii), 90, 91

‘Ummáin, Sea of — 148, 212, 214

Ung Khan (the supposed original of Presbyter John), 11, 19 n.

‘Unsúri (poet, xi), 65, 522

Urdú (Hindustání) language, 107–8

‘Urfa, 389, 414

‘Urff of Shiráz (poet, circa A.D. 1000), 422

Urmíya, 188

Urúk Khátán (mother of Uljáttú Khudá-banda), 46

Ibn Abí Usaybi'á (author of the Tabagáttu’l-A’ïábá, or Biographies of Physicians, xi-xii), 64


“Ussun Cassano” (Italian corruption of Úzún Hasan, q.v.), 389, 404

Ustájšú (one of the nine tribes which supported Sháh Isma‘ili the Safávi), 417

Usury prohibited by Gházáñ Khan (A.D. 1299), 40

‘Utbí (author of the Ta’ríkhku’l Yamíní, xi), 88

‘Utmán. — b. ‘Affán (the Caliph, vii), 225; Amir — of Mawsil (A.D. 1502), 417. See also Osmán

Utrár, 202

Uways. Sultan — (Íl-khání of Baghdád, xiv), 55, 104 n., 164, 171, 172, 208, 239, 250, 265–5, 264–5, 366 n., 399; Sultan — b. Sháh Shuyáj (Muzaffarí, xiv), 167, 169; — (Aq-qoyúnlí, brother of Uzún Hasan), 408

Úyghúr script, 112 and n.

‘Uyán’t-Tawdríkh (of al-Kházin al-Baghdání), 88

Uzbek Khán (of the Golden Horde, A.D. 1333), 57, 59

Uzbek, 204, 379, 380, 390, 393, 399, 418, 419, 445

Úzún Hasan (Aq-qoyúnlí, also called Bâyandari, q.v., d. A.D. 1477-8), 380, 381, 389, 400, 404–14, 429 n., 443

Ván, 188

Venice, Venetians, 61, 380, 381, 405, 410, 411, 416, 429 n.

Vergil, 311

“Vision of God” (Rúyatul’ídh), 301 n.

Vüllers, 89 n.

Abúl-Wáfá, Shaykh — (xiv-xv), 445

Wafayátu’l-A’ýádn (by Ibn Khalilikán, xiii), 64

Wahl (translator of Hááfiz), 303

Wajíhu’d-Din. Khwája — Zangí (xiii), 111; Mawlána — Násafi (xiii), 175; Khwája — Masúd-í-Sarbádár (xiv), 211–12

Wall, Amir — (ruler of Mázandarán, xiv), 186

Abúl-Walíd Aḥmad, Tomb of — in Herát, 504

Walt Whitman, 107

Wang (or Ung or Ong) Khan, 11 n.

See Presbyter John

Wáqí’í-dí-Bábúrí, 392. See Bábúrnáma

Waráwini, Sa’du’d-Dín (author of Marzbúrán-náma, xiii), 356

Wársq (one of the nine tribes who supported Sháh Isma‘íl the Safávi), 417

Wásit (in Mesopotamia), 357

Wášíbatu’l-Iqád (Jámi’s second Diwán), 515

Wássáfí-í-Hádrát (the “Court Panegyrist,” “Abúl-láh b. Fáḍhúlláh of Shiráz, xiv), 21, 42, 67–8, 87, 434. See also Ta’ríkh-í-Wássáf

Water of Life, 291 n.

Wattá, Rashidú’d-Dín — (poet, xiii), 65

Weil, 88 n.

Whinfield, E. H. — 119 n., 146, 148, 300, 446 n., 448

White, Dr — (Professor of Arabic at Oxford in A.D. 1779), 184

“A White Garden” (Herát), 501

“A White Hand” (Yád-i-Baydd), 367, 470 and n.
Zanján, 37, 48, 87, 97 n., 425
-Zanjání (grammarian), 354
Zanzíbar, 398
Zarkúb, Shaykh — of Shiráz, 360
Záwa, 179, 211
Abú Zayd Ahmad b. Sahl al-Balkhí (author of the Šuwaru’l-Aqdálím), 99
Zaynál b. Úzún Ḥasan (killed in battle in A.D. 1472 or 1474), 411, 412
Zaynu’l-‘Abidín b. Sháh Shujá’-i-Muẓaffarí (A.D. 1384-7), 167-9, 188, 189, 191, 282
Zaynu’d-Dín. — ‘Ali b. Sā’id (preacher and rhapsodist, xiii), 34; Muhammad (brother of Ham-
du’lláh Mustawfi of Qazwín, xiv), 87; — ‘Ali (brother of Mubárizu’d-Dín Muhammad, xiii), 163; — Abú Bakr-i-Táyahádí (saint, xiv), 186, 281; — of Hamadán (mer-
chant, friend of Háfiz, xiv), 285; Shaykh — of Khwáf (xiv), 321
Zeno, Caterino — (Venetian traveller, xv), 380, 405, 411, 412, 416 n.
Zíj (Astronomical tables). — i-Ikhání by Naṣiru’d-Dín of Tús (xiii), 502; — i-jadíd-i-Sultání (by Ulugh
Beg, xv), 386, 502
Zirí, 186
Zírbád, 398
Zoroastrians, 342 n., 494. See also Gabr, Guebre, Magians
Zubdatu’t-Tawárith. — of Jamá-
u’d-Dín Abu’l-Qásim of Káshán,
88; — of Háfiz Abrú, 424-6, 430
Zubayrí, clan or family of Qazwín, 94
Zuhra (in the allegory of Saládmán and
Absál), 523
Zuká’u’l-Mulk (author of the Ta’rikh-
i-Írán, xix), 383
Zumnár (zonarium or sacred girdle), 342 n.