

A LITERARY HISTORY OF PERSIA

Volume IV

Modern Times
(1500-1924)

BY
EDWARD G. BROWNE

Cambridge
At the University Press
1959

I DEDICATE THIS VOLUME TO MY MOTHER
IN TOKEN OF A GREAT DEBT OF GRATITUDE AND LOVE

همانم که از چشم نگذاشتی ' مدامم در آغوش بر داشتی '
گرامت بودم از جان خویش ' نبودت ز من هیچ کس بیش
مرا هوش و جان و روان با تو است ' دلم آشکار و نهان با تو است '

Firdawsí, *Yúsuf u Zulaykhá* (ed. Ethé, p. 240, ll. 2431-2 and 2426).

گویند مرا چو زاد مادر پستان بدهان گرفتن آموخت '
شب بر سر کاهواره من بیدار نشست و خفتن آموخت '
لب خند نهاد بر لب من بر غنچه گل شگفتن آموخت '
دستم بگرفت و پا بپا برد تا شیوه راه رفتن آموخت '
يك حرف و دو حرف بر دهانم الناظ نهاد و گفتن آموخت '
پس هستی من زهستی اوست '
تا هستم و هست دارمش دوست '

Íraj Mírzá *Jalálu'l-Mamálik*.

PREFACE

THIS volume concludes the task which I undertook more than twenty-two years ago, and which represents the labour of a life-time, for ever since I began the study of Persian in the summer of 1880, being then only eighteen years of age, the desire to write a complete Literary History of Persia has increasingly possessed me. The first instalment, "from the earliest times until Firdawsí," carried the history down to the early days of the eleventh century of the Christian era, and was published in

1902; and the continuation, down to the Mongol Invasion in the middle of the thirteenth century, in 1906, both these volumes being published by Mr. Fisher Unwin. Fourteen years elapsed ere the third volume, entitled *A History of Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion (A.D. 1265-1502)*, saw the light. The reasons which led me to issue it in a form and under a title differing somewhat from its predecessors are explained on p. viii of the Preface, but essentially it constitutes the third volume of the *Literary History of Persia*, just as this, which deals with the last four centuries (A.D. 1500-1924), and is entitled, as foreshadowed in the same Preface (p. ix), *A History of Persian Literature in Modern Times*, is to be regarded as the fourth and last volume of the work.

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

[page viii]

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

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

[page ix]

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

- (1) *Kashfu’l-Ghiṭá fi Akhbári ‘Áli’l-Muṣṭafá*, by Shaykh Ja‘far al-Kabír.
- (2) *Kitábu’l Qawánín*, by al-Qummí.
- (3) *Kitábu Rasá‘ili’sh-Shaykh Murtaḍá al-Anṣári*.
- (4) *Jawáhiru’l-Kalám*, by Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥasan.
- (5) *Kitábu’l-Wasá’il*, by Hájji Mírzá Ḥusayn an-Núrí

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

كُفَيْتَ أَدْبَىٰ يَا مَنْ تَعَدُّ مَحَاسِنِي ، عَلَانِيَتِي هَذَا وَلَمْ تَدْرِ بَاطِنِي

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

EDWARD G. BROWNE.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	vii
<p>PART I AN OUTLINE OF PERSIAN HISTORY DURING THE LAST FOUR CENTURIES</p>	
CHAP.	
I. Some general considerations on the Şafawí Dynasty	3
II. The Creation of the Şafawí Power to 930/1524. Sháh Isma‘íl and his Ancestors	32
III. Culmination and Decline of the Şafawí Power, from Sháh Tahmásp (A.D. 1524-1576) to Sháh Husayn (A.D. 1694-1722)	84
IV. An Outline of the history of Persia during the last two centuries (A.D. 1722-1922)	121
<p>PART II PERSIAN VERSE DURING THE LAST FOUR CENTURIES</p>	
V. Some general considerations on the later and especially the Religious Poetry of the Persians	161
VI. Poets of the Classical Tradition. Pre-Qájár period (A.D. 1500-1800)	224
VII. Poets of the Qájár period	298
<p>PART III PERSIAN PROSE DURING THE LAST FOUR CENTURIES</p>	
VIII. The orthodox Shí‘a Faith and its exponents, the Mujtahids and Mullás	353
IX. Prose writers until A.D. 1850	412
X. The most modern developments (A.D. 1850 onwards)	458
INDEX	491

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

I. Sháh ‘Abbás I (“the Great”)	<i>Frontispiece</i>
II. Shaykh Abdál Pír-záda presenting the Uzbek leader’s horse to Sháh ‘Abbás	<i>To face page 42</i>
III. Sháh ‘Abbás II	112
IV. Karím Khán-i-Zand’s Court	140
V. Karím Khán-i-Zand alone	142
VI. Áqá Muḥammad Khán and Hájji Ibráhím	144
VII. Shifá’í, poet and physician	256
VIII. Autograph of the poet Şá’ib	266
IX. Autograph of the poet Wişál	300
X. Hájji Mírzá Áqásí	328
XI. Autograph of the poet Yaghmá	338
XII. Muzaffaru’ d-Dín Mírzá with his tutor Riḍá-qulí Khán “Hidáyat”	344
XIII. Autograph of Mullá Muḥammad Báqir-i-Majlisí	404
XIV. Autograph of Mullá Şadrá	408
XV. Autograph of Shaykh Bahá’u’ d-Dín-i-‘Ámilí	428
XVI. Autograph of Mullá Muḥsin-i-Fayḍ	432

ERRATA AND ADDENDA

(The letters *T.z.* in brackets at the end of a note indicate that the correction was suggested by Taqí-záda.)

- p. 170, l. 14. “Read **معايير** (‘ways,’ ‘passages’) for **مقابر** (‘Tombs’), which gives no good sense.” [T.z.] The washing of the feet before praying is a Sunni practice; the Shí‘a confine themselves to mere stroking of the foot (*mash*) with the damp hand. The clasping of the hands mentioned in the succeeding *mišrá‘* is also characteristic of the Sunnis; the Shí‘a let them hang down by their sides.
- p. 187, l. 14. “For **مرد** read **خلق**. No Shí‘a could have written this verse without exposing himself to the charge of blasphemy.” [T.z.]
- p. 188, last three lines. “The *Asrár-i-Shahádat*¹ is commonly ascribed to Mullá Áqá-yi-Darbandí, entitled ‘the Promoter of mourning for the Holy Family’ (*Murawwij-i-‘Azá-dári-yi-Ahl-i-Bayt*).” [T.z.]
- p. 220, last paragraph. “Mention should be made of the poems of Šafi-‘Alí Sháh, and of his versified Persian commentary on the *Qur‘án*.” [T.z.] (I can find no mention of him in the *Majma‘u‘l-Fuṣahá*, the *Riyádu‘l-‘Árifín*, the *Bustánu‘s-Siyáhat*, or any of the Catalogues at my disposal.)
- p. 221, “Rúdagí,” and p. 299, “Rúdakí” should be identical in spelling, and I believe that the latter form is the more correct.
- p. 222. “Mention should be made of V. Zhukovski’s collection of Persian *Tašnifs*, with Russian translations, published at St Petersburg in 1902. Berezine also published nine *Tašnifs* with English

[page xiv]

translations set to music and adapted to the piano.” [T.z.] (I find that I possess the former work, which is entitled **ОБЯЗЦНИ ПЕРСПДСАГО НАРОДНАГО ТВОРЧЕСТВА**, but I cannot identify the latter.)

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

عكسِ تو فتاده است در آئینه عالم
[ز آن روی همه ز نقحبه گشته است پدیدار]
ز نقحبه محالست ز تو دست بدارم
تا آنکه بز نقحبه گی خود کنی اقرار

- p. 355, l. 1. There is some difference of opinion as to the proper vocalization of the place-name which I have written “Tanukábun.” Taqí-záda thinks it should be “Tunukábun,” while Riḍá-qulí Khán in his *Anjuman-árá-yi-Náširi* gives it as “Tanakábun.”
- pp. 369-370. “The titles ‘*Muḥaqqiq-i-Ardabíli*’ and ‘*Muqaddas-i-Ardabíli*’ both belong to Mullá Aḥmad, so that the first line on p. 370 should read “The same *mujtahid* of Ardabíl, also entitled *Muḥaqqiq*,” etc.
- p. 370, last line. “Ḥájji Mírzá Ḥasan-i-Shirází and Ḥájji Mírzá Ḥasan-i-Ashtiyání are not to be mentioned in the same breath. The former was to the latter as a king is to a petty local governor.” [T.z.]
- p. 373. “Áqá Jamál-i-Khwánsárí was the author of the well-known book on the superstitions of Persian women entitled *Kitáb-i-Kulthúm Nana*. His father, Áqá Ḥusayn-i-Khwánsárí, was called *Ustádu‘l-Kull fi‘l-Kull* (‘the Master of All in All’), and, besides many *facetiae*, wrote glosses on the *Shahíd-i-thání’s* commentary on the Lum‘a.” [T.z.]
- p. 378, ll. 19 *et seqq.* “Many similar catechisms (with such titles as *Risála-i-‘amaliyya*, *Mas‘ila*, *Nukhba*, and the like) have been composed in the last century, and as many as a hundred may have been printed. One of the best known is the *Jámi‘u‘sh-Shattát* of Mírzá Abu‘l-Qásim ibnu‘l-Ḥusayn ar-Riḍawí al-Qummí, author of the *Kitáb-i-Qawánín*.” [T.z.] Concerning the last-named writer, see Edwards’s *Catalogue of Persian printed books*, cols. 60 and 61.
- p. 393, ll. 8-9. “‘Alí Awsaṭ succeeded his father Ḥusayn as Imám, not ‘Alí Akbar, who, together with the infant ‘Alí Ašghar, perished at Karbalá.” [T.z.]

[page xv]

¹ It is, however, ascribed, as I have ascribed it, to Isma‘íl Khán Sarbáz by Edwards in his *Catalogue of Persian Books in the British Museum*, col. 302-3. The life of Mullá Áqá-yi-Darbandí, who died at an advanced age sometime before A.D. 1873, is given in the *Qīṣaṣu‘l-‘Ulamá* (Tíhrán lith. ed. of 1304/1886, pp. 75-9). Amongst his works mention is there made of one entitled *Iksíru‘l-‘Ibádát fi Asrári‘sh-Shahádát*.

- p. 407, l. 14. “The *Jámi‘-i-‘Abbásí* was completed in 20 chapters, and has been printed repeatedly, but the first five chapters are often published separately for the instruction of children in elementary religious duties.” [T.z.] According to Edwards (*op. cit.*, cols. 407-8) chapters vi-xx were subsequently added to Shaykh-i-Bahá‘í’s unfinished work by Nizám b. Husayn-i-Sáwají.
- p. 407, fourth line from the end, and p. 435, l. 5. “The *Abwábu‘l-Janán* was not by Mullá Muḥsin-i-Fayḍ, but, so far as I remember, by Mullá Husayn *Wá‘iz-i-Káshifí*, the author of the well-known *Anwár-i-Suhaylí*.” [T.z.] The real author appears to have been Muḥammad b. Fathu‘lláh Rafí‘u‘d-Dín, called ‘*Wá‘iz-i-Qazwini*’ (‘the Preacher of Qazwín’). See Edwards, *op. cit.*, cols. 405-6.
- p. 410. “Sayyid Muḥammad Báqir of Rasht was only a third- or fourth-rate theologian, and Mullá Aḥmad-i-Niráqí (p. 411) only of the second class. Much more important, though omitted here, are: —
- (i) Áqá-yi-Bihbihání, the founder of the Uṣúlí and Mujtahidí School, who flourished at the end of twelfth century of the *hijra*.
 - (ii) Shaykh Ja‘far-i-‘Arab (also called *al-Kabír*, ‘the Great’), who was contemporary with Fath-‘Alí Sháh.
 - (iii) Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥasan, author of the *Jawáhiru‘l-Kalám*, a large work in six volumes on Shí‘a Jurisprudence (see p. ix *supra*).
 - (iv) Shaykh Murtaḍá al-Anṣarí, founder of present-day Shí‘a Law, and the Master of all the *mujtahids* of the last seventy years with the exception of —
 - (v) Shaykh Hádí of Ṭíhrán, who was also of the first class.”
- p. 430. “Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsá‘í was not an admirer and follower but a great enemy of Mullá Ṣadrá. Of modern Persian philosophers mention should have been made of Mírzá Abu‘l-Ḥasan-i-Jilwa, who died only some twenty years ago.” [T.z.] I met him in Ṭíhrán in the winter of 1887-8. See my *Year amongst the Persians*, p. 149.
- p. 435. “One of the best of Mullá Muḥsin’s works is the *Kalimát-i-Maknúna* (‘Hidden Words’), of which mention should have been made here.” [T.z.]
- p. 441. “Dr Muḥammad of Kirmánsháh, called *Kufwí*, who died in 1326/1908, specialized in cardiac diseases, and first called attention

[page xvi]

to a peculiar murmur (called in French ‘*empiolement*’) characteristic of embolism, on which he published a monograph in French². He also wrote several medical treatises on the Diseases of Women and Children in Persian.” [T.z.]

- p. 454, l. 1. “For *I‘timádu‘d-Dawla* read *I‘timádu‘s-Salṭana*.” [T.z.]
- p. 468. “Newspapers existed in Persia before A.D. 1851, in the reign of Muḥammad Sháh (A.D.1835-1848) and even in the later days of his predecessor Fath-‘Alí Sháh. See the *Káwa* newspaper *passim*, especially No. 6 of the New Series (*Dawra-i-Jadid*).” [T.z.] The article in question appeared in the issue of June 8, 1921, pp. 14-16. It mentions a rather vague report of a Persian newspaper published at Dihlí in A.D. 1798, and a much more definite report of one published in Ṭíhrán in 1253/1837-8.
- p. 486, end. “The articles to which reference is here made were not by Mírzá Muḥammad Khán but by myself, writing under the pen-name of *Muḥaṣṣil* (‘Student’).” [T.z.]³
- p. 488. “To say ‘Mírzá Kázim-záda,’ ‘Sayyid Jamál-záda,’ ‘Taqí-záda Khán’ and the like is as contrary to Persian usage as to say in English ‘Sir Grey’ for ‘Sir Edward Grey’ and the like. Such titles as ‘Mírzá,’ ‘Sayyid’ and Ḥájji can only be prefixed, as ‘Khan,’ ‘Beg’ and the like can only be suffixed, to personal names, such as Ḥasan, ‘Alí and Muḥammad, not to patronymics.” [T.z.]⁴

² I have been unable to find any trace of this alleged discovery or of the French term connoting it (which I think should be *empilement*), though I have consulted two eminent physicians on the subject.

³ Taqí-záda’s letter was received in time to correct the two passages to which the two concluding notes refer, but I have allowed them to stand because the first specifies the true authorship of the articles in question, while the second lays down a rule of which I had hitherto been unaware.

⁴ Taqí-záda’s letter was received in time to correct the two passages to which the two concluding notes refer, but I have allowed them to stand because the first specifies the true authorship of the articles in question, while the second lays down a rule of which I had hitherto been unaware.

PART I.
AN OUTLINE OF PERSIAN HISTORY
DURING THE LAST FOUR CENTURIES

CHAPTER I.
SOME GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ON
THE ŞAFAWÍ DYNASTY.

The rise of the Şafawí dynasty in Persia at the beginning of the sixteenth century of the Christian era was an event of the greatest historical importance, not only to Persia herself and her immediate neighbours, but to Europe generally. It marks not only the restoration of the Persian Empire and the re-creation of the Persian nationality after an eclipse of more than eight centuries and a half, but the entrance of Persia into the comity of nations and the genesis of political relations which still to a considerable extent hold good. Mr. R. G. Watson in the brief retrospect with which he opens his excellent *History of Persia from the beginning of the Nineteenth Century to the year 1858*⁵ shows a true appreciation of the facts when he takes this period as his starting-point, for in truth it marks the transition from mediaeval to comparatively modern times. The Arab conquest in the middle of the seventh century after Christ overthrew the Zoroastrian religion and the Sásánian Empire, and reduced Persia to the position of a mere province of the Caliphate, until the Caliphate itself was destroyed by the Mongols or Tartars in the middle of the thirteenth century. Both before and after this momentous event there were, it is true, independent or quasi-independent dynasties ruling in Persia, but these were generally of Turkish or Tartar origin, like the Ghaznawís, Saljúqs, Khwázazmsháhs, and Houses of Chingíz and Tímúr; or, if Persian like the Buwayhids, exercised control over a portion only of the old Persian Empire. To the

[page 4]

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

Yet, in spite of its importance and the abundant materials available, no good complete history⁶ of the Şafawí dynasty has yet been written. The outlines given by Sir John Malcolm and Sir Clements Markham in their histories of Persia are inadequate in scope and inaccurate in detail, and are based on very limited materials, and those not by any means the most authentic. The abundance and variety of the materials, the inaccessibility of many important sources of information, and the polyglot character of the documents concerned constitute serious obstacles to one who aspires to treat adequately of this period. The four most important contemporary Persian records of its earlier portion, down to the death of Sháh ‘Abbás the Great, are the *Şafwatu’s-Şafá*, containing the biography of Shaykh Şafíyyu’d-Dín, that celebrated saint of the thirteenth century from whom the dynasty derives its name; the *Nasab-náma-i-Silsila-i-Şafawiyya* on the genealogy of the family, with valuable biographical details of its earlier representatives not to be found elsewhere; the

[page 5]

Aḥsanu’t-Tawárikh, completed in A.D. 1577, only about a year after the death of Shah Ṭahmásp, whose reign together with that of his father and predecessor Sháh Isma‘íl, the founder of the dynasty, it records; and the *Ta’rikh-i-‘Álam-árá-yi-‘Abbásí*, an immense monograph on the reign of Sháh ‘Abbás the Great. Not one of these has been published⁷, much less translated, and all except the last are very rare even in manuscript. Of the *Nasab-náma* and the *‘Álam-árá* I am fortunate enough to possess copies which formerly belonged to the late Sir Albert Houtum-Schindler, while the incomparable generosity of Mr. A. G. Ellis placed at my disposal manuscripts of the two other histories mentioned above. And though the authors of later general histories in Persian, such as Ridá-qulí Khán in his supplement to Mirkhwánd’s *Rawḍatu’s-Şafá*, have made use of some of these works, they too often not merely abridge but grievously distort the passages they cite.

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

⁵ London: Smith and Elder, 1866.

⁶ Of Krusinski’s and Hanway’s admirable accounts of the later Şafawí period I shall speak in chap. iii.

⁷ Since this was written I have received through a Persian correspondent a copy of the excellent lithographed edition of the *Şafwatu’s-Şafá* published at Bombay in 1329/1911.

and the Seniory of Venice. This mission included Ḥusayn ‘Alí Beg⁸ as Persian Envoy, with four Persian gentlemen or “knights” (*caballeros*, as they are called in Don Juan of Persia’s narrative), fifteen Persian servants, the celebrated Sir Anthony Sherley with fifteen English attendants, two Portuguese friars, and five interpreters.

[page 6]

Travelling by way of the Caspian Sea and the Volga, they first visited Moscow, where they remained for five or six months; thence through Germany to Italy, where they were not permitted to go to Venice for fear of offending an Ottoman envoy who happened to be there at the time, but were well received at Rome, where they arrived in April, 1601, and remained for two months. Thence they proceeded by ship from Genoa to the south of France and so to Spain, where three of the four “Persian knights” adopted the Catholic faith and took the names of Don Philippe, Don Diego and Don Juan of Persia.

Sir Anthony Sherley, whose relations with his Persian colleague had from the first been very strained, separated himself from the mission at Rome, but up to that point the independent accounts written by himself and some of his companions⁹ enable us to check Don Juan’s narrative. Don Juan, however, having apostasized from Islám, dared not return to Persia to meet the fate of a renegade, so that for the tragic sequel we must turn to the Persian historians. In the *‘Álam-árá-yi-‘Abbási* under the year 1022/1613-4¹⁰ we find an account of the arrival at Iṣfahán of ambassadors from the King of Spain, accompanied by several Christian priests and a Persian envoy returning from Europe¹¹. The latter, who had incurred the Sháh’s displeasure, was incontinently put to death in the most cruel manner, without being permitted any opportunity for explanation or apology; and the Sháh then explained to the Spaniards that he had dealt thus with him because of sundry treasonable and disrespectful acts of

[page 7]

which he had been guilty during his mission, such as opening letters sealed with the royal seal and making known their contents; wearing mourning on the occasion of the Queen of Spain’s death; and selling the credentials to the Pope with which he had been provided to a merchant who should impersonate him and derive what profit he could from the transaction. “But,” the Sháh concluded, “the chief of his faults and the chief reason for his punishment was that he behaved so ill towards the attendants who accompanied him, and vexed them so much, *that several of them adopted the Christian faith and remained in Europe in order to escape from his tyranny*, so that zeal for Islám required his punishment, and thus he received his deserts.”

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

Before leaving this subject, I must refer to an erroneous conjecture of Sir John Malcolm’s arising from an inadequate use of the Persian sources. In the year 1002/1593-4, being the seventh year of Sháh ‘Abbás’s reign, Jalál, the Chief Astrologer, foretold dis-

[page 8]

aster to the occupant of the Throne, and advised that the Sháh should abdicate for a few days and substitute for himself some person worthy of death on whom the prediction of the stars might be fulfilled. This was accordingly done, and a man named Yúsufi was made king for three days, at the conclusion of which he was put to death, and Sháh ‘Abbás resumed the Throne. Sir John Malcolm¹² says that this Yúsufi, “whom Persian authors take care to tell us was an unbeliever,” was “probably a Christian,” but this is an error; he belonged to a heterodox Muslim sect called *Nuḡṭawīyya* (“People of the Point”) who believed in metempsychosis and other heretical doctrines, and of whose appearance and destruction a full account is given by the *‘Álam-árá-yi-‘Abbási*¹³ and reproduced in the *Rawḍatu ‘s-Ṣafá*. It is therefore essential, if a true history of the Ṣafawís is to be written, that we should go back to the original sources, and, as a preliminary, that these sources, at present existing only in manuscript, should be published.

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

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

¹⁰ F. 230 of my MS. marked H. 14.

¹¹ Although the envoy is here named Dengiz Beg Shámlú with the title of *Yúz-báshí* (Captain), not Ḥusayn ‘Alí Beg, as in Don Juan’s narrative (f. 120^b), there can, I think, be little doubt as to their identity.

¹² *History of Persia* (London, 1815), vol. i, p. 527.

¹³ Ff. 46^b-47^b of my MS. H.14.

The Persian histories, however, are only part of the material available for such a work: the numerous and in some cases excellent Turkish chronicles, published and unpublished, dealing with this period, and especially with the Turco-Persian wars which continued almost without intermission during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, constitute an indispensable supplement and corrective. Almost more important is Firídún Bey's great collection of Turkish State Papers entitled *Munsha'át-i-Salátín*, compiled some time before 991/1583 and published at Constantinople in two volumes¹⁴ in 1274/1858.

[page 9]

The diplomatic correspondence contained in this valuable and insufficiently-appreciated book is arranged chronologically and is partly in Turkish, partly in Arabic, and partly in Persian. From the time of Tímúr onwards much of it is concerned with contemporary Persian affairs, and of the last half of the first volume a large portion consists of letters interchanged between the Sultáns Báyazíd II (A.D. 1482-1512), Salím I (A.D. 1512-1520), and Sulaymán I (A.D. 1520-1566) on the one hand, and Sháh Isma'íl (A.D. 1500-1524) and his son and successor Sháh Tahmásp (A.D. 1524-1576) on the other. There are also valuable journals of certain campaigns, such as that which culminated in the Battle of Cháldirán, so disastrous to the Persians, on August 23, 1514, wherein the movements of the Ottoman army and the incidents of their outward and homeward marches are chronicled day by day. Other State Papers, both Persian and Turkish, which exist only in manuscript, have hitherto remained practically unexplored¹⁵.

A third class of materials of which it is impossible to overestimate the importance consists of the writings of Europeans who visited Persia during this period on diplomatic, missionary or commercial business. Thanks to the liberal attitude of Sháh 'Abbás the Great towards Christians, the number of these in his and the succeeding reigns was very large. The best general account of them and their works with which I have met is that given by the late M. Charles Schefer, in the Introduction (pp. i-cxv) to his edition of *l'Estat de la Perse en 1660*¹⁶ by le Père Raphaël du Mans, Superior of the Capuchin Mission at Işfahán, a man singularly qualified by

[page 10]

his high character and intellectual attainments, as well as by his prolonged sojourn of fifty years (A.D. 1644-1696) in Işfahán, to speak with authority. The works enumerated by M. Schefer¹⁷ are variously written in Dutch, English, French, German, Italian, Latin, Portuguese and Spanish, but many of the more important have appeared in two or three different languages. Of their authors (excluding the earlier Venetian envoys to the Court of Úzún Hasan, such as Caterino Zeno, Josepho Barbaro and Ambrosio Contarini, most of whom visited Persia during the latter half of the fifteenth century, and consequently before the rise of the Şafawí dynasty) the best known are Anthony Jenkinson, the Sherley brothers, Cartwright, Parry and Sir Thomas Herbert of the English, and of the others Antonio di Govea, Don Garcias de Silva Figuerosa, Olearius, Teixeira, Pietro della Valle, Tavernier, Thevenot, and last but not least Chardin and Pétis de la Croix. M. Schefer does not carry his survey beyond the seventeenth century, but the final downfall of the Şafawís before the Afghán onslaught in A.D. 1722 found an able historian in the Jesuit Père Krusinski, while letters from some of the Dutch merchants in Işfahán, a few of which have been published by H. Dunlop in his *Perzië* (Haarlem, 1912; pp. 242-7), serve to illuminate the tragic details of that disaster. From this time until the rise of the present Qájár dynasty towards the end of the eighteenth century comparatively few Europeans visited or resided in Persia, a fact due partly to the unsettled state of the country, and the consequent difficulties in the way of missionary or commercial enterprises, and partly to the

[page 11]

changed political conditions. The object of the numerous diplomatic missions from various European countries which visited Persia during and immediately before the Şafawí period was, in nearly all cases, to seek her cooperation in combating the formidable power of the Ottoman Turks, which was at its height during the period which began with their conquest of Constantinople in A.D. 1453 and culminated in the reigns of Sultáns Salím "the Grim" and Sulaymán "the Magnificent" (A.D. 1512-1566), of whom the former conquered Egypt and the Holy Cities and assumed the title of Caliph, while the latter only failed by the narrowest margin to capture Vienna. So formidable did the Turkish menace appear to European statesmen that Busbecq, Ferdinand's ambassador at the Court of Sulaymán, expressed himself in the following remarkable words: "'Tis only the Persian stands between us and ruin. The Turk would fain be upon us, but he keeps him back. This war with him

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

¹⁵ Some other very interesting State Papers from the *Dastúru'l-Inshá* of Şarí 'Abdu'lláh Efendi (d. 1079/1668) have also been published and annotated by the late M. Ch. Schefer in his *Chrestomathie Persane* (Paris, 1885), vol. ii, pp. 218-259 and ۲۳۱-۲۰۹.

¹⁶ Leroux, Paris, 1890, pp. cxv + 465.

¹⁷ To these we must not omit to add the *Mirátu'l-Mamálík* ("Mirror of Kingdoms") of the gallant Turkish admiral Sídí 'Alí Ra'is, who travelled overland from India to Turkey in A.D. 1554-6, and was received by Sháh Tahmásp at Qazwín. Vambéry's English translation of this book (Luzac, London, 1899) leaves a good deal to be desired.

affords us only a respite, not a deliverance¹⁸.” In A.D. 1722 when the Şafawí dynasty, long degenerate, finally collapsed, Persia was left for the moment a negligible quantity, the Turks had ceased to be a menace to Europe, and the bitter sectarian quarrel which lay at the root of two centuries of Turco-Persian warfare gradually lost much of its virulence, especially after the development of the more conciliatory policy of the great Nádír Sháh. Under these changed conditions the earlier European policy became at once unnecessary and impossible.

From this brief survey of the sources whence our knowledge of the Şafawí dynasty is derived, we must now pass to the consideration of its chief characteristics. These, though clear enough in general outline, present a series of very interesting problems

[page 12]

which even yet cannot be regarded in all cases as definitely solved. These problems group themselves under the headings of Nationality, Religion, Art and Literature, and in this order we shall now proceed to consider them.

NATIONALITY.

It has been said above that to the Şafawís belongs the credit of making Persia, after the lapse of eight centuries and a half, “a nation once again.” This is true, but the nationalism which thus found expression was very different in several respects from the various forms of nationalism with which we are familiar at the present day. Language and race, which are the key-notes of the latter, played a very small part in it compared with religion. At no time was the mutual hatred of Turk and Persian more violent and bitter than during the eight years (A.D. 1512-1520) when Sultán Salím “the Grim,” and Sháh Isma‘íl, the founder of the Şafawí power, were the respective protagonists of the two nations. The despatches of this period, recorded by Firídún Bey, pass from the realm of diplomacy to that of vulgar abuse, and “rascally Red-heads” (*Awbásh-i-Qizil-básh*) is the politest expression wherewith the Turkish Sultán refers to his Persian foes, The cause of this intense hatred, equally adequate and obvious, will be discussed under the heading of “Religion,” but it did not extend to race or language. When America entered the late War it was stated in the newspapers that in certain towns the people, to give vent to their hatred of everything German, collected all the German books they could find and burned them. No Turk or Persian of the sixteenth century would have given expression to his feelings of hostility in so puerile a fashion. On the contrary, it is a remarkable fact that while Sultán Salím and Sháh Isma‘íl both possessed considerable poetic talent, the former wrote almost exclusively in Persian, and the latter, under the pen-

[page 13]

name of Khatá‘í, almost exclusively in Turkish¹⁹. Ottoman hatred was directed against the heretical *Qizil-básh* as misbelievers, not as Persians (*Írání*), while the Persian language (*Fársí*) continued to hold its position as the polite idiom of literature and diplomacy. And though the ancient conflict between Írán and Túrán was familiar to all educated Turks and Persians in the classical *Sháh-náma*, or “Book of Kings,” of Firdawsí, Salím, in the following curious exordium to a despatch written in April, 1514 (Şafar, 920)²⁰, compares himself to the legendary Persian kings Firídún, Kay-Khusraw and Dárá, while likening his Persian opponent Sháh Isma‘íl to the Turkish protagonist Afrásiyáb:

.. اَمَّا بَعْدُ، اَيْنَ خُطَابِ مُسْتَطَابِ اِز جَنَابِ خِلَافَتِ مَأَبِ مَا كَه
 قَاتِلِ الْكُفْرَةِ وَالْمَشْرِكِينَ قَامِعِ اِعْدَاءِ الدِّينِ مَرْغَمِ اَنْوَابِ الْفِرَاعِينَ
 مَعْفَرِ تَيْجَانِ الْخَوَاقِينِ سُلْطَانِ الْغَزَاةِ وَالْمَجَاهِدِينَ فَرِيدُونَ فَر
 سَكَنْدَرِ دُرُ كَيْخَسْرُو عَدَلِ وَ دَادِ دَارَايِ عَالِي نَزَادِ سُلْطَانِ سَلِيمِ شَاهِ
 بِنِ سُلْطَانِ بَايَزِيدِ بِنِ سُلْطَانِ مُحَمَّدِ خَانِيمِ بَسُوِي تُو كَه فَرْمَانِ
 دِهِ عَجْمِ سَهْسَالَارِ اَعْظَمِ سَرْدَارِ مَعْظَمِ ضَمَّكَ رُوژگارِ دَارَابِ كِبَرِ وَ دَارِ
 اِفْرَاسِيَاپِ عَهْدِ اَمِيرِ اِسْمَعِيلِ نَامِدَارِي سَهْمَتِ صَدُورِ يَافَتِ ...

[After the doxology] “But to proceed. This excellent address hath been issued on our part, we who are the Refuge of the Caliphate²¹, the slayer of the infidels and polytheists,

¹⁸ Creasy’s *History of the Ottoman Turks* (London, 1877), pp. 171-2 *ad calc.* Cf. Forster and Daniell’s *Life and Letters of...Busbecq* (London, 1881), vol. i, pp. 221-2.

¹⁹ See E. J. W. Gibb’s *History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. ii, p. 261, for a brief account of Salím’s Persian *Díwán*, of which a most sumptuous edition, based on numerous MSS., by the late Dr. Paul Horn, was printed in Berlin as a gift to the late Sultán ‘Abdu’l-Ĥamíd from the ex-Emperor of Germany in 1904. A number of Sháh Isma‘íl’s Turkish poems are given in my MS. of the *Silsilatü’n-Nasab-i-Şafawiyya*. See *J.R.A.S.* for July, 1921, p. 412, where other references are given.

²⁰ See Firídún Bey, vol. i, p. 381.

²¹ An interesting proof that, contrary to the views of Professor Nallino, the position of Caliph was already claimed by Sultán Salím, as it certainly was by his son and successor Sulaymán.

the extirpator of the foes of the Faith, the humbler of the Pharaohs' pride²², the tarnisher of the Kháqán's²³ crowns, the King of those who fight and strive for Religion, whose pomp is as that of Fíridún, whose Court is as that of Alexander, whose justice and equity is as that of Kay-Khusraw, that Dárá of noble descent, Sultán Salím Sháh, son of Sultán Báyzíd, son of Sultán Muḥammad Khán, to thee, who art the ruler of the Persians, the most mighty general and puissant leader, the Ḍaḥḥák²⁴ of the time, the Dáráb of the combat, the Afrásiyáb of the age, the famous Amír Isma'íl."

On the other hand I have only found one verse wherein Sháh Isma'íl is definitely identified with the Persian as contrasted with the Shí'a cause. This verse occurs in the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh*²⁵ and runs:

فروزنده تاج و تخت کیان، فرازنده اختر کاویان،

"The illuminator of the crown and throne of the Kayánians²⁶,
The upholder of the star of the Káwayán²⁷."

For the rest, the seven tribes who formed the back-bone of the *Qizil-básh* army were, as their names Rúmlú, Shámlú, Mawşillú, etc., sufficiently indicate, almost exclusively Turkish, as were the principal officers of the Şafawí army, whose war-cry, as we learn

from the rare history of Sháh Isma'íl²⁸, was not "Long live Persia!" or the like, but, in the Turkish language, "O my spiritual guide and master whose sacrifice I am!"

صدای قربان اولدیغیر و صدقه اولدیغیر پیروم مرشدم که شیوه و
شعار فرقه ناجیه قزلباشی است در میهنه و میسره کارزار انداختند

More than a century after Isma'íl's death, when the capital had been transferred from the north of Persia to Işfahán, Turkish seems still to have been the language generally spoken at Court²⁹. These instances, to which might be added many more, will suffice to show how different was the spirit which animated the Şafawí revival (though it undoubtedly produced that homogeneity which is the basis of national sentiment) from the Nationalism of the modern Pan-Turanians and "Young Persians," who put the extension and purification from foreign elements of the national language in the foremost place in their programme. At the present time the Turkish nationalists of Angora proclaim their new Caliph in Turkish instead of in the time-honoured Arabic, while Riḏá Khán, the Persian military dictator, strives to introduce in his army a purely Persian military terminology.

RELIGION.

Although the Muhammadans, according to their own statements, are divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects³⁰, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination and the

²² Literally, "he who rubs in the dust the noses of the Pharaohs," alluding to Sultán Salím's conquest of Egypt and overthrow of the Mameluke dynasty.

²³ The Kháqán is the title given to the king of Túrán and the Turks. The word is, I believe, Mongol, and is identical with the alternative forms Qá'án and Khán.

²⁴ Ḍaḥḥák is the Azhi-daháka or Dragon-king of the Avesta, represented in the *Sháh-náma* as an Arab usurper.

²⁵ Under the year 908/1502-3, f. 47^b of Mr. A. G. Ellis's MS.

²⁶ The second dynasty of the ancient legendary kings of Persia.

²⁷ Káwa was the patriotic blacksmith who led the revolt against the foreign usurper Ḍaḥḥák, and whose leather apron became the national standard under the name of *Dirafsh-i-Káwayán*.

²⁸ Add. 200, f. 41^a of the Cambridge University Library. See Sir E. Denison Ross's description of this book in the *J.R.A.S.* for 1896, vol. xxviii, pp. 264-283.

²⁹ See the second English edition of Olearius (London, 1669); p. 212.

³⁰ See Shahristání's *Kitábu'l-Milal*, ed. Cureton, pp. 2-3.

Creation of the *Qur'án*, have sunk into a subordinate position, it may fairly be said that the capital and cardinal division is into the People of the *Sunnat* and the People of the *Shí'a*. Scattered communities of the latter are found in Asia Minor, Syria (where they are called *Mutawallí*, pl. *Matáwila*), India and other Muhammadan lands, but in Persia only is the *Shí'a* doctrine not only that held by the great majority of the people, but also the State Religion. Before considering how it was raised to this position by the *Şafawís* about the year A.D. 1500, we must briefly consider its essential nature, and here we cannot do better than quote Shahristání, the learned author of the *Kitábu'l-Milal*, or "Book of Sects," who died in the middle of the twelfth century, and who writes of them³¹ as follows:

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

[page 17]

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

Put in a briefer, clearer and more concrete form, this means that all the *Shí'a* reject and repudiate the first three of the "Four Orthodox Caliphs" (*al-Khulafá-u'r-Ráshidún*), *Abú Bakr*, 'Umar and 'Uthmán, who were elected, and hold that 'Alí, the cousin of the Prophet *Muhammad* and the husband of his daughter *Fátima*, should have succeeded him, and had in fact been nominated by him as his successor; and that after 'Alí the succession continued in his family by Divine Right. But even within this family there was no place for election, each *Imám* specifically choosing and nominating his successor, as the Prophet had chosen and nominated 'Alí. Amongst those who agreed in these general principles, however, there was plenty of room for disagreement as to details. Some of the *Shí'a* were content that the *Imám* should be descended from 'Alí, and were therefore ready to recognise *Muhammad ibnu'l-Ĥanafíyya*, "the son of the *Ĥanafite* woman"; others, including the "Sect of the Seven" or *Isma'ílís* and the "Sect of the Twelve" or *Imámís*, with which last we are chiefly concerned, limited the succession to the children born to 'Alí by his wife *Fátima*, the Prophet's daughter. With the third *Imám* *Ĥusayn*, 'Alí's younger son by *Fátima*, a new factor came into operation, for, according to quite early and respectable historians, such as

[page 18]

*al-Ya'qúbí*³³, a daughter of the last *Sásánian* king of Persia, *Yazdigird III*, was given to him in marriage and bore him a son named 'Alí and entitled *Zaynu'l-'Ábidín*, who was the Fourth *Imám*, and who combined in himself direct descent from the Prophet through his daughter *Fátima* and from the ancient Royal House of Persia. Small wonder that to him and his descendants the loyal devotion of the Persians was so freely rendered!

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

Who, then, were these *Şafawís*, when did they so vehemently adopt the *Shí'a* doctrine, and how did they succeed in establishing their supremacy?

[page 19]

³¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 108-9.

³² *E.g.* the second *Imám*, *al-Ĥasan*, elder son of 'Alí, ostensibly surrendered his rights "for prudential reasons" (*taqiyya*) to the *Umayyad* *Mu'áwiya*, but he could not really divest himself of the sacred quality of *Imám*.

³³ He wrote about the end of the ninth Christian century, and his excellent history, edited by *Houtsma*, was published at *Leyden* in two vols. in 1883. See also vol. i of my *Lit. Hist. of Persia*, p. 229 and n. 2 *ad calc.*

³⁴ Abundant illustrations of this are furnished by such works of the *Saljúq* period as the *Siyásat-náma* and the *Ráhatu's-Şudúr*.

Şafawí is the adjective formed from Şafi, a notable Şúfi saint, named in full Şafíyyu'd-Dín, who died in Gilán in A.D. 1334 at the age of 85 in the odour of sanctity, and who claimed to be descended in the twentieth degree from Músá Kázim the seventh Imám³⁵. That he was really a man of note in his own time is proved beyond doubt by the way in which his contemporary, the great statesman and historian Rashídu'd-Dín Faḍlu'lláh, speaks of him in his letters³⁶, and also by the fact that an immense biography of him, the *Şafwatu's-Şafá*, was composed shortly after his death, largely from data supplied by his son Şadru'd-Dín, which has been used directly or indirectly by all the historians of the great dynasty whereof he was the ancestor. Sháh Isma'íl, the actual founder of the dynasty, was sixth in descent from him, but I have found no evidence to prove that he himself adopted the violent Shí'a views characteristic of his descendants. The little evidence available points rather the other way, for in a letter written to Isma'íl's son Sháh Ṭahmásp in A.D. 1529-30 by the Uzbek leaders, they say that, according to what they have heard, Shaykh Şafíyyu'd-Dín was a good Sunní, and express their astonishment that Ṭahmásp "neither follows the example of His Holiness Murtaḍá 'Alí, nor that of his forefather"³⁷. Khwája 'Alí, grandson of Şafíyyu'd-Dín and great-great-grandfather of Sháh Isma'íl, is the first member of the House who shows a strong Shí'a bias³⁸ and holds converse in his dreams with the Imáms, and his grandson Junayd and his great-grandson Ḥaydar are the first to assert their claims with the sword and to die on the field of battle.

At the beginning of the fifteenth century, then, the Şafawís were simply the hereditary *pírs*, *murshids*, or spiritual

[page 20]

directors of an increasingly large and important order of *darwishes* or Şúfis which drew its adherents not only from Persia but from the Turkish provinces of Asia Minor, where they appear to have carried on an active propaganda³⁹. How successful this promised to become in later days is shown by the dreadful massacre of some forty thousand of the Shí'a perpetrated in his dominions by Sultán Salím "the Grim" as a preliminary to his great campaign against Sháh Isma'íl in A.D. 1514⁴⁰. To these devoted *darwishes* or *muríds*, as their war-cry cited above (p. 15) sufficiently shows, the head of the Şafawí House, even after he had ceased to be a Shaykh and had become a Sháh, continued to be regarded as the *pír* or *murshid*. Chardin, Raphaël du Mans⁴¹, and other reputable authorities have scoffed at the title "Great Sophi," by which the Şafawí Sháhs are commonly designated by contemporary European diplomatists and writers, on the ground that the Şúfis were generally poor and humble people and of doubtful orthodoxy, despised and rejected of men, and unlikely to lend their name to the Great King of Persia. But in the Persian histories of the Şafawís, even in the *Silsilatu'n-Nasab* compiled about the time when Raphaël du Mans wrote, and still more in the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh* and other earlier chronicles, the Şúfis, especially the Şúfis of Rúm (*i.e.* Turkey in Asia), are represented as the cream of the Şafawí army; we read of "self-sacrifice, courage, and whatever else is inseparable from Şúfi-hood"⁴² and of unworthy and disloyal acts described as "un-Şúfi-like" (*ná-Şúfi*). What, then, more natural than that he who was regarded not only as the Sháh of Persia

[page 21]

but as the Shaykh of these devoted *darwishes* or Şúfis, whose courage amazed contemporary Venetian travellers, should be called in Europe "the Great Şúfi" or "Sophi"? At any rate no more probable origin has been suggested for this term, which can scarcely be regarded as a corrupt pronunciation of Şafawí.

It would appear that an idea prevailed in Europe (based, perhaps, on vague recollections of the Magi or Wise Men from the East) that Sophi was derived from *σοφός*, an opinion which Don Juan of Persia⁴³ is at pains to refute; for, having described how Sháh Isma'íl immediately after he had conquered Tabriz adopted the title of "*gran Sophi de Persia*," he adds: "*no Sophi por sabio, como algunos mal entendieron, pensando que venia de Sòpos vocablo Griego, sino de Sophi, que es vocablo Persiano, y quiere dezir, lana, ó algodón*" ("Not Sophi in the sense of wise, as some have erroneously supposed, thinking it to come from the Greek word *σοφός*, but from Sophi, which is a Persian word meaning wool or cotton"⁴⁴).

The rapid rise to power of Isma'íl is one of the most remarkable events in Persian history, especially in view of his forlorn and threatened childhood. His father, Shaykh Ḥaydar, was killed in A.D. 1490 when he was only about three years of age⁴⁵, and he and his two brothers, of whom the elder, Sultán 'Alí, also fell in battle about A.D. 1495, were in constant danger from the Turkmán rulers of the "White Sheep" dynasty, and had many hair-breadth escapes in which they owed their lives to the devoted loyalty of their faithful Şúfis. Only seven of these accompanied Isma'íl when, at the age of thirteen, he set out from Láhiján for Ardabil to win a kingdom or perish in the attempt, but at every

³⁵ For the full pedigree, see the *J.R.A.S.* for July, 1921, p. 397 and n. I *ad calc.*

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 417-18.

³⁷ For the text of this passage, see p. 43 *infra*.

³⁸ See the *J.R.A.S.* for July, 1921, pp. 407-8.

³⁹ See Gibb's *History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. ii, pp. 227-8 *ad calc.*

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 259, and pp. 71-3 *infra*.

⁴¹ *L'Etat de la Perse en 1660*, ed. Schefer, pp. 16-17.

⁴² See *J.R.A.S.* for July, 1921, the Persian words on the illustration facing p. 415.

⁴³ Ed. Valladolid. 1604. f. 50^a.

⁴⁴ Krusinski agrees with this view. See p. 68 of the English version (London, 1728).

⁴⁵ He was born on Rajab 5, 892 (June 27, 1487).

[page 22]

stage he received reinforcements, so that at ʿArzinjān on his way to attack Farrukh-Yasār, king of Shīrwān, it had increased to seven thousand. Within a year he had taken Tabrīz, been crowned king of Persia, and, despite the attempts of his counsellors to dissuade him, imposed the Shīʿa doctrine on his subjects. He was warned that two-thirds of the people of Tabrīz were Sunnīs, and that the introduction into the prayers and professions of Faith of the distinctively Shīʿa clauses, and more especially the cursing of the first three Caliphs, Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān, might lead to trouble. “God and the Immaculate Imāms are with me,” he replied, “and I fear no one. By God’s help, if the people utter one word of protest, I will draw the sword and leave not one of them alive⁴⁶.” He was as good as his word, and when the above-mentioned anathema was uttered all men were commanded, on pain of death, to exclaim, “May it (*i.e.* the curse) be more, not less!” (*Bīsh bād, kam ma-bād!*).

Ruthless and bloodthirsty as he showed himself, Shāh Ismaʿīl, as depicted by contemporary Venetian travellers, had many attractive characteristics. At the age of thirteen he was, according to Caterino Zeno, “of noble presence and a truly royal bearing, ... nor did the virtues of his mind disaccord with the beauty of his person, as he had an elevated genius, and such a lofty idea of things as seemed incredible at such a tender age.” Angiolello describes him as “very much beloved ... for his beauty and pleasing manners”; and, when grown to man’s estate, as “fair, handsome, and very pleasing; not very tall, but of a light and well-framed figure; rather stout than slight, with broad shoulders. His hair is reddish; he only wears moustachios, and uses his left hand instead of his right. He is as brave as a game-cock, and stronger than

[page 23]

any of his lords; in the archery contests, out of the ten apples that are knocked down, he knocks down seven.” The anonymous merchant, after describing Ismaʿīl’s doings in Tabrīz, adds “from the time of Nero to the present, I doubt whether so bloodthirsty a tyrant has ever existed,” yet adds a little further on that at Caesarea “he caused proclamation to be made that everyone who brought provisions for sale should be liberally paid, and forbade his men, under pain of death, to take even as much as a handful of straw without paying for it, as it was a friendly city.” He further describes him as “amiable as a girl, left-handed by nature, as lively as a fawn, and stronger than any of his lords,” and says that “this Sophi is loved and revered by his people as a god, and especially by his soldiers, many of whom enter into battle without armour, expecting their master Ismael to watch over them in the fight.”

The closest historical parallel to the Ṣafawī movement is, I think, afforded by the propaganda in favour of the ʿAbbāsids carried on by Abū Muslim in Persia with so great a success in the first half of the eighth century of our era. Both were consciously religious and only unconsciously, though none the less truly, racial; the chief difference was that the later movement had to confront in the person of the Ottoman Sulṭān Salīm a far more energetic and formidable antagonist than the earlier in the Umayyad Caliph Marwān, and hence its more limited success; for while the ʿAbbāsīd cause triumphed throughout almost the whole of the Eastern lands of Islām, the Ṣafawī triumph was limited to Persia, though without doubt at one time it threatened Turkey as well. Fear is the great incentive to cruelty, and it was chiefly fear which caused Sulṭān Salīm to massacre in cold blood some forty thousand of his Shīʿa subjects. Fear, however, was not the only motive of this ferocity; with it were mingled anger

[page 24]

and disappointment. For Sulṭān Salīm was what is now called a Pan-Islamist, and his ambition was to be not merely the Sovereign of the greatest and most powerful Muhammadan State, but the supreme head of the whole Muslim world. His conquest of Egypt and the Holy Cities of Mecca and Madīna in A.D. 1517, and his assumption of the title of Caliph, which, whether by threats or promises, or a combination of the two, he induced the last titular ʿAbbāsīd Caliph to surrender to him, might well have given him this position but for Shāh Ismaʿīl and the barrier of heterodoxy which he had erected between the Turks, Egyptians and other Sunnīs to the West and their fellow-believers to the East in Transoxiana, Afghānistān, Balūchistān and India. The Persians not only refused to recognise Sulṭān Salīm as Caliph, but repudiated the whole theory of the Caliphate. The Turkish victory over the Persians at Chāldīrān in August, 1514, failed of its results owing to the refusal of the Ottoman troops to push home their advantage, and thus robbed the succeeding Egyptian campaign of its full measure of success, and left a lasting soreness which served greatly to weaken the political power of Islām and to impose a check on Turkish ambitions whereby, as we have seen, Europe greatly profited. Between A.D. 1508, when it was taken by the Persians, and A.D. 1638, when it was finally recovered by the Turks, Baghdād, once the metropolis of Islām, changed hands many times as the tide of these bitter and interminable wars ebbed and flowed, until the increasing weakness and effeminacy of the later Ṣafawī kings left Turkey in undisputed possession of Mesopotamia.

ART AND LITERATURE.

⁴⁶ The original text is quoted on p. 53 *infra, ad calc.*

One of the most curious and, at first sight, inexplicable phenomena of the Şafawî period is the extraordinary dearth of notable poets in Persia during the two centuries of its duration. Architecture,

[page 25]

miniature-painting and other arts flourished exceedingly; the public buildings with which Sháh ‘Abbás adorned his realms, and especially his capital Işfahán, have not ceased to command the admiration of all who beheld them from his time until the present day; and Bihzád and the other artists who flourished at the Timúrid court of Herát found worthy successors in Riḏá-yi-‘Abbási and his colleagues. Yet, though poets innumerable are mentioned in the *Tuḥfa-i-Sámi*⁴⁷ and other contemporary biographies and histories, there is hardly one (if we exclude Jámí, Hátifí, Hilálí and other poets of Khurásán, who were really the survivors of the school of Herát) worthy to be placed in the first class. During the seventy stormy years of Timúr’s life there were at least eight or ten poets besides the great Háfiz, who outshone them all, whose names no writer on Persian literature could ignore; while during the two hundred and twenty years of Şafawî rule there was in Persia, so far as I have been able to ascertain, hardly one of conspicuous merit or originality. I say “in Persia” advisedly, for a brilliant group of poets from Persia, of whom ‘Urfí of Shíráz (d. A.D. 1590) and Şá’ib of Işfahán (d. A.D. 1670) are perhaps the most notable, adorned the court of the “Great Moghuls” in India, and these were in many cases not settlers or the sons of emigrants, but men who went from Persia to India to make their fortunes and returned home when their fortunes were made. This shows that it was not so much lack of talent as lack of patronage which makes the list of distinctively Şafawî poets so meagre. The phenomenon is noticed by Riḏá-qulí Khán in the preface to his great anthology of Persian poets entitled *Majma‘u-l-Fuṣaḩá*⁴⁸, composed in the middle of the last century, as well

[page 26]

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

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

“There is at any rate no doubt that during the Şafawî period literature and poetry in Persia had sunk to a very low ebb, and that not one single poet of the first rank can be reckoned as representing this epoch. The chief reason for this, as you yourself have observed, seems to have been that these kings, by reason of their political aims and strong antagonism to the Ottoman Empire, devoted the greater part of their energies to the propagation of the Shí‘a doctrine and the encouragement of divines learned in its principles and laws. Now although these divines strove greatly to effect the religious unification of Persia (which resulted in its political unification), and laid the foundations of this present-day Persia, whose inhabitants are, speaking generally, of one faith, one tongue, and one race, yet, on the other hand, from the point of view of literature, poetry, Şúfiism and mysticism, and, to use their own expression, everything connected with the ‘Accomplishments’⁴⁹ (as opposed to the

[page 27]

‘Legalities’)⁴⁹, they not merely fell far short in the promotion thereof, but sought by every means to injure and annoy the representatives of these ‘Accomplishments,’ who were generally not too firmly established in the Religious Law and its derivatives. In regard to the Sufis particularly they employed every kind of severity and vexation, whether by exile, expulsion, slaughter or reprimand, slaying or burning many of them with their own hands or by their sentence. Now the close connection between poetry and Belles Lettres on the one hand, and Şúfiism and Mysticism on the other, at any rate in Persia, is obvious, so that the extinction of one necessarily involves the extinction and destruction of the other. Hence it was that under this dynasty learning, culture, poetry and mysticism completely deserted Persia, and the cloisters, monasteries, retreats and rest-houses [of the *darwishes*] were so utterly destroyed that there is now throughout the whole of Persia no name or sign of such charitable foundations, though formerly, as, for instance, in the time of Ibn Baṭúṭa, such institutions were to be found in every town, hamlet and village, as abundantly appears from the perusal of his Travels, wherein he describes how in every place, small or great, where he halted, he alighted in such buildings, of which at the present day no name or sign exists. Anyone ignorant of the circumstances of the Şafawî period might well wonder whether this Persia and that are the same country, and the creed of its inhabitants the same Islám; and, if so, why practically, with rare exceptions, there exists now not a single monastery throughout the whole of Persia, while in those parts of Turkey, such as Mesopotamia, Kurdistán and

⁴⁷ This biography of contemporary poets by Prince Sâm Mírzá, the son of Sháh Isma‘íl, is another work which urgently needs publication.

⁴⁸ Lithographed at Tíhrán in two large volumes in 1295/1878.

⁴⁹ و بقول خودشان هرچه معلى بكمالات بود (در مقابل شرعيات)

Sulaymáníyya, which did not remain under the Şafawí dominion, there are many such buildings just as there were in Ibn Baţúta's days.

“At all events during the Şafawí period in place of great

[page 28]

poets and philosophers there arose theologians, great indeed, but harsh, dry, fanatical and formal, like the Majlisís, the *Muḥaqqiq-i-thání*, Shaykh Ḥurr-i-Ámulí and Shaykh-i-Bahá'í, etc.”

Most professional poets in the East are primarily panegyrists, and if Riḍá-qulí Khán is correct in his assertion that the Şafawí kings, especially Tahmásp and ‘Abbás the Great, expressed a wish that laudatory poems should be addressed to the Imáms rather than to themselves, another and a more creditable cause for the diminution of poets in their realms is indicated. More material benefits were to be looked for from the Great Moghuls⁵⁰ than from the Imáms, and hence the eyes and feet of the more mercenary poets turned rather to Dihlí than to Karbalá. But to religious poetry commemorating the virtues and sufferings of the Imáms a great impetus was given in Persia, and of these poets Muḥtasham of Káshán (d. A.D. 1588) was the most eminent. But, besides these more formal and classical elegies, it is probable that much of the simpler and often very touching verse, wherein the religious feelings of the Persians find expression during the Muḥarram mourning, dates from this period, when every means was employed to stimulate and develop these sentiments of devotion to the House of ‘Alí and detestation of its oppressors. On the other hand the dramatisation of these moving scenes, which now form so remarkable a feature of the Muḥarram mourning (*Ta'ziya*), and are often described by European writers as “Miracle Plays,” seems to have taken place at a much later period. That careful writer Olearius spent the month of Muḥarram, A.H. 1047 (May-June, 1637) at Ardabíl, the sanctuary of the Şafawí family,

[page 29]

and gives a very full description of all that he saw, the mournings, wailings, lamentations and cuttings culminating on the ‘*Ashúrá*, the tenth day of the month or *Rúz-i-Qatl*, but he makes no mention of any dramatic representations, so that it is pretty certain that none existed at that time. To elucidate this point I addressed enquiries to two well-informed and intelligent Persian friends, Sayyid Taqí-záda and Mírzá Ḥusayn Dánish. The former expressed the opinion that while the solemn recitations known as *Rawḍa-khwání* (*i.e.* the reading from the pulpit of the *Rawḍatu'sh-Shuhadá*, or “Garden of the Martyrs,”) and other similar books) dates from Şafawí times, the *Ta'ziya-gardání, shabíh*, or “Passion Play” was of much later date, and perhaps owes something to European influences. The latter also placed the origin of these “Passion Plays” (of which Sir Lewis Pelly's translations give a good idea to the English reader) about the end of the eighteenth or beginning of the nineteenth century, *i.e.* at the beginning of the Qájár period, and incidentally cited the following interesting verses by Shaykh Riḍá-yi-Kurd in illustration of the view that the Persian dislike of ‘Umar is due not less to the fact that he conquered Persia and overthrew the Sásánian dynasty than to his usurpation of the rights of ‘Alí and Fátíma:

بشكست عَمْرٍ پُشتِ هُزْبِرانِ اجمرا
بر بادِ فنا داد رك و ريشهٔ جمرا
اين عريده بر غصبِ خلافت ز على نيست
با آلِ عمر كينه قديم است عجمرا

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

In conclusion we must not omit to notice another step taken by the Şafawí kings which added greatly to the

[page 30]

consolidation of Persia and the prevention of a continued outflow of men and money from the country, namely the exaltation and popularisation of Mashhad, Qum and other holy cities of Persia, whereby the tide of pilgrims was to a considerable extent confined within the limits of their Empire, in which, as we have seen, the most sacred shrines of Karbalá, Najaf and Mashhad ‘Alí were long included before they finally fell under Turkish dominion⁵¹.

POSTSCRIPT.

⁵⁰ The liberality of Humáyún towards poets and men of letters is especially noticed under the year of his death (962/1555) in the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh*. This and the succeeding topics will be more fully discussed in a subsequent chapter.

⁵¹ See Krusinski, *op. cit.*, pp. 159-161.

claim is probably at least as good as that of any contemporary Sayyid), two facts prove that in his own time (the thirteenth century) he was highly accounted as a saint and spiritual guide.

The first and more important of these two facts is the concern shown by that great Minister Rashídu'd-Dín Faḍlu'lláh for his welfare, and the desire to win his favour and intercession. In the very rare collection of the Minister's letters known as the *Munsha'át-i-Rashidí*⁵³ there occur two documents affording proof of this. The first is a letter (No. 45 of the collection, ff. 145^b-149^a of the MS.) addressed to Shaykh Şafíyyu'd-Dín himself, offering to his monastery (*Khánqáh*) a yearly gift of corn, wine, oil, cattle, sugar, honey and other food-stuffs for the proper entertainment of the notables of Ardabil on the anniversary of the Prophet's birthday, on condition that prayers should be offered up at the conclusion of the feast for the writer and benefactor. The second (No. 49, ff. 161^a-169^b) is addressed by Rashíd to his son Mír Aḥmad, governor of Ardabil, enjoining on him consideration for all its inhabitants, and especially "to act in such wise that His Holiness the Pole of the Heaven of Truth, the Swimmer in the Oceans of the Law, the Pacer of the Hippodrome of the Path, the Shaykh of Islám and of the Muslims, the Proof of such as attain the Goal, the Exemplar of the Bench of Purity, the Rose-tree of the Garden of Fidelity, *Shaykh Şafíyyu'l-Millat wa'd-Dín* (may

[page 34]

God Most High perpetuate the blessings of His Holy Exhalations!) may be well pleased with and grateful to thee⁵⁴." These letters, and especially the second, which is filled with the most exaggerated praises of Shaykh Şafí, sufficiently prove the high repute which he enjoyed amongst his contemporaries⁵⁵.

The second fact germane to our thesis is that comparatively soon after his death a most extensive monograph on his life, character, teachings, doctrines, virtues and miracles was compiled by one of his followers, the *darwish* Tawakkul⁵⁶ ibn Isma'íl, commonly called Ibnu'l-Bazzáz, apparently under the inspiration and direction of Shaykh Şadru'd-Dín, who succeeded his father Shaykh Şafí as head of the Order and held this position for fifty-eight years (A.D. 1334-1392). This rare and important book has never been printed⁵⁷, but is the chief source of all later accounts of the head of the family and dynasty, in most of which it is frequently and explicitly cited. A much later recension of it was made in the reign of Sháh Tahmásp (A.D. 1524-1576) by a certain Abu'l-

[page 35]

Faḥ al-Ḥusaynî. I have personal knowledge of only three manuscripts, Add. 11745 of the British Museum⁵⁸; No. 87 of the Pote Collection in the library of King's College, Cambridge⁵⁹; and a fine copy made at Ardabil in 1030/1621, now belonging to Mr. A. G. Ellis, who, with his customary generosity, placed it at my disposal for as long as I required it. This exhaustive work comprises an Introduction, twelve chapters, and a Conclusion, each of which is divided into numerous sections⁶⁰, and its contents are summarized by Rieu with his usual precision. It contains interesting matter, diluted by much that is wearisome save to a devoted disciple, and represents on a more extensive scale the type of hagiography familiar to all Persian students in such books as the *Manáqibu'l-'Árifín* of Aflákí, available in the English version of Redhouse⁶¹ and the French of Huart⁶². The extracts from it included in most later histories of the family, notably the *Silsilatu'n-Nasab-i-Şafawíyya*⁶³, will suffice to satisfy the curiosity of most readers, though a careful perusal and analysis of the original work would undoubtedly yield results of value, most of the anecdotes and sayings being vouched for by Shaykh Şadru'd-Dín. But before further discussing Shaykh Şafí and his descendants something more must be said about his ancestors.

[page 36]

⁵³ See my article on the *Persian MSS. of the late Sir Albert Houtum-Schindler, K.C.I.E.* in the *J.R.A.S.* for Oct. 1917, pp. 693-4, and my *Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion* (hereinafter sometimes denoted as "*Pers. Lit. iii*"), pp. 80-87.

و نومی سازی که چنان قطب فلک حقیقت و سباح بحار
شریعت، مساح مضمار طریقت، شیخ الإسلام و المسلمین، برهان
الواصلین، قدوه، صفه، صفا، کلبین دوحه، وفا، شیخ صفی المیله
و الدین ادم الله تعالی برضات انفاسه الشریعة از تو راضی و شاکر
باشد.

⁵⁵ Shaykh Şafí died in 735/1334 at the age of 85. Rashídu'd-Dín was put to death in A.D. 1318 at the age of 70 or somewhat over.

⁵⁶ Or Tükli (توکلی) as it is written and pointed in a note in Mr. Ellis's manuscript.

⁵⁷ Since this was written I have obtained through the kindness of one of my Persian correspondents a copy of an excellent lithographed edition published at Bombay in 1329/1911, of the very existence of which I was ignorant when this chapter was written.

⁵⁸ See Rieu's *Pers. Cat.*, pp. 345-6.

⁵⁹ See my *Suppl. Hand-list*, p. 137, No. 837.

⁶⁰ Ch. viii comprises no less than 27 sections.

⁶¹ Prefixed to his metrical translation of the First Book of the *Mesnevi* (*Mathnawi*) of Jalálu'd-Dín Rûmí, published in Trübner's Oriental Series in 1881. The *Manáqib*, or "Acts of the Adepts," occupies pp. 3-135.

⁶² *Les Saints des Derviches Tourneurs (Études d'Hagiographie Musulmane)*, vol. i (Paris, Leroux), 1918; vol. ii, 1922.

⁶³ See my account of this rare and interesting work in the *J.R.A.S.* for July, 1921, pp. 395-418. Both Dr. Babinger and M. Minorsky have called my attention to the fact that another MS. of this work at St. Petersburg was described by Khanikoff in the *Mélanges Asiatiques*, i, pp. 580-583.

That the seventh Imám Músá Kázim had, besides the son 'Alí Ridá who succeeded him in the Imámate, another son named Ḥamza, from whom Shaykh Şafí claimed descent, is a fact vouched for by the historian al-Ya'qúbí⁶⁴, but the next dozen links in the chain (including five Muḥammads without further designation) are too vague to admit of identification. The earliest ancestor of the Şafawís who is invested with any definite attributes is Fírúزشáh-i-Zarrín-kuláh ("Golden-cap"), who is stated by the *Silsilatu'n-Nasab* to have been made governor of Ardabíl, henceforth the home and rallying-point of the family, by a son of Ibráhim-i-Adham, here represented as king of Persia. Ibráhim-i-Adham, however, though reputed of kingly race, renounced the world, became a notable saint, and died about A.D. 780 in Syria, and history knows nothing of any son of his who succeeded to a throne in Persia or elsewhere. Fírúزشáh died after a prosperous life at Rangín in Gílán, and was succeeded by his son 'Awaḍ, of whom nothing is recorded save that he lived and died at Isfaranján near Ardabíl. His son Muḥammad earned the title of Ḥáfíẓ because he knew the *Qur'án* by heart, an accomplishment for which he is said to have been indebted to the *Jinn*⁶⁵, who kidnapped him at the age of seven and educated him amongst themselves for a like number of years. The two succeeding heads of the family, Şaláḥu'd-Dín Rashíd and Quṭbu'd-Dín Aḥmad, seem to have lived quietly at Kalkhorán⁶⁶, devoting themselves to agriculture, until a fierce incursion of

[page 37]

the Georgians compelled the latter to flee to Ardabíl with his family, including his little son Amínu'd-Dín Jibrá'il, then only a month old. Even here they were not left unmolested: the Georgians pursued them and they had to take refuge in a cellar, where their lives were only saved by a devoted youth, who, ere he fell beneath the swords of his assailants, succeeded in concealing the entrance to the cellar by throwing down a large earthen jar over it. Quṭbu'd-Dín himself was severely wounded in the neck and hardly escaped with his life, and his grandson Shaykh Şafí, who was born during his life, used to relate that when his grandfather took him on his shoulder he used to put four baby fingers into the scar left by the wound. In due course Quṭbu'd-Dín was succeeded by his son Amínu'd-Dín Jibrá'il, farmer and saint, who adopted Khwája Kamálu'd-Dín 'Arabsháh as his spiritual director, and married a lady named Dawlatí; she in due course, in the year 650/1252-3, bore him the son who afterwards became famous as Shaykh Şafíyyu'd-Dín, with whom the family suddenly emerges from comparative obscurity into great fame. The author of the *Silsilatu'n-Nasab*, not content with giving the year of his birth, further fixes the date as follows. At the time of his birth Shams-i-Tabríz had been dead five years, Shaykh Muḥyi'd-Dín ibnu'l-'Arabí twelve years, and Najmu'd-Dín Kubrá thirty-two years. He was five years old when Húlágú Khán the Mongol conquered Persia, twenty-two on the death of Jalálu'd-Dín Rúmí, and forty-one on the death of Sa'dí. The eminent saints contemporary with him included Amír 'Abdu'lláh-i-Shirází, Shaykh Najíbu'd-Dín Buzghúsh, 'Alá'u'd-Dawla-i-Samnání and Shaykh Maḥmúd-i-Shabistarí (author of the *Gulshan-i-Ráz* or "Rose-bed of Mystery"). He had three elder⁶⁷ and two younger brothers⁶⁸ and one

[page 38]

elder sister, being thus the fifth in a family of seven; and his father died when he was six years of age.

SHAYKH ŞAFIYYU'D-DÍN (A.D. 1252-1334).

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

Introduction (in 2 sections). Shaykh Şafí's advent foretold by the Prophet and by former saints, such as Jalálu'd-Dín Rúmí.

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

⁶⁴ Ed. Houtsma, vol. ii, p. 500.

⁶⁵ For some account of the believing *Jinn*, see *Qur'án*, lxxii.

⁶⁶ This, as M. V. Minorsky has pointed out to me, and not "Gilkhwárán," is the proper pronunciation of this name.

⁶⁷ Muḥammad, Şaláḥu'd-Dín Rashíd and Isma'il.

⁶⁸ Ya'qúb and Fakhru'd-Dín Yúsuf.

Chapter II (in 3 sections). Some of the miracles of Shaykh Ṣafī, whereby he delivered men from the perils of the sea and of deep waters, of mountains, mist and snow, and from foes, bondage and sickness.

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

[page 39]

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

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

Chapter VI (undivided). Ecstasies and devotional dancing of Shaykh Ṣafī.

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

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

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

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

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

Chapter XII (in 2 sections). Miracles wrought by Shaykh Ṣafī's disciples.

Conclusion.

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

[page 40]

That these *karámát*⁶⁹ have an interest of their own in connection with Psychical Research has been recognised by D. B. Macdonald in his excellent book on *The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam*⁷⁰ and by Cl. Huart in his *Saints des Derviches Tourneurs*⁷¹. The latter classifies the psychical phenomena recorded in his original, the *Manāqibu 'l-'Arifin* (composed about 718/1318, only some thirty years earlier than the *Ṣafwatu 's-Ṣafā*, which was very probably modelled on it), as follows: dreams; knowledge of future events; second sight and divination of hidden objects; thought-transference; luminosity of bodies, human and inanimate; automatic opening of closed doors; ubiquity; anaesthesia and immunity against poisons; action on material objects at a distance; production of the precious metals; abnormal muscular, digestive and sexual powers and physical enlargements of the body; shifting features and instability of countenance; apparitions; psychotherapy; replies to difficult questions; conversions to Islām; sermons to animals; vengeance of the Saints; mental alienation; protracted seclusion and fasting; talismans; sudden disappearances. Examples of all, or nearly all, of these phenomena are to be found in the *Ṣafwatu 's-Ṣafā*, while a smaller but fairly representative selection is contained in the *Silsilatu 'n-Nasab*, but a detailed examination of them, though not without interest and value, would be out of place in this volume. It must be noted, however, that certain aspects of these Muslim saints, as recorded by their disciples and admirers, are to Western

[page 41]

minds somewhat repellent; their curses are no less effective than their blessings, and their indulgences no less remarkable than their abstentions, while grim jests on the fate of such as have incurred their displeasure are not uncommon. Thus a certain prince named Siyámak, son of Shírwánsháh, when setting out for the Mongol camp (*urdú*), spoke in a disparaging manner of Shaykh Záhíd's disciples, and threatened on his return to pull down or burn their monasteries. When this was reported to the Shaykh he merely remarked, playing on the prince's name, that *Siyámak* would become *Siyáh-marg* (meaning "the Black Death"); which saying was duly fulfilled, for, having in some way incurred the wrath of the Mongol sovereign, he was, after the barbarous fashion of these people, wrapped up in black felt and kicked or trampled to death⁷². To Shaykh

⁶⁹ The supernatural achievements of thaumaturgists are divided by Jámí (*Nafahātu 'l-Uns*, ed. Nassau Lees, pp. 22-31) into three classes: (i) the evidential miracles of the Prophets, called *ma'jizát*; (ii) the "gifts" (*karámát*) vouchsafed by God to his saints for their greater honour; and (iii) the "wonders" (*khawáriqu 'l-'ádát*) wrought by ordinary men by means of Black or White Magic.

⁷⁰ University of Chicago Press, 1909.

⁷¹ Paris, Leroux, 1918-1922.

⁷² The last 'Abbásid Caliph, al-Musta'šim, is said to have been put to death by Húlágú Khán in this way, the Mongols having a dislike to shedding kingly blood. So Clavijo informs us that at the court of Timúr "the custom is that when a great man is put to death he is hanged; but the meaner sort are beheaded." See Sir Clements Markham's translation of his *Narrative*, published by the Hakluyt Society in 1859, p. 150.

Záhíd, on the other hand, Gházán Khán⁷³ the Mongol Ílkhán showed the greatest respect, especially after the saint had exhibited his powers of mind-reading, which so impressed Gházán that he insisted on kissing his feet.

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

[page 42]

Najību'd-Dín Buzghúsh of Shíráz, he desired to go thither, but, having finally overcome his mother's opposition to the journey, arrived there only to find the saint dead⁷⁴. While at Shíráz he made the acquaintance of many notable saints and *darwishes*, and of the celebrated poet Sa'dí, of whom, however, he seems to have formed but a poor opinion. Indeed he appears to have treated the poet with scant civility, even refusing to accept an autograph copy of his poems. Finally Záhíru'd-Dín, the son and successor of Shaykh Buzghúsh, told Shaykh Šafī that no one could satisfy his spiritual needs except Shaykh Záhíd of Gílán, whose personal appearance and dwelling-place on the shore of the Caspian Sea he described to him in detail. Four years elapsed, however, ere he was successful in tracking down the elusive saint, then sixty years of age, by whom he was cordially welcomed, and with whom he spent the next twenty-five years of his life.

Shaykh Záhíd's full name, as given in the *Šafwatu's-Šafá*, is Tájú'd-Dín Ibráhím ibn Rawshan Amír ibn Bábíl ibn Shaykh Pindár (or Bundár) al-Kurdí as-Sanjání, and the mother of his grandfather Bábíl is said to have been a *Jinniyya*. The title of *Záhíd* (“the Ascetic” or “Abstemious”) was given to him by his Director Sayyid Jamálu'd-Dín for reasons which are variously stated. He gave his daughter Bībí Fátima in marriage to Shaykh Šafī, to whom she bore three sons, of whom the second, Šadru'd-Dín, ultimately succeeded his father as head of the Order. The author of the *Silsilatu'n-Nasab* was one of his descendants, who were collectively known as *Pir-záda* and apparently continued to enjoy high consideration during the whole Šafawí period.

From the data given by the *Silsilatu'n-Nasab*, viz. that

[Illustration: *Shaykh Abdál Pir-záda presenting the captured horse of the Uzbek leader, Dín Muḥammad Khán, to Sháh 'Abbás the Great*]

[page 43]

Shaykh Záhíd was 35 years older than Shaykh Šafī, that both died at the age of 85, and that the latter died in 735/1334, we may conclude that the former died about 700/1300; and this is corroborated by the further statement that his grandson Šadru'd-Dín was born in 704/1305, four years after his death. Shaykh Šafī now became head of the Order, and held this position for 35 years, when he died⁷⁵, and was in turn succeeded by his son Šadru'd-Dín. He produced some poetry both in the dialect of Gílán (in which also several of his conversations with Shaykh Záhíd were conducted) and likewise in ordinary Persian. Though one of his quatrains⁷⁶ testifies to his love of 'Alí (“how much soever he in whose heart is a grain of love for 'Alí may sin, God will forgive him” are his words), I find no evidence that he held those strong Shí'a views which subsequently characterised his descendants. There is, indeed, a piece of evidence to the contrary in the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh*, an important unpublished history of the first two Šafawí kings composed in the reign of Sháh Ṭahmásp and including the years A.H. 901-985 (A.D. 1495-1577)⁷⁷. In a letter of remonstrance addressed to this ruler by the Uzbek 'Ubayd Khán in 936/1529-1530 the following sentence occurs⁷⁸:

و پدر کلان شما جناب مرحوم شیخ صفی را همچین شهنیده ایمر
که مردی عزیز اهل سنت و جماعت بوده مارا حیرت عظیم
دست میدهد که شما نه روش حضرت مرتضی علی را تابعید و
نه روش پدر کلان را

[page 44]

“We have thus heard concerning your ancestor, His sainted Holiness Shaykh Šafī, that he was a good man and an orthodox Sunnī, and we are greatly astonished that you neither follow the conduct of Murtaḏá 'Alí nor that of your ancestor.”

⁷³ He reigned A.D. 1295-1304. See my *Pers. Lit. iii*, pp. 40-46.

⁷⁴ According to Jámí (*Nafahát*, p. 548) he died in Sha'bán 678 (Dec. 1279).

⁷⁵ On Monday, Muḥarram 12, 735 (Sept. 12, 1334).

⁷⁶ See *J.R.A.S.* for July, 1921, p. 403.

⁷⁷ Mr. A. G. Ellis most kindly placed at my disposal his MS. of this rare book, to which all subsequent references are made.

⁷⁸ F. 166^a.

He did much, however, to extend and develop the Order of which he was the Superior, and his influence is illustrated by a statement of Mawláná Shamsu'd-Dín Barníqí of Ardabíl, quoted in the *Silsilatu'n-Nasab*⁷⁹, that the number of those who came to visit him along one road only — that from Marágha and Tabríz — in the course of three months amounted to some thirteen thousand. Many if not most of these must have come from Asia Minor, so that even at this early date the Order was establishing and consolidating itself in regions where it was afterwards destined to cause the greatest anxiety to the Ottoman Sultáns⁸⁰.

Shaykh Şadru'd-Dín succeeded his father at the age of 31 in 735/1334 and controlled the affairs of the Order for 59 years until his death in 794/1392. He also composed verses in Persian, and is besides credited with many miracles, the most celebrated of which was his recovery and restoration to Ardabíl of the door of the principal mosque which had been carried off by the Georgians when they raided that city about 600/1203-4⁸¹. Amongst the most celebrated of his disciples was the poet Qásimu'l-Anwár, whose orthodoxy was somewhat suspect, and who was expelled from Herát by Sháh-rukhs under circumstances which I have discussed elsewhere⁸². That Shaykh Şadru'd-Dín's influence and ac-

[page 45]

tivities also aroused the suspicions of neighbouring potentates is shown by the action of Malik-i-Ashraf⁸³, who lured him to Tabríz and kept him in confinement there for three months, when, warned by a dream, he released him, but subsequently attempted to recapture him and compelled him to flee into Gilán. Other holy and learned men suffered at the hands of this tyrant, and one of them, the Qádi Muhyi'd-Dín of Barda'a, depicted in such vivid colours the odious oppression of Malik-i-Ashraf to Jání Beg Khán son of Uzbek, the ruler of the Dasht-i-Qipcháq, that the latter invaded Ádharbáyján, defeated Malik-i-Ashraf, and put him to death. According to the *Silsilatu'n-Nasab*⁸⁴ he also had an interview with Shaykh Şadru'd-Dín, treated him with great respect, and confirmed to him the possession of certain estates whereof the revenues had formerly been allocated to the shrine at Ardabíl.

Shaykh Şadru'd-Dín, like his father Shaykh Şafí, performed the pilgrimage to Mecca at the end of his life, and is said to have brought back with him to Ardabíl the Prophet's standard. Shortly after his return he died, in 794/1392, and was succeeded by his son Khwája 'Alí, who controlled the affairs of the Order for thirty-six years until his death on Rajab 18, 830 (May 15, 1427). This happened in Palestine, where he is buried, his tomb being known as that of "Sayyid 'Alí 'Ajami"⁸⁵. Like his father and grandfather he

[page 46]

was a worker of miracles and a poet, and over two hundred of his Persian verses are quoted in the *Silsilatu'n-Nasab*. In him strong Shí'a tendencies reveal themselves: instigated by the Ninth Imám Muḥammad Taqí in a dream he converts the people of Dizful, by a miraculous stoppage of their river, to a belief in and recognition of the supreme holiness of 'Alí ibn Abí Tálíb; and he exhorts Tímúr, whose regard he had succeeded in winning by a display of his psychical powers, to "chastise, as they deserve, the Yazídí Kurds, the friends of Mu'áwiya, because of whom we wear the black garb of mourning for the Immaculate Imáms"⁸⁶. More celebrated is his intercession with Tímúr on behalf of a number of Turkish prisoners (*asirán-i-Rúm*) whose release he secured, and whose grateful descendants, known as "the Turkish Şúfis" (*Şúfiyán-i-Rúmlú*), became the most devoted adherents and supporters of the Şafawí family⁸⁷.

[page 47]

⁷⁹ See *J.R.A.S.* for July, 1921, pp. 403-4.

⁸⁰ Compare Dr. Franz Babinger's remarks in his admirable study *Schejch Bedr ed-Dín der Sohn des Richters von Simāw* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1921), especially p. 15 of the *Sonderabdruck*.

⁸¹ See pp. 36-7 *supra*, and *J.R.A.S.* for July, 1921, pp. 406-7.

⁸² *Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion*, pp. 473-486 and pp. 365-6. I must here note an error into which I fell concerning the verses of Qásim quoted on p. 474. These obviously refer not to Shaykh Şafí but to his son Şadru'd-Dín, who actually lived exactly ninety years (A.H. 704-794). The word □□□ in l. 1 probably needs emendation to some word (like □□□) meaning "son"; in any case this is its meaning here. The translation should run: "The Şadr of Saintship, who is the son [or survivor or representative] of Shaykh Şafí etc."

⁸³ See d'Ohsson's *Histoire des Mongols*, vol. iv, pp. 740-2.

⁸⁴ *J.R.A.S.* for July, 1921, pp. 405-6.

⁸⁵ See *J.R.A.S.* for July, 1921, p. 407. Dr. Franz Babinger wrote to me in a private letter: "*Quds-i-Khalil* ist vielmehr *al-Quds wa'l-Khalil*, d.h. Jerusalem und Hebron, eine häufige Bezeichnung für Südpalästina." This is confirmed by the Rev. Canon J. E. Hanauer, to whom Dr. Babinger wrote about this matter, and who kindly endeavoured to identify this tomb. His very interesting letter is too long to quote in full. "The Arab historian Mejd ed-Dín," he says, "who wrote about A.D. 1495, i.e. seventy years later [than Khwája 'Alí's death], gives a list of the most renowned Shaykhs buried at Hebron, but does not mention 'Alí 'Ajami. We must therefore look for the shrine elsewhere. Four different places of note suggest themselves." These are (1) the *Ḥaram* of 'Alí ibn 'Alawí 2½ hours north of Jaffa; (2) the Wali of al-'Ajami, just south of Jaffa; (3) a sacred oak-grove with the shrine of "the Imám 'Alí" near the Báb-el-Wad; and (4) another very holy shrine of al-'Ajami, on the hill above the village of Bayt Maḥsír, amidst woods and thickets. Canon Hanauer is inclined to think that the last is most probably the tomb in question.

⁸⁶ *J.R.A.S.* for July, 1921, p. 408.

⁸⁷ See Sir John Malcolm's *History of Persia* (ed. 1815), vol. i, pp. 496-7 and footnotes. The ascription of this act of intercession to Shaykh Şadru'd-Dín and still more to his father Şafíyyu'd-Dín is an anachronism.

Shaykh Ibráhím, better known as Shaykh Sháh, succeeded his father in 830/1427 and died in 851/1447-8. Little is recorded of him save the names of his six sons, and he is even omitted entirely in the succession by the *Ta'rikh-i-Álam-ará-yi-Abbási*. He was succeeded by his youngest son Shaykh Junayd, with whom the militant character of the family first asserted itself. He visited Diyár Bakr and won the favour of Úzún Hasan, the celebrated ruler of the “White Sheep” Dynasty, who bestowed on him the hand of his sister Khadija in marriage. This alliance, combined with the assembly round his standard of ten thousand Šúfi warriors (*ghuzát-i-Šúfiyya*), “who deemed the risking of their lives in the path of their perfect Director the least of the degrees of devotion⁸⁸,” aroused the alarm of Jahánsháh, the Turkmán ruler of Ádharbáyján and the two ‘Íraqs, and other neighbouring princes, and Shaykh Junayd fell in battle against Shírwánsháh⁸⁹. His body, according to one account, was brought to Ardabíl and there buried, but according to others it was buried near the battle-field at a village variously called Quryál, Qarúyál or Qúriyán.

Shaykh Haydar (the “Sechaidar” of Angiolello), like his father Junayd, whom he succeeded, found favour in the eyes of the now aged Úzún Hasan, his maternal uncle, who gave him in marriage his daughter Marta, Hálíma, Bakí Áqá or ‘Álam-sháh Begum, whose mother, the celebrated Despina Khátún (“Despinacaton”), was the daughter of Kalo Ioannes, the last Christian Emperor of Trebizond, of the noble Greek family of the Comneni⁹⁰. The anonymous Venetian merchant whose narrative is included in the *Italian travels in Persia in the*

[page 48]

*fifteenth and sixteenth centuries*⁹¹ describes him as “a lord about the rank of a count, named Secaidar, of a religion or sect named Sophi, revered by his co-religionists as a saint and obeyed as a chief. There are,” he continues, “numbers of them in different parts of Persia, as in Natolia (Anatolia) and Caramania (Qaramán), all of whom bore great respect to this Secaidar, who was a native of this city of Ardouil (Ardabíl or Ardawíl), where he had converted many to the Suffavean (Şafawí) doctrine. Indeed he was like the abbot of a nation of monks; he had six children, three boys⁹² and three girls, by a daughter of Assambei (Hasan Bey, *i.e.* Úzún Hasan); he also bore an intense hatred to the Christians.” He it was who, divinely instructed in a dream, bade his followers adopt in place of the Turkmán cap (*táqiya-i-Turkmáni*) the scarlet cap of twelve gores (*Táj-i-duwázda tark*)⁹³ from which they became universally known as “Red Heads” (*Qizil-básh* in Turkish; *Surkh-sar* in Persian). “They are accustomed,” says the anonymous Venetian merchant cited above (p. 206 of the *Italian Travels*), “to wear a red caftan, and above that a high conical turban made with a dozen folds, representing the twelve sacraments of their sect, or the twelve descendants of ‘Alí⁹⁴.”

Shaykh Haydar, like his father, fell in battle against the hosts of Shírwánsháh and his Turkmán allies at Ṭabarsarán near Darband. Twenty-two years later his death was

[page 49]

avenged and his body recovered and brought to Ardabíl by his redoubtable son Sháh Isma‘íl, who was at this time (Rajab 20, 893: June 30, 1488)⁹⁵ only a year old.

SHÁH ISMA‘ÍL.

(Born 892/1487; crowned 905/1499-1500; died 930/1523-4)

Nothing could appear more unpromising than the position of the three little sons of Shaykh Haydar, who were for the moment entirely at the mercy of their father’s enemies. Sulṭán Ya‘qúb, the son of Úzún Hasan, however, shrank from killing them for the sake of their mother, who was his sister, and contented himself with exiling them to Iştákh in Fárs, where they were placed in the custody of the governor Manşúr Beg Parnák. According to Angiolello⁹⁶, however, the three boys were confined on an island in the “Lake of Astumar” (identified by the translator with Lake Van) inhabited by Armenian Christians, where they remained for three years and became “very much beloved, especially Ismael, the second, for his beauty and pleasing manners,” so that when Rustam, the grandson of Úzún Hasan, after the death of his uncle Ya‘qúb, sent a

⁸⁸ These particulars are from the *Ta'rikh-i-Álam-ará-yi-Abbási*.

⁸⁹ In 850/1456 according to Babinger, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

⁹⁰ See *Pers. Lit.* iii, p. 407.

⁹¹ Translated and edited by Charles Grey and published by the Hakluyt Society in 1873, pp. 139-207.

⁹² These were Sulṭán ‘Alí Mírzá (or Pádisháh), Isma‘íl, and Ibráhím, according to the *Ta'rikh-i-Álam-ará-yi-Abbási*, but they are differently given in the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh*.

⁹³ See the late Sir A. Houtum-Schindler’s note on this in the *J.R.A.S.* for 1897, pp. 114-115. For a long note on *Qizil-básh*, see Babinger’s *Shejch Bedr ed-Din*, pp. 84-5 of the *Sonderabdruck*.

⁹⁴ This, of course, is an error, for the Twelve Imáms include ‘Alí, who was the first of them and was succeeded by eleven of his descendants.

⁹⁵ According to the rare history of Sháh Isma‘íl represented by Add. 200 of the Cambridge University Library, however, Shaykh Haydar was killed in 895/1490.

⁹⁶ Pp. 101-2 of the Hakluyt Society’s translation by Charles Grey.

message to demand their surrender, intending to put them to death, the Armenians not only made excuses for not giving them up but enabled them to escape by boat to the “country of Carabas” (Qará-bágh). In the Persian accounts, however, Rustam is credited with their release from Ištakhr, because, being at war with his cousin Baysunqur, he thought to strengthen himself by an alliance with them and their numerous devoted followers. He accordingly invited the eldest brother Sultán ‘Alí to Tabríz,

[page 50]

received him with much honour, conferred on him all the paraphernalia of sovereignty and the title of *Pádisháh*, and despatched him to attack Baysunqur, whom he defeated and slew in a battle near Ahar. Having thus got rid of his rival, Rustam sought to rid himself of his ally, who, warned by one of his Turkmán disciples, fled to Ardabíl, but was overtaken by his enemies at the neighbouring village of Shamási and killed in the ensuing skirmish in the year 900/1494-5⁹⁷. His two brothers, however, reached Ardabil in safety, and were concealed by their faithful followers during the house-to-house search instituted by the Turkmáns, until an opportunity presented itself of conveying them secretly into Gilán, first to Rasht, where they remained for a short period, estimated at anything from seven to thirty days, and then to Láhiján, the ruler of which place, Kár-kiyá Mírzá ‘Alí, accorded them hospitality and protection for several years. It is related that on one occasion when their Turkmán foes came to look for them he caused them to be suspended in a cage in the woods so as to enable him to swear that they had no foothold on his territory.

To the valour and devotion of Isma‘íl’s disciples, the “Šúfis of Láhiján,” contemporary European writers testify as forcibly as the Persian historians. “This Sophi,” says the anonymous Italian merchant⁹⁸, “is loved and revered by his people as a

[page 51]

god, and especially by his soldiers, many of whom enter into battle without armour, expecting their master Ismael to watch over them in the fight. ... The name of God is forgotten throughout Persia and only that of Ismael remembered.” “The Suffaveans fought like lions” is a phrase which repeatedly occurs in the pages of the Venetian travellers. Yet for all this, and the numbers and wide ramifications of the Order (“from the remotest West to the limits of Balkh and Bukhára,” says the rare history of Sháh Isma‘íl, speaking of the days of his grandfather Junayd), it is doubtful if their astounding successes would have been possible in the first instance but for the bitter internecine feuds of the ruling “White Sheep” dynasty after the death of the great and wise Úzún Ḥasan in A.D. 1478, from which time onwards their history is a mere welter of fratricidal warfare.

Isma‘íl was only thirteen years of age when he set out from the seclusion of Láhiján on his career of conquest. He was accompanied at first by only seven age of thirteen devoted “Šúfis,” but, as he advanced by way Tárúm and Khalkhál to Ardabíl, he was reinforced at every stage by brave and ardent disciples, many from Syria and Asia Minor⁹⁹. Ordered to leave Ardabíl by the Turkmán Sultán ‘Alí Beg Chákarlú, he retired for a while to Arjawán near Astará on the Caspian Sea, where he amused himself with fishing, of which he was very fond; but in the spring of A.D. 1500 he was back at Ardabíl, having rallied round him a goodly army of the seven Turkish tribes who constituted the backbone of the

[page 52]

Šafawí military power¹⁰⁰. He now felt himself strong enough embark on a holy war against the Georgian “infidels” and a war of revenge against Farrukh-Yasár, king of Shírwán, whom he defeated and killed near Gulistán (906/1500). He decapitated and burned the corpse, built a tower of his enemies’ heads, destroyed the tombs of the Shírwánsháhs, and exhumed and burned the remains of the last king, Khalíl, who had killed his grandfather Shaykh Junayd. The noble dynasty thus extinguished claimed descent from the great Sásánian king Anúsharwán (Núshírwán), and numbered amongst them the patron of the famous panegyrist Kháqání.

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

⁹⁷ The following portion of this account, taken from the rare history of Sháh Isma‘íl mentioned in n. 1 on p. 15 above, has been published with translation by Sir E. Denison Ross in the *J.R.A.S.* for 1896 (vol. xxviii), pp. 264-283.

⁹⁸ P. 206 of the Hakluyt Society’s *Travels of Venetians in Persia* (London, 1873). See also p. 223 of the same volume, where Vincentio d’Alessandri speaks in similar terms of the devotion of his subjects to Ṭahmásp, the son and successor of Isma‘íl. Most of this passage has been already quoted on p. 23 *supra*.

⁹⁹ Cf. *Pers. Lit. iii*, p. 417. So the rare history of Sháh Isma‘íl (Add. 200 of the Cambridge University Library, f. 27^a):

در عرض راه ارباب جلاوت و صوفیان باک طینت از روی عقیدت
در هر منزلی از منازل از طوائف رور و شام بموکتب عالی می
پیوستند

¹⁰⁰ These were the Shámlú, Rúmlú, Ustájlú, Takallú, Dhu‘l-Qadar, Afshár and Qájár. From the two last respectively there arose in later days Nádír Sháh and the present Royal House of Persia.

Already Sháh Isma‘íl and his partisans had given ample proof of their strong Shí‘a convictions. Their battle-cry on the day they slew Shírwánsháh was *Alláh! Alláh! wa ‘Alí waliyyu’lláh* (God! God! and ‘Alí is the Friend of God!)¹⁰¹, while Alwand was offered peace if he would

[page 53]

embrace this doctrine and pronounce this formula¹⁰². But now Sháh Isma‘íl resolved that, with his assumption of the kingly rank, the Shí‘a faith should become not merely the State religion but the only tolerated creed. This decision caused anxiety even to some of the Shí‘a divines of Tabríz, who, on the night preceding Isma‘íl’s coronation, represented to him that of the two or three hundred thousand inhabitants of that city at least two-thirds were Sunnis; that the Shí‘a formula had not been publicly uttered from the pulpit since the time of the Imáms themselves; and that if the majority of the people refused to accept a Shí‘a ruler, it would be difficult to deal with the situation which would then arise. To this Sháh Isma‘íl replied, “I am committed to this action; God and the Immaculate Imáms are with me, and I fear no one; by God’s help, if the people utter one word of protest, I will draw the sword and leave not one of them alive¹⁰³.” Nor did he content himself with glorifying ‘Alí and his descendants, but ordained the public cursing of the first three Caliphs of the Sunnis, Abú Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmán, and that all who heard the cursing should respond

[page 54]

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

Immediately after his coronation, according to the *Ahsanu’t-Tawárikh*¹⁰⁴, he ordered all preachers (*Khuṭabá*) throughout his realms to introduce the distinctively Shí‘a formulae “I bear witness that ‘Alí is the Friend of God” and “hasten to the best of deeds” (*hayya ila khayri’l-‘amal*) into the profession of Faith and the call to Prayer respectively; which formulae had been in abeyance since Tughril Beg the Saljúq had put to flight and slain al-Basásírí five hundred and twenty-eight years previously¹⁰⁵. He also instituted the public cursing of Abú Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmán in the streets and markets, as above mentioned, threatening recalcitrants with decapitation. Owing to the dearth of Shí‘a theological works the religious instruction of the people necessitated by the change of doctrine presented great difficulties, but finally the Qáđi Naşru’lláh Zaytúní produced from his library the first volume of the *Qawá’idu’l-Islám* (“Rules of Islám”) of Shaykh Jamálu’d-Dín ... ibn ‘Alí ibnu’l-Muṭahhir al-Hillí¹⁰⁶, which served as a basis of instruction “until day by day the Sun of Truth of the Doctrine of the Twelve [Imáms]

[page 55]

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

Of the anger and alarm aroused by these proceedings in the neighbouring kingdoms, and especially in the Ottoman Empire, we shall have to speak presently, but first we may with advantage give from the *Ahsanu’t-Tawárikh*¹⁰⁷ the list of potentates in Persia itself who at this time claimed sovereign power: (1) Sháh Isma‘íl in Ádharbáyján; (2) Sulṭán Murád in most of ‘Iráq; (3) Murád Beg Báyardarí in Yazd; (4) Ra’ís Muḥammad Karra (?□□◄) in Abarqúh; (5) Ḥusayn Kiyá-yi-Chaláwí in Samnán, Khwár and Firúzkuh; (6) Bárík Parnák in ‘Iráq-i-‘Arab; (7) Qásim Beg ibn Jahángír Beg ibn ‘Alí Beg in Diyár Bakr; (8) Qáđi Muḥammad in conjunction with Mawláná Mas‘úd in Káshán; (9) Sulṭán Ḥusayn Mírzá (the Tímúrid) in

¹⁰¹ Add. 200 of the Cambridge University Library, f. 35^b.

¹⁰² Add. 200 of the Cambridge University Library, f. 40.

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

قربانت شویر دویست سیصد هزار خلق که در تبریزت چهار
دانگ آن همه سنی اند و از زمان حضرات تا حال این خطبه را
کسی بر ملا نخوانده و میتوسیر که مردم بگویند که پادشاه
شیعه نمیخواهد و نعوذ بالله اگر رعیت برگردند چه تدارک درین
باب توان کرد، پادشاه فرمودند که مرا باین کار باز داشته
اند و خدای عالم را با حضرات ائمه معصومین همراه منند و من
از هیچ کس باک ندارم بتوفیق الله تعالی اگر رعیت حرفی بگویند
شمشیر میکشور و یک کس را زنده نمیگذارم

¹⁰⁴ F. 44 of Mr. A. G. Ellis’s manuscript.

¹⁰⁵ See Weil’s *Geschichte der Chalifen*, vol. iii, pp. 92-102. Al-Basásírí was the Commander-in-chief of the troops of the Buwayhid al-Maliku’r-Raḥím. He espoused the cause of the Fátimid Caliph al-Mustanshir and attempted to depose the ‘Abbásid Caliph al-Qá’im. He was killed on Dhu’l-Qa’da 6, 451 (Dec. 14, 1059). Since Isma‘íl was crowned in 907/1501-2, we must understand “previously” as referring not to this event, but to the composition of the *Ahsanu’t-Tawárikh*, or rather this portion of it, for it extends to the year 985/1577, while the date we require is 979/1571-2 (451 + 528 = 979).

¹⁰⁶ The name is defective in the MS., but most closely resembles this. Such a writer is mentioned towards the end of the fifth *Majlis* of the *Majálisu’l-Mú’minín*, but he has no work bearing precisely this name. It is possible that the popular *Sharáyi’u’l-Islám* of another al-Hillí is intended. See Rieu’s *Arabic Supplement*, p. 212.

¹⁰⁷ F. 45 of Mr. Ellis’s MS.

Khurásán; (10) Amír Dhu'n-Nún in Qandahár; (11) Badí'u'z-Zamán Mírzá (the Timúrid) in Balkh; and (12) Abu'l-Faḥ Beg Báyardari in Kirmán.

Many of these petty rulers (*Mulúku't-Tawá'if*) were quite insignificant, and several of them I cannot even identify. None of them long stood in Sháh Isma'íl's victorious path. His old enemy Alwand of the "White Sheep" dynasty suffered a decisive defeat at his hands in the summer of A.D. 1503, and died a year or so later at Diyár Bakr or Baghdád¹⁰⁸. His brother Murád was defeated and Shíráz occupied about the same time, and stern punishment overtook the Sunni doctors of Kázarún, many of whom were put to death, while the tombs and foundations of their predecessors were destroyed¹⁰⁹. The words *Rahmat^{um} li'l-Ála-*

[page 56]

mín ("a Mercy to the Worlds") were found, not very appropriately from an impartial point of view, to give the date 909 (A.D. 1503-4) of this event; while the equivalent chronogram *Shaltáq-i-Sipáhi* ("Military Coercion") was observed by the poets and wits of Fárs to commemorate in like manner the appointment by Sháh Isma'íl of his captain Ilyás Beg Dhu'l-Qadar as governor of Shíráz. Káshán, always a stronghold of the Shí'a¹¹⁰, received Isma'íl with enthusiasm, and he held a great reception at the beautiful suburb of Fín. Thence he passed to the holy city of Qum, intending, apparently, to winter there, but hearing that Ilyás Beg, one of his most trusted officers, "a Súfí of pure disposition and right belief¹¹¹," had been murdered by Ḥusayn Kiyá-yi-Chaláwí, he marched out on February 25, 1504, to avenge him. Three weeks later he was at Astarábád, where he was met by Muḥammad Muḥsin Mírzá, the son of the Timúrid Sultán Ḥusayn Mírzá, and, having attacked and destroyed the fortresses of Gulkhandán and Fírúzkúh, he reduced the stronghold of Ustá by cutting off the water-supply, massacred the garrison (ten thousand souls, according to the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh*), and took captive the wretched Ḥusayn Kiyá, whom he confined in an iron cage, but who succeeded in inflicting on himself a wound which in a few days proved mortal¹¹². Still more unfortunate was Ra'ís Muḥammad Karra of Abarqúh, who rebelled and took possession of the ancient city of Yazd. Him also Sháh Isma'íl confined in a cage, and smeared his body with honey so that the wasps tormented him until he was finally burned alive in the *maydán* of Iṣfahán.

[page 57]

About the same time an embassy came from the Ottoman Sultán Báyzid II (A.D. 1481-1512) to offer "suitable gifts and presents" and congratulations on Sháh Isma'íl's conquest of 'Iráq and Fárs. They were dismissed with robes of honour and assurances of Isma'íl's friendly sentiments, but were compelled to witness several executions, including, perhaps, that of the philosopher and judge Mír Ḥusayn-i-Maybudí¹¹³, whose chief offence seems to have been that he was a "fanatical Sunni." Persian kings were disposed to take this means of impressing foreign envoys with their "justice"; Clavijo relates a similar procedure on the part of Timúr¹¹⁴, and Sháh Isma'íl's son and successor Ṭahmásp sought to impress and intimidate Humáyún's ambassador Bayrák Beg by putting to death in his presence a number of heretics¹¹⁵. To the Turkish envoys it would naturally be particularly disagreeable to witness the execution of a learned Sunní doctor by those whom they regarded as detestable schismatics.

Of the increasingly strained relations between Turkey and Persia, culminating in the Battle of Cháldirán (August, 1514), we shall have to speak very shortly, but we must first conclude our brief survey of Sháh Isma'íl's career of conquest. To describe in detail his incessant military activities would be impossible in a work of the scope and character of this book, and only the barest summary is possible.

During the years A.H. 911-915 (A.D. 1506-1510) Sháh Isma'íl was for the most part busy in the West. He first entered Hamadán and visited the tomb of the Imám-záda Sahl 'Alí. A serious revolt

[page 58]

of the "Yazidi" Kurds¹¹⁶ next demanded his attention. Their leader, Shír Šárim, was defeated and captured in a bloody battle wherein several important officers of Sháh Isma'íl lost their lives. To their relatives the Kurdish prisoners were surrendered to be put to death "with torments worse than which there may not be." War was next waged against the conjoined forces of

¹⁰⁸ According to contemporary European accounts he was put to death in cold blood by Isma'íl. See p. 62 *infra*.

¹⁰⁹ Add. 200 of the Cambridge University Library, f. 55.

¹¹⁰ See the *Ráḥatu'ş-Şudúr*, ed. Muḥammad Iqbál ("E. J. W. Gibb Memorial," New Series, vol. ii, 1921), p. 30.

¹¹¹ *آن صوفی صافی نهاد پاک اعتقاد*

¹¹² According to Add. 200 of the Cambridge University Library (f. 61) the body was conveyed to Iṣfahán and there blown to pieces in the *maydán* with gunpowder.

¹¹³ His commentary on the *Hidáya* is still the favourite text-book for beginners in philosophy. See also Brockelmann's *Gesch. d. Arab. Litt.*, vol. ii, p. 210, and Rieu, *B.M.P.C.*, p. 1077.

¹¹⁴ *Embassy to the Court of Timour, A.D. 1403-6*, published by the Hakluyt Society, 1859, pp. 149-150.

¹¹⁵ W. Erskine's *History of India*, etc. (London, 1854), vol. ii, p. 281.

¹¹⁶ "All the Kurds," says the anonymous Italian merchant (p. 157), "are truer Mahometans than the other inhabitants of Persia, since the Persians have embraced the Suffavean doctrine, while the Kurds would not be converted to it: and though they wear the red caftans, yet in their hearts they bear a deadly hatred to them."

Sultán Murád, the thirteenth¹¹⁷ and last of the “White Sheep” dynasty, and ‘Alá’u’d-Dawla Dhu’l-Qadar (the “Aliduli” of the Italian travellers of this period), who, refusing Isma‘il’s proposal that he should “set his tongue in motion with the goodly word ‘*Ali is the Friend of God*, and curse the enemies of the Faith” (to wit, the first three Caliphs), appealed for help to the Ottoman Turks. Sháh Isma‘il, however, was not to be denied, and successively captured Diyár Bakr, Akhlát, Bitlís, Arjish, and finally in 914/1508 Baghdád itself, whereby he obtained possession of the Holy Shrines of Karbalá and Najaf, so dear to Shí‘a hearts, where he hastened to offer prayers and thanksgivings. At Hūwayza he showed that, ardent Shí‘a as he was, he would not tolerate the exaggerated veneration of ‘Alí characteristic of the *Ghulát*, represented there by certain Arabs called *Musha‘shi*, who venerated ‘Alí as God, and, invoking his name, would cast themselves on sharp swords without

[page 59]

sustaining injury, after the fashion of the modern *‘Isáwiyya* of North Africa. Their leader, Mír Sultán Muḥsin, died about this time, and was succeeded by his son Sultan Fayyád, who claimed for himself divine honours¹¹⁸. Sháh Isma‘il ruthlessly suppressed these heretics, and proceeded to Dizful and Shúshtar, receiving the submission of the Lur chieftain Sháh Rustam, who won his favour by “the utterance of prayer and praise in the Lurí tongue with extreme sweetness.” Thence Sháh Isma‘il made his way eastwards to Fárs, encamped for a while at Dárábjird, and organised a great hunting expedition, of which the special object was a kind of mountain goat which yields the “animal antidote” (*pádzahr-i-ḥaywání*)¹¹⁹. He also put to death the Qádí Muḥammad-i-Káshí, who held the high ecclesiastical office of *Ṣadr*, and replaced him by the Sayyid-i-Sharíf of Astarábád, who was descended on his mother’s side from the celebrated Jurjání. He further erected at Qaşr-i-Zar a mausoleum in memory of his brother Sultán Aḥmad Mírzá, who had died there, and, under the title of *Najm-i-Thání* (“the Second Star”), appointed Amír Yár Aḥmad-i-Khúzání of Işfahán to succeed “the First Star,” Amír Najmu’d-Dín Mas‘úd of Rasht, who had recently died and been buried at Najaf. The poet Ummídí celebrated this appointment in a very ingenious and sonorous *qaşida* beginning:

زهی جوهرت گوهر آسمانی توئی عقلِ اولِ توئی نجمِ ثانی
رواقِ حرمر را تو رکنِ عراقی عراقِ عجم را سبیلِ یمانی

[page 60]

From Fárs Sháh Isma‘il marched into Shírwán (where Shaykh Sháh, the son of Farrukh-Yasár, had re-established himself), recovered the body of his father Shaykh Ḥaydar and conveyed it to Ardabil for burial, as already related, and took Darband.

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

[page 61]

llo¹²¹ speaks of “his beauty and pleasing manners” when he was a child, and relates¹²² how, in his campaign against ‘Alá’u’d-Dawla (“Alidoli”), “he supplied himself with provisions, paying for everything, and proclaiming abroad that

¹¹⁷ They are thus enumerated in the *Aḥsanu’-t-Tawárikh* (f. 109^b of Mr. Ellis’s MS.): (1) Qará ‘Uthmán; (2) ‘Alí Beg; (3) Sultán Ḥamza; (4) Jahángír Mírzá (these four ruled over Diyár Bakr only); (5) Úzún Ḥasan; (6) Khalíl; (7) Ya‘qúb; (8) Báysunghur; (9) Rustam; (10) Aḥmad Beg; (11) Muḥammadí Mírzá; (12) Alwand Mírzá; (13) Sultán Murád.

¹¹⁸ Add. 200, Camb. Univ. Lib., f. 83^a.

و آن کافر مردود دعوی الوهیت کرده قوم مشعشع حلالا بالوهیت
قیاض... قایل اند

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

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

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

¹²² *Ibid.*, pp. 109 and 196, and p. 23 *supra*.

everyone might bring supplies to the camp for sale, and that anyone taking anything without paying for it would be put to death.” “This Sophi,” he says a little further on¹²³, “is fair, handsome, and very pleasing; not very tall, but of a light and well-framed figure; rather stout than slight, with broad shoulders. His hair is reddish; he only wears moustachios, and uses his left hand instead of his right. He is as brave as a game-cock, and stronger than any of his lords; in the archery contests, out of the ten apples that are knocked down, he knocks down seven; while he is at his sport they play on various instruments and sing his praises.” “He is almost worshipped,” he remarks in another place¹²⁴, “more especially by his soldiers, many of whom fight without armour, being willing to die for their master. While I was in Tauris [Tabriz] I heard that the king is displeased with this adoration, and being called God!” The anonymous merchant describes him¹²⁵ at the age of thirty-one as “Very handsome, of a magnanimous countenance, and about middle height; he is fair, stout, and with broad shoulders, his beard is shaved and he only wears a moustache, not appearing to be a very heavy man. He is as amiable as a girl, left-handed by nature, is as lively as a fawn, and stronger than any of his lords. In the archery trials at the apple he is so expert that of every ten he hits six.” The same writer, on the other hand, after describing his massacre of Alwand’s soldiers, of the male and female kinsmen of Sulṭān Ya‘qúb, of three

[page 62]

hundred courtezans of Tabriz, of “eight hundred avaricious Blasi¹²⁶” who had been brought up under Alumut [*i.e.* Alwand], of “all the dogs in Tauris,” and of his own mother [or step-mother], concludes, “From the time of Nero to the present, I doubt whether so bloodthirsty a tyrant has ever existed.” He presented, in short, the strangest blend of antithetical qualities; and we are alternately attracted by his personal charm, his unquestionable valour, generosity and — within certain limits — justice, and repelled by actions, such as those recorded above, revealing a savagery remarkable even in that cruel and bloodthirsty age. His courage was shown not only on the field of battle but in the chase. Hearing after his conquest and occupation of Baghdád of a singularly fierce man-eating lion which had its lair in a thicket and terrified the inhabitants of the neighbourhood, he insisted, in spite of all remonstrances, in destroying it single-handed with the bow he knew so well how to use¹²⁷. At the age of thirteen he had already slain a fierce bear in like manner in a cave near Arzinján¹²⁸. When “immense treasures” fell into his hands on the capture of one of the Caspian ports, “he divided them amongst his men, keeping nothing for himself¹²⁹.” Yet the same traveller who reports this instance of generosity and political foresight (for in consequence of it “he was joined by numbers, even those who were not Suffaveans flocking to his standard in hopes of receiving gifts of this nature from the valiant Ismael”) describes how the Sháh with his own hand cut off the head of the unfortunate young prince “Alumut¹³⁰,” captured by treachery, whom he himself had seen bound in chains in a tent; and tells of even darker deeds wrought at Tabriz on the occasion of the Sháh’s

[page 63]

second entry into that city in A.D. 1520¹³¹. Towards the Sunnis he showed himself ruthless, sparing neither eminent divines like the learned Faridu’d-Dín Aḥmad, a grandson of the celebrated scholar Sa‘du’d-Dín-i-Taftázání, who for thirty years had held the office of Shaykhu’l-Islám in Herát¹³², nor witty poets like Banná’i, who perished in the massacre of Qarshí in 918/1512. But perhaps the most conspicuous instance of a ferocity which pursued his foes even after their death was his treatment of the body of his old enemy Muḥammad Khán Shaybání, or Shaybak, the Uzbek, of which we shall have to speak very shortly.

It has already been stated that the foreign relations of Sháh Isma‘íl, after he had cleared Persia of the “White Sheep” and other rivals for the sceptre of that ancient kingdom, were chiefly with three Powers, the Timúrids, who still kept a precarious hold on Herát and portions of Khurásán and Central Asia; the formidable Uzbeks of Transoxiana; and the Ottoman Turks. With the last two, rigid Sunnis in both cases, the relations of Persia were, and continued to be, uniformly hostile; with the Timúrids, themselves menaced by the Uzbeks, comparatively friendly and at times even cordial. The aged Sulṭān Ḥusayn ibn Bayqará, whose brilliant and luxurious court at Herát was so famous a centre of literature and art¹³³, is reckoned amongst the rulers who, with less success than Sháh Isma‘íl, endeavoured to replace the Sunni by the Shí‘a doctrine in their dominions¹³⁴; and Bábur, whether

¹²³ *Ibid.*, p. 111. See pp. 22-3 *supra*.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 202. Part of this passage has been already quoted on p. 23 *supra*.

¹²⁶ I am at a loss to explain this word.

¹²⁷ *Aḥsanu’-t-Tawárikh* (Ellis MS.), f. 74^b.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, f. 26.

¹²⁹ *Travels of a Merchant*, p. 188.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 197-8. The *Habibu’s-Siyar* and other Persian histories, however, represent Alwand as dying a natural death. Cf. p. 55 *supra*.

¹³¹ *Travels of a Merchant*, p. 207.

¹³² He was put to death in Ramaḍán, 916/December, 1510.

¹³³ See Dr. F. R. Martin’s *Miniature Paintings and Painters of Persia etc.*, pp. 35-6.

¹³⁴ See *Lit. Hist. Pers.* iii, p. 456, and Add. 200 of the Cambridge University Library, f. 45^b, which places this attempt in the year 873/1468-9.

[page 64]

from conviction or policy, showed enough partiality towards the Shí'a faction to cause grave disaffection amongst his Central Asian Sunní subjects¹³⁵. There existed, then, in this case no such essential cause of enmity as in the two others, while a common hatred of Shaybání Khán and his redoubtable Uzbeks naturally tended to unite Bábur to Isma'íl.

It is beyond the scope of this work to enter into a detailed account of the decline of the Tímúrid and the rise of the Uzbek power, of which ample particulars may be found in Erskine's and other works¹³⁶. Suffice it to say that Shaybání or Shaybak Khán, a direct descendant of Chingíz Khán¹³⁷, first became prominent about A.D. 1500, when he captured Samarqand and Bukhára, and later Táshkand and Farghána. He invaded Khurásán in 911/1505-6, in the year of Sulţán Husayn's death, and in the course of the next year or two practically exterminated the Tímúrids, with the exception of Bábur and Badí'u'z-Zamán, of whom the latter sought refuge with Sháh Isma'íl. It was not until 916/1510-11, however, that he came into direct conflict with Sháh Isma'íl, whom he had provoked by a raid on Kirmán in the previous year and a most insulting letter in reply to Isma'íl's politely-worded remonstrance¹³⁸. Sháh Isma'íl was not slow to respond to his taunts, and,

[page 65]

the rest of his realms being for the moment tranquil, at once marched into Khurásán to meet him, visiting on his way the Shrine of the Imám 'Alí Ridá at Mashhad, so sacred in Shí'a eyes. The decisive battle was fought on Dec. 1 or 2, 1510, at Táhír-ábád near Merv, where, after a stubborn and protracted conflict, the Uzbeks were utterly defeated and Shaybání killed. When his body was found under a heap of slain, Sháh Isma'íl ordered the limbs to be cut off and distributed to different parts of his kingdom, and the head to be stuffed with straw and sent as a grim gift to the Ottoman Sulţán Báyzíz II at Constantinople¹³⁹. The bones of the skull he caused to be mounted in gold and made into a drinking-cup for his own use, and one hand he sent to Áqá Rustam Rúz-afzún, the ruler of Mázandarán, by a special messenger, Darwísh Muḥammad Yasá'úl, who cast the hand on to Rustam's skirt as he sat amidst his courtiers at Sári, crying "Thou didst say, 'My hand on Shaybak Khán's skirt' (*dast-i-man-ast u dáman-i-Shaybak Khán*)¹⁴⁰: lo, his hand is now on thy skirt!" So astounded were those present by this audacity that none lifted a hand to stay the messenger's departure, and Rustam received so great a shock that he soon afterwards sickened and died. Of the drinking-cup the following grim anecdote is told. One of Shaybání's trusted advisers, Khwája Kamálu'd-Dín Ságharchí, saved his life by professing the Shí'a faith, and was admitted into the service of Sháh Isma'íl. One day at a banquet the latter, pointing to the drinking-cup, asked him if he recognized the skull of his late master. "Yes, glory be to God," replied Kamálu'd-Dín; "and how favoured by fortune was

[page 66]

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

سبحان الله چه صاحب دولتی بوده که هنوز دولت درو باقیست
که با این حال بر روی دست چون تو صاحب اقبالیست که
در بدر باده نشاط می نوشد

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

¹³⁵ See W. Erskine's *History of India*, vol. i (London, 1854), pp. 319-320.

¹³⁶ For example, the *History of the Moghuls of Central Asia etc.*, by N. Elias and Sir E. Denison Ross (London, 1898), and, of course, the incomparable *Memoirs of Bábur*, in the tasteful new edition of Erskine and Leyden's translation annotated and revised by Sir Lucas King (Oxford, 1921).

¹³⁷ The *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh* (f. 88^b) gives his pedigree thus: Shaybak Khán b. Búdáq Sulţán b. Abu'l-Khayr Khán b. Dawlat Shaykh b. Ílti-Oghlan b. Fúlád-Oghlan b. Aybu Khwája b. ... b. Bulgháy b. Shaybán b. Jújí b. Chingíz Khán.

¹³⁸ See Erskine's *History of India*, vol. i, pp. 297 *et seqq.* The text of this long letter is given in the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh* (Ellis MS., ff. 80^b *et seqq.*).

¹³⁹ According to the history of Sháh Isma'íl contained in Add. 200 of the Cambridge University Library (f. 141), Prince (afterwards Sulţán) Salím was greatly offended at this, and had a violent quarrel with his father Báyzíz on the subject.

¹⁴⁰ *I.e.* "I seek protection from him."

We must now turn to the far more important relations of Persia with the Ottoman Turks at this period, on which more light is thrown by the State Papers so industriously compiled and edited by Firidún Bey in 982/1574 under the title of *Munsha'át-i-Salátin* ("Correspondence of the Kings")¹⁴¹ than by

[page 67]

most of the Persian or Turkish historians. These letters, which passed between successive Ottoman Sultáns and neighbouring rulers, as well as between them and their sons, ministers and governors, are sometimes in Turkish and sometimes in Persian or Arabic. Unfortunately many of them are undated. They have hitherto been so little used that no apology is needed for summarizing the contents or indicating the purport of such of them as concern the Şafawís down to the death of Sháh Isma'íl in 930/1523-4, that is, during the reigns of the Ottoman Sultáns Báyazid II (886-918/1481-1512), Salím I (918-926/1512-1520), and the first four years of Sulaymán "the Magnificent" (926-930/1520-1524).

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

(2) *Sultán Báyazid's answer to the above, also in Persian and undated* (p. 311). Congratulations are offered to Ya'qúb on the victory of "the Báyandari¹⁴² hosts of salvation" over the "misguided Haydarí faction" (*gurúh-i-dálá-i-Haydariyya*).

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

[page 68]

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

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

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

(7) *From Alwand, the Áq-Qoyúnlu ruler of Persia, to Sultán Báyazid, in Persian, except the Arabic prologue, and undated* (pp. 351-2). Alwand announces the arrival of Báyazid's envoy Maḥmúd Áqá Cháwúsh-báshi with his master's letter, urging the Báyandari or Áq-Qoyúnlu family to unite against their common enemy, the "rascally Red-heads" (*Awbásh-i-Qizil-básh*). Alwand promises to do his best, whether his relations help him or not, provided he can count on material and moral support from Báyazid.

(8) *Báyazid's answer to the above, also in Persian and undated* (pp. 352-3). He commends Alwand's resolve, and promises help against the "rebellious horde of the Qizil-báshes" (*ta'ifa-i-bághiya-i-Qizil-báshiyya*).

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

[page 69]

(10) *Hájji Rustam's reply to the above, in Persian and undated* (pp. 353-4). The writer states that the "religion-rending Qizil-báshes" (*Qizil-básh-i-Madhab-kharásh*), having defeated Alwand and Murád of the Áq-Qoyúnlu family, are now seeking an alliance with Egypt against the Ottoman Turks, and are advancing on Mar'ash and Diyár Bakr.

(11) *From Sultán Báyazid to Sultán Ghúri of Egypt, in Arabic, dated 910/1504-5* (pp. 354-5). This letter contains an allusion to "the man who has appeared in the Eastern countries and defeated their ruler and overcome their peoples," which, as appears from the answer, refers to Sháh Isma'íl, or possibly Sháh-qulí.

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

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

¹⁴² Báyandari is an alternative name for the *Áq-Qoyúnlu*, or "White Sheep" dynasty.

These are the only letters in Sultán Báyazid's correspondence directly connected with the Şafawís, though there are others of interest to students of Persian history addressed to Sultán Abu'l-Gházi Ḥusayn (911/1506), the poet Jámí¹⁴³, the philosopher Jalálu'd-Dín Dawání, and the Shaykhu'l-Islám of Herát Farídu'd-Dín Aḥmad-i-Taftázání (913/1507), who was put to death by Sháh Isma'il three years later for refusing to subscribe to the Shí'a doctrine. Before we consider the State Papers of Sultán Salím's reign, something more must be said of the beginnings of that bitter strife between Turkey and Persia which is one of the most prominent features of the whole Şafawí period, and has done so much to undermine the unity and weaken the power of Islám. And here we cannot do better than quote the opening paragraph of

[page 70]

old Richard Knolles's¹⁴⁴ account of the formidable Shí'a revolt in Anatolia promoted by the celebrated Sháh-qulí ("King's servant"), called by the Turks Shaytán-qulí ("Devil's servant"), the son of Ḥasan Khalífa a disciple of Isma'il's father Shaykh Ḥaydar.

"After so many troubles," says Knolles, "*Bajazet* gave himself unto a quiet course of life, spending most part of his time in study of Philosophy and conference with learned men; unto which peaceable kind of life he was of his own natural disposition more enclined than to Wars; albeit that the regard of his State and the earnest desire of his Men of War drew him oftentimes even against his Will into the Field. As for the Civil Government of his Kingdom he referred it wholly to his three principal Bassaes, *Alis*, *Achmetes* and *Jachia*¹⁴⁵, who at their pleasure disposed of all things. After that he had in this quiet and pleasing kind of life to his great contentment passed over five years, of a little neglected Spark suddainly arose such a Fire in *Asia* as was hardly after with much blood of his People and danger of that part of his Empire quenched; the reliques whereof yet trouble those superstitious People at this day. Which thing was brought to pass by the crafty device of *Chasan Chelife* and *Schach Culi* his Boy (whom some call *Teckel Scachoculu* and others *Techellis*)¹⁴⁶, two Hypocritical Persians; who flying into those countries and with the counterfeit shew of feigned Holiness having procured to themselves a great name amongst those rude People, with a number of windy headed Followers (filled with the novelty of their new

[page 71]

Doctrine) raised first such a diversity of opinions about the true successors of their untrue Prophet, and afterwards such a Rebellion amongst the People, as that the one yet remaineth, and the other was not in a good while after without great bloodshed appeased."

There follows a lengthy account of this dangerous rebellion, in which the Turks suffered several severe reverses and lost many notable officers, including the Grand Vezír Khádím 'Alí Pasha, ere the rebels were dispersed, killed, or driven into Persia. Instead of rewarding or comforting the fugitives, however, Sháh Isma'il put many of them to death at Tabríz, because, as Knolles says¹⁴⁷, they had plundered a caravan of rich merchants; but, according to the most modern Turkish historian¹⁴⁸ in order to clear himself of complicity in the eyes of Báyazid. Knolles adds that "Techellis himself (*i.e.* Sháh-qulí), to the terror of others, was burnt alive"; but, according to the Turkish historian, he fell at the same time as 'Alí Pasha in the battle of Gyuk Cháy, between Síwás and Qayşariyya, in which statement the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh*¹⁴⁹ agrees. "Techellis thus put to flight," continues Knolles, "*Jonuses*¹⁵⁰ caused strait inquisition to be made through all the Cities of the lesser *Asia* for all such as had professed the Persian Religion; and them whom he found to have borne Arms in the late Rebellion he caused to be put to death with most exquisite torments and the rest to be burnt in their Foreheads with an hot Iron, thereby forever to be known; whom together with the Kinsfolks and Friends of them that were executed or

[page 72]

fled with *Techellis* he caused to be transported into *Europe* and to be dispersed through *Macedonia*, *Epirus* and *Peleponnesus*, for fear lest if *Techellis*, now fled into the *Persian* Kingdom, should from thence return with new Forces, they should also again repair unto him and raise a new Rebellion. This was the beginning, course, and ending of one of the most dangerous Rebellions that ever troubled the Turkish Empire; wherein all, or at leastwise the greatest part, of their Dominions in *Asia* might have been easily surprised by the *Persian* King, if he would thoroughly have prosecuted the occasion and opportunity then offered." These events are placed by Knolles in A.D. 1508, but by the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh* in 917/1511-12, the year before Báyazid's death.

¹⁴³ See *Lit. Hist. Pers.*, iii, pp. 422-3.

¹⁴⁴ I quote the sixth edition of his *Turkish History*, with Sir Paul Rycaut's continuation, published in London in 1687. The passage in question occurs on p. 315 of vol. i.

¹⁴⁵ *I.e.* 'Alí, Aḥmad and Yahyá Pashas.

¹⁴⁶ These names stand for Ḥasan Khalífa, Sháh-qulí, and Takallú or Tekellú, *i.e.* of the *Tekké-ili*.

¹⁴⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 324.

¹⁴⁸ 'Abdu'r-Raḥman Sheref's *History of the Ottoman Empire* (Constantinople, 2nd edition, 1315/1897-8), vol. i, pp. 196-7. Cf. von Hammer's *Gesch. d.Osmanisch. Reich.*, vol. ii, pp. 359-360 and 393-4.

¹⁴⁹ Ff. 90-91 of Mr. A. G. Ellis's MS.

¹⁵⁰ Yúnus Pasha, Grand Vezír to Sultán Selím, executed in 923/1517.

It is curious that little or nothing is said by the Persian historians about this massacre of the Shí'a in Turkey, which von Hammer describes as one of the most dreadful deeds ever perpetrated in the name of Religion, not excepting the cruelties of the Inquisition or the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. That most of the Turkish historians ignore it is less astonishing, since it can hardly be a matter of pride for them. Knolles appears to be mistaken in placing it in the reign of Báyazíd II, for there can hardly have been two such massacres, and one certainly took place in 1514 after the accession of Salím, as witnessed by Nicolo Giustiniani in an account dated October 7 of that year¹⁵¹. The number of victims is placed by Sa'du'd-Dín, Soláq-záda and 'Alí Abu'l-Faḍl, the son of Idrís of Bitlis, at 40,000. The particulars given by the last-named writer, quoted by von Hammer in the original Persian verse transliterated into the Roman character, are as follows¹⁵²:

[page 73]

فرستاد سلطان دانا رسوم' دبیران دانا بهر مروز و بوم'
 كه اتباع این قوم را قسر قسر' در آرد بنوك قلمر اسمر اسمر'
 ز هفت و ز هفتاد ساله بنام' بیآرد بدیوان عالی مقام'
 چو دفتر سپردند اهل حساب' عدد چهل هزار آمد از شیخ و شاب'
 پس آنکه بگمار هر کشوری' رساندند فرمانبران دفتری'
 بهر جا که رفته قدم از قلمر' نهاد تیغ بران قدم بر قدم'
 شد اعداد این کشته های دیار' فزون از حساب قلمر چهل هزار'

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

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

Turning now once more to the *Munsha'at* of Firídún Bey, we find the following letters belonging to the reign of Sulṭán Salím which bear on his relations with Persia.

(13) *From Sulṭán Salím to 'Ubayd Khán the Uzbek, in Persian, dated the end of Muḥarram, A.H. 920 (March 27, 1514), only five months before the Battle of Cháldirán* (pp. 374-7). In this long letter, sent by the hand of a certain Muḥammad Bey, Salím denounces “that vile, impure, sinful, slanderous, reprehensible and blood-thirsty

[page 74]

Şúfi-cub” (to wit Sháh Isma'íl), “at whose hands the people of the Eastern lands are rendered desperate”

که اهالی بلاد شرق از دست صوفی بچه' لئیر ناپاک ائیر ائک
 ذمیر سقاك بجان آمده اند

and calls upon 'Ubayd Khán to do his part in avenging the death of his father Shaybak Khán.

(14) *Answer to the above, also in Persian, dated the end of Jumáda ii, 920 (August 21, 1514), pp. 377-9*. In this letter 'Ubayd Khán describes how he has already avenged his father and slain “the lesser dog, agent and lieutenant of the greater dog (*i.e.* Sháh Isma'íl), who in his quintessential folly had conferred on him the title of *Najm-i-Tháni*¹⁵³,” and promises to aid

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

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 638.

¹⁵³ This victory of the Uzbeks over the allied forces of Sháh Isma'íl and Bábur took place on Ramaḍán 17, 918 (Nov. 26, 1512). Amír Najmu'd-Dín Mas'úd (“the First Najm” or “Star”) died in 915 (1509-1510) and was succeeded in his office and title by Amír Yár Aḥmad-i-Işfaháni, called *Najm-i-Tháni*, “the Second Najm” or “Star.”

the Turkish Sultán in extirpating the “inconsiderable remnant” (شردمه قديله) of the “rascally infidels and heretical ‘Red-heads’” (قزلباش زنادقه اوباش و ملاحده).

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

(16) *From Sultán Salím to Muḥammad Beg Áq-Qoyúnlu, in Persian, dated the end of Şafar, 920 (April 25, 1514)*, pp. 381-2, congratulating him on the sound Sunní principles of himself and his family and subjects, and inviting his co-operation against the “heretical ‘Red-heads’.”

[page 75]

(17) *Reply to the above, in Persian, dated the end of Rabí‘ ii, 920 (June 23, 1514)*, p. 382. From this it appears that Salím’s letter was brought by an envoy named Aḥmad Ján, who took back the answer, and that the writer was in great fear that the correspondence might be discovered.

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

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

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

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

Shortly after this last letter was written, namely early in the month of Rajab¹⁵⁴, 920 (August-September, 1514), a great battle was fought between the Turks and Persians at Cháldirán, situated some 20 parasangs from Tabríz, where 3000 of the former and 2000 of the latter were slain, but the Turkish artillery decided the day, and Sháh Isma‘il, notwithstanding the valour shown by him and his devoted followers, was forced

[page 76]

to give way and to fall back beyond Tabríz, which was occupied by the Turks on Rajab 16, 920 (Sept. 6, 1514). Many men of note on both sides were slain; of the Turks Ḥasan Pasha, Begler-begi of Rumelia, who commanded the left wing of the Ottoman army, Hasan Bey, Governor of Morea, Uways Bey of Caesarea, Ayás Bey of Latakia, and many other high civil and military officials; of the Persians Amír Sayyid-i-Sharíf of Shíráz, a protagonist of the Shí‘a doctrine, Amír ‘Abdu’l-Báqí, a descendant of the noted saint Sháh Ni‘matu’lláh of Kirmán, Sayyid Muḥammad Kamúna of Najaf, Khán Muḥammad Khán, and many others.

Sultán Salím, greatly elated by his success, immediately despatched the usual bombastic proclamations of victory (*fath-náma*) to his son Sulaymán, to the Khán of the Crimea, to the Kurdish chieftains, to Sultán Murád, the last of the *Áq-Qoyúnlu* or “White Sheep” dynasty, to Sháh Rustam of Luristán, to the Governor of Adrianople, and others. The texts of these documents are given by Firidún Bey (pp. 386-96), but they are followed (pp. 396-407) by a document of much greater historical value, namely a detailed journal of the movements of the Turkish army from the time they marched out of Adrianople on Muḥarram 3, 920 (March 20, 1514) until they returned to winter at Amásiya at the end of the same year (Nov.-Dec., 1514). They marched in 105 stages from Adrianople to Tabríz by way of Constantinople, Caesarea, Siwás, Arzinján, Cháldirán, Khúy and Marand; thence back to Amásiya in 58 stages, by way of Nakhjuwán, Jisr-i-Júbán, and Bayburt. They erected a pyramid of the skulls of their enemies on the field of battle, handed over to Ja‘far Bey one of Sháh Isma‘il’s wives who fell into their hands, and massacred Khálid Bey and 150 of his *Qizil-básh* companions at the village of Sáhílán the day before they entered Tabríz, in which city, however, they seem to have behaved with

[page 77]

moderation, as even the Persian historian of Sháh Isma‘il testifies¹⁵⁵. Sultán Salím remained there only about a week (Sept. 6-14, 1514), when he departed, taking with him the Tímúrid Prince Badí‘u’z-Zamán, the fugitive son of the late Sultán Abu’l-Gházi Ḥusayn ibn Bayqará¹⁵⁶, and a number of skilled artisans whom he proposed to settle in his dominions. Within two or

¹⁵⁴ On the first of the month (Aug. 22, 1514) according to Firidún Bey (p. 402).

¹⁵⁵ Add. 200 of the Cambridge University Library, f. 151.

¹⁵⁶ He died at Constantinople four months later of the plague.

three weeks of his departure Sháh Isma‘íl was back in Tabríz. According to Sir John Malcolm¹⁵⁷, “the effect of so great a reverse upon the sanguine mind of Isma‘íl was deep and lasting, and though before of a cheerful disposition he was never afterwards seen to smile.” But as a matter of fact the defeat, decisive as it was, had little permanent effect, since the discontent and nostalgia of the Janissaries compelled the Ottoman Sulţán to withdraw from Persian territory, and, save for the extirpation of the little Dhu‘l-Qadar dynasty¹⁵⁸ at Kamákh near Arzinján in the spring of A.D. 1515, his martial ardour was fully occupied, until his death in A.D. 1520, with the subjection of Egypt, Syria and Arabia.

Sháh Isma‘íl, on his return to Tabríz after the battle of Cháldirán, sent a very polite and apologetic letter¹⁵⁹ by the hand of Núru‘d-Dín ‘Abdu‘l-Wahháb to Sulţán Salím, who, apparently, vouchsafed no reply, but some months later (end of Rajab, 921 = Sept. 9. 1515) wrote in Turkish a long letter to ‘Ubayd Khán the Uzbek inciting him to persecute the Shí‘a¹⁶⁰.

[page 78]

The documents connected with Sulţán Salím’s reign fill another 84 pages of Firídún Bey’s compilation¹⁶¹, but, with one notable exception, contain only incidental abusive references to Sháh Isma‘íl. The exception is formed by two poems, one in Persian and the other in Turkish, addressed to Sulţán Salím by an unpatriotic Persian named Khwája Işfahání, probably identical with Khwája Mawláná-yi-Işfahání, a fanatical Sunní who attached himself to the Uzbek Shaybak Khán, and whose death is recorded in the *Aḥsanu‘t-Tawárikh* under the year 927/1521¹⁶².

The following verses from the Persian poem will suffice to give an idea of its character.

اِلا اِی قاصِدِ فرخنده منظرِ
نیازم بر سوی شاهِ مظفرِ
بگو ای پادشاهِ جمله عالمِ
توئی امروز در مردی مسدّمِ
اساسِ دین تو در دنیا نهادی
تو شرعِ مصطفی بر جا نهادی
مجدّد گشت دین از همّتِ تو
جهان در زیر بارِ مَنّتِ تو
اگر ملکِ شریعت مستقیم است
همه از دولتِ سلطانِ سلیم است
ز بیمت در تزلزلِ فارس و ترک
چو افکندی ز سر تاجِ قزل بُرک
فکندی تاجش از سر ای مظفرِ
فگن اکنون بمردی از تنش سر

[page 79]

¹⁵⁷ *History of Persia*, vol. i, p. 504. I can find no confirmation of this in the Persian histories which I have consulted.

¹⁵⁸ According to the *Aḥsanu‘t-Tawárikh* comprised only four rulers, Malik Aşlán, Sulaymán, Náşiru‘d-Din and ‘Alá‘u‘d-Dawla, of whom the last, together with four of his sons and thirty of his followers, was decapitated by Sulţán Salím’s soldiers on June 13, 1515.

¹⁵⁹ Firídún Bey, vol. i, pp. 413-414.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 415-416.

¹⁶¹ The last ends on p. 500.

¹⁶² From a line in his Turkish poem it appears that his home was in Khurásán and Khwárazm (Khiva), which he had been compelled to leave since “Infidelity had completely destroyed the Home of Faith, and established itself in the Seat of Religion.”

قزل بُرُکست همچون مار افعی
 سرش را تا نکوبی نیست نفعی
 توئی امروز ز اوصافِ شریفه
 خدایا و محمّدا خلیفه
 ۱۰ روا داری که گبر و ملحدِ دد
 دهد دشنامِ اصحابِ محمّد
 تو اورا نشکنی از زورِ مردی
 سرش را تا بُریده باز گروی
 اگر گیرد امانی در سلامت
 بگیرم دامنت را در قیامت
 چنین دیدم ز اخبارِ پیغمبر
 که ذو القرنین بُد در رومِ قیصر
 بدو القرنین از آن خود را علم کرد
 که ملکِ فارس را با رومِ ضم کرد
 ۱۰ دو قرنِ او شبی اندر جهان شد
 بشرق و غرب حکم او روان شد
 بها از نصرِ دین کسرِ صنم کن
 بتختِ رومِ ملکِ فارس ضم کن

“O messenger of auspicious aspect, carry my prayer to the victorious King.
 Say, ‘O King of all the World, thou art today accredited in valour.
 Thou didst lay the foundations of Religion in the World; thou didst restore
 the Holy Law of Muṣṭafā [Muḥammad].
 Religion hath been renovated by thy zeal, the World lies under the burden of
 thy favour.
 If the realm of the Holy Law is firmly established, it is all through the fortune
 of Sulṭān Salīm

[page 80]

Persia and Turkey quake through fear of thee, since thou hast cast from his
 head the crown of the Red-cap¹⁶³.
 O victorious one, thou hast cast his crown from his head: now manfully
 cast his head from his body!
 The Red-head is like the viper; until thou crushest his head it availeth
 nothing.
 Thou art today, through thy noble qualities, the Vicar (*Khalifa*) of God and
 of Muḥammad.
 Dost thou hold it right that the guebre¹⁶⁴ and brute-heretic should revile
 the Companions of the Prophet?¹⁶⁵
 If thou dost not break him by the strength of thy manhood, and if thou
 turnest back without having cut off his head,
 If he obtains amnesty in safety, I will seize thy skirt in the day of
 Resurrection.
 Thus have I seen in the accounts of the Prophet, that *Dhu'l-Qarnayn*
 (“the Two-horned”)¹⁶⁶ was Emperor in Rome.
 For this cause did he style himself *Dhu'l-Qarnayn*, because he added
 the dominion of Persia to that of Rome¹⁶⁷.

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

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

¹⁶⁵ This, of course, refers to the cursing of Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān instituted by Shāh Isma‘il. See pp. 53-4 *supra*.

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

¹⁶⁷ The term *Rūm* was applied successively to the Roman, the Byzantine and the Ottoman Empires, and by the Persian historians of this period the Ottoman Sulṭān is constantly called *Qayṣar-i-Rūm*.

His two horns were sovereignty throughout the World; his orders ran
through East and West.
Come, break the Idol by the aid of the Faith, and add the Kingdom of
Persia to the Throne of Rome¹⁶⁸!”

Sulṭān Salīm died in 926/1520, having reigned, according to the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh*, 8 years, 8 months and 8 days. He was succeeded by his son Sulaymán, called by his

[page 81]

countrymen “the Law-giver” (*Qánúni*) and by Europeans “the Magnificent.” The Persian poet Amíní composed a poem on his accession, of which each half-verse (*mišrá'*) yields the date 926. The following verse is cited as a specimen by the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh*:

بداده زمانِ ملكتِ كامرانی ' بكاوسِ عهد و سليمانِ ثانی'

“Fortune hath given the Kingdom of Desire to the Ká'ús of the Age, the Second Solomon.”

Three years later (in 929/1523), when Sulṭān Sulaymán conquered Rhodes, another Persian Poet, Niyází, commemorated this victory in an equally ingenious *qaṣída* beginning:

در اولِ جلوسی بوی سرفرازی ' دوم فتحِ اردوسِ الا ای نیازی'

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

Sháh Isma'íl died on Monday, Rajab 19, A.H. 930 (May 23, 1524) at the age of 38 after a reign of 24 years, and was buried with his fathers at Ardabíl. He left four sons, Tahmásp, born on Dhu'l-Hijja 26, A.H. 919 (Feb. 22, 1514), who succeeded him; Alqás, born in 922/1516, and Sám and Bahrá, both born in the following year; besides five daughters¹⁷⁰. In his reign the sword was more active than the pen. He not only eliminated all of his numerous rivals in Persia, but greatly enlarged her frontiers. “His kingdom,” says the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh*¹⁷¹,

[page 82]

“included Ádharbáyján, Persian 'Iráq, Khurásán, Fárs, Kirmán and Khúzistán, while Diyár Bakr, Balkh Merv were at times under his control. In the battle-field he was a lion wielding a dagger, and in the banquet-hall a cloud raining pearls. Such was his bounty that pure gold and worthless salt were alike in his sight, while by reason of his lofty spirit the produce of ocean and mine did not suffice for the donations of a single day, and his treasury was generally empty. He had a passion for the chase, and alone used to slay lions. He had issued orders that whoever should bring news of a lion should receive from his officers a horse and saddle; and he who should bring news of a leopard an unsaddled horse. He would go forth alone and kill lions and leopards. During his reign he fought five [great] battles, the first with Farrukh-Yasár king of Shírwan at the place called Jabání, the second with Alwand at Shurúr, the third with Sulṭān Murád at Alma Qúlághí near Hamadán, the fourth with Shaybak Khán in the neighbourhood of Merv, and the fifth with Sulṭān Salīm at Cháldirán¹⁷².” The date of his death (930) is given by the word *Zill*, “Shadow” (of God), and by the words *Khusraw-i-Dín*, “Prince of the Faith,” as expressed in the two following chronograms:

شاه گردون پناه اسمعیل ' آنکه چون مهر در نقاب شده
از جهان رفت و ظل شدش تاریخ ' سایه تاریخ آفتاب شده
رباعی
شاهی که چو خورشید جهان گشت مبین
بزدود غبارِ ظلم از روی زمین'

¹⁶⁸ The term *Rúm* was applied successively to the Roman, the Byzantine and the Ottoman Empires, and by the Persian historians of this period the Ottoman Sulṭān is constantly called *Qayṣar-i-Rúm*.

¹⁶⁹ *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh* (Mr. Ellis's MS., f. 128). The first *mišrá'* gives the correct date (926), but the second, as written in the MS. (with *دوم*), gives 940. I have emended this to *دوم*, which gives 930, though this is still one too much.

¹⁷⁰ Khánish Khánum, Parí-Khán Khánum, Mihínbánú Sulṭánú, Firangís Khánú and Zaynab Khánú.

¹⁷¹ F. 131.

¹⁷² These battles were fought in 906/1500, 907/1501, 908/1503, 916/1510, and 920/1514 respectively. In all except the last Sháh Isma'íl was victorious.

تاریخ وفات آن شه شیر کمین
از خسرو دین طلب که شد خسرو دین

As regards literature, there was, as elsewhere explained, an extraordinary dearth of remarkable poets in Persia during the whole Şafawí period¹⁷³, while the great theologians belong to a later time when the Shí'a faith, raised by Sháh Isma'íl to the position of the established national religion of Persia, had taken firm root. Most of the celebrated writers whose deaths are recorded in the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh* and other chronicles of Isma'íl's reign really belong to the brilliant circle who gathered round the Tímúrid Sultán Abu'l-Gházi Ḥusayn and his talented Minister Mír 'Alí Shír Nawá'í. Such were the poets Hátifí, nephew of the great Jámí, who died in 927/1521; Amír Ḥusayn Mu'ammá'í (d. 904/1498-9); Banná'í, who perished in the massacre wrought by Isma'íl's general *Najm-i-Tháni*¹⁷⁴ at Qarshí in 918/1512; Hilálí, who was killed by the Uzbeks at Herát in 935/1528-9 for his alleged Shí'a proclivities; the philosopher Jalálu'd-Dín Dawání (d. 908/1502-3); the historian Mírkhwánd (d. 903/1497-8 at the age of 66); and the versatile Ḥusayn Wá'iz-i-Káshifí, commentator, ethicist and narrator, best known as the author of the *Anwár-i-Suḥayli*¹⁷⁵. The poet Qásimí celebrated the achievements of Sháh Isma'íl in a *Sháh-náma*, hitherto unpublished and but rarely met with even in manuscript¹⁷⁶, completed ten years after the death of that monarch, who appears to have been less susceptible than most Persian potentates to the flattery of courtiers and venal verse-makers¹⁷⁷.

CHAPTER III.
CULMINATION AND DECLINE OF THE ŞAFAWÍ
POWER, FROM SHÁH ṬAHMÁSP (A.D. 1524-1576) TO
SHÁH ḤUSAYN (A.D. 1694-1722).

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

طهماسب شاه عالم کز نصرتِ الهی
جا بعد شاه غازی بر تختِ زر گرفت
جای پدر گرفتنی کردی جهان مستخر
تاریخ سلطنت شد جای پدر گرفتنی¹⁷⁸

"O Ṭahmásp, King of the World, who, by the Divine Assistance,
didst take thy place on the throne of gold after the Victorious King!

Thou didst take the place of thy father; thou didst subdue the world:
'Thou didst take the place of thy father' (*já-yi-pidar girifti*)¹⁷⁸
was the date of thine accession."

Of the numerous records of his long reign two, on which in what follows I shall chiefly draw, are worthy of special note; his own autobiography¹⁷⁹ from his accession on Monday, Rajab 19, 930 (May 23, 1524), to his shameful surrender of the Turkish Prince

Báyazíd, who had sought refuge at his court, in 969/1561-2; and the excellent *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh* of Ḥasan Beg Rúmlú, concluded in 985/1577-8 only a year after Ṭahmásp's death. The autobiography, possibly suggested by Bábur's incomparable Memoirs, is far inferior to that most instructive and amusing work, and is not greatly superior to the over-estimated Diaries of

¹⁷³ See pp. 24-29 *supra*.

¹⁷⁴ See p. 74 *ad calc.*

¹⁷⁵ Accounts of the more notable of these writers will be found in the preceding volume of this history, *Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion*.

¹⁷⁶ See Rieu's *Persian Catalogue*, pp. 660-661.

¹⁷⁷ See p. 28 *supra*.

¹⁷⁸ 3 + 1 + 10 + 2 + 4 + 200 + 20 + 200 + 80 + 400 + 10 = 930 A.H. = 1523-4 A.D.

¹⁷⁹ Printed by the late Dr. Paul Horn in vol. xlv of the *Z.D.M.G.* (for 1890), pp. 563-649; and lithographed in vol. ii of the *Maṭla'u'sh-Shams* of Muḥammad Ḥasan Khán *I'timádu's-Saḥāna*, pp. 165-213.

the late Nāşiru'd-Dīn Shāh; but it throws some valuable light on the mentality of Ṭahmāsp, and on those inner conditions which it is so difficult to deduce from the arid pages of the official chronicles, containing for the most part a mere record of interminable wars and massacres, and leaving us quite in the dark as to the social and intellectual state of the people. That Ṭahmāsp was a bigot is indicated both by Sir John Malcolm¹⁸⁰ and Erskine¹⁸¹, though the former historian takes the more favourable view of his character, describing him as “of a kind and generous disposition,” and adding that he “appears to have possessed prudence and spirit, and, if he was not distinguished by great qualities, he was free from any remarkable vices.” Anthony Jenkinson, who carried a letter of recommendation from Queen Elizabeth¹⁸², had a not very gratifying audience with him at Qazwīn in November, 1562¹⁸³. The Venetian Ambassador Vincentio d’Alessandri, who was accredited to his Court in 1571, describes him¹⁸⁴, “in the sixty-fourth year of his age, and the fifty-first of his reign,” as “of middling stature, well formed in

[page 86]

person and features, although dark, of thick lips and a grizzly beard,” and says that he was “more of a melancholy disposition than anything else, which is also known by many signs, but principally by his not having come out of his palace for the space of eleven years, nor having once gone to the chase nor any other kind of amusement, to the great dissatisfaction of his people.” He further describes him as boastful, but unwarlike and “a man of very little courage”; as caring little for law and justice, but much for women and money; as mean and avaricious, “buying and selling with the cunning of a small merchant.” “Notwithstanding the things mentioned above,” he concludes, “which make one think he ought to be hated, the reverence and love of the people for the King are incredible, as they worship him not as a king but as a god, on account of his descent from the line of ‘Alī, the great object of their veneration,” and he cites the most extraordinary instances of this devotion and even deification, which is not confined to the common people but extends to members of the Royal Family and courtiers, and to the inhabitants of the remotest parts of his realms. One magnanimous act of the king’s reign, which led to a great alleviation of the burden of taxation imposed on his people, the Venetian Ambassador ascribes to the influence of a dream, “in which the Angels took him by the throat and asked him whether it was becoming to a king, surnamed the Just and descended from ‘Alī, to get such immense profits by the ruin of so many poor people; and then ordered him to free the people from them.” This story is likely enough, for Ṭahmāsp in his Memoirs records numerous dreams to which he evidently attached great importance. Thus in a dream ‘Alī promises him victory over the Uzbeks about A.D. 1528¹⁸⁵, and a year or two later at Herāt advises

[page 87]

him as to another campaign¹⁸⁶, whereon he remarks, “the belief of this weak servant Ṭahmāsp aş-Şafawī al-Mūsawī al-Ḥusaynī¹⁸⁷ is that whoever sees His Holiness the Commander of the Faithful (*i.e.* ‘Alī), on whom be the blessings of God, in a dream, that which he says will come to pass.” Again in his twentieth year two consecutive dreams, in the second of which he sought and obtained from the Imām ‘Alī Ridā confirmation of the first, led him to repent of wine-drinking and other excesses, and to close all the taverns and houses of ill-repute in his domains, on which occasion he composed the following quatrain¹⁸⁸:

یکچند بی زمرد سوده شدیم یکچند بیاقوت تر آلوده شدیم
 آلودگی بود بهر رنگ که بود شستیم بآب توبه آسوده شدیم

“For a while we pursued the crushed emerald¹⁸⁹;
 For a while we were defiled by the liquid ruby¹⁹⁰;
 Defilement it was, under whatever colour:
 We washed in the Water of Repentance, and were at peace.”

This “repentance” or conversion of Shāh Ṭahmāsp is recorded in the *Aḥsanu't-Tawārikh* under the year 939/1532-3.

¹⁸⁰ *History of Persia*, vol. i, pp. 511-513.

¹⁸¹ *A History of India under ... Baber and Humāyūn* (London, 1854), vol. ii, pp. 285 *etc.*

¹⁸² For the text of this curious letter, see the Hakluyt Society’s *Early Voyages and Travels to Russia and Persia* (No. lxxii, London. 1886), pp. 112-114.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, pp. 144-147.

¹⁸⁴ *Travels of Venetians in Persia* (Hakluyt Society, 1873), pp. 215 *et seqq.*

¹⁸⁵ P. 584 of Horn’s *Denkwürdigkeiten* cited above p. 84, n. 2.

¹⁸⁶ Horn, *loc. cit.*, p. 592.

¹⁸⁷ These three epithets refer to his ancestors Shaykh Şafīyyu’d-Dīn, the Imām Mūsá al-Kázim and the Imām Ḥusayn.

¹⁸⁸ Horn, *loc. cit.*, p. 600, also cited in the *Atash-kada* (Bombay lith., 1277/1860-1, p. 17).

¹⁸⁹ *I.e.* *Bang* or *Hashish* (Cannabis Indica), as explicitly stated in the *Atash-kada*.

¹⁹⁰ *I.e.* wine.

About the same time the army of the Ottoman Sultán Sulaymán, profiting as usual by Persia's preoccupation with one of the constantly recurring Uzbek invasions of her north-eastern province, marched into Ádharbáyján, where it was overtaken by a premature but violent snow-storm (it was in the month of

[page 88]

October), in which numbers of the Turkish troops perished. This disaster to the arms of his hereditary foe Sháh Ṭahmásp¹⁹¹ ascribes to "the help of God and the aid of the Immaculate Imáms." It has been commemorated in the following forcible quatrain, given in the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh* and the *Ta'rikh-i-'Álam-árá-yi-'Abbásí*:

رفتم سوی سلطانیّه آن طرفه چمن
دیدم دو هزار مرده بی گور و کفن
گفتم که بگشت این همه عثمانی را
بادِ سحر از میانه بر خاست که من

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

Other dreams are meticulously recorded by Sháh Ṭahmásp in his Memoirs: at Ardabíl he sees and converses with the vision of his ancestor Shaykh Şafíyyu'd-Dín¹⁹², on another occasion he receives encouragement from the spirit of Shaykh Shihábu'd-Dín¹⁹³; other allegorical dreams are recorded under the years 957/1550 and 961/1554¹⁹⁴.

In his domestic relations Sháh Ṭahmásp was unhappy, though not perhaps more so than most contemporary Asiatic sovereigns, notably the Ottoman Sultáns. He had three younger brothers, Sám (notable as a poet and biographer of poets)¹⁹⁵, Bahrám and

[page 89]

Alqás, of whom the first and third rebelled against him. Sám Mírzá was cast into prison in 969/1561-2 and was ultimately put to death there in 984/1576-7 by Ṭahmásp's successor. The case of Alqás was much worse, for he was a traitor as well as a rebel, and not only took refuge with Sultán Sulaymán at Constantinople, but incited him to attack Persia and took an active part in the ensuing war against his own country. At Hamadán, in 955/1548, he plundered the house of his sister-in-law, the wife of Bahrám Mírzá, and later advanced as far as Yazdikhwást, where he made a massacre of the inhabitants, but in the following year he was defeated and fell into the hands of his brother Bahrám, who handed him over to Ṭahmásp. The King imprisoned him in the Castle of Alamút, according to his own Memoirs¹⁹⁶, or, according to the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh*, in the Castle of Qahqaha, where he perished a week later. "In short," says Ṭahmásp in recording the event, "after some days I saw that he did not feel safe from me, but was constantly preoccupied, so I despatched him to a fortress with Ibráhím Khán and Ḥasan Beg the centurion, who took him to the Castle of Alamút and there imprisoned him. After six days, those who had custody of him being off their guard, two or three persons there, in order to avenge their father whom Alqás had killed, cast him down from the castle. After his death the land had peace." It can scarcely be doubted that Ṭahmásp approved, if he did not actually arrange, this deed of violence. Bahrám Mírzá died the same year at the age of 33.

Much worse was the case of the unfortunate Prince Báyzid, son of the Ottoman Sultán Sulaymán, who, deprived of his government of Kútáhiya and driven from his native land by the intrigues of his father's Russian wife Khurram¹⁹⁷ (whose

[page 90]

one object was to secure the succession of her son Salím, afterwards known as "the Sot") took refuge at Ṭahmásp's court in 967/1559-60. An Ottoman mission headed by 'Alí Páshá was sent to Qazwín to demand the surrender of Báyzid and his children. They arrived there, as we learn from Anthony Jenkinson's narrative¹⁹⁸, four days earlier than himself, to wit on

¹⁹¹ Horn, *loc. cit.*, p. 602. See also the Turkish journal of this campaign given by Fíridún Bey (vol. i, pp. 588-9), where mention of this severe cold is made. Sultániyya was reached by the Turkish army on 5 Rabí' ii, 941 (October 14, 1534).

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 607.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 623.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 635-6.

¹⁹⁵ He was the author of a valuable but unpublished Biography of contemporary poets entitled *Tuḥfa-i-Sámi*.

¹⁹⁶ Horn, *loc. cit.*, p. 631.

¹⁹⁷ See Gibb's *History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. iii, pp. 10-11.

¹⁹⁸ *Early Voyages, etc.* (Hakluyt Society, 1886, vol. i), p. 141 and footnote, in which the substance of Knolles's contemporary account is given. See also Creasy's *History of the Ottoman Turks* (London, 1877), pp. 186-7.

October 30, 1562, and Ṭahmásp, moved partly by fear of the Turkish power, partly by bribes, disregarded his solemn promises to the contrary and caused or suffered the unfortunate Prince and his four little sons to be put to death, and, as Anthony Jenkinson says, “sent his head for a present, not a little desired, and acceptable to the unnatural father.” Ṭahmásp seems to have overcome any scruples he may have felt in breaking his solemn promises to the guest he thus betrayed by handing him over not directly to his father, but to the emissaries of his brother Salím. The case is bad enough even as stated by the Sháh himself in his Memoirs, which conclude with a pretty full account of this episode¹⁹⁹, ending thus:

“At this date ‘Alí Áqá came from his Majesty the Sultán²⁰⁰, and of [my] Nobles and Court everyone who had sent a present received its equivalent, save in the case of my own gift and offering, which on this occasion also had not proved acceptable; and there was a letter full of hints and complaints. I said, ‘Here have I arrested and detained Prince Báyazíd with his four sons for the sake of His Majesty the Sultán and Prince Salím; but since I have given my word not to

[page 91]

surrender Báyazíd to the Sultán, I have determined that when the Sultán’s commands arrive and likewise the emissaries of Prince Salím, I will surrender [Báyazíd] to the latter, so that I may not break my promise.’ So when the Sultán’s messengers arrived, I said, ‘Your Excellency and Ḥasan Áqá are welcome, and I will act according to the commands of His Majesty and in no wise transgress his orders, but faithfully accomplish whatever service he may indicate. But in return for so material a service I desire from His Majesty the Sultán and Prince Salím such reward and recompense as may be worthy of them; and, moreover, I hope of the Sultán in a friendly way that no hurt may befall Prince Báyazíd and his sons.’”

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

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

[page 92]

supports by numerous illustrations) that in reality “Humáyún had much to suffer and many humiliations to endure”; and that in particular great pressure was brought to bear on him to compel him to adopt the Shí‘a faith, which might have gone even further but for the moderating influence of the Sháh’s sister Sultánum Khánum, the Minister Qáđi-i-Jahán and the physician Núru’d-Dín. One of the pictures in the celebrated palace of *Chahil Sutún*²⁰⁴ at Işfahán represents an entertainment given by Ṭahmásp to Humáyún.

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

Between the Ottoman Turks on the one hand and the Uzbeks on the other, Persia enjoyed little peace at this period, and these campaigns on the N.E. and N.W. frontiers

[page 93]

¹⁹⁹ Horn’s text, *loc. cit.*, pp. 642-9.

²⁰⁰ Here, as elsewhere, called *Khwándgár*, apparently a corruption of *Khudáwandgár* (“the Lord”), itself in turn corrupted by the Turks into *Khúnkár* (“the Shedder of Blood”).

²⁰¹ *History of Persia* (London, 1815), vol. i, pp. 508-9.

²⁰² *History of India under ... Baber and Humáyún* (London, 1854), vol. ii, pp. 280 *et seqq.*

²⁰³ Translated by Major Charles Stewart and printed in London in 1832 for the Oriental Translation Fund.

²⁰⁴ See Lord Curzon’s *Persia*, vol. ii, p. 35. A copy of the picture in question by Texier is reproduced in Sir Percy Sykes’s *History of Persia* (2nd ed., London, 1921), vol. ii, p. 164.

succeeded one another with varying fortune but with monotonous reiteration. Sulṭán Sulaymán's chief campaigns were in 940-942/1534-6, when Baghdád was taken from the Persians and Ádharbáyján invaded²⁰⁵; 950/1543-4; 953-955/1546-8, when the Sháh's brother Alqás allied himself with the Turks; 959/1552, when the Persians recovered Arjísh; and 961/1554, when Sulaymán burned Nakhjuwán and attacked Ádharbáyján for the fourth time. The Turkish military power was at this time at its zenith, and was formidable not only to the Persians but to the great European Powers, who, indeed, were thankful for such diversion of its activities as the Persians from time to time effected, so that Busbecq, Ferdinand's ambassador at the Court of Sulaymán, declares that "only the Persian stands between us and ruin"²⁰⁶. Creasy²⁰⁷ speaks of the "pre-eminence of the Turks of that age in the numerical force and efficiency of their artillery"; and adds that "the same remark applies to their skill in fortification, and in all the branches of military engineering." Inferior as were the Persian to the Ottoman troops alike in discipline and equipment, it was much to their credit that they were able to offer as stout a resistance as they did, especially as the continual object of Turkish diplomacy at this time was to incite the Uzbeks, Turkmáns, and other Sunni peoples, to combine with them in attacking "the rascally Red-heads" (*Qizil-básh-i-Awbásh*). Of this policy the State Papers of Sulaymán's, as of his father Salím's, reign afford ample evidence; for instance the letter addressed to a Turkmán

[page 94]

chief about the end of 960/1553 (given on pp. 612-613 of Firidún Bey's *Munsha'át*) and transmitted to him, apparently, by four of his representatives, Muḥammad, Mír Abú Turáb, Mír Ṭúti and Sunduk, who, after performing the Pilgrimage, had visited the Sulṭán's Court at Constantinople on their homeward journey, and had delighted him with accounts of their achievements against the Persians.

The wars with the Uzbeks were equally continuous, especially until the death of the redoubtable 'Ubayd Khán, the son of Shaybak Khán, a direct descendant of Chingíz, in 946/1539-40, at the age of fifty-three, after a reign of thirty years. He is said by the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh* to have suffered defeat in only one of the seven campaigns he fought against the Persians. Ṭús, Mashhad, and especially Herát suffered terribly during these wars, which were nearly always accompanied by severe religious persecutions. The poet Hilálí fell a victim to the Sunní fanaticism of the Uzbeks at Herát in 935/1528-9, as the poet Banná'í had fallen a victim to Shí'a intolerance at Qarshí in 918/1512-13; and under the year 942/1535-6 the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh* gives the following graphic account of the persecution of the Shí'a which took place on the capture of Herát by 'Ubayd Khán on Rajab 20, 942 (January 14, 1536):

هر روز بحكیم آن خان بی ایمان پنج شش کس بواسطه تشیع
 باقوال جهال در چهار سوق هراة كشته می شدند و روستائیان بی
 دیانت و شهریان با خیانت با هر کس که عداوتی داشتند اورا
 گرفته نزد قاضی می بردند که این مرد در زمان قزلباش لعن
 ابو بکر و عثمان کرده است بسخن آن دو گواه جاهل قاضی
 بقتل آن مظلوم حکم می کرد و اورا کشان کشان بچهار سوق
 هراة می بردند و بقتلش می آوردند و از شومی ایشان امواج محن

[page 95]

و افواج قتن بدرجه اعلی رسید و سلب و نهب در اطراف
 خراسان واقع گردید

"Every day by order of that unbelieving Khán ('Ubayd) five or six individuals were slain for Shí'a proclivities on the information of ignorant persons in the market-place²⁰⁸ of Herát. Godless villagers and treacherous townsmen would seize anyone against whom they cherished a grudge and drag him before the judge, asserting that in the time of the 'Red-heads' (*i.e.* the Shí'a Persians) he used to curse Abú Bakr and 'Uthmán²⁰⁹; and on the word of these two ignorant witnesses the judge would pronounce sentence of death on the victim, whom they would then drag to the market-place of Herát and put to death. Through their sinister acts the waves of sorrow and the hosts of mischief attained their culmination, while plunder and looting took place throughout the confines of Khurásán."

²⁰⁵ A complete diary of this campaign against the "arch-heretic Qizil-básh King Ṭahmásp" will be found in vol. i of Firidún Bey's *Munsha'át*, pp. 584-598. The Ottoman army left Constantinople on June 10, 1534, occupied Baghdád in December of the same year, and returned to Constantinople on Jan. 7, 1536.

²⁰⁶ See p. 11 *supra*.

²⁰⁷ *History of the Ottoman Turks* (London, 1877), p. 202.

²⁰⁸ *Chahár-súq* (from which is derived the modern Turkish *chárshi*) is the point of intersection of two main bázárs; a sort of Oriental Oxford Circus, affording the greatest publicity.

²⁰⁹ The omission of 'Umar, unless due to a scribe's error, is remarkable.

With the Georgians also the Persians were constantly at war during this period, to wit in 947/1540-1, 950/1543-4, 958/1551, 961/1554, 963/1556, 968/1560-1, and 976/1568-9. These wars were also waged with great ferocity, and it is worth noting that contemporary Persian historians constantly speak of the Christian inhabitants of Georgia as “guebres” (*gabrán*, a term properly applicable only to the Zoroastrians), as in the following verse describing the first of these campaigns:

‘دردان سنگلاخ آن ددان کرده جای، وطنگاه گبران مردم ربای’

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

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

[page 96]

غازیان ظفر شعار پست و بلند دیار کُفّار فجارا احاطه فرمودند
و هر کوه و کمر که گریزگاه آن گمراه بود از لندکوب دلاوران
با هامون یکسان شد و يك متنفس از آن مشرکین از دائره قهر
و کین و الله محیط بالکافرین جان بسلامت بیرون نبرد و اهل
و عیال و اموال بآرث شرعی از مقتولان بقاتلان انتقال
نمود’

“The victorious champions encompassed the lands of the sinful unbelievers, lowlands and highlands, and every mountain and ridge whither that misguided one [their ruler] had fled was levelled with the plain by the trampling of the [Persian] warriors. Not one who drew breath of those polytheists saved his soul alive from the circle of wrath and vengeance of ‘and God encompasseth the unbelievers’²¹⁰,’ and, by lawful heritage, the wives, families and property of the slain passed to their slayers.”

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

[page 97]

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

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

بی تکلف خوش ترقی کرده اند، کاتب و نقاش و قزوینی و خرد’

²¹⁰ *Qur’án*, ii, 18.

“The scribe, the painter, the Qazwíni and the ass
Obtained easy promotion without trouble.”

He made a great ostentation of piety, “regarding most things as unclean, and often spitting out his half-eaten food into the water or the fire,” in view of which it is satisfactory to know that “he would not eat in company.” He was also punctilious about such matters as cutting his nails, and would spend the day after this operation in the bath.

[page 98]

Ṭahmásp died on Tuesday, Safar 15, 984 (May 14, 1576) at the age of sixty-four after a reign of fifty-three years and a half, the longest reign, according to the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh*, of any Muhammadan sovereign except the Fátimid Caliph al-Mustanšir bi'lláh²¹¹. Eleven of his sons are enumerated in the history just cited, of whom nine at least survived him. The eldest, Muḥammad Khudá-banda, who was about forty-five years of age, though he succeeded to the throne a year later, renounced it on his father's death on account of his partial blindness, this infirmity, whether natural or deliberately inflicted, being regarded in the East, and especially in Persia, as an absolute disqualification for the exercise of regal functions²¹². His younger brother Ḥaydar, taking advantage of the absence from the capital of his brothers, of whom Isma'íl was imprisoned in the Castle of Qahqaha, while the others were for the most part resident in distant provinces, endeavoured to seize the throne, but was murdered in the women's apartments, where he had taken refuge, by the partisans of his brother Isma'íl, who was proclaimed king in the principal mosque of Qazwín nine days after his father's death.

Isma'íl's reign was short but sanguinary, and in his drastic methods of dealing with possible competitors for the Crown he rivalled the most ruthless of the Ottoman Sultáns. He first put to death his two brothers Sulaymán and Muṣṭafá; then, after providing an elaborate funeral for his father at Mashhad and a gorgeous coronation for himself at Qazwín, in which his remaining brothers occupied their due positions, he resumed his fratricidal activities. On Sunday the sixth of Dhu'l-Ḥijja, A.H. 984 (Feb. 24, 1577), he put to death the six following princes: Sultán Ibráhím Mírzá, poet, artist, musician and calligrapher;

[page 99]

his nephew Muḥammad Ḥusayn Mírzá, a lad of eighteen, who had already been deprived of his eyesight; Sultán Maḥmúd Mírzá; his son Muḥammad Báqir Mírzá, a child of two; Imám-qulí Mírzá, and Sultán Aḥmad Mírzá. He next turned his attention to those princes who were resident in outlying provinces, such as Badí'u'z-Zamán Mírzá and his little son Bahrán Mírzá in Khurásán, Sultán 'Ali Mírzá in Ganja, and Sultán Ḥasan Mírzá in Ṭihrán, all of whom he destroyed. Only by a most wonderful chance, accounted by his biographer Iskandar Munshi²¹³ as a miraculous intervention of Providence, did the little Prince 'Abbás Mírzá, destined to become the greatest of Persia's modern rulers, escape his uncle's malevolence. The blood-thirsty Isma'íl had actually sent 'Ali-qulí Khán Shámlú to Herát, of which 'Abbás Mírzá, though only six years of age²¹⁴, was the nominal governor, to put the young prince to death, but the emissary, whether actuated by pity or superstition, delayed the accomplishment of his cruel task till the sacred month of Ramaḍán should be over, and ere this respite had come to an end a courier arrived bringing the joyful news of Isma'íl's death, the manner of which was as discreditable as his life. On the night of Sunday, Ramaḍán 13, A.H. 985 (Nov. 24, 1577), being at the time the worse for drink, he had gone out in search of adventures into the streets and *bázárs* of the city accompanied by one of his favourites, a confectioner's son named Ḥasan Beg, and other disreputable companions, and towards dawn had gone to rest in Ḥasan Beg's house, where he was found dead later in the day. Some suggested that he had been poisoned, or first drugged and afterwards strangled, while others maintained that he had merely taken an overdose of the opium

[page 100]

wherewith he was wont to assuage the pain of a colic to which he was subject. But his death was so welcome to all that no great trouble seems to have been taken to arrive at the manner of it, and it does not even appear that any punishment was inflicted on Ḥasan Beg, who, indeed, is said to have been also half paralysed when found²¹⁵.

Muḥammad Khudá-banda, in spite of his blindness, was now placed on the throne which he had refused on the death of his father Sháh Ṭahmásp. He was at this time about forty-six years of age²¹⁶ and was resident at Shíráz, having been replaced in his former government of Herát by his little son Prince 'Abbás Mírzá, whose narrow escape from death has just been described. The new king at once set out for Qazwín, and amongst those who welcomed him at Qum was Ḥasan Beg Rúmlú, the author of the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh*, which important but unpublished history was concluded in this very year and contains the most authoritative account of the events above narrated. That this account is in places confused and must be

²¹¹ He reigned sixty lunar years, A.H. 427-487 (A.D. 1035-1094).

²¹² See Chardin's *Voyages* (Paris, 1811), vol. v, pp. 241-244.

²¹³ Author of the well-known monograph on Sháh 'Abbás the Great entitled *Ta'rikh-i-'Álam-árá-yi-'Abbási*.

²¹⁴ He was born at Herát on Ramaḍán I, 978 (Jan 27, 1571).

²¹⁵ Cf. Sir John Malcolm's *History of Persia* (London, 1815), vol. i, pp. 516-517.

²¹⁶ According to the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh* he was born in 938/1531-1.

supplemented by later histories like the *Khuld-i-Barín* and *Ta'rikh-i-'Álam-árá-yi-'Abbásí* arises from the fact that the author, for his own personal safety, had to walk with great caution amidst the rapidly-changing circumstances of these perilous times.

At Qazwín, Muḥammad Khudá-banda received the homage of Sulaymán Páshá, a great-grandson of Abú Sa'íd the Tímúrid, who greeted him with the following verses:

شاه در تو قبله شاهان عالم است
گردون ترا مستخر و گیتی مسلم است
یکتا شدست رشته شاهى بجهت تو
الحمد لله ارجه که یکتاست محکم است

[page 101]

“O King, thy gate is the *qibla* of the Kings of the world,
Heaven is subjugated and earth surrendered to thee:
In thy reign the thread of royalty hath become single²¹⁷,
But, Praise be to God, though single it is strong!”

The able, ambitious and beautiful Princess Parí-Khán Khánum, Ṭahmásp Sháh's favourite daughter²¹⁸ by a Circassian wife, who had played a prominent part in the troubles succeeding his death, and aspired to rule in fact if not in name, was put to death at Muḥammad Khudá-banda's command by Khalíl Khán Afshár, together with her mother's brother Shamkhál Khán, and Sháh Shujá', the infant son of the late King Isma'íl. In consequence of these pitiless slaughters the representatives of the Şafawí Royal Family were now reduced to Sháh Muḥammad Khudá-banda himself and his four sons, Ḥamza, 'Abbás, Abú Ṭálib and Ṭahmásp. The first, who is sometimes reckoned amongst the Şafawí kings (since he seems for a while to have exercised regal functions during his half-blind father's life-time), was murdered by a young barber named Khudá-verdí²¹⁹ on the 22nd of Dhu'l-Hijja, 994 (Dec. 4, 1586). Abú Ṭálib was thereupon nominated *Walí-'ahd*, or Crown Prince, instead of his elder brother 'Abbás, who was still in Khurásán, but who speedily appeared on the scene with his guardian and tutor Murshid-qulí Khán Ustájlú,

[page 102]

inflicted condign punishment on those who had prompted the murder of his elder brother Ḥamza, and rendered his two younger brothers harmless by depriving them of their eye-sight and imprisoning them in the Castle of Alamút²²⁰. His father abdicated in his favour after a reign of ten years in Dhu'l-Qa'da, 995 (October, 1587), and Sháh 'Abbás ascended the throne to which he was destined to add so great a glory. He and his three brothers were all the sons of one mother, a lady of the Mar'ashí Sayyids of Mázandarán, who seems to have resembled her sister-in-law Parí-Khán Khánum in her masterful character as well as in her tragic fate, for she, together with her aged mother and many of her kinsfolk and countrymen, was murdered by some of the Qizil-básh nobles who objected to her autocratic methods and dominating influence over her irresolute and peace-loving husband, being of opinion that —

فروغی نماند درآن خاندان ' که بانگِ خروس آید از ماکیان

“No luck remains in that household where the hen crows like a cock²²¹.”

Muḥammad Khudá-banda was born in 938/1531-2, was forty-six years of age when his father Sháh Ṭahmásp died in 984/1576-7, reigned ten years after the death of his brother Isma'íl, survived his abdication eight or nine years, and died in 1004/1595-6. His character is thus described by Ridá-qulí Khán in his Supplement to the *Rawdatu 's-Şafá*: “He had some knowledge of all the current sciences, and was incomparable in understanding and judgement, virtue and discernment, bounty and generosity, and expression and eloquence. Being a ‘servant of God’ (*Khudá-banda*) he showed an excessive

[page 103]

clemency in matters of administration, war, anger and punishment, and, so far as possible, would not consent to the death of any one. Though he struck the first blow at Khudá-verdí the barber²²², this was only according to the enactment of the Holy

²¹⁷ I suppose this alludes to the practical extermination of the rest of the Royal Family by Isma'íl II.

²¹⁸ Sir John Malcolm (*op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 514 and 517) appears to confuse her with her mother, since he calls her “the favourite *Sultána* of the deceased monarch” (Ṭahmásp), and “the sister of Shamkhál.” In the *'Álam-árá-yi-'Abbásí* she is enumerated as the second of Ṭahmásp's eight daughters, but according to other Persian historians she was one of the five daughters of Sháh Isma'íl and the sister of Ṭahmásp. See p. 81 *supra*, n. 2 *ad calc.* By “Don Juan of Persia” she is called the Infanta.

²¹⁹ Called by “Don Juan of Persia” (f. 104^a) “Cudy de Lac” (*i.e.* *Dallák*), “que es como si dixeramos en Español, Cudi el barbero del Rey.”

²²⁰ “Don Juan of Persia,” f. 107^b.

²²¹ Supplement to the *Rawdatu 's-Şafá*.

Law. In consequence of his weak eyesight he seldom gave public audience, and, while he tarried in the women's apartments, the Sayyida [his wife] gave effect to his commands, and, in order more effectively to control affairs, herself sealed the documents. ... In short, he was a king with the qualities of a religious mendicant, or a religious mendicant endowed with regal pomp (*Pádisháhi darwísh-khišál, yá darwíshi pádisháh-jalál*).”

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

Sháh ‘Abbás I, commonly and justly called “the Great,” was only sixteen or seventeen years of age when he ascended the throne in 996/1588²²³, and died in Jumádá i, 1038/Jan. 1629 at the age of 60 after a reign of 43 lunar years, in which, by general agreement, Persia reached the highest degree of power, prosperity and splendour ever attained by her in modern times. His position at first was, however, fraught with dangers and difficulties. Not only was his kingdom threatened, as usual, by the Ottoman Turks on the west and the Uzbeks on the east, but many of the provinces were in revolt and the country was distracted by the rivalries and ambitions of the great Qizil-básh

[page 104]

nobles of different tribes, in the hands of two of whom, Murshid-qulí Khán and ‘Alí-qulí Khán, the young King seemed at first to be a mere puppet. When the former accompanied him to Qazwín to place him on the throne, the latter was left in Khurásán to bear the brunt of the Uzbek attack, to which, after a defence of nine months, he fell a victim. ‘Abbás, suspecting Murshid-qulí Khán of deliberately withholding help from his rival, caused him to be murdered one night in camp at Sháhrúd, thus freeing himself from an irksome tutelage, and becoming a sovereign ruler in fact as well as in name. Realizing that he could not possibly wage successful war simultaneously with the Turks and the Uzbeks, he determined, with far-sighted prudence, to make peace, even on unfavourable terms, with the former in order to check the encroachments of the latter and to devise some mechanism to control the disorderly rivalries of the Qizil-básh nobles, whereby his authority and the efficiency of his military force were paralysed. The terms of the treaty with Turkey included the surrender of the towns and districts in Ádharbáyyán and Georgia conquered by the Ottoman troops during a war which had lasted more than twelve years (985-998/1577-1590), such as Tabriz, Ganja, Qárs, Nakhjuwán, Shakí, Shamákhí and Tiflís, as well as part of Luristán; the abandonment of the cursing of the first three Caliphs, Abú Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmán; and the sending as a hostage to Constantinople of Sháh ‘Abbás’s nephew Haydar Mírzá, who departed with the Turkish general Farhád Páshá for the Ottoman capital, where he died two years later.

Sháh ‘Abbás next proceeded to subdue Shíráz, Kirmán, Gílán and Khurram-ábád in Luristán, and to inflict condign punishment on Ya‘qúb Khán Dhu’l-Qadar and other rebels. Meanwhile ‘Abdu’l-Mú’min Khán and his Uzbeks were again ravaging Khurásán, and the

[page 105]

Sháh, advancing to attack them, was stricken down by fever at Tíhrán. While he lay sick and unable to move, the holy city of Mashhad was taken and sacked by the savage Uzbeks and many of its inhabitants slain. Sabzawár²²⁴ suffered a similar fate in 1002/1593-4; but three or four years later²²⁵ ‘Abdu’lláh Khán, the Uzbek sovereign, died, and his son, the above-mentioned ‘Abdu’l-Mú’min Khán, was killed by his own people. It was at this juncture (April, 1598) that Sháh ‘Abbás was at length able to attack the Uzbeks in force and drive them out of Khurásán, which now at length enjoyed a period of peace and tranquillity. On his return from this victorious campaign to Qazwín in the autumn of the same year, he found awaiting him there those celebrated English soldiers of fortune Sir Anthony and Sir Robert Sherley, whose romantic adventures are fully described in several excellent monographs²²⁶. These, who were accompanied by some dozen English attendants, including at least one cannon-founder, aided him greatly in the reconstruction of his army and especially in providing it with artillery, the lack of which had hitherto so severely handicapped the Persians in their wars with the Turks, so that, as it is quaintly phrased in *Purchas’s Pilgrims*, “the mighty Ottoman, terror of the Christian world, quaketh of a Sherley fever, and gives hopes of approaching fates. The prevailing Persian hath learned Sherleian arts of war; and he which before knew not the

[page 106]

use of ordnance, hath now five hundred pieces of brass and sixty thousand musqueteers; so that they, which at hand with the sword were before dreadful to the Turks, now also, in remoter blows and sulphurean arts, are grown terrible.” The discipline

²²² The murderer of his son Hamza. See p. 101 *supra* and n. 3 *ad calc.*

²²³ He was born, according to the *‘Álam-árá-yi-‘Abbásí*, on Ramadán 1, 978 (Jan. 27, 1571), or 979 (Jan. 17, 1572). The words **عظ الله** form the chronogram of his coronation.

²²⁴ The author of the *‘Álam-árá-yi-‘Abbásí* says that he himself saw amongst those slain at Sabzawár women with children at the breast.

²²⁵ In 1006/1597-8, according to the *‘Álam-árá-yi-‘Abbásí*.

²²⁶ *e.g.* “The Sherley Brothers, an historical Memoir of the Lives of Sir Thomas Sherley, Sir Anthony Sherley, and Sir Robert Sherley, Knights, by one of the same House” (Evelyn Philip Shirley; Roxburgh Club: Chiswick, 1848); “The Three Brothers, or the Travels and Adventures of Sir A., Sir R. and Sir T. Sherley in Persia, Russia, Turkey, Spain, etc., with Portraits” (Anon., London, 1825).

of the Persian army had also been improved by the elimination of the more ambitious and disobedient Qizil-básh nobles; the creation of a composite tribal force known as *Sháh-seven* (“King-lovers”), united not by tribal allegiance but by personal devotion to the King; and the formation of a regular infantry comparable in some degree to the Turkish Janissaries.

A year or two later circumstances were favourable for the long-projected attempt to recover the provinces wrested from Persia by the Turks during the interregnum which succeeded the death of Ṭahmásp. The reign of the feeble Muḥammad III was approaching its end, and Turkey was weakened by a prolonged war with Austria and by the so-called Jaláli²²⁷ revolt in Asia Minor when Sháh ‘Abbás opened his campaign in 1010/1601-2. Tabríz was retaken “with cannon, an engine of long-time by the Persians scorned as not beseeming valiant men,” in 1012/1603-4, and two years later the celebrated Turkish general Chighála-záda Sinán Páshá (“Cicala”) was defeated near Salmás and compelled to retreat to Ván and Diyár Bakr, where he died of chagrin. Baghdád and Shírwán were recaptured by the Persians about the same time, but the former changed hands more than once during the reign of Sháh ‘Abbás, and the occasion of its recapture from the Turks in A.D. 1625 gave rise to an

[page 107]

interchange of verses between Háfiz Páshá and Sultán Murád IV which has attained a certain celebrity in Turkish literary history²²⁸.

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

Allusion has already been made in the introductory chapter²²⁹ to the splendour and prosperity of Işfahán under Sháh ‘Abbás, and to the number of foreigners, diplomatists, merchants and missionaries, which his tolerant attitude towards non-Muslims brought thither. These and other similar matters are very fully discussed in the first volume of the great monograph on his reign entitled *Ta’rikh-i-‘Álam-árá-yi-‘Abbási*, half of which consists of an Introduction (*Muqaddama*) comprising

[page 108]

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

[page 109]

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

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

²²⁸ See E. J. W. Gibb’s *History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. iii, pp. 248-251, and, for the originals, vol. vi, pp. 190-191.

²²⁹ Pp. 24-5 *supra*.

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

Amongst the towns and districts which benefited most from his munificence were, besides his capital Işfahán, Mashhad and its holy shrine of the eighth Imám ‘Ali Riđá, which, as we have seen, he rescued from the savage and fanatical Uzbeks and raised to a position of the greatest glory and honour; Ardabil, the original home of his family; Qazwín, the earlier capital of the Şafawís; Káshán, near which he constructed the celebrated dam known as the Band-i-Quhrúd²³⁰; Astarábád; Tabriz; Hamadán; and the province of Mázandarán, one of his favourite resorts, which he adorned with several splendid palaces and the great causeway extending from Astarábád to Ashraf, of which full particulars are given in Lord Curzon’s great work on Persia²³¹. As regards his conquests, his armies reached Merv, Nisá, Abíward, Andakhúd and even Balkh in the north-east, and Nakhjuwán, Erivan, Ganja, Tiflís, Darband and Bákú in the north-west.

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

[page 110]

men of learning, Mír Muḥammad Dámád and Shaykh Bahá’u’d- Dín Ámilí; amongst the calligraphists, Mawláná Işhâq Siyáwushání, Muḥammad Ḥusayn-i-Tabrizí, Mír Mu’izz-i-Káshí, Mír Şadru’d- Dín Muḥammad, and others; amongst the artists and miniature painters, Muẓaffar ‘Alí, Zaynu’l-‘Ábidín, Şádiq Beg, ‘Abdu’l-Jabbár, and others; amongst the poets, Damírí, Muḥtasham, Walí, Waḥshí, Khwája Ḥusayn, Mír Ḥaydar Mu‘ammá’í, the brothers Tayfúr and Dá’í, Wálih and Malik of Qum, Ḥátim of Káshán, Şabrí Rúzbihání, Ḥisábí, the Qáđí Núr-i-Işfahání, Ḥálatí, Halákí, Maẓharí of Cashmere, and the Qazwíní Furúghí, Tabkhí, Sulţánu’l-Fuqará, Ká’ká and Sharmí; and amongst the singers and minstrels²³², Ḥáfiz Aḥmad-i-Qazwíní, Ḥáfiz, Jalájl-i-Bákhazí, Ḥáfiz Muẓaffar-i-Qumí, Ḥáfiz; Háshim-i-Qazwíní, Mírzá Muḥammad Kamáncha’í, Ustád Muḥammad Mú’min, Ustád Shahsuwár-i-Chahár-tári, Ustád Shams-i-Shaypúrghú’í-i-Warámíní, Ustád Ma’şúm Kamáncha’í, Ustád Sulţán Muḥammad Ṭanbúra’í, Mírzá Ḥusayn Ṭanbúra’í, Ustád Sulţán Muḥammad-i-Changí, and the *Qişsa-khwáns* (story-tellers) and *Sháhnáma-khwáns* (reciters of the ‘Epic of Kings’), Ḥaydar, Muḥammad Khursand and Fathí, of whom the two last were brothers and natives of Işfahán. It is because the fame of the singers, minstrels and musicians who constitute this last class is in its nature so ephemeral that I have enumerated them in full, as indicating what forms of musical talent were popular at the court of Sháh ‘Abbás. That Sháh ‘Abbás deserved the title of “the Great” there can be no question, and many of his severities have been palliated, if not excused, even by European historians like

[page 111]

Sir John Malcolm²³³; but his cruel murder of his eldest son Şafí Mírzá and his blinding of another, Khudá-banda Mírzá, and the tragical circumstances connected therewith²³⁴, form a dark page in the records of his otherwise glorious reign, which ended with his death in the early part of A.D. 1629. He was succeeded by his grandson Sâm Mírzá, who, on his accession, took the name of his unfortunate father, and mounted the throne of Persia under the title of Sháh Şafí I.

There is a well-known tradition of the Muhammadans²³⁵ that Solomon died standing, supported by the staff on which he leaned, and that his death remained unknown to the *Jinn*, who laboured at his command in the construction of the Temple, for a year, until the wood-worm ate through the staff and the body fell to the ground. This legend may well serve as a parable of the century of Şafawí rule which followed the death of Sháh ‘Abbás the Great, who, by his strength and wisdom, gave to Persia a period of peace and outward prosperity which for nearly a hundred years protected his successors from the results of their incompetence. Four of his house succeeded him ere the catastrophe of the Afghán invasion in A.D. 1722 effected its downfall, to wit, his grandson Sháh Şafí above mentioned (A.D. 1629-1642); his great-grandson Sháh ‘Abbás II (A.D. 1642-1666); his great-great-grandson Şafí, subsequently recrowned under the name of Sulaymán (A.D. 1666-1694); and his great-great-great-grandson Sháh Ḥusayn (A.D. 1694-1722). Of Sháh Şafí, Krusinski²³⁶ says that “’tis certain there has not been in Persia a more cruel and bloody reign than his” and describes it as “one continued series

[page 112]

of cruelties”; while Hanway²³⁷ observes that “he interfered so little in the affairs of the government that the Persians would have scarcely perceived they had a king, had it not been for the frequent instances of barbarity which stained his reign with

²³⁰ See my *Year amongst the Persians*, pp. 185-6.

²³¹ Vol. i, pp. 376-8, etc.

²³² Of these titles, *Ḥáfiz* denotes a *Qur’án*-reciter or rhapsodist; *Kamáncha’í* a violinist; *Chahár-tári* a player on the four-stringed lute; *Shaypúrghú’í* a trumpeter; *Ṭanbúra’í* a drummer; and *Changí* a harper.

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

²³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 560-5.

²³⁵ See the commentaries on *Qur’án* xxxiv, 13.

²³⁶ P. 44 of the English translation (London, 1728).

²³⁷ *Revolutions of Persia* (London, 1753), vol. i, p. 20.

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

[Illustration: SHÁH ‘ÁBBAS THE SECOND
1920. 9.17-013 [2] (Brit. Mus.)]

[page 113]

the bare mention of which is shocking. When he was in wine or in wrath nobody about him was sure of life or estate. He caused hands, feet, nose and ears to be cut off eyes to be plucked out, and lives to be sacrificed upon the least whim that took him; and the man that was most in his favour at the beginning of a debauch was generally made a sacrifice at the end of it. This is the character given us of him by Sir John Chardin, who was in part a witness of what he relates as to this matter. Persons thought their lives in such danger whenever they approached him that a great lord of his Court said, when he came from his presence, that he always felt if his head was left standing upon his shoulders. It was under this prince that Persia began to decay. He thought so little like a king that when it was represented to him what danger he was in from the Turks, who, when they had made peace with the Christians, would come and attack his finest provinces if he did not put himself in a position to repel them, he answered very indifferently that he did not care, provided they left him Işfahán.”

Sháh Ĥusayn, the last Şafawí king (for his nominal successors Tahmásp II and ‘Abbás III were mere puppets in the hands of Nádir Sháh), was very unlike his predecessors, for his clemency was so excessive as “rendered him incapable of any severity, though never so moderate and necessary²⁴⁰,” while having one day accidentally wounded a duck with his pistol “he himself was as much terrified as if he had really committed murder, and made the same exclamation as is customary in Persia upon the shedding of human blood, by saying *Kanlu oldum*²⁴¹, i.e. ‘I am polluted with blood’; and that very instant he caused two hundred *tomons* to be given to the poor as an atonement for what he thought a

[page 114]

great sin.” He was something of a scholar and theologian, much under the influence of the *Mullás*, and so careful of his religious duties and so much attached to the reading of the *Qur’án* as to earn for himself the nick-name of *Mullá* or “Parson Ĥusayn²⁴².” Though at first a vehement prohibitionist, he was later induced by his grandmother, instigated by wine-loving courtiers and power-seeking eunuchs, to taste the forbidden liquor, which gradually obtained such a hold on him that “he would not by any means hear the mention of business, but left it all to the discretions of his ministers and eunuchs, who governed the kingdom just as they pleased, and took the greater license because they were very sensible they had nothing to fear from a prince who was so weak as to refer the very petitions he received to them without so much as reading them²⁴³.”

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

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

²³⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 49.

²³⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 57-8.

²⁴⁰ Krusinski, *op. cit.*, pp. 105-108.

²⁴¹ Turkish: قاتلو اولدم

²⁴² Krusinski, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

²⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

name, was a careful observer, and seems to have had a very fair knowledge both of Persian and Turkish, and his work is one of the best accounts of Persia in the seventeenth century.

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

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

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

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

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

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

These are only a few of the many writers and travellers whose works throw light on this period. I have mentioned them because they are the ones I have chiefly used, but a long and serviceable account of a much larger number will be found in Schefer's Introduction to his edition of le Père Raphaël du Mans mentioned above. The European writers are here, for reasons well set forth by Sir John Malcolm²⁴⁴, more instructive and illuminating than the Persian historians, for

whom, as he says, "we can hardly imagine an era more unfavourable. A period of nearly a century elapsed without the occurrence of any one political event of magnitude; and yet the extraordinary calm was productive of no advantage to Persia. The princes, nobles, and high officers of that kingdom were, it is true, exempt from the dangers of foreign or internal war; but their property and their lives were the sport of a succession of weak, cruel and debauched monarchs. The lower orders were exposed to fewer evils than the higher, but they became every day more unwarlike; and what they gained by that tranquillity which the State enjoyed lost almost all its value when they ceased to be able to defend it. This period was distinguished by no glorious achievements. No characters arose on which the historian could dwell with delight. The nation may be said to have existed on the reputation which it had before acquired till all it possessed was gone, and till it became, from the slow but certain progress of a gradual and vicious decay, incapable of one effort to avert that dreadful misery and ruin in which it was involved by the invasion of a few Afghan tribes, whose conquest of Persia affixed so indelible a disgrace upon that country that we cannot be surprised that its historians have shrunk from the painful and degrading narration."

Shaykh 'Alí Ḥazín²⁴⁵ takes precisely the same view. "Many ages having now elapsed," says he, "since civilization, tranquillity, and the accomplishment of all worldly blessings had attained a state of perfection in the beautiful provinces of Írán, these were become a fit object for the affliction of the malignant eye²⁴⁶. The indolent King and princes, and the army that sought nothing but repose and for near a

²⁴⁴ *History of Persia* (London, 1815), vol. i, pp. 568-570.

²⁴⁵ P. 106 of Belfour's text = p. 116 of his translation.

²⁴⁶ The Evil Eye is called by the Arabs '*Aynu'l-Kamál*, "the Eye of Perfection," because anything perfect of its kind is especially exposed to its attacks.

[page 118]

hundred years had not drawn the sword from the scabbard, would not even think of quelling this disturbance²⁴⁷, until Maḥmūd²⁴⁸ with a large army marched into the provinces of Kirmán and Yazd, and, having committed much plunder and devastation, proceeded on his route to Iṣfahán. This happened in the early part of the year 1134/1721.”

Jonas Hanway²⁴⁹ speaks in a similar strain. “Persia never enjoyed,” says he, “a more perfect tranquillity than in the beginning of the present [*i.e.* the eighteenth] century. The treaties she had concluded with her neighbours were perfectly observed and secured her against any foreign invasions; whilst the effeminacy and luxury of her inhabitants, the ordinary consequences of a long peace, left no room to apprehend any danger from the ambition of her own subjects. This monarchy, which had suffered so many revolutions in past ages, seemed to be settled on a solid foundation when the news of its subversion surprised the whole world. The authors of this amazing catastrophe were a people hardly known even to their own sovereigns, and have now acquired a reputation only by the fame of those nations which they brought under their subjection. These people ... are comprised under the general denomination of Afghans²⁵⁰.”

The policy of Sháh ‘Abbás the Great has been described above as wise and far-sighted, but this statement needs some qualification; for, while it greatly strengthened the power of the Crown, it undoubtedly conduced in the end to the weakening of the nation

[page 119]

and the degeneration of its rulers. Previous kings had been embarrassed chiefly by ambitious relatives, powerful tribal chiefs, and turbulent townsmen; and for all these things Sháh ‘Abbás set himself to provide remedies. Instead of allowing his sons to hold high administrative posts and take a prominent part in wars, he either blinded them or put them to death, or immured them in the *ḥaram*, where, as Krusinski well explains²⁵¹, they lead a life of hardship and privation rather than of luxury and pleasure, while receiving a very imperfect education, and falling under the influence of the palace eunuchs, who ended by becoming the dominant power in the State. To his destruction of the great nobles and tribal chiefs, and his creation of the *Sháh-sevens* as a counterpoise to the seven tribes to whom his predecessors owed their power, allusion has already been made²⁵². A more extraordinary example of his application of the maxim *Divide et impera* was his deliberate creation in all the large towns of two artificially antagonized parties, named, according to Krusinski²⁵³, *Pelenk* and *Felenk*, who indulged at intervals in the most sanguinary faction-fights, they being, as Krusinski puts it, “so opposite, and so much enemies one to the other, that people in different States, in arms against one another, do not push their aversion and enmity farther.” He adds (p. 92) that “though they fought without arms, because they were not supposed to make use of anything else but stones and sticks, it was with so much fury and bloodshed that the King was obliged to employ his guards to separate them with drawn swords; and hard it was to accomplish it, even with a method so effectual, insomuch that at Ispahan in 1714 they were under a necessity, before

[page 120]

they could separate the combatants, to put about three hundred to the sword on the spot.”

Besides the eunuchs, there grew up and attained its full development under “Mullá Ḥusayn,” the last unhappy though well-meaning occupant of the Ṣafawí throne at Iṣfahán, another dominant class whose influence hardly made for either spiritual unity or national efficiency, namely the great ecclesiastics who culminated in the redoubtable Mullá Muḥammad Báqir-i-Majlisi, the persecutor of Ṣúfis and heretics, of whom we shall have to speak at some length in a future chapter. His admirers²⁵⁴ call attention to the fact that his death, which took place in 1111/1699-1700²⁵⁵, was followed in a short time by the troubles which culminated in the supreme disaster of 1722, and suggest that the disappearance of so saintly a personage left Persia exposed to perils which more critical minds may be inclined to ascribe in part to the narrow intolerance so largely fostered by him and his congeners.

²⁴⁷ The seizure of Qandahár by the revolted Afgháns led by Mír Ways.

²⁴⁸ The son and successor of Mír Ways.

²⁴⁹ *Revolutions of Persia*, vol. i, p. 22.

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

²⁵¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 65-70.

²⁵² See p. 106 *supra*

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

²⁵⁴ *e.g.* the Qīṣaṣu’l-‘Ulamá, p. 216 of the lithographed edition of 1306/1888-9.

²⁵⁵ The chronogram is **غمر وحزن**.

CHAPTER IV.

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

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

[page 122]

of the two centuries which must now engage our attention. During this period the literary language (which, indeed, had become fixed at any rate in the fourteenth century, so that the odes of Háfiz, save for their incomparable beauty, might have been written but yesterday) underwent no noticeable change; few fresh forms of literary expression were developed until the middle of the nineteenth century; and few fresh ideas arose to modify the Shí‘a frenzy of Şafawí times until the rise of the Bábí doctrine in A.D. 1844, of which, however, the literary effects were less considerable than those of the Revolution of 1906. Moreover excellent and detailed accounts of the Afghán invasion, of Nádír Sháh, and of the earlier Qájár period already exist in English, several of which have been mentioned at the end of the preceding chapter²⁵⁶; these could hardly be bettered, and would only be marred by such abridgment as would be necessary to fit them into the framework of this book. Hence I have deemed it best to limit myself in this chapter to a brief outline of the more salient events of these last two centuries.

THE AFGHÁN INVASION (A.D. 1722-1730).

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

[page 123]

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

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

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

²⁵⁶ See pp. 114-118 *supra*.

[page 124]

arose, in resisting him, if necessary by force of arms. The decision, which supported the latter alternative and so accorded with his designs, he carried back with him to Işfahán and subsequently to Qandahár, whither he was permitted to return, with strong recommendations to Gurgín Khán, in 1709. There he soon organized a conspiracy against the latter, and, taking advantage of the temporary absence of a large part of the Persian garrison on some expedition in the neighbourhood, he and his followers fell on the remainder when they were off their guard, killed the greater number of them, including Gurgín Khán, and took possession of the city. It was at this juncture that the *fatwá* obtained at Mecca proved so useful to Mír Ways, for by it he was able to overcome the scruples of the more faint-hearted of his followers, who were at first inclined to shrink from a definite repudiation of Persian suzerainty, but who now united with the more hot-headed of their countrymen in electing Mír Ways “Prince of Qandahár and General of the national troops²⁵⁷.”

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

Mír Ways, having thus in five or six years laid the foundations of the Afghán power, died in A.D. 1715, and was

[page 125]

succeeded by his brother Mír ‘Abdu’lláh, whose disposition to accept, under certain conditions, Persian suzerainty led to his murder by his nephew Mír Maḥmúd, son of Mír Ways, who was forthwith proclaimed king. The weakness of the Persian government thus becoming apparent, others were led to follow the example of the Afgháns of Qandahár. Amongst these were the Abdálí Afgháns of Herát, the Uzbeks of Transoxiana, the Kurds, the Lazgís and the Arabs of Baḥrayn, and though the Persian General Şafi-qulí Khán with 30,000 troops succeeded in defeating an Uzbek army of 12,000, he was immediately afterwards defeated by the Abdálí Afgháns.

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

The fatal year 1722 began with the second siege and

[page 126]

capture of Kirmán by Mír Maḥmúd. The most remarkable incident connected with this was that he was joined by a number of “guebres” (*gabr*)²⁵⁸, the small remnant of the Persians who still profess the ancient religion of Zoroaster, and who exist in any number only in the cities of Kirmán and Yazd and the intervening region of Rafsínján with its chief town Bahrámábád. Why these people should have attached themselves to foreign Muslims to make war on their Muslim compatriots it is hard to understand, unless the fanaticism of the Shí‘a divines was responsible for driving them into this extraordinary course. Still more remarkable, if true, is Hanway’s statement that they provided Mír Maḥmúd with one of his best generals, who, though he bore the Muhammadan name of Naşru’lláh, was, according to the same authority²⁵⁹, “a worshipper of fire, since there were two priests hired by the Sultan who kept the sacred flame near his tomb.”

From Kirmán Mír Maḥmúd marched by way of Yazd, which he attempted but failed to take by storm, to Işfahán, having scornfully refused an offer of 15,000 *túmáns*²⁶⁰, to induce him to turn back, and finally pitched his camp at Gulnábád, distant some three leagues from the Şafawí capital. After much dispute and diversity of opinions, the Persian army marched out of Işfahán to engage the Afgháns on March 7th and on the following day, largely through the treachery of the Wálí of ‘Arabistán, suffered a disastrous defeat.

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

²⁵⁷ Krusinski, p. 187.

²⁵⁸ Hanway’s *Revolution of Persia*, vol. i, p. 99.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 186.

²⁶⁰ At that time, according to Hanway (*loc. cit.*, p. 100), equivalent to £37,500.

[page 127]

the Mongols outside Baghdád in A.D. 1258 that of the ‘Abbásids. Between these three battles, moreover, there was a remarkable point of similarity in the splendour and apparent strength of the defenders and the squalor and seeming weakness of their assailants. The similarity in this respect between the battles of Qádisiyya and Baghdád has been noticed in a well-known passage of the *Kitábu'l-Fakhrí*²⁶¹, to which the following account of the battle of Gulnábád by Hanway²⁶² forms a remarkable parallel:

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

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

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

[page 128]

ration which rendered the final catastrophe not only possible but inevitable is fairly obvious to subsequent historians, even if its extent and significance were not realized until the fatal touchstone was applied. The results, however, differed widely according to the character and abilities of the assailants. The Arab invaders of the seventh century established an Empire which endured for six centuries and effected a profound and permanent change in the lands and peoples whom they brought under their sway. The Mongol conquests were even more extensive, reaching as they did from China and Thibet to Germany and Russia, but the cohesion and duration of the vast Empire which they created were far inferior. The Afghán conquest, with which we are now concerned, was little more than an extensive and destructive raid, resulting in some seventy-five years of anarchy (A.D. 1722-1795), illuminated by the meteoric career of that Napoleon of Persia, Nádír Sháh, and ending in the establishment of the actually reigning dynasty of the Qájárs. The actual domination of the Afgháns over Persia only endured for eight or nine years²⁶³.

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

[page 129]

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

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

²⁶¹ See vol. ii of my *Lit. Hist.*, p. 462, for the translation, and pp. 97-8 of Ahlwardt's edition for the text of this passage.

²⁶² *Revolutions of Persia* (London, 1753), vol. i, pp. 104-5.

²⁶³ Maḥmúd the Afghán laid siege to Kirmán in January, 1722, and captured Işfahán in October of the same year. His cousin Ashraf, who succeeded him, was killed by Balúchís in 1730.

At the end of September, 1722, Sháh Ḥusayn offered to surrender himself and his capital to the Afghán invader, but Mír Maḥmúd, in order still further to reduce by famine the numbers and spirit of the besieged, dragged out the negotiations for another three or four weeks, so that it was not until October 21 that Sháh Ḥusayn repaired on foot to Farahábád, once his favourite residence, now the headquarters of his ruthless foe, to surrender the crown which Mír Maḥmúd assumed six days later. When news of his father's abdication reached

[page 130]

Ṭahmásp Mírzá at Qazwín he caused himself to be proclaimed king, but was driven out of that city on December 20 by the Afghán general Amánu'lláh Khán, who on his way thither received the submission of Qum and Káshán.

Ṭahmásp was now reduced to the miserable expedient of invoking the help of Russia and Turkey, who had already fixed covetous eyes on the apparently moribund Persian kingdom and had occupied Gílán and Tiflís respectively. On September 23, 1723, a treaty was signed whereby, in return for the expulsion of the Afgháns and the restoration of his authority, Ṭahmásp undertook to cede to Russia the Caspian provinces of Gílán, Mázandarán and Gurgán, and the towns of Bákú, Darband and their dependencies. Soon afterwards the Turks took Erivan, Nakhjuwán, Khúy and Hamadán, but were repulsed from Tabríz. On July 8, 1724, an agreement for the partition of Persia was signed between Russia and Turkey at Constantinople²⁶⁴.

Meanwhile Mír Maḥmúd was continuing his cruelties at Iṣfahán. In A.D. 1723 he put to death in cold blood some three hundred of the nobles and chief citizens, and followed up this bloody deed with the murder of about two hundred children of their families. He also killed some three thousand of the deposed Sháh's body-guard, together with many other persons whose sentiments he mistrusted or whose influence he feared. In the following year (A.D. 1724) the Afghán general Zabardast Khán succeeded, where his predecessor Naṣru'lláh²⁶⁵ had failed and fallen, in taking Shíráz; and towards the end of the year Mír Maḥmúd prepared to attack Yazd, which had hitherto remained unsubdued. The Muslim inhabitants of that town, fearing that the numerous Zoroastrians dwelling

[page 131]

in it might follow the example of their co-religionists of Kirmán and join the Afgháns, killed a great number of them.

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

The death of Peter the Great about this period made Russia slightly less dangerous as a neighbour, but the Turks continued to press forwards and on August 3, 1725, succeeded at last in capturing Tabríz. They even advanced to within three days' march of Iṣfahán, but turned back before reaching it. They subsequently (A.D. 1726) took Qazwín and Marágha, but were defeated by Ashraf near Kirmánsháh. Negotiations for peace were meanwhile in progress at Constantinople, whither Ashraf had sent an ambassador named 'Abdu'l-'Azíz Khán, whose arrogant proposal that his master should be Caliph of the East and the Ottoman

[page 132]

Sultán Caliph of the West caused great umbrage to the Porte. The war, however, was very unpopular with the Turkish soldiers and people, who failed to see why they should fight fellow-Sunnis in order to restore a heretical Shí'a dynasty, though the 'ulamá were induced to give a *fatwá* in favour of this course, on the ground that a divided Caliphate was incompatible with the dignity or safety of Islám. Finally, however, a treaty of peace was concluded and signed at Hamadán in September, 1727²⁶⁶.

This danger had hardly been averted when a far greater one, destined in a short time to prove fatal to the Afgháns, presented itself in the person of Nádir-qulí, subsequently known to fame as Nádir Sháh, one of the most remarkable and ruthless military geniuses ever produced by Persia. Hitherto, though he was now about forty years of age, little had been heard of him; but this year, issuing forth from his stronghold, that wonderful natural fastness named after him Kalát-i-Nádirí²⁶⁷, he defeated an Afghán force and took possession of Nishápúr in the name of Sháh Ṭahmásp II, at that time

²⁶⁴ For the contents of the six articles, see Hanway's *Revolutions of Persia*, i, pp. 200-1.

²⁶⁵ See p. 126 *supra*.

²⁶⁶ For its provisions, contained in nine articles, see Hanway, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 254-5.

²⁶⁷ This fortress, which is jealously guarded, Lord Curzon attempted but failed to penetrate. See his *Persia*, vol. i, pp. 125-140, especially the bird's-eye view on p. 134.

precariously established at Farahábád in Mázandarán, and supported with a certain condescending arrogance by the Qájár chief Fath-‘Alí Khán. After this success Nádir paid a visit to the fugitive Sháh, and, after insinuating himself into his favour, contrived the assassination of the Qájár, against whom he had succeeded in arousing the Sháh’s suspicions. On May 15 of the following year (1728) the Shih, accompanied by Nadir (or ʿAḥmásp-qulí, “the slave of ʿAḥmásp,” to give him the name which

[page 133]

he temporarily assumed about this time), made a solemn entry into Níshápúr, amidst the rejoicings of the inhabitants, and shortly afterwards occupied Mashhad and Herát. He also despatched an ambassador to Constantinople, whence in return a certain Sulaymán Efendi was sent as envoy to Persia.

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

[page 134]

THE CAREER OF NÁDIR UNTIL HIS ASSASSINATION IN A.D. 1747.

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

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

[page 135]

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

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

treaty with Turkey, by which Persia recovered all her lost provinces; and in December he set out at the head of 100,000 men against Afghánistán and India, leaving his son Riḏá-qulí as regent.

The next two years (A.D. 1737-9) witnessed Nádír Sháh's

[page 136]

greatest military achievement, the invasion of India, capture of Lahore and Delhi, and return home with the enormous spoils in money and kind which he exacted from the unfortunate Indians, and which Hanway²⁶⁸ estimates at £87,500,000. Having taken Qandahár, Kábul and Peshawur in 1738, he crossed the Indus early in the following year, captured Lahore, and in February, 1739, utterly defeated the Indian army of Muhammad Sháh, two hundred thousand strong, on the plains of Karnál. Delhi was peaceably occupied, but a few days later a riot occurred in which some of Nádír's soldiers were killed, and he avenged their blood by a general massacre of the inhabitants which lasted from 8 a.m. until 3 p.m., and in which 110,000 persons perished. He never dreamed of holding India, and, having extorted the enormous indemnity mentioned above and left the unhappy Muhammad Sháh in possession of his throne, with a threat that he would return again if necessary, he began his homeward march in May, turning aside to chastise the predatory Uzbeks of Khiva and Bukhárá, which latter town he captured on November 28, 1739.

During the absence of Nádír Sháh his son Riḏá-qulí had put to death the unfortunate Ṭahmásp and most of his family at Sabzawár, and began to show signs of desiring to retain the powers with which he had been temporarily invested by his father. Being suspected of instigating an unsuccessful attempt on Nádír's life, he was deprived of his eyesight, but with this cruel act the wonderful good fortune which had hitherto accompanied Nádír began to desert him. His increasing cruelty, tyranny, avarice and extortion, but most of all, perhaps, his attempt to impose on

[page 137]

his Persian subjects the Sunní doctrine, made him daily more detested. His innovations included the production of Persian translations of the *Qur'án* and the Gospels. The latter, on which several Christians were employed, he caused to be read aloud to him at Ṭíhrán, while he commented on it with derision, and hinted that when he found leisure he might (perhaps after the model of Akbar) produce a new religion of his own which should supplant alike Judaism, Christianity and Islám²⁶⁹. His military projects, moreover, began to miscarry; his campaign against the Lazgís in A.D. 1741-2 did not prosper, and in the war with Turkey in which he became involved in 1743 he was unsuccessful in his attempt to take Mosul (Mawṣil). Revolts which broke out in Fárs and Shírwán were only suppressed with difficulty after much bloodshed. However he put down a rebellion of the Qájárs at Astarábád in A.D. 1744, defeated the Turks in a great battle near Erivan in August, 1745, and concluded a satisfactory peace with them in 1746. In the following year Nádír Sháh visited Kirmán, which suffered much from his cruelties and exactions, and thence proceeded to Mashhad, where he arrived at the end of May, 1747. Here he conceived the abominable plan of killing all his Persian officers and soldiers (the bulk of his army being Turkmáns and Uzbeks and consequently Sunnís), but this project was made known by a Georgian slave to some of the Persian officers, who thereupon decided, in the picturesque Persian phrase, "to breakfast off him ere he should sup off them." A certain Šálih Beg, aided by four trusty men, undertook the task²⁷⁰, and, entering his tent

[page 138]

by night, rid their country of one who, though he first appeared as its deliverer from the Afghán yoke, now bade fair to crush it beneath a yoke yet more intolerable. At the time of his death Nádír Sháh was sixty-one years of age and had reigned eleven years and three months (A.D. 1736-47). He was succeeded by his nephew 'Alí-qulí Khán, who assumed the crown under the title of 'Ádil Sháh, but was defeated and slain by his brother Ibráhím in the following year. He in turn was killed a year later (A.D. 1749) by the partisans of Nádír's grandson Sháhrukh, the son of the unfortunate Riḏá-qulí and a Šafawí princess, the daughter of Sháh Ḥusayn, who now succeeded to the throne. Youth, beauty and a character at once amiable and humane²⁷¹ did not, however, secure him against misfortune, and he was shortly after his accession deposed and blinded by a certain Sayyid Muḥammad, a grandson on the mother's side of the Šafawí Sháh Sulaymán II. He in turn soon fell a victim to the universal violence and lawlessness which now prevailed in Persia, and Sháhrukh was restored to the throne, but again deposed and again restored to exercise a nominal rule at Mashhad over the province of Khurásán, which Aḥmad Khán Abdáli (afterwards famous as Aḥmad Sháh Durrání, the founder of the modern kingdom of Afghánistán) desired, before leaving

²⁶⁸ *Revolutions of Persia*, ii, p. 188. The loss to India he puts at one hundred and twenty million pounds and the number of those slain at 200,000 (*Ibid.*, p. 197).

²⁶⁹ See Sir John Malcolm's *History of Persia* (ed. 1815), vol. ii, p. 104.

²⁷⁰ According to the *Ta'rikh-i-ba'd Nádiriyya* (ed. Oskar Mann, Leyden, 1891, pp. 15 *et seqq.*), which gives a very full account of the matter, the four chief conspirators, Muḥammad Khán Qájár, Músá Beg Afshár, Qoja Beg Günduzlú and Muḥammad Šálih Khán, were accompanied by seventy young volunteers, but only four had the courage to enter Nádír's tent. The assassination took place on Sunday, 11 Jumáda ii 1160 (June 20, 1747).

²⁷¹ *Malcolm's History*, Vol. ii, p. 111.

Persia, to erect into a buffer state between that country and his own. The remainder of the blind Sháhrúkh's long reign was uneventful, and he survived until A.D. 1796, having reigned nearly fifty years.

[page 139]

THE ZAND DYNASTY (A.D. 1750-1794)

“The history of Persia,” says Sir John Malcolm²⁷², “from the death of Nádír Sháh till the elevation of Áqá Muḥammad Khán, the founder of the reigning family, presents to our attention no one striking feature except the life of Karím Khán-i-Zand. The happy reign of this excellent prince, as contrasted with those who preceded and followed him, affords to the historian of Persia that description of mixed pleasure and repose which a traveller enjoys who arrives at a beautiful and fertile valley in the midst of an arduous journey over barren and rugged wastes. It is pleasing to recount the actions of a chief who, though born in an inferior rank, obtained power without crime, and who exercised it with a moderation that was, in the times in which he lived, as singular as his humanity and justice.”

Karím Khán, however, who fixed his capital at Shíráz, which he did so much to beautify and where he is still gratefully remembered, never ruled over the whole of Persia and never assumed the title of Sháh, but remained content with that of *Wakil*, or Regent. Originally he and a Bakhtiyári chief named ‘Alí Mardán Khán were the joint regents of “a real or pretended grandson of Sháh Ḥusayn²⁷³” in whose name they seized Iṣfahán, where they placed him on the throne. Before long they fell out; ‘Alí Mardán Khán was killed; and Karím Khán became the *de facto* ruler of Southern Persia. His rivals were the Afghán chief Ázád in Ádharbáyján and the North-west, and in the Caspian provinces Muḥammad Ḥasan the Qájár, son of that Fath-‘Alí Khán who was murdered by Nádír at the outset of his career, and father,

[page 140]

of Áqá Muḥammad Khán, the actual founder of the Qájár dynasty.

Ázád was the first to be eliminated from this triangular contest. He defeated Karím Khán and compelled him to evacuate not only Iṣfahán but Shíráz, but, rashly pursuing him through the narrow defile of Kamárij, fell into an ambush, lost most of his followers, and finally, having sought refuge first with the Páshá of Baghdád and then with Heraclius, Prince of Georgia, threw himself upon the generosity of Karím Khán, who received him with kindness, promoted him to the first rank among his nobles, and treated him with so generous a confidence that he soon converted this dangerous rival into an attached friend²⁷⁴.

In A.D. 1757, about four years after the battle of Kamárij, Karím Khán had to face a fierce onslaught by his other rival, Muḥammad Ḥasan Khán the Qájár, who, after a striking initial success, was finally driven back into Mázandarán, where he was eventually defeated and killed in A.D. 1760 by Karím Khán's general Shaykh ‘Alí Khán. From this time until his death in the spring of 1779 Karím Khán practically ruled over the whole of Persia except Khurásán, where the blind and harmless Sháhrúkh exercised a nominal sovereignty. The chief military exploit of his reign was the capture of Baṣra from the Turks in 1776, effected by his brother Šádiq, who continued to administer it until Karím's death, when he relinquished it to the Turks in order to take part in the fratricidal struggle for the Persian crown²⁷⁵.

[page 141]

“The most important, if we consider its ultimate consequences, of all the events which occurred at the death of Karím Khán, was the flight of Áqá Muḥammad Khán Qájár, who had been for many years a prisoner at large in the city of Shíráz²⁷⁶.” As a child he had suffered castration by the cruel command of Nádír's nephew ‘Ádil Sháh²⁷⁷, on account of which the title of Ághá or Áqá, generally given to eunuchs, was added to his name. After the defeat and death of his father Muḥammad Ḥasan Khán the Qájár in A.D. 1757, he fell into the hands of Karím Khán, who interned him in Shíráz, but otherwise treated him kindly, and even generously, so far as was compatible with his safe custody. He was even allowed to gratify his passion for the chase in the country round Shíráz on condition of re-entering the city before the gates were closed at night-fall. Returning to the city on the evening of Šafar 12, 1193 (March 1, 1779), and learning through his sister, who was an inmate of the Palace, that Karím Khán lay at the point of death, he suffered a favourite hawk to escape, and made its pursuit an excuse for spending the night in the plain. Next morning, two hours after dawn²⁷⁸, having learned that Karím Khán had breathed his last, he took advantage of the prevailing confusion to make his escape northwards, and travelled so swiftly that he reached Iṣfahán on the third day²⁷⁹, and thence made his way into Mázandarán, which thenceforth became the base of

²⁷² *Op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 115.

²⁷³ R. G. Watson's *History of Persia*, p. 44.

²⁷⁴ Sir John Malcolm's *History of Persia*, vol. ii, p. 125. The two preceding pages contain a graphic account of the battle of Kamárij, as narrated to the author on the spot by persons who had themselves taken part in it.

²⁷⁵ See ‘Alí Riḍá's *Ta'rikh-i-Zandiyya* (ed. Ernst Beer, Leyden, 1888).

²⁷⁶ Sir John Malcolm, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 157.

²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 263.

²⁷⁸ *Ta'rikh-i-Zandiyya*, p. 6, l. 1.

²⁷⁹ Sir John Malcolm's *History*, ii, p. 158 *ad calc.*

those operations by which, fifteen years later, he accomplished the final overthrow of the Zand, dynasty and won for his own house that supremacy over Persia which they hold to this day.

It is unnecessary to describe here the fratricidal wars

[page 142]

which during the next ten years (A.D. 1779-89) sapped the power of the Zand dynasty while Áqá Muḥammad Khán, with incredible self-control and political sagacity, was uniting and consolidating the Qájár power. Within the year which witnessed Karím Khán's death four of his house had successively mounted his throne, to wit, his son Abu'l-Faṭḥ, his nephew 'Alí Murád, his son Muḥammad 'Alí, and his brother Sádiq. The last-named, together with all his sons except Ja'far, was put to death in March, 1782, by 'Alí Murád, who thus regained the throne, but died at Múrchakhúr near Iṣfahán in January, 1785, and was succeeded by Ja'far, the date of whose accession is commemorated in the following ingenious chronogram by Ḥájji Sulaymán of Káshán called Şabáhi²⁸⁰:

بضبطِ سالِ جلوسِ مباركِ ميمونِ
كه هست مبداءِ تاريخِ عشرتِ دورانِ
نوشت كلكِ صباحى ز قصرِ سلطانىِ
على مراد برون شد نشست جعفر خانِ

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

The letters composing the words *Qaşr-i-Sulṭání* yield the number 550; from this we subtract (355) equivalent to 'Alí Murád, which gives us 195; to this we add the number equivalent to *Ja'far Khán* (1004), which finally gives us the correct date A.H. 1199 (A.D. 1785).

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

[page 143]

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

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

[page 144]

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

²⁸⁰ *Ta'rih-i-Zandiyya*, pp. 24-25.

²⁸¹ *The Dynasty of the Kajars, etc.* (London, 1833), pp/- cxx-cxxi. Sir H. J. Brydges “visited Shíráz for the first time in 1786.”

²⁸² To wit, the notorious Ḥájji Ibráhim — “the scoundrel,” as Sir H. J. Brydges calls him (*Account of ... H.M.'s Mission, etc.* vol. i. pp. 95-96), “whose mad ambition and black heart brought ruin on his confiding King, and misery the most severe on his fellow-citizens.”

The full and detailed accounts of the reigning Qájár dynasty already available to the English reader render any attempt to summarize their history in this place quite unnecessary²⁸³. Áqá Muḥammad Khan was not actually crowned until A.D. 1796, and was assassinated in the following year, so that he wore the crown of Persia for not more than fifteen months²⁸⁴, but his reign practically began on the death of Karím Khán in A.D. 1779, though “he used to observe that he had no title even to the name of king till he was obeyed through the whole of the ancient limits of the Empire of Persia²⁸⁵,” so that it was only after he had finally subdued Georgia that he consented to assume the title of Sháh. His appearance and character are admirably summarized by Sir John Malcolm in the following words²⁸⁶:

[page 145]

“Áqá Muḥammad Khán was murdered in the sixty-third year of his age. He had been ruler of a great part of Persia for upwards of twenty years, but had only for a short period enjoyed the undisputed sovereignty of that country. The person of that monarch was so slender that at a distance he appeared like a youth of fourteen or fifteen. His beardless and shrivelled face resembled that of an aged and wrinkled woman; and the expression of his countenance, at no times pleasant, was horrible when clouded, as it very often was, with indignation. He was sensible of this, and could not bear that anyone should look at him. This prince had suffered, in the early part of his life, the most cruel adversity; and his future conduct seems to have taken its strongest bias from the keen recollection of his misery and his wrongs. The first passion of his mind was the love of power; the second, avarice; and the third, revenge. In all these he indulged to excess, and they administered to each other: but the two latter, strong as they were, gave way to the first whenever they came in collision. His knowledge of the character and feelings of others was wonderful; and it is to this knowledge, and his talent of concealing from all the secret purposes of his soul, that we must refer his extraordinary success in subduing his enemies. Against these he never employed force till art had failed; and, even in war, his policy effected more than his sword. His ablest and most confidential minister²⁸⁷, when asked if Áqá Muḥammad Khán was personally brave, replied, ‘No doubt; but still I can hardly recollect an occasion when he had an opportunity of displaying courage. The monarch’s head,’ he emphatically added, ‘never left work for his hand.’”

Áqá Muḥammad Khán was succeeded by his nephew the uxorious and philoprogenitive²⁸⁸ Fath-‘Alí Sháh. He was

[page 146]

avaricious and vain, being inordinately proud of his handsome face and long beard, but not by nature cruel (at any rate compared to his late uncle), and it is related that, though obliged by custom to witness the execution of malefactors, he would always avert his face so as not to behold the unhappy wretch’s death-agony. He was something of a poet, and composed numerous odes under the pen-name of Kháqán. Politically the chief features of his reign were the Anglo-French rivalry typified by the missions of Malcolm and Harford Jones Brydges on the one hand, and Jaubert and General Gardanne on the other (A.D. 1800-1808); the growing menace of Russia, resulting in the successive disastrous treaties of Gulistán (A.D. 1813) and Turkmán-cháy (A.D. 1826); and the war with Turkey in A.D. 1821, concluded in 1823 by the Treaty of Erzeroum. Other notable events of this reign were the disgrace and death of the traitor Hájji Ibráhím and the almost complete extirpation of his family about A.D. 1800²⁸⁹; the massacre of Grebaiodoff and the Russian Mission at Tíhrán on February 11, 1829²⁹⁰; and the premature death, at the age of forty-six, of the Sháh’s favourite son ‘Abbás Mírzá, the Crown Prince, “the noblest of the

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

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

²⁸⁵ Malcolm’s *History*, ii, p. 287.

²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 300-302.

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

²⁸⁸ According to the *Násikhu’t-Tawárikh*, the issue of Fath-‘Alí Sháh during the 47 years of his mature lifetime amounted to two thousand children and grandchildren, and would, adds the historian, during the twenty-one years intervening between his death and the date of writing, probably amount to about ten thousand souls. He enumerates 57 sons and 46 daughters who survived him, 296 grandsons and 292 granddaughters, and 158 wives who had borne children to him. R.G. Watson (*History of Persia*, p. 269) puts the number of his children at 159. In any case the number was so large as to justify the well-known Persian saying *Shutur u shupush u shahzáda hama já paydá’s* (“Camels, lice and princes are to be found everywhere”).

²⁸⁹ See R. G. Watson’s *History of Persia*, pp. 128-129.

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 247-256.

Kajar race," as Watson calls him²⁹¹, in A.D. 1833. His heart-broken father only survived him about a year, and died at the age of sixty-eight on October 23, 1834, leaving fifty-seven sons and forty-six daughters to mourn his loss.

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

[page 147]

however, were overcome without much difficulty by Persian troops commanded by Sir Henry Lindsay Bethune, and though the new Sháh had every reason to be grateful to England and Russia for assuring his succession, the fact that these two powerful neighbours had for the first time intervened in this fashion was an ominous portent and a dangerous precedent in the history of Persia. The same year witnessed the fall and execution (on June 26, 1835) of the celebrated *Qá’im-maqám* Mírzá Abu’l-Qásim²⁹², hitherto the all-powerful minister of the King, still regarded by his countrymen as one of the finest prose stylists of modern times. He was succeeded as Prime Minister by the notorious Hájji Mírzá Ághásí, concerning whom many ridiculous anecdotes are still current in Persia²⁹³. Of the protracted but fruitless siege of Herát by the Persians in 1838 and the manifestations of Anglo-Russian rivalry for which it afforded occasion it is unnecessary to speak; nor of the withdrawal of Sir J. McNeill, the British Minister (A.D. 1838-1841), from the Persian Court; nor of the Turco-Persian boundary disputes of 1842 and the Turkish massacre of Persians at Karbalá in the early part of 1843. From our point of view none of these events, fully discussed by R. G. Watson and other historians of Persia, are equal in interest to the Isma‘íli revolt of 1840 or thereabouts, and the rise of the Bábi religion in 1844.

Of the origin and doctrines of the Isma‘íli heresy or “Sect of the Seven” (*Sab’iyya*), some account will be found in the

[page 148]

first volume²⁹⁴ of this work, while their destruction by Húlágú Khán the Mongol in the middle of the thirteenth century of our era is briefly described in the second²⁹⁵. But, though their power in Persia was shattered, they still continued to exist, and, from time to time, to reappear on the pages of Persian history. In the volume of the *Násikhu’t-Tawárikh* dealing with the reigning Qájár dynasty several references to them occur. The first, under the year 1232/1817, refers to the death of the then head of the sect Sháh Khalílu’lláh, the son of Sayyid Abu’l-Ḥasan Khán, at Yazd. Under the Zand dynasty Abu’l-Ḥasan had been governor of Kirmán, whence on his dismissal he retired to the Maḥallát of Qum. There he received tribute from his numerous followers in India and Central Asia, who, it is recorded, if unable to bring their offerings in person, used to throw them into the sea, believing that they would thus be conveyed into the hands of their Imám; but, when possible, used to visit him in his abode and deem it an honour to render him personal service, even of the most menial kind. His son, Sháh Khalílu’lláh, transferred his abode to Yazd, but after residing there two years he was killed in the course of a quarrel which had arisen between some of his followers and the Muslim citizens of Yazd, instigated by a certain Mullá Ḥusayn. The Sháh punished the perpetrators of this outrage, gave one of his daughters in marriage to Áqá Khán, the son and successor of the late Imám of the Isma‘ílís, and made him governor of Qum and the surrounding districts (*Maḥallát*).

We next hear of this Áqá Khán in 1255/1839 or 1256/1840²⁹⁶, when, apparently in consequence of the arrogant

[page 149]

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

²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 269.

²⁹² His father, Mírzá ‘Ísá of Faráhán, bore the same title. Notices of both occur in vol. ii of the *Majma’u’l-Fuṣaḥá*, pp. 87 and 425. Some account of his literary achievements will be given when we come to consider the prose-writers of the Qájár period in the penultimate chapter of Part iii of this volume.

²⁹³ See Gobineau’s *Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l’Asie Centrale* (2nd ed., Paris, 1866), pp. 160-166; and my *Year amongst the Persians*, pp. 116-117. A sketch of his character is also given by R. G. Watson, *History of Persia*, pp. 288-289.

²⁹⁴ *Lit. Hist. of Persia*, i, pp. 391-415, etc.

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, ii, pp. 190-211; 453-460.

²⁹⁶ R. G. Watson in his *History of Persia* gives a fairly full account of the insurrection (pp. 331-334).

to Lár, whence he ultimately escaped to India, where his descendant, the present Áqá Khán²⁹⁷, lives a wealthy and spacious life at Bombay when not engaged in his frequent and extensive travels.

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

[page 150]

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

[page 151]

"Creator of Gods" (*Khudá-áfarín*) while one of them went so far as to write of Bahá'u'lláh²⁹⁹:

خلق گویند خدائی و من اندر غضب آیم
پرده برداشته میسند بخود ننگ خدائی؛

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

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

Dark indeed were the horizons at the beginning of the new reign. The *Walí-'ahd*, or Crown Prince, Náṣiru'd-Dín, was absent at Tabriz, the seat of his government, at the time of his father's death, and until he could reach Tihrán his mother, the *Mahd-i-Ulyá*, assumed control of affairs. Hájji Mírzá Áqásí, whose unpopularity was extreme, not only ceased to act as Prime Minister, but had to flee for his life, and took refuge in the Shrine of Sháh 'Abdu'l-'Azím³⁰⁰. Disturbances broke out in the capital itself, and more serious revolts in Burújird, Kirmánsháh, Kurdistán, Shíráz, Kirmán, Yazd and Khurásán. The young Sháh, then only seventeen years of age³⁰¹, finally

[page 152]

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

²⁹⁷ Sultán Muḥammad Sháh, G.C.I.E., etc., born in 1875. See *Who's Who*, s.v. "Aga Khan," and the conclusion of Stanislas Guyard's entertaining article Un Grand Maître des Assassins au temps de Saladin in the *Journal Asiatique* for 1877.

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

²⁹⁹ Cited in the *Hasht Bihišt*, f. 244^a of my MS. The verse is ascribed to Nabil of Zarand, who killed himself at 'Akká on Bahá'u'lláh's death on May 28, 1892.

³⁰⁰ R. G. Watson's *History of Persia*, pp. 357-8.

³⁰¹ He was born on July 17, 1831.

the *Qá'im-maqám*)³⁰², was one of the greatest men and most honest, capable and intelligent ministers produced by Persia in modern times. "The race of modern Persians," exclaims Watson³⁰³ enthusiastically, "cannot be said to be altogether effete, since so recently it has been able to produce a man such as was the *Amír-i-Nizám*"; and the Hon. Robert Curzon, in his *Armenia and Erzeroum*, has described him as "beyond all comparison the most interesting personage amongst the commissioners of Turkey, Persia, Russia and Great Britain who were then assembled at Erzeroum." In the brief period of three years during which he held the high office of Prime Minister he did much for Persia, but the bright promise of his career was too soon darkened by the envy and malice of his rivals. The tragic circumstances of his violent and cruel death in his exile at the beautiful palace of Fín near Káshán are too well known to need repetition³⁰⁴, but the admirable fidelity of his wife, the Sháh's only sister, can-not be passed over in silence. "No princess educated in a Christian court, says Watson³⁰⁵, "and accustomed to the contemplation of the brightest example of conjugal virtues that the history of the world has recorded could have shown more tenderness and devotion than did the sister of the Sháh of Persia towards her unfortunate husband." Her untiring vigilance was, however, finally tricked and out-

[page 153]

witted by the infamous Hájjí 'Alí Khán *Hájibu'd-Dawla*, who owed so much to the minister whose life he succeeded in bringing to an end on January 9, 1852.

The Bábís, however, had no cause to love Mírzá Taqí Khán, whose death they had already striven to compass, and whose ultimate fate was regarded by them as a signal instance of Divine retribution, since, apart from other measures which he had taken against them, he was responsible for the execution of the Báb himself at Tabriz on July 9, 1850. The Báb indeed, helpless prisoner that he was, had kindled a flame which proved inextinguishable, and which especially illumines with a lurid glow the first four years of Náşiru'd-Dín Sháh's reign. The story of the almost incredible martial achievements of the Bábís at Shaykh Ṭabarsí in Mázarán, at Zanján, Yazd, Nayríz and elsewhere during the years 1849-1850 will never be more graphically told than by the Comte de Gobineau, who in his incomparable book *Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale* combines wit, sympathy and insight in an extraordinary degree. I personally owe more to this book than to any other book about Persia, since to it, not less than to an equally fortunate and fortuitous meeting in Işfahán, I am indebted for that unravelling of Bábí doctrine and history which first won for me a reputation in Oriental scholarship. Gobineau was for some time a "prophet without honour in his own country," but, while France long neglected him, Germany produced a "Gobineau-Vereinigung"³⁰⁶ and several important works³⁰⁷ on his life and writings. The militant

[page 154]

phase of Bábíism. culminated in the attempted assassination of Náşiru'd-Dín Sháh by three members of the sect on August 15, 1852, and the frightful persecution which followed, wherein twenty-eight more or less prominent Bábís, including the beautiful and talented poetess Qurratu'l-'Ayn, suffered death with horrible tortures³⁰⁸. Most of the leading Bábís who survived emigrated or were exiled to Baghdád, and thenceforth, though the sect continued to increase in Persia, the centre of its activity, whether at Baghdád, Adrianople, Cyprus or Acre, lay beyond the frontiers of Persia.

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

[page 155]

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

³⁰³ See Watson's *History*, p. 264.

³⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 398-406.

³⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 403.

³⁰⁶ Founded in 1894.

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

³⁰⁸ See my *Travellers Narrative*, vol. ii, pp. 326-334, and *Materials for the Study of the Bábí Religion*, pp. 265-271.

³⁰⁹ I refer to the second and enlarged edition, published in 1921, in which (on p. 526 of vol. ii) March of that year is mentioned as the current date at the time of writing.

and coherent narrative of events from 1857 to 1921), had far-reaching reactions³¹⁰, and was one of the factors in the modernization of Persia. Others were the extension of the Press (first introduced into Tabríz by ‘Abbás Mírzá about A.D. 1816) and consequent wider diffusion of literature; the slow growth of journalism since 1851³¹¹ down to its enormous expansion during the Revolution of 1906-1911 and again after the Russian collapse; the foundation of the *Dáru’l-Funún*, or Polytechnic College, at Tíhrán in 1851, and the introduction of European science and instruction; and, in a lesser degree, the Sháh’s three journeys to Europe in 1873, 1878 and 1889, though it is doubtful whether he or his attendants derived more advantage from what they saw in the course of their peregrinations than Persian literature did from his accounts of his experiences.

Náşiru’d-Dín Sháh was only a little over seventeen years of age when he was crowned on the 24th of Dhu’l-Qa’da, 1264 (20 October, 1848), and would have entered upon the fiftieth year of his reign on the same date of the Muhammadan year A.H. 1313, corresponding to May 5, 1896. Four days earlier, however, when all the preparations for the celebration of his jubilee were completed, he was shot dead by Mírzá Riđá of Kirmán, a disciple of that turbulent spirit Sayyid Jamálu’d-Dín al-Afghán, in the Shrine of Sháh ‘Abdu’l-‘Azím a few miles south of Tíhrán. Of the events which led up to this catastrophe and their significance I have treated fully in my *History of the Persian Revolution of 1905-1909*, and will not attempt to epitomize here matters which are fully discussed there, and which it would be a waste of space to

[page 156]

recapitulate. The seeds of the Revolution were sown, and even began to germinate, about the time of the Sháh’s third and last visit to Europe, fruitful in ill-advised concessions, which (especially the Tobacco concession of 1890) were a potent factor in stimulating the political discontents which found their first open expression in the Tobacco-riots of 1891 and culminated in the Revolution of 1905. If we ignore the external relations of Persia with foreign Powers, especially England and Russia, which form the principal topic of such political histories as that of Sir Percy Molesworth Sykes, we may say, broadly speaking, that of the long reign of Náşiru’d-Dín Sháh the first four years (A.D. 1848-52) were notable for the religious fermentation caused by the Bábís, and the last six years Sháh’s reign. (A.D. 1890-6) for the political fermentation which brought about the Revolution in the following reign; while the intervening period was, outwardly at any rate, one of comparative peace and tranquillity. It was my good fortune to visit Persia in 1887-8 towards the end of this period, and, while enjoying the remarkable security which then prevailed in the country, to see almost the last of what may fairly be called mediaeval Persia. To this security I hardly did justice in the narrative of my travels³¹² which I wrote soon after my return, for I hardly realized then how few and short were the periods, either before or after my visit, when a young foreigner, without any official position or protection, could traverse the country from North-West to South-East and from North to South, attended only by his Persian servant and his muleteers, not only without danger, but practically without the occurrence of a single disagreeable incident. And if this

[page 157]

remarkable security, which compared favourably with that of many European countries, had originally been brought about by frightful exemplary punishments of robbers and ill-doers, these were no longer in evidence, and during the whole of my time in Persia I not only never witnessed an execution or a bastinado, but never heard of a specific case of either in any place where I stayed, though the ghastly pillars of mortar with protruding human bones outside the gates of Shiráz still bore witness to the stern rule of the Sháh’s uncle Farhád Mírzá, *Mu’tamadu’d-Dawla*, whom I met only in the capacity of a courtly and learned bibliophile. Yet withal the atmosphere was, as I have said, mediaeval: politics and progress were hardly mentioned, and the talk turned mostly on mysticism, metaphysics and religion; the most burning political questions were those connected with the successors of the Prophet Muḥammad in the seventh century of our era; only a languid interest in external affairs was aroused by the occasional appearance of the official journals *Írán* and *Iṭtilá’*, or the more exciting *Akhtar* published in Constantinople; while at Kirmán one post a week maintained communication with the outer world. How remote does all this seem from the turmoil of 1891, the raging storms of 1905-11, the deadly paralysis of the Russian terror which began on Christmas Day in the year last mentioned, and then the Great War, when Persia became the cockpit of three foreign armies and the field of endless intrigues. The downfall of Russian Imperialism freed her from the nightmare of a century, and seemed to her to avenge the desecration of the holy shrine of Mashhad in April, 1912, while the collapse of the Anglo-Persian Agreement and consequent withdrawal of British troops and advisers has left her for the time being to her own devices, to make or mar her future as she can and will.

[page 158]

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

³¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, ii, p. 369.

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

³¹² *A Year Amongst the Persians* (London: A. & C. Black, 1893). This book has long been out of print and is now very scarce.

Constantinople; and his great-grandson Sultán Aḥmad Sháh the reigning monarch. It would be premature to discuss the reign and character of the last, while the very dissimilar characters of his father and grandfather I have endeavoured to depict in my *History of the Persian Revolution*. But since the death of Náṣiru'd-Dín-Din Sháh twenty-seven years ago it may truly be said that the centre of interest has shifted from the king to the people of Persia, nor, so far as we can foresee the future, is it likely that we shall see another Isma'íl, another Nádir, or (which God forbid!) another Áqá Muḥammad Khán.

PART II.

PERSIAN VERSE DURING THE LAST FOUR CENTURIES

CHAPTER V.

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

Four hundred years ago the Persian language (or at any rate the written language, for no doubt fresh colloquialisms and slang may have arisen during this period) was to all intents and purposes the same as it is to-day, while such new literary forms as exist go no further back, as a rule, than the middle of the nineteenth century, that is to say than the accession of Náṣiru'd-Dín Sháh, whose reign (A.D. 1848-1896) might not inappropriately be called the Persian Victorian³¹³ Era. In the three previous volumes of this book each historical chapter has been immediately followed by a chapter dealing with the literature of that period; but in this volume, for the reason just given, it appeared unnecessary to break the sequence of events in this way, and to be preferable to devote the first part of the volume to a brief historical sketch of the whole period, and the second and third parts to a consideration of the literature in verse and prose, arranged according to categories.

How to arrange these categories is a problem which has cost me a good deal of thought. Nearly all those who have written on Persian literature have paid an amount of attention which I regard as excessive and disproportionate to poetry and *belles-lettres*, and have almost entirely ignored the plainer but more positive fields of history, biography, theology, philosophy and the ancient sciences. If we understand literature in the

[page 162]

narrower sense as denoting those writings only, whether poetry or prose, which have artistic form, there is, no doubt, some justification for this view; but not if we take it in the wider sense of the manifestation in writing of a nation's mind and intellectual activities. Still, in deference to the prevalent view, we may begin this general survey of the recent literature of Persia with some consideration of its poetry.

Here we have to distinguish some half-dozen categories of verse, namely (1) the classical poetry; (2) occasional or topical verse; (3) religious and devotional verse, from the formal *marthiyas*, or threnodies, of great poets like Muḥtasham of Káshán to the simple popular poems on the sufferings of the Imáms recited at the *Ta'zias*, or mournings, of the month of Muḥarram; (4) the scanty but sometimes very spirited verses composed by the Bábís since about 1850, which should be regarded as a special subdivision of the class last mentioned; (5) the ballads or *tasnifs* sung by professional minstrels, of which it is hard to trace the origin or antiquity; (6) the quite modern political verse which has arisen since the Revolution of 1906, and which I have already discussed in some detail in another work³¹⁴. In this chapter I shall deal chiefly with the religious verse, leaving the consideration of the secular poetry to the two succeeding chapters.

(1) *The Classical Poetry.*

Alike in form and matter the classical poetry of Persia has been stereotyped for at least five or six centuries, so that, except for such references to events or persons as may indicate the date of composition, it is hardly possible, after reading a *qaṣída* (elegy), *ghazal* (ode), or *rubá'i* (quatrain), to guess whether it was composed by a contemporary of Jámí (d. A.H. 1492)

[page 163]

³¹³ Náṣiru'd-Dín, indeed, approximately means "Victor" or "Defender of the Faith."

³¹⁴ *The Press and Poetry of Modern Persia* (Cambridge, 1914).

or by some quite recent poet, such as Qá'ání. Of the extremely conventional character of this poetry I have spoken in a previous volume³¹⁵, and of Ibn Khaldún's doctrine "that the Art of composing in verse or prose is concerned only with words, not with ideas." Hence, even in the most recent poetry of this type, we very seldom find any allusion to such modern inventions as tea-drinking, tobacco-smoking, railways, telegraphs or newspapers³¹⁶; indeed several of the greatest modern poets, such as Qá'ání, Dáwarí and the like, have chiefly shown their originality by reviving certain forms of verse like the *musamma*³¹⁷ which had fallen into disuse since the eleventh or twelfth century.

Perhaps the statement with which the above paragraph opens is too sweeping and requires some qualification, for in some of the later Persian poets Indian and Turkish critics do profess to discover a certain originality (*táza-gú'i*) marking an epoch in the development of the art, and the rise of a new school. The Persians themselves are not addicted to literary criticism; perhaps because, just as people only discuss their health when they are beginning to lose it, so those only indulge in meticulous literary criticism who are no longer able, or have never been able, to produce good literature. According to Gibb³¹⁸, Jámí and Mír 'Alí Shír Nawá'í, 'Urfí of Shíráz (d. 999/1590-1) and the Indian Faydí (Feyzí, d. 1004/1595-6), and lastly Šá'ib of Isfahán (d. 1080/1669-70) were successively the chief foreign influences on the development of Ottoman Turkish poetry, and a great deal has been written about them by the Turkish critics. The best and fullest

[page 164]

critical estimate of the leading Persian poets from the earliest times down to the latter part of the seventeenth century is, however, so far as I can judge, a work written (most unfortunately) in the Urdú or Hindustáni language, the *Shi'ru'l-'Ajam* ("Poetry of the Persians") of that eminent scholar Shibli Nu'mání. The third volume of this work, composed in 1324-5/1906-7, deals with seven Persian poets of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries of our era, namely Fighání (d. 925/1519), Faydí (d. 1004/1595-6), 'Urfí (d. 999/1590-1), Nažírí (d. 1021/1612-3), Tálíb-i-Ámulí (d. 1036/1626-7), Šá'ib (d. 1080/1669-1670), and Abú' Tálíb Kalím (d. 1061/1651). All these were Persians, attracted to India by the liberal patronage of the Moghul Court, except Faydí whom Shibli regards as the only Indian poet except Amír Khusraw who could produce Persian verse which might pass for that of a born Persian. 'Urfí and Šá'ib were the most notable of these seven, but even they enjoy a greater repute in India and Turkey than in their own country³¹⁹. The explanation of this fact offered by some Persians of my acquaintance is that they are easily understood and therefore popular with foreigners, who often find the more subtle poetry admired in Persia beyond their powers of comprehension. I must confess with shame that in this case my taste agrees with the foreigners, and that I find Šá'ib especially attractive, both on account of his simplicity of style and his skill in the figures entitled *husn-i-ta'líl* or "poetical aetiology," and *irsálu'l-mathal* or "proverbial commission"³²⁰. Nearly forty years ago (in 1885) I read through the Persian portion of that volume of the great trilingual anthology entitled *Kharábát*³²¹ which deals with the lyrical

[page 165]

verse of the Arabs, Turks and Persians, both odes and isolated verses, and copied into a note-book which now lies before me those which pleased me most, irrespective of authorship; and, though many of the 443 fragments and isolated verses which I selected are anonymous, more than one-tenth of the total (45) are by Šá'ib.

India, at all events, thanks to the generous patronage of Humáyún, Akbar, and their successors down to that gloomy zealot Awrangzib, and of their great nobles, such as Bayram Khán-Khánán and his son 'Abdu'r-Raḥím, who succeeded to the title after his father's assassination about A.D. 1561, continued during the greater part of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to attract a great number of the most talented Persian poets, who found there an appreciation which was withheld from them in their own country. Badá'úní³²² enumerates about one hundred and seventy, most of whom were of Persian descent though some of them were born in India. Shibli³²³ gives a list of fifty-one who came to India from Persia in Akbar's time and were received at court, and a long list is also given by Sprenger³²⁴. Shibli quotes numerous verses showing how widely diffused amongst Persian poets was the desire to try their fortune in India³²⁵.

Thus Šá'ib says:

³¹⁵ *Lit. Hist. of Persia*, ii, pp. 83-9.

³¹⁶ Cf. Gibb's *History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. iv, p. 4. Such allusions will, however, be found in the poem by Na'im quoted in the latter part of this chapter, though in general it follows the orthodox *qaṣída* form.

³¹⁷ *Lit. Hist. of Persia*, ii, pp. 41-2.

³¹⁸ *History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. iii, pp. 247-48.

³¹⁹ Ridá-qulí Khán explicitly says of both of them that their style is not approved by modern Persians.

³²⁰ See Gibb's *History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. i, pp. 113-14.

³²¹ Compiled by Žiyá (Diyá) Pasha, and published in three volumes at Constantinople in 1291-2/1874-5.

³²² *Muntakhabu't-Tawárikh* (Calcutta, 1869), vol. iii, pp. 170-390.

³²³ *Shi'ru'l-'Ajam*, vol. iii, p. 5.

³²⁴ *Catalogue of the Library of the King of Oude*, vol. i, pp. 55-65.

³²⁵ *Shi'ru'l-'Ajam*, vol. iii, p. 10.

همچو عزمِ سفرِ هند که در هر دل هست،
رقصِ سودای تو در هیچ سری نیست،

“There is no head wherein desire for thee danceth not,
Even as the determination to visit India is in every heart.”

[page 166]

And Abú Ṭálib Kalím says:

اسیرِ هندم و زین رفتنِ بیجا پشیمانم،
کجا خواهد رساندن پُرفشانی مرغِ بسمل را،
بایران میروند نالان کلیم از شوقِ همراهان،
بپای دیگران همچون جرس طی کرده منزل را،
ز شوقِ هند زان سان چشمِ حسرت بر قفا دارم،
که رو هم گمراه آورم نمی بینم مقابل را،

“I am the captive of India, and I regret this misplaced journey
Whither can the feather-flutterings of the dying bird³²⁶ convey it?
Kalím goes lamenting to Persia [dragged thither] by the eagerness of his fellow-travellers,
Like the camel-bell which traverses the stage on the feet of others.
Through longing for India I turn my regretful eyes backwards in such fashion
That, even if I set my face to the road, I do not see what confronts me.”

So also ‘Alí-qulí Salím says:

نیست در ایران زمین سامانِ تحصیلِ کمال،
تا نیامد سوی هندستان حنا رنگین نشد،

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

The Persian dervish-poet Rasmí, commemorating the Khán-Khánán’s liberal patronage of poets, says³²⁷:

ز یمنِ مدح تو آن نکته سنج شیرازی،
رسید صیت کمالش بروم ز خاور،
بطرز تازه ز مدح تو آشنا گردید،
چو روی خوب که یابد ز ماشطه زیور،

[page 167]

³²⁶ When a Muslim kills a bird for food by cutting its throat, he must pronounce the formula *Bismi’lláh* (“In the Name of God”) over it.
Such a bird, in its (lying) struggles on the ground, is called *Murgh-i-Bismil*, or *Nim-bismil*.

³²⁷ *Shi’ru’l-‘Ajám*, vol. iii, p. 13.

ز فیضِ نامِ تو فیضی گرفت چون خسرو'
 بتشیخِ هندی اقلیمِ سبعة را یکسر'
 ز ریزه چینی خوانت نظیری شاعر'
 رسیده است بجائی که شاعران دگر'
 کنند بهر مدیحه قصیده انشا'
 که خون رشك چكد از دل سخن پرور'
 سوادِ شعرِ شکیبی چو کحلِ صفاهان'
 بتحفه سوی خراسان برند اهلِ نظر'
 ز مدحتِ تو حیاتی حیاتِ دیگر یافت'
 بلی مقوی طبعِ عرض بود جوهر'
 حدیثِ نوعی و کفوی بیان چه سازمن'
 چو زنده اند بمدح تو تا دمِ محشر'
 ز نعمتِ تو به نوعی رسید آن مایه'
 که یافت میر معزی ز نعمتِ سنجر'

"Through auspicious praise of thee the fame of the perfection of that
 subtle singer of Shīrāz³²⁸ reached from the East to Rūm³²⁹.
 In praising thee he became conversant with a new style, like the fair
 face which gains adornment from the tire-woman.
 By the grace (*fayḍ*) of thy name Fayḍī, like [his predecessor]
 Khusraw³³⁰, annexed the Seven Climes from end to end with the Indian sword.
 By gathering crumbs from thy table Nazīrī the poet hath attained a
 rank such that other poets
 Compose such elegies in his praise that blood drips in envy from the
 heart of the singer.
 Men of discernment carry as a gift to Khurāsān, like the collyrium
 of Iṣfahān, copies of Shakībī's verses.
 By praising thee Ḥayātī found fresh life (*hayāt*): yea, the substance
 must needs strengthen the nature of the accident.

[page 168]

How can I tell the tale of Naw'í and Kufwí, since by their praise of
 thee they will live until the Resurrection Dawn?
 Such measure of thy favour accrued to Naw'í as Amír Mu'izzí
 received from the favour of Sanjar."

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

(2) Occasional or Topical Verse.

³²⁸ I.e. 'Urfí, as Shibli notes.

³²⁹ I.e. Turkey. See above, p. 80, n. 5.

³³⁰ Cf. p. 164 *supra*.

Some of the most interesting pieces of poetry are those composed, not necessarily by professional poets, for some special purpose or some particular occasion. These are not so often to be found in the regular *díwáns* of verse as in the pages of contemporary histories. The following from the unpublished *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh* may serve as specimens.

In the year 961/1553-4 died three Indian kings, Maḥmúd III of Gujerát, Islám Sháh son of Shír Sháh the Afghán of Dihlí, and Nizámu'l-Mulk of the Deccan. This coincidence, with the date, is commemorated in the following verses:

[page 169]

سه خسرو را قرآن آمد بیک سال
 که هند از عدلشان دار آلمان بود
 یکی محمود شاهنشاه گجرات
 که همچون دولت خود نو جوان بود
 دوم اسلام شه سلطان دهلی
 که در هندوستان صاحب قرآن بود
 سیم آمد نظام الملک بحری
 که در ملک دکن خسرو نشان بود
 زمن تاریخ فوت آن سه خسرو
 چه میپرسی زوال خسروان بود

“In one year the [fatal] conjunction came to three princes by whose justice India was the Abode of Security. One was Maḥmúd³³¹, the monarch of Gujerát, who was youthful as his own fortune. The second was Islám Sháh³³², King of Dihlí, who was in India the lord of a fortunate conjunction. The third was the Nizámu'l-Mulk³³³-i-Baḥrí, who ruled in royal state in the kingdom of the Deccan. Why dost thou ask of me the date of the death of these three Kings? It was ‘the decline of the kings’ (زوال خسروان = 961).”

The following verses by Mawláná Qásim commemorate the death of Humáyún in the succeeding year (962/1554-5):

همایون پادشاه ملک معنی
 ندارد کس چو او شاهنشهی یاد
 ز بام قصر خود افتاد ناگاه
 وزو عمر گرامی رفت بر باد
 بی تاریخ او قاسم رقم زد
 همایون پادشاه از بام افتاد

“Humáyún, king of the realm of the Ideal, none can recall a monarch like him:

[page 170]

Suddenly he fell from the roof of his palace; precious life departed from him on the winds. Qásim³³⁴ thus ciphered the date of his death: ‘King Humáyún fell from the roof’.”

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

³³¹ See S. Lane-Poole's *Mohammadan Dynasties*, p. 313.

³³² *Ibid.*, pp. 300 and 303.

³³³ *Ibid.*, p. 320. I doubt if *Baḥrí* is a correct reading: it should perhaps be *Burhán*, the proper name of the second of the Nizám Sháhs of Aḥmadnagar, who reigned from 914 to 961 A.H. (1508-1553 A.D.).

³³⁴ My text has *gáhi*, which I have ventured to emend to Qásim. For the particulars of Humáyún's death, see Erskine's *History of India under the first two sovereigns of the House of Taimúr, Baber and Humáyún* (London, 1854), vol. ii, pp. 527-8. The chronogram is unusually natural, simple and appropriate.

وقت آن آمد که آساید سپهر بی مدار،
 چون زمین در سایهات ای سایه پروردگار،
 پادشاهان مدت نه ماه شد کین نا توان،
 مانده در قزوین خراب و خسته و مجروح و زار،
 یافتند رسم تسنن در وضیع و در شریف،
 دیدند آثار تخریب در صغار و در کبار،
 در مقابر پای شسته از فقیر و از غنی،
 در مساجد دست بسته از یمین و از یسار،
 در زمان چون تو شاهی دست بستن در نماز،
 هست کاری دست بسته ای شه عالی تبار،
 قاضی این ملک نسل خالد بن الولید،
 مفتی این شهر فرزندی سعید ناپکار،
 کشته گردیده ز تیغ شاه غازی هر دورا،
 هم برادر هم پدر هم یار هم خویش و تبار،
 خود بفرما ای شه دانا که اکنون این گروه،
 داعی خصمند یا مولای شاه کامکار،
 قتل عامی گر نباشد قتل خاصی میتوان،
 خاصه از بهر رضای حضرت پروردگار،

[page 171]

نیستند اینها رعایائی که باشد قتلشان،
 موجب تخفیف مال و مانع خرج دیار،
 بلکه هر يك مبلغی از مال دیوان میخورند،
 سر بسر صاحب سیورغانند هم ادرار دار،

“The time has come when the pivotless sphere, like the earth, should
 rest under thy shadow, O Shadow of God!
 O King! It is a period of nine months that this helpless one hath
 remained in Qazwín ruined, weary, wounded and wretched.
 I found the practices of the Sunnís in humble and noble alike: I saw
 the signs of schism in small and great:
 Poor and rich with washed feet at the Tombs: hands clasped in the
 mosques to right and to left.
 In the time of a King like thee to clasp the hands in prayer is an
 underhand action, O King of lofty lineage!
 The judge of this Kingdom is of the race of Khálid ibnu’l-Walíd;
 the Muftí of this city is the son of the worthless Sa’íd.
 By the sword of the victorious King the brother, father, friend,
 kinsman and family of both have been slain together.
 Say thyself, O wise King, whether now this group are the propa-
 gandists of the enemy, or the clients of the victorious King.
 If there cannot be a public massacre one might [at least contrive]
 a private massacre for the special satisfaction of the Divine Majesty.
 These are not subjects whose slaughter would cause a reduction of
 the revenue or would check the spending power of the country;
 Nay, rather each one of them consumes a quantity of the wealth of
 the exchequer, for they are all fief-holders and pensioners.”

The worst of these “occasional verses” is that we seldom know enough of the circumstances under which they were composed to enable us fully to understand all the allusions contained in them. What, for example, had the people of Qazwín done to the author of the above verses to arouse in him such bitter anger? Who were the Qádí and the Muftí whom he particularly denounces? How did their relatives come to be slain by the King, and of what enemy were they the propagandists? The fact that we do not know at

[page 172]

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

(3) Religious and Devotional Verse.

Of the numerous poets of the Şafawí period who devoted their talents to the celebration of the virtues and sufferings of the Imáms, Muhtasham of Káshán (died 996/1588) is the most eminent. In his youth he wrote erotic verse, but in later life he seems to have consecrated his genius almost entirely to the service of religion. Riḏá-qulí Khán in his *Majma‘u‘l-Fuṣahá* (vol. ii, pp. 36-8) gives specimens of both styles, of which we are here concerned only with the second. The author of the *Ta‘rikh-i-‘Álam-árá-yi-‘Abbási*³³⁵ in his account of the chief poets of Sháh Tahmásp’s reign states that though in earlier life that king enjoyed and cultivated the society of poets, in his later years his increasing austerity and deference to the views of the theologians led him to regard them with disfavour as latitudinarians (*wasí‘u‘l-mashrab*), so that when Muhtasham, hoping for a suitable reward, sent him two eloquent panegyrics, one in his praise and the other in praise of the Princess Parí-Khán Khánúm, he received nothing, the Sháh remarking that poetry written in praise of kings and princes was sure to consist largely of lies and exaggerations, according to the

[page 173]

well-known Arabic saying, “The best poetry is that which contains most falsehoods,” but that, since it was impossible to exaggerate the virtues of the Prophet and the Imáms, the poet could safely exert his talents to the full, and in addition would have the satisfaction of looking for a heavenly instead of an earthly reward. Thereupon Muhtasham composed his celebrated *haft-band*, or poem of seven-verse strophes, in praise of the Imáms, and this time was duly and amply rewarded, whereupon many other poets followed his example, so that in a comparatively short time some fifty or sixty such *haft-bands* were produced. This poem is cited in most of the anthologies which include Muhtasham, but most fully in the *Kharábát*³³⁶ of Ḍiyá (Ziyá) Pasha (vol. ii, pp. 197-200). In this fullest form it comprises twelve strophes each consisting of seven verses, and each concluding with an additional verse in a different rhyme, thus comprising in all ninety-six verses. The language is extraordinarily simple and direct, devoid of those rhetorical artifices and verbal conceits which many Europeans find so irritating, and shows true pathos and religious feeling. I wish that space were available to quote the whole poem, the prototype of so many others of a similar character, but I must content myself with citing three of the twelve strophes (the fourth, fifth and sixth).

بر خونِ غمِ چو عالمیان را صلا زدند،
 اول صلا بسلسله انبیا زدند،
 نوبت باولیا چو رسید آسمان طپید،
 ز آن ضربتی که بر سر شیر خدا زدند،
 پس آتشی ز اخگرِ الماس ریزها،
 افروختند و بر حسنِ مجتبی زدند،

[page 174]

³³⁵ Ff. 138^a-139^b of my MS. marked H.13. Unfortunately this very important history has never been published.

³³⁶ This excellent anthology of Arabic, Persian and Turkish poetry was printed in three volumes in Constantinople in A.H. 1291-2 (A.D. 1874-5). See p. 164, n. 3 *supra*.

و آنکه سرادقیکه مَلَك محرمش نبود
 گنندند از مدینه و در کربلا زدند
 وز تیشه ستیزه در آن دشت کوفیان
 بس نخلها ز گلشن آل عبا زدند
 بس ضربتی گزان چگرِ مصطفی درید
 بر حلق تشنه خلف مرتضی زدند
 اهلِ حرَم دریده گریبان کشاده موی
 فریاد بر درِ حرَم کپریا زدند
 روح الامین نهاده بزانو سرِ حجاب
 تاریک شد ز دیدن او چشم آفتاب
 چون خونِ حلق تشنه او بر زمین رسید
 جوش از زمین بذرزه عرش برین رسید
 نزدیک شد که خانه ایمان شود خراب
 از بس شکسته که پارکان دین رسید
 نخلِ بلند او چو حسان بر زمین زدند
 طوفان بر آسمان ز غبارِ زمین رسید
 باد آن غبار را بمسازِ نسبی رساند
 کرد از مدینه بر فلک هفتمین رسید
 یکباره جامه در حُرْم گردون بنیل زد
 چون این خبر بعیسی گردون نشین رسید
 پر شد فلک ز غلغله چون نوبت هروش
 از انبیا بحضرت روح الامین رسید
 کرد این خیال وهمِ غلط کار کین غبار
 تا دامنِ جلالِ جهان آفرین رسید
 هست از ملال کُچه بری داتِ دو الجلال
 او در دست و هیچ دلی نیست بیجلال

[page 175]

ترسم جزای قاتلِ او چون رقم زنند
 یکباره بر چریده رحمت قلم زنند
 ترسم کزین گناه شفیعانِ روزِ حشر
 دارند شرم کز کُنه حلق دم زنند
 دستِ عتابِ حق بدر آید ز آستین
 چون اهلِ بیت دست بر اهلِ ستم زنند
 آه از دمیکه با کفنِ خونچکان ز خاک
 آلِ علی چو شعله آتش سَکَم زنند
 فریاد از آن زمانکه جوانانِ اهلِ بیت
 گلگون کفن بعرضه محشر بهر زنند
 جمعی که زد بهر صفشان شورِ کربلا
 در حشر صفِ زنان صفِ محشر بهر زنند
 از صاحبِ حرَم چه توقع کنند باز
 آن نا کسان که تیغِ بصیدِ حرَم زنند
 پس بر سنان کنند سربوا که جبرئیل
 شوید غبارِ گسویش از آبِ سلسبیل

“When they summoned mankind to the table of sorrow, they first issued the summons to the hierarchy of the Prophets. When it came to the turn of the Saints, Heaven trembled at the blow which they smote on the head of the Lion of God³³⁷.

³³⁷ I.e. ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, the Prophet’s cousin and son-in-law and the first of the Twelve Imāms.

Then they kindled a fire from sparks of diamond-dust and cast it on
Ḥasan³³⁸ the Chosen one.
Then they tore up from Madína and pitched at Karbalá those
pavilions to which even the angels were denied entrance.

[page 176]

Many tall palm-trees from the grove of the 'Family of the Cloak'³³⁹
did the people of Kúfa fell in that plain with the axe of malice.
Many a blow whereby the heart of Muṣṭafá [Muḥammad] was rent
did they inflict on the thirsty throat of Murtaḏá 'Alí's successor'³⁴⁰,
While his women, with collars torn and hair unloosed, raised their
laments to the Sanctuary of the Divine Majesty,
And the Trusted Spirit [Gabriel] laid his head in shame on his knees,
and the eye of the sun was darkened at the sight.

When the blood of his thirsty throat fell on the ground, turmoil arose
from the earth to the summit of God's high Throne.
The Temple of Faith came nigh to ruin through the many fractures
inflicted on the Pillars of Religion.
They cast to the ground his tall palm-tree³⁴¹ even as the thorn-bush;
a deluge arose from the dust of the earth to heaven.
The breeze carried that dust to the Prophet's Tomb: dust arose from
Madína to the seventh heaven.
When tidings of this reached Jesus dwelling in the heavenly sphere,
he forthwith plunged his garments in indigo³⁴² in the vat of heaven.
Heaven was filled with murmuring when the turn to cry out passed
from the Prophets to the presence of the Trusted Spirit.
Mistaken imagination fancied that this dust³⁴³, had [even] reached
the skirts of the Creator's glory,
For although the Essence of the All-glorious is exempt from vexation,
He dwells in the heart, and no heart remains unvexed.

I am afraid that when they record the punishment of his murderer,
they may forthwith strike the pen through the Book of Mercy.
I am afraid that the Intercessors on the Resurrection Day may be
ashamed, by reason of this sin, to speak of the sins of mankind.
When the People of the House shall lay hands on the People of
Tyranny, the hand of God's reproach shall come forth from its sleeve.
Alas for the moment when the House of 'Alí, with blood dripping
from their winding-sheets, shall raise their standards from the
dust like a flame of fire!

[page 177]

Alas for that time when the youths of that Holy House shall dash
together their crimson shrouds on the Resurrection Plain!
That company, whose ranks were broken by the strife of Karbalá,
at the Resurrection in serried ranks will break the ranks of the uprisen.
What hopes from the Lord of the Sanctuary³⁴⁴ can those worthless
ones entertain who wounded with their swords the quarry³⁴⁵ of the Sanctuary?
Then [finally] they raise on a spear-point that Head³⁴⁶ from whose

³³⁸ 'Alí's eldest son, the second Imám, said to have been poisoned at the instigation of Mu'áwiya.

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

³⁴⁰ *I.e.* his younger son Ḥusayn, the third Imám and "Martyr of Karbalá."

³⁴¹ *I.e.* stature, as in the fifth verse.

³⁴² The colour of mourning in Persia.

³⁴³ *I.e.* sorrow and vexation.

³⁴⁴ God or His Prophet.

³⁴⁵ No game or wild animal or bird may be slain within a certain radius of Mecca.

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

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

[page 178]

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

بارد چه؟ خون! که؟ دیده، چسان؟ روز و شب، چرا؟
 از غم، کدام غم؟ غم سلطان کربلا،
 نامش چه بود؟ حسین، ز نژادِ که؟ از علی،
 مامش که بود؟ فاطمه، جدش که؟ مصطفی،
 چون شد؟ شهید شد، بکجا؟ دشتِ ماریه،
 کی؟ عاشقِ محرم، پنهان؟ نه بر ملا،
 شب کشته شد؟ نه روز، چه هنگام؟ وقتِ ظهر،
 شد از گلو بُریده سرش؟ نی نی از قفا،
 سیرابِ کشته شد؟ نه، کس آبش نداد؟ داد،
 که؟ شمر، از چه چشمه؟ ز سرچشمه فنا،
 مظلوم شد شهید؟ بلای، جرم داشت؟ نه،
 کارش چه بُد؟ هدایه، و یارش که بُد؟ خدا،
 این ظلمرا که کرد؟ یزید، این یزید کیست؟
 ز اولادِ هند، از چه کس؟ از نطفه زنا،
 خود کرد این عمل؟ نه فرستاد نامه،
 نزدِ که؟ نزدِ زاده، مرجانه، دغا،
 ابن زیاد زاده، مرجانه بُد؟ نعم،
 از گفته، یزید تخلف نکرد؟ لا،
 این نابکار کُشت حسین را بدستِ خویش؟
 نه او روانه کرد سپه سوی کربلا،
 میرِ سپه که بُد؟ عمیرِ سعد، او بُرید،
 خلقِ عزیزِ فاطمه؟ نه شمر بی حیا،

[page 179]

³⁴⁶ I.e. the head of the Imám Husayn.

³⁴⁷ One of the rivers of Paradise.

خنجر بُرید حنجر اورا نکرد شمر؟
 کرد، از چه پس برید؟ نپذیرفت ازو قضا،
 بهر چه؟ بهر آنکه شود خلق را شفیح،
 شرط شفاعتش چه بود؟ نوحه و بنا،
 کس کشته شد هر از پسرانش؟ بلی دو تن
 دیگر که؟ به نراد، و دیگر که؟ اقربا،
 دیگر پسر نداشت؟ چرا داشت، آن که بود؟
 سجاد، چون بُد او؟ بخمر و رنج مبتلا،
 ماند او بکربلای پدر؟ نی بشامر رفت،
 با عتر و احتشام؟ نه با ذلت و عنا،
 تنها؟ نه با زنانِ حرمر، نامشان چه بود،
 زینب سکنه فاطمه کلثوم بی نوا،
 بر تن لباس داشت؟ بلی کرد رهگذار،
 بر سر عمامه داشت؟ بلی چوب اشقیبا،
 بیمار بُد؟ بلی! چه دوا داشت؟ اشک چشم،
 بعد از دوا غذاش چه بُد؟ خون دل غذا،
 کس بود همروش؟ بلی اطفال بی پدر،
 دیگر که بود؟ تب که نمی گشت ازو جدا،
 از زینتِ زنان چه بجا مانده بود؟ دو چیز،
 طوقِ ستم بگردن و خلخالِ غیر بپا،
 گیر این ستم کنند؟ نه، مجوس و یهود؟ نه،
 هندو؟ نه، بُت پرست؟ نه، فریاد ازین جفا،
 قانی است قابل این شعرها؟ بلی،
 خواهد چه؟ رحمت، از که؟ ز حق، کی؟ صف جزا،

[page 180]

“What rains down? Blood! Who? The Eye! How? Day and Night! Why?
 From grief! What grief? The grief of the Monarch of Karbalá!
 What was his name? Ḥusayn! Of whose race? ‘Alí’s!
 Who was his mother? Fáṭima! Who was his grandsire? Muṣṭafá!
 How was it with him? He fell a martyr! Where? In the Plain of Máriya!
 When? On the tenth of Muḥarram! Secretly? No, in public!
 Was he slain by night? No, by day! At what time? At noontide!
 Was his head severed from the throat? No, from the nape of the neck!
 Was he slain unthirsting? No! Did none give him to drink? They did!
 Who? Shimr! From what source? From the source of Death!
 Was he an innocent martyr? Yes! Had he committed any fault? No!
 What was his work? Guidance! Who was his friend? God!
 Who wrought this wrong? Yazíd! Who is this Yazíd?
 One of the children of Hind! By whom? By bastard origin!³⁴⁸
 Did he himself do this deed? No, he sent a letter!
 To whom? To the false son of Marjána!
 Was Ibn Ziyád the son of Marjána? Yes!
 Did he not withstand the words of Yazíd? No!
 Did this wretch slay Ḥusayn with his own hand?
 No, he despatched an army to Karbalá!
 Who was the chief of the army? ‘Umar ibn Sa’d!
 Did he cut down Fáṭima’s dear folk? No, shameless Shimr!
 Was not the dagger ashamed to cut his throat?
 It was! Why then did it do so? Destiny would not excuse it!
 Wherefore? In order that he might become an intercessor for mankind!

³⁴⁸ Yazíd was the son of Mu‘áwiya, the rival of ‘Alí and the founder of the Umayyad dynasty, who was the son of Abú Sufyán and Hind “the liver-eater” (*Ákilatu’l-akbád*). The term “bastard origin” should refer to Ibn Ziyád, not to Yazíd. See the *Kitábu’l-Fakhrí*, ed. Ahlwardt, pp. 133-5.

What is the condition of his intercession? Lamentation and weeping!
 Were any of his sons also slain? Yes, two!
 Who else? Nine brothers! Who else? Kinsmen!
 Had he no other son? Yes, he had! Who was that?

[page 181]

‘The Worshipper’ (*Sajjád*)³⁴⁹! How fared he? Overwhelmed with grief and sorrow
 Did he remain at his father’s Karbalá? No, he went to Syria!
 In glory and honour? No, in abasement and distress!
 Alone? No, with the women of the household I What were their names?
 Zaynab, Sakína, Fátima, and poor portionless Kulthúm!
 Had he garments on his body? Yea, the dust of the road!
 Had he a turban on his head? Yea, the staves of the wicked ones!
 Was he sick? Yes! What medicine had he? The tears of his eyes!
 What was his food after medicine? His food was heart’s blood!
 Did any bear him company? Yes, the fatherless children!
 Who else was there? The fever which never left him!
 What was left of the women’s ornaments? Two things,
 The collar of tyranny on their necks, and the anklet of grief on their feet!
 Would a pagan (*gabr*) practise such cruelty? No! A Magian or a Jew? No!
 A Hindoo? No! An idolater? No! Alas for this harshness!
 Is Qá’ání capable of such verses? Yes!
 What seeks he? Mercy! From whom? From God! When? In the ranks of recompense!”

Besides these *maráthi* (singular *marthiya*), or threnodies of the classical type, the contemplation of the sufferings and misfortunes of the Imáms has inspired a copious literature, both in verse and prose, of a more popular kind. The mourning proper to the month of Muḥarram finds expression not only in the actual dramatic representations of this cycle of tragedies, of which there are at least forty (a few of which, however, are connected with prophets and holy men antecedent to Islám), but in recitations of these melancholy events known as *Rawḍa* [*Rawza*]-*Khwání*. These latter are said to derive this name from one of the earliest and best-known books of this kind, the *Rawḍatu* [*Rawzatu*] *sh-Shuhadá* (“Garden

[page 182]

of the Martyrs”) of Ḥusayn Wá‘iz-i-Káshifí³⁵⁰, so that these functions are called “*Rawza*-readings,” whether the readings be taken from this or from some similar work, such as the *Túfánu* *l-Buká* (“Deluge of Weeping”) or the *Asráru* *sh-Shahádat* (“Mysteries of Martyrdom”). Such entertainments are commonly given in the month of Muḥarram by rich notables, nobles, statesmen or merchants, who provide an adequate number of professional rhapsodists or reciters of this class, called *Rawza-Khwáns*, and a more or less sumptuous supper to follow. I possess a copy of a curious little poem entitled *Kitábu* *’s-Sufra* *fi dhammi* *’r-Riyá* (“the Book of the Table, censuring hypocrisy”)³⁵¹ in which the ostentation of the host and the greed of the guests is satirized with some pungency. The following lines describe how the word is passed round as to whose entertainment is likely to prove most satisfactory to the guests:

کنون بشنو از من یکی داستان
 که رنگین ترست از گل بوستان
 کسانیکه گیرند عزای حسین
 بمجلس نشینند با شور و شین
 بُرای جگرگوشه فاطمه
 سیه پوش گردند یکسر همه
 نمایند بر پا عزا خانه‌ها
 بگيرند عزای شه كربلا
 بهر گوشه بزمی مهیا کنند
 یکی مجلس نغز بر پا کنند

³⁴⁹ ‘Alí ibn Ḥusayn, commonly called *Zaynu* *’l-’Ábidín* (“the Ornament of the Worshippers”), who, on the death of his father at Karbalá, succeeded him as the Fourth Imám.

³⁵⁰ He died in 910/1504-5. See my *Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion*, pp. 441 and 503-4.

³⁵¹ The author’s name is given as Turkí of Shíráz, and the little book (48 pp.) was lithographed at Bombay in 1309/1891-2.

مفرّش نمایند صحن و اطاق،
منقّش نمایند طاق و رواق،
همه گسترانند فرش لطیف،
بچینند اسبابهای ظریف،
کروهی ز مردان اشکر پرست،
ز جام طمع جمله بیخویش و مست،
بایشان طمع کرده ز آنسان اثر،
که مانده سگه بر روی زر،
بپیشانی خویش بنهاده داغ،
نمایند ازین گونه مجلس سُرّاغ،
یکی زآن میان گوید ای همهران،
پسندیده یازان کار آکهان،
من و حاجی عباس رفتیم دوش،
سوی بزم آن شخص سبزی فروش،
نبود اندر آن مجلس مختصر،
بجز چاهی و قهوه چیزی دگر،
ندیدیم آنجا کس از مردمان،
بجز بانی و یک دو تن روضه خوان،
نشستن در آن بزم نبود روا،
که بی قند و چاهی ندارد صفا،
خداوند از آن بنده خورند نیست،
که در مجلسش شربت قند نیست،
و لیکن بروزی ده انس و جان،
فلان جاست بزمی چو بزمِ شهان،
عجب مجلس خوب و راحت فزاست،
یقین دانه آن مجلس بپریاست،

در آن بزم چاهی بود آق پر
 همیش قنبر یزدی بجای شکر
 ز نی پیچ قلمانیهای بساور
 که یابد دل از قلقل وی سرور
 رود عطر تنباکویش چند میل
 درخشد بسر آتشش چو سهیل
 نخواهد در آنجا شود آب صرف
 بجز شربت قند و لیمو و برف
 نموده‌است بانسی عالی جناب
 ز هر کشوری ذاکری انتخاب
 یک از ذاکران میرزا کاشی است
 که گویند او روضه خوان باشی است
 دیگر زآن کسان ذاکر رشتی است
 که دریای آوازرا کشتی است
 ز کرمان و از یزد و کرمانشهان
 ز شیراز و از شوشتر و اصفهان
 همه موسیقی دان و خوش صوت و نغز
 بود دیگران قشر و ایشان چو مغز
 حقیقت عجب مجلس بیرباست
 بجان شما رفتن آنجا بجاست
 چو یاران کنند این سخن استماع
 بدان بزم یکسر کنند اجتماع

“Now hear from me a story which is more brightly coloured than a garden flower,
 Of those who make mourning for Ḥusayn and sit in assemblies in frenzied excitement.

[page 185]

All wear black for Fāṭima’s darling³⁵²,
 Establish houses of mourning and make lament for the King of Karbalá³⁵³.
 In every corner they prepare a feast and arrange a pleasant assembly;
 They carpet court-yard and chamber, they bedeck with inscriptions arch and alcove;
 They spread fair carpets, they set out graceful furnishings;
 A host of gluttonous men, all beside themselves and intoxicated with the cup of greed,
 On whom greed has produced such an effect that, like the stamp on the gold³⁵⁴,
 It has set its mark on their foreheads, make enquiry about such assemblies.
 One of them says, ‘O comrades, well-approved friends, versed in affairs,
 ‘I and Ḥájji ‘Abbás went yesterday to the entertainment of that green-grocer fellow.
 ‘In that modest entertainment there was nothing but tea and coffee,
 ‘And we saw no one there except the host and one or two *rawza-khwáns*³⁵⁵.
 ‘To sit in such an assembly is not meet, for without sugar and tea it has no charm.
 ‘God is not pleased with that servant in whose entertainment is neither sherbet nor sugar.
 ‘But, by Him who gives men and *jinn* their daily bread, in such-
 and-such a place is an entertainment worthy of kings,
 ‘A wonderfully pleasant and comfortable entertainment, which, I am
 sure, is devoid of hypocrisy.
 ‘There is white tea and sugar-loaf of Yazd in place of sugar,
 ‘And crystal *qalyáns* with flexible tubes, at the gargle of which the heart rejoices.
 ‘The fragrance of their tobacco spreads for miles, and the fire gleams
 on their heads like [the star] Canopus.

³⁵² *I.e.* her son the Imám Ḥusayn. *Jigar-gúsha* (lit. “corner of the liver”) is an expression very similar to the Irish *cuirte mo époróe*.

³⁵³ Again Ḥusayn, “the martyr of Karbalá.”

³⁵⁴ *e.* its trace is ineffaceably stamped upon them.

³⁵⁵ The professional reciters or rhapsodists employed on these occasions.

‘No water will be drunk there, but draughts of lemon, sugar and snow.

[page 186]

‘One of the reciters is Mírzá Káshí, who, they say, is the chief of *rawza-khwáns*.
‘Another of them is the rhapsodist of Rasht, who is like a boat in the ocean of song.
‘From Kirmán, Yazd and Kirmánsháh, from Shiráz, Shúshtar and Işfahán,
‘All are skilled musicians of melodious and charming voices: they
are like the kernel and others like the shell.
‘In truth it is a wonderful entertainment, devoid of hypocrisy: by
your life it is right to attend it!’
When the friends hear this speech with one accord they assemble at that banquet.”

On the whole, however, the emotion evoked by these Muḥarram mournings, whether dramatic representations or recitations, is deep and genuine, and even foreigners and non-Muslims confess themselves affected by them. “If the success of a drama,” says Sir Lewis Pelly in the Preface to his translation of thirty-seven scenes from the *Ta’ziyas*³⁵⁶, “is to be measured by the effects which it produces upon the people for whom it is composed, or upon the audiences before whom it is represented, no play has ever surpassed the tragedy known in the Mussulman world as that of Ḥasan and Husain. Mr Matthew Arnold, in his ‘Essays on Criticism,’ elegantly sketches the story and effects of this ‘Persian Passion Play,’ while Macaulay’s Essay on Lord Clive has encircled the ‘Mystery’ with a halo of immortality.” Even the critical and sceptical Gibbon says³⁵⁷: “In a distant age and climate the tragic scene of the death of Hosein will awaken the sympathy of the coldest reader.” *Sayyidu’sh-Shuhadá* (“the Chief of the Martyrs”) the Persians call their favourite hero, who is, indeed, in their eyes more even than this, since his intercession will be accepted by God for his sinful followers even when the intercession of the

[page 187]

Prophet has failed. “Go thou,” says the latter to him on the Resurrection Day, “and deliver from the flames every one who has in his life-time shed but a single tear for thee, every one who has in any way helped thee, every one who has performed a pilgrimage to thy shrine, or mourned for thee, and every one who has written tragic verse for thee. Bear each and all with thee to Paradise³⁵⁸.” To the Persian Shí‘a, therefore, Ḥusayn occupies the same position that Jesus Christ does to the devout Christian, notwithstanding the fact that the doctrine of the Atonement is utterly foreign to the original spirit of Islám. To us no Persian verse could well appear more exaggerated in its deification of a human being than this³⁵⁹:

مرد گویند خدائی و من اندر غضب آیم
پرده بر داشته مهسند بخود ننگِ خدائی

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

But I am not sure whether the following verse, ascribed to the Bábí poet Nabil³⁶⁰, would not more greatly shock the Persian Shí‘a:

شهادای طلعتِ نارِ من بدوید سوی دیارِ من
سر و جان کنید نثارِ من که منم شهنشه کربلا

“O witnesses of my aspect of fire, haste ye towards my home;
Make head and life my offering, for I am the Monarch of Karbalá!”

[page 188]

³⁵⁶ *The Miracle Play of Hasan and Husain* (2 vols., London, 1879).

³⁵⁷ Professor J. B. Bury’s edition of the *Decline and Fall* in seven volumes (London, 1898), vol. v, p. 391.

³⁵⁸ Sir Lewis Pelly’s *Miracle Play*, vol. ii, p. 347.

³⁵⁹ By an Azalí controversialist it is said to have been written of Bahá’u’lláh by one of his followers, but I have been told that it, or a very similar verse, was really composed in honour of Ḥusayn.

³⁶⁰ Nabil is a Bábí substitute for *Muḥammad*, the numerical values of both names being equivalent to 92. The poet Nabil at one time after the Báb’s death advanced a claim on his own behalf, and the verse here cited appears to have been composed at this period. Later he became one of the most devoted adherents of Bahá’u’lláh, on whose death in 1892 he drowned himself at ‘Akká.

It would be an interesting study, but beyond the capacity of this volume, to trace the growth of the Ḥusayn-Legend from its comparatively meagre historical basis, as given by Ṭabarī and the earlier Arab historians, to the elaborate romance into which it has finally developed in the *ta'ziyas* and *rawza-khwáns*. But the romantic element appears early, even in the narrative of Abu' Mikhnaf Lúṭ ibn Yahyá, who flourished in the first half of the second century of the *hijra* (circa A.D. 750)³⁶¹, and it has even been suggested that Ḥusayn has been indued with the attributes of some far more ancient prototype like Adonis. At any rate no one at the present day can see anything more like the performances of the priests of Baal than the ghastly ceremonies of the *'Áshúrâ* or *Rúz-i-Qatl* which take place on the tenth of Muḥarram (the anniversary of Ḥusayn's death at Karbalá) wherever there is a considerable Persian colony, but especially, of course, in Persia itself.

Certain episodes in the Ḥusayn-Legend would almost seem to indicate an unconscious sense of solidarity with the Christians on the part of the Shí'a Persians arising from their participation in the doctrine of the Atonement. The best-known example of this is the conversion and martyrdom of the "Firangí ambassador" at the Court of Yazid³⁶², a very favourite scene in the *ta'ziyas*, and considered especially appropriate when European visitors are included in the audience. Another instance occurs in the *Asráru'sh-Shahádat*, or "Mysteries of Martyrdom," of Isma'íl Khán "Sarbaz"³⁶³, when Ibn Sa'd invites certain Christians to aid

[page 189]

him in killing the Imám Ḥusayn, but when the eyes of their leader fell upon him —

كربلا را دید عرشِ كبریا
 عرش را تر دید از خونِ خدا
 نقش بست اندر دل از كلكِ خیال
 كین خدا باشد بدین قر و جلال
 گر خدا نبود یقین عیسی بود
 آفتابِ عرشِ دین ما بود

"He saw Karbalá as the Throne of Divine Majesty, he saw that
 Throne wet with God's blood³⁶⁴;
 By the pen of imagination an impression grew in his heart, 'Surely
 this is God in such glory and splendour!
 'If he be not God, then surely he is Jesus,, the Sun of the Throne of our Faith."

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

خواست اذنِ جنگ با صد شور و شین
 رفت و جان بنمود قربانِ حسین

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

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

The librettos giving the words actually spoken by the

[page 190]

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

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

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

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

³⁶⁴ This expression in the mouth of a professing Muslim is extraordinary.

cite a passage from the “Martyrdom of Ḥurr ibn Yazīd ar-Riyāḥī³⁶⁵,” wherein an Arab from Kúfa brings to the Imám Ḥusayn the news of the execution of his cousin Muslim ibn ‘Aqīl.

آمدن مرد عرب از کوفه و خبر آوردن از شهادت مسلم بن عقیل
(عرب) منکه بینی که بصد شور و نوا میآیم
هدهدم نزد سلیمان ز سبا میآیم
آیم از کوفه و دارم خبر از مسلم زار
چون نسیم سحری روح فزا میآیم
بر سرم شوق لقای پسر فاطمه است
که بدر دل مجروح دوا میآیم
(عباس) این دربرا که بود خاک سرایش کافور
سرمه چشم ملک باشد و خدامش حور
هست این در بخدا قبله ارباب وفا
دردمندان بلارا بود این دار شفا
(عرب) سلام من بتو ای مقتدای عالمیان
ز کوفه میرسم ای پیشوای اهل جنان
خدایرا گجا میروی تو ای سرور
بیان نما تو بحق خدای جن و بشر
(امام) علیک من بتو ای قاصد نکو منظر
روم بکوفه من ایندم بحالت مضطر

[page 191]

³⁶⁵ This constitutes a separate scene in Sir L. Pelly’s *Miracle Plays*, vol. i, pp. 171-189.

نوشته‌اند بهین نامه‌های اشتیاق
 فلک کشیده عنانرسوی مُلکِ عراق
 بهین بگو تو ز مسلم اگر خبر داری
 کسی بکوفه باو کرد از وفا یاری
 (عرب) مه‌رس از حالتِ مسلم فدایت
 بی‌آ آقا ببوسر دست و پسایت
 مَرُو در کوفه ای سلطان ابرار
 که می‌ترس شوی محزون و بی یار
 مَرُو در کوفه ای سَرُوَر امان است
 بکن رحمی علی اکبر جوان است
 مَرُو در کوفه زینب خوار گردد
 اسیرِ کوچه و بازار گردد
 (امام) عرب از حالتِ مسلم بمیان کن
 (عرب) برای مسلم محزون فغان کن
 (امام) بگو در کوفه چون شد حالِ مسلم
 (عرب) بدان برگشته شد اقبالِ مسلم
 (امام) مگر کوفی تنش در خون کشیدند
 (عرب) سرِ پاکش ز ملک تن بُردند
 (امام) مگر کردند جسمش پاره پاره
 (عرب) زدند جسم شریفش بر قناره
 (امام) دگر برگو چه کردند قوم اشرار
 (عرب) کشیدندش میان شهر و بازار
 (امام) بگو از حالتِ طفلانِ مسلم
 (عرب) شدند اندر جنان مہمانِ مسلم
 (امام) که بر آن کودکان ظلم و جفا کرد
 (عرب) سرِ ایشان ز تن حارث جدا کرد

[page 192]

(امام) فغان از دیده گویان مسلم
 (عرب) بود این جامه طفلانِ مسلم
 ایوای که مسلم وفا دار
 کشته شده از جفای اشرار

*“How the Arab comes from Kúfa bringing news of the
 martyrdom of Muslim ibn ‘Aqil.*

(Arab) ‘I whom thou seest coming with an hundred passionate strains
 Am the hoopoe coming from Sheba into the presence of Solomon.
 I come from Kúfa, having tidings of poor Muslim,
 I come enlarging the spirit like the morning breeze.
 In my head is a longing to meet the son of Fátima³⁶⁶,
 I come as the remedy for the pain of a wounded heart.’

(‘Abbás) ‘To this gate, of whose pavilion the dust is camphor
 And collyrium for the angels’ eyes, and its servants the Húrís³⁶⁷.
 By God, this gate is the qibla³⁶⁸ of all faithful folk,
 And a house of healing to those stricken with sorrow!’

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

³⁶⁶ I.e. the Imám Ḥusayn son of ‘Alí and Fátima the Prophet’s daughter.

³⁶⁷ The Húru’l-‘Ayn, or black-eyed damsels of Paradise.

³⁶⁸ The point to which the worshipper turns in prayer in order to face Mecca-wards.

I come from Kúfa, O leader of the people of Paradise!
For God's sake whither goest thou, O my lord?
Explain to me [I conjure thee] by the God of *Jinn* and men!

(*The Imám*) 'And on thee [be my salutation], O messenger of comely face!
Even now I am going to Kúfa in an agitated condition.
They have written to me letters of longing:
Heaven draws my reins towards the land of 'Iráq.
Tell me, therefore, if thou hast news of Muslim:
Has any one in Kúfa loyally aided him?'

[page 193]

(*Arab*) 'May I be thy sacrifice! Ask not of Muslim's case!
Come, master, let me kiss thy hands and feet!
Go not to Kúfa, O King of the righteous!
For I fear that thou may'st become sorrowful and friendless.
Go not to Kúfa, O Lord! It were a pity!
Be merciful! 'Alí Akbar³⁶⁹ is so young!
Go not to Kúfa! Zaynab³⁷⁰ will be humiliated,
And will be led captive through the streets and markets!'

(*Together*)

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

It has only been possible here to touch the fringe of this vast literature of what is commonly and not inappropriately termed the Persian Passion Play, and I have had to content myself with a few specimens of the main types in which it is manifested, namely the classical threnody or elegy (*marthiya*) of Muḥtasham and his imitators; the more

[page 194]

popular presentations of these legends in verse, prose, or mixed verse and prose, contained in innumerable and obscure lithographed books, of which I have chosen the *Asráru'sh-Shahádat* as a type, not because it enjoys any supreme excellence, but simply because it is one of those of which I happen to possess a copy; and lastly the actual librettos of the dramatized *ta'ziyas*, to be seen at their best at the Royal *Takya* of Tíhrán during the first ten days of the month of Muḥarram. Manuscript note-books for the use of *rawza-khwáns* on such occasions are commonly met with in collections of Persian books, and the full description of one such (Add. 423) will be found in my *Catalogue of the Persian HSS. in the Cambridge University Library*³⁷². Most of these pieces are anonymous, but amongst the poets named are Muqbil, Mukhlis, Mawzún, Nasím, Shaff'i and Lawḥi, of none of whom can I find any biographical notice.

³⁶⁹ The eldest son of the Imám Ḥusayn. His death forms the subject of Scene xvii of Pelly's *Miracle Play* (Vol. i, pp. 287-303).

³⁷⁰ The daughter of 'Alí and sister of Ḥasan and Ḥusayn.

³⁷¹ It is not clear from the text whether this verse is uttered by one or both of the speakers.

³⁷² No. LXVI, pp. 122-142. On this last page are given references to descriptions of other similar collections.

(4) *Bábi Poetry.*

One of my young Persian friends who, like so many of the rising generation, deplores the influence of the mullás and *rawza-khwáns* and the religious atmosphere created by them, especially in connection with the Muḥarram celebrations, admitted to me that at least the work has been done so thoroughly that even the most ignorant women and illiterate peasants are perfectly familiar with all the details of these legends of martyrdom, however little they may know of the authentic history of the events portrayed or the persons represented. Even the greatest *mujtahids*, like Mullá Muḥammad Báqir-i-Majlisi, however little they might approve the exaggerations and even blasphemies which characterized the Passion Plays in their final popular developments, were at great pains to supply their compatriots with popular and easily

[page 195]

intelligible religious treatises in Persian, so that a knowledge of these matters might not be confined to Arabic scholars or professed theologians.

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

[page 196]

hundred converts arise." The *mujtahid* reflected for a while and then replied, "You are right, and I will spare the lives of these people³⁷³."

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

يك دست جامِ باده و يك دست زلف يار
رقصی چنين ميانه، ميدانم آرزوست

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

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

ای خوش آن عاشقی سرمست که در پای حبيب
سر و دستار نداند که کدام اندازد

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

Of the ancient Arabs Wilfrid Blunt well says³⁷⁴: "Their courage was of a different quality, perhaps, from that admired among ourselves. It was the valour of a nervous, excitable people who required encouragement from onlookers and from their own voices to do their best..." and the same holds good to some extent of the Persians. Poetry is called "Lawful Magic"

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

³⁷⁴ *The Seven Golden Odes of Pagan Arabia* (London, 1903), p. xii.

(*Sihr-i-Halál*) because, in the words of the author of the *Chahár Maqála*³⁷⁵, it is “that art whereby the poet...can make a little thing appear great and a great thing small, or cause good to appear in the garb of evil and evil in the form of good...in such a way that by his suggestion

[page 197]

men’s temperaments become affected with depression or exaltation; whereby he conduces to the accomplishment of great things in the order of the world.”

The Karbalá legend is a potent factor in producing in these martyrs the psychological state which makes them not only endure with fortitude but glory in their sufferings. In one of the two celebrated poems ascribed to the Bábí heroine Qurratu’l-‘Ayn³⁷⁶) who was one of the victims of the great persecution of August, 1852, occurs the verse³⁷⁷:

من و عشقِ آن مه خوبرو که چو شد صلاهی بلا برو
بنشاط و قهقهه شد فرو که أنا الشّیید بکربلا‘

“For me the love of that fair-faced Moon who, when the call of affliction came to him,
Went down with exultation and laughter, crying, ‘I am the Martyr at Karbalá!’”

In its original and primitive form Bábíism was Shí‘ism of the most exaggerated type, and the Báb himself the ‘Gate’ to the unseen Imám or Mahdí. Gradually he came to regard himself as actually the Imám; then he became the ‘Point’ (*Nuqta*), an actual Manifestation of the Supreme Being, and his chief disciples became re-incarnations, or rather “returns” or “recurrences” of the Imáms, and the whole tragedy of Karbalá was re-enacted “in a new horizon” at Shaykh Ṭabarsí in Mázandarán. The nineteen chapters constituting the first “Unity” (*Wáhid*) of the Persian *Bayán* (the most intelligible and systematic of the Bib’s writings) are entirely devoted to the thesis that all the protagonists of the Islamic Cycle have returned³⁷⁸ in this cycle to the life of the world,

[page 198]

and Hájji Mírzá Jání, the earliest Bábí historian and himself a victim of the persecution of 1852, gives a long comparison between Karbalá and Shaykh Ṭabarsí, greatly in favour of the latter³⁷⁹.

In the eleventh and last section of my *Materials for the Study of the Bábí Religion* (pp. 341-58) I published a selection of Bábí and Bahá’í poems, and here I will only add to these a *qaṣida* comprising 133 verses composed in the spring of 1885 by Mírzá’ Na‘ím³⁸⁰ of Si-dih near Iṣfahán, an ardent Bahá’í, whose son, as I lately heard from a friend in the British Legation at Ṭihrán, is still resident there. Mírzá Na‘ím sent me an autograph copy of this poem in the summer of 1902 through my late friend George Grahame, and in the concluding colophon he states that he was born at Si-dih in 1272/1855-6 and came to Ṭihrán in 1304/1886-7. The poem is so long that I originally intended only to give extracts from it, but, finding that this could not be done without injury to the sequence of ideas, I have decided to print it in full as a typical Bahá’í utterance having the authority of an autograph.

هو الله تعالی شانه‘
مرا بود دل و چشمی ز گردشِ گردون‘
یکی چو دجله‘ آب و یکی چو لجه‘ خون‘
چرا ننالم سخت و چرا نگریم زار‘
که از مضیقِ جهان ره نمیبوم بیرون‘
درونِ دایره مقصودِ خود نمی یابم‘
مرا نه پای برون باشد و نه جای درون‘

[page 199]

³⁷⁵ E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series, vol. xi, i (Text), p. 26; vol. xi, 2 (Translation), p. 27.

³⁷⁶ Both are given in full, with versified translations, in my *Materials for the Study of the Bábí Religion*, pp. 347-51.

³⁷⁷ Compare the initial verse of the poem cited on p. 173 *supra*.

³⁷⁸ Concerning this typical doctrine of “Return” (*Raj‘at*) see my *Materials etc.*, pp. 330, 335 and 338, and my translation of the *New History*, pp. 334 et seqq.

³⁷⁹ *Nuqatu’l-Káf* (Gibb Series, vol. xv), pp. 404-5.

³⁸⁰ He is referred to in my *Year amongst the Persians* (p. 519), where he is wrongly described as a native of Abáda.

مرا چه فایده از جاه اگر شوم قارن
 مرا چه عاید از مال اگر شوم قارون
 چو می نهر چه نهر میدهد ضیاع و عقار
 چو بگذرد چه اثر میکند بنات و بتون
 مرا چه نضر شد نوشهر مقام یا جلاب
 مرا چه فضل که پوشم حریر یا اکسون
 چو ملک و مال نماند چه مستشر چه فقیر
 چو روزگار نباید چه شاد و چه محزون
 بعقل نازم و هر جانور از آن مملو
 بروح بالمر و هر جایگه از آن مشحون
 مرا از این چه که گویم چه کرد اسکندر
 مرا بدین چه که دانم که بود ناپلیون
 ۱۰ مرا چه کار که مه شد هلال و بدر از آنک
 بقدر تابش خور بر وی هست چهره نمون
 چه فایده است کسوف و خسوف را دانم
 که خور ز ماه و مه از ظل ارض نیلی کون
 چه لازم است که گویم ثوابت و سیار
 همه شمس و کراتند در خم گردون
 مرا از این چه که دانم کرات گرد شمس
 معلقتند و روان وز دو جذبه اند زبون
 مرا چه کار که باد آن هوا که موج زند
 خفیف خشک بفق و ثقیل تر سوی دون
 ۱۰ چه گویم آنکه قمر بر زمین زمین بر شمس
 هر او بشمس ذکر میچند به پیرامون
 چه گویم این رمل سالم است یا معذوف
 چه گویم این رجز مطوی است یا مستحیون

[page 200]

ز صرف و نحو و حروف و قرائت و تجوید
 ز وقف کوفتین و ز وصل بصریون
 ز اشتقاق و بدیع و معانی و انشاء
 بیان و خط و عروض و قریض شعر و فنون
 رجال و نقد و اصول و جدال و استنباط
 حدیث و حجّت و تفسیر و سنت و قانون
 ۲۰ ز رسم و هیأت و جبر و مناظر و تاریخ
 حساب و هندسه جغرافی از جمیع شؤون
 سیاست مدن و شرع و زرع و کمان و لغات
 حقوقی ملت و خرج و خراج و قرض و قشون
 طب و علائم و تشریح و نبض و قاروره
 خواص جمله ادویه مفرد و معجون
 طلسم و دعوت و تعبیر و کیمیا و حیال
 نجوم و طالع و اعداد و رمل و جغرافیون
 علوم فلسفه و منطق از قدیم و جدید
 تحاشیات حواشی تفسیرات متون
 ۲۰ بدین علوم هلا نقد عمر خویش مده
 کزین معامله گشتند عالمی مغبون
 از این علوم سوی علم دین حق بگرای
 که غیر معرفت حق همه فریب و فسون
 فسون فلسفه مشنوه که سرسر سفه است
 فنون دهری و کلبی تمام جهل و جنون
 چرا ظنون طبیعی شمرده تو علوم
 چرا علوم الهی گرفته تو ظنون
 مقال این حکما چیست جملگی مشکوک
 کلام این جهلا چیست سر بسر مضمون

۳۰ علومشان پی دفع حیا و صدق و صفا
فنونشان پی فسق و فساد و مکر و مجون
همه اباحه ارض است و اشتراك حظوظ
همه اشاعه فسق است و امتلا بظون
خیالتان همه کوتاه و چشمشان همه تنگ
فنونشان همه وهمر و شؤنشان همه ذون
نبود سب شریعت اگر بر این یا جوج
نبود هیچ کس از عرض و مال و جان مأمون
بحق حق سخن این گروه ظاهرین
بجسم ملت و ملک است بدترین طاعون
۳۱ شوی ز علم الهی ساله کونین
شوی ز حکمت کلی نبیره میمون
هر آنچه گفت نبی این زمان ببین مشهود
هر آنچه گفت حکیم این زمان ببین مطعون
علومشان همه از انبیا ولی ناقص
فنونشان همه از اولیا ولی ملحون
و لیکن از در انصاف در جهان انسان
بعلیر و دانش ممتاز باشد از ما ذون
بعلیر و حکمت ره میبرد بذات قدیر
بعقل و فکر برد ره بحضرت بیچون
تعلم است که فرموده افضل الاعمال
تفکر است کز او ساعتی به از سبعون
مقیر ذات قدیمش حکیمهای بزرگ
چو سقراط چو بقراط ارسطو و زینون
چو بو علی و چو اقلیدس و چو بطلمیوس
چو طالس و چو فلاطون چو هرمس و شاپون

یقَدَسون له بالعشی و الاشراق
 یسَبِّحون اذا یُضَبِّحون اذا یُؤْمِنون
 جهان سری که حکیم اندرو بجای خرد
 زمان تنی که علوم اندر او بجای عیون
 •• ولی تو نُست عنان توسن فنون سرکش
 ولی تو خام ضعیف اَبْرَشِ علوم حرون
 نخوانده سطرې ربیب آوری برَبِ قدیم
 زهی مزاج که قبض آورد ز انتیمون
 ز مبد تا بلعد علم چو ز نُؤْ بِالْمَین
 ز علم حق که بر آنست اعتماد و رکون
 حقایقِ حکمش را حکیمها مبهوت
 جوامع کلمش را ادیبها مرهون
 طبایع اند چو اجسام در ظهور و بروز
 حقایق اند چو ارواح در خفا و کمون
 •• ز تنگ ظرفی درین فضای نا محدود
 بود عوالم بیحد بیکدگر مدثون
 امور عادیه را عام دید و خاصه خاص
 بِنَدْرِ خود و هُوَ اَعْلَمُ بِمَا یَصِفُون
 بگنّه پستترین صنع حادثش نرسد
 چه جای ذاتِ قدیمش هزار افلاطون
 بحکمِ حق متحرک بود سپهر و نجوم
 بلی ز جان متأثر بود عیون و جفون
 ز امر نیست پس از کیست جنبش اجرام
 ز آب نیست پس از چیست گردش طاهون
 •• یکی بچشمِ تأمل ز روی عقل ببین
 درین سراچه که رُعی از آن بود مسکون

بهریکی ز جهاد و نبات و از حیوان
 هزار عالم نا دیده ظاهر و مکنون
 ورای عقل تو عقلی دگر بود غالب
 درون جان تو جان دگر بود مکنون
 بین بدان که آن دانه با ازل همدوش
 بین به بیضه که آن بیضه با ابد مقرون
 نهان و ظاهر از این صد جهان طیور و فروخ
 قدیر و حادث از آن صد چمن ثمار و غصون
 ۶۰ کجا بکوی حقیقت گذر توانی کرد
 تو کز سرای طبیعت نیروی بیرون
 چنانکه بیتی فیض حیات از این عالم
 بطف از مدد ما میسر شد بیطون
 ز ما ورای طبیعت اگر مدد نرسد
 بدین جهان بخدا این جهان شود وارون
 ز ما ورای طبیعت در این مضیق جهان
 عوالمی است خدا را ز حد و عد افزون
 گروهی از عقلا بر خلاف عادت کَل
 بطوع و طبع بین غوطه میزنند بخون
 ۶۰ خلاف طبع گروهی بدرد و غیر خوشنود
 خلاف طبع فریقی ز جور کین مینون
 بیلی طبع بین جمعی از جهان بیزار
 بطیب نفس نگر قومی از وطن سرگون
 بین بشوق و شغف فرقه همه مقتول
 بین بدوق و طرب زمره همه مسجون
 بطوع سلسله در عذاب رنگارنگ
 بطبع طائفه در بلای گوناگون

جمیع مست و غزلخوان ولی نه از باده
 تمار محو و پریشان ولی نه از افیون
 ۷۰ چگونگی داد خیر دانیال از امروز
 چگونگی کرد اثر قول اشعیا اکنون
 چگونگی گشت وفا وعده جمیع کتب
 بطبق مصحف و تورات و صحف و انگلیون
 گسی بدار سلام و گسی باورشلمیر
 گسی بکرمل و گاهی ادومر و گه صیون
 معین آمده ارض مقدس مسعود
 مؤرخ آمده یوم مبارک میسون
 وَ كَيْفَ جَاءَ لَنَا الْحَقُّ كَمَا أَشَارَ لَنَا
 نَبِينَا الْعَرَبِيُّ وَالْإِيمَةُ الْهَادُونَ
 ۷۰ چسان بوعده جمال قدم نمود جمال
 از آن جمال مبارک زمانه یافت شگون
 چگونگی گشت عیان حق بوادی و آتین
 چگونگی گشت پدید او بکوه و آتیشون
 چگونگی بی سپه او قاهر است و کل مقبور
 چگونگی یکتنه او غالب است و خلق زبون
 سروده بی سبب علم خوشترین آیات
 نهاده بی مدد غیر بهترین قانون
 چرا ندیده باو صد هزار جان قربان
 چرا ندیده باو صد هزار دل مفتون
 ۸۰ ز جنبش قلمش جنبش قلوب و صدور
 ز رامش نظرش رامش ظهور و بطون
 عائم علما مشعلش نکرد خموش
 کتائب امرا رایتش نکرد نگون

[page 205]

نبین رود سخنش در جهان چو در تن جان
 ببین جهد اثرش در روان چو در رگ خون
 خصومت خصما آب سوده در هاون
 رقابت رقبا باد بوده بر هامون
 ثبوت حکمش در قلب با روان همدم
 دوام امرش در دهر با قرون مقرون
 ۸۰ چدونه آتشی افروخته است در دلها
 که هیچ آب نیارد نشاندن این کانون
 گرفتگی حکمش روی زمین و زیر زمین
 گذشته صیتش از چین و هند و از ژاپون
 بیک نظر بگشوده دو صد بلاد و بلوک
 بیک قلمر بستانده صد قلاع و حصون
 چگونگی کرد بها محفل بدعوت دین
 که تا بحشر نگردند منهی از ناهون
 پی بنای شریعت ز کس نخواست مدد
 بلی نداشت بها آسمان خدا بستون
 ۹۰ بفضل و رحمتش اقرار کی نمائی کی
 بعلم و قدرتش انکار چون نمائی چون
 تو خود که نظر بیک خانواده توانی
 مکن معارضه با ناظر جمیع قرون
 تو خود که مصلحت کار خود نپیدانی
 مکن لجاج بسلطان ملک کن فیکون
 تو با پدر بستیزی بیک پشیز ضرر
 دهند در ره او مال و جان وزو مهنون
 هزار حیف که دارم درین قوافی تنگ
 هزار نکته که نتوان نمودنش موزون

۹۰ سخن ز دست شد و درد دل تمام نشد
 روز دو باره کنون بر سر همان مضمون
 مرا دلپست در این روزگار بو قلمون
 فریب خورده بازبچه‌های گوناگون
 زمانه جلوه کند رنگ رنگ چون طواس
 سپهر عشوهد دهد گونه گون چو بو قلمون
 بس است تابشت ای مهر شد دلبر بریان
 بس است گردشت ای چرخ شد تنرمطحون
 مرا سویست چه سازد باین همه سودا
 مرا دلپست چه سازد باینهمه افسون
 ۱۰۰ بجز بجانان جان را کجاست تاب و شکب
 بجز بدلیز دل را کجاست صبر و سکون
 هسی بخویش بگویم که الکمال وبال
 گهی بخویش بخندم که الجنون فنون
 دود خیالم گاهی بدشت چون ماشین
 پرد هوایم گاهی بچرخ چون بالون
 ز تن گسته‌ام و جان نمیرود از تن
 ز جان گذشته‌ام و دل نمیشود مأمون
 دلبر گرفت ز ویران سرای فضل و هنر
 خوشا ممالک عشق و خوشا دیار جنون
 ۱۰۰ ز پای بُختی بختم عقالی عقل کسخت
 کجاست لیلی من ای خدا شدم مجنون
 بجز اراده رحمانی از در قدرت
 که میتواند از این ورطه‌ام برد بیرون
 هلا اراده حق مَنْ أَرَادَهُ اللَّهُ است
 که شد اراده حق با اراده‌اش مقرون

یگانه عبد بها آنکه از اراده حق
 إِذَا أَرَادَ لِشَيْءٍ يَقُولُ كُنْ فَيَكُونُ
 شبی که مارا حق سوی اوست راه نما
 مپی که مارا سوی حق اوست راه نمون
 ۱۱۰ عجسته گوهر بحر وصال سر الله
 که اوست در صدق علم حق در مکنون
 بنزد فضلش فضل است فاقد الفضال
 بنزد جودش معن است مانع الهماعون
 عدوی اوست بخود خصم و یار ازو بیزار
 مطیع اوست ز خود امن و خلق ازو مأمون
 بوصف طلعت من طاف حوله الاسماء
 سرودمی سخن او بودمی از او مأذون
 بمدیح ذاتش میگفتم آنچه گفته خدای
 نه شعر الشعراء یتبعهم الغاؤون
 ۱۱۰ تو ای خلیفه رحمان و ای سفینه نوح
 غمین مشو که حقیقت ز نقض شد موهون
 بعهد حضرت آدم بجور و کین قابیل
 بدون جریر و گنه ریخت از برادر خون
 بعهد نوح چو کنعان شکست عهد پدر
 بذل نفی نسب شد غریقی بحر الهون
 بعهد حضرت یعقوب یوسف صدیق
 ز کید اخوان در قید بندگی مسجون
 بعهد حضرت موسی ز سبط اسرائیل
 یکی چو حضرت هارون و دیگری قارون
 ۱۲۰ بعهد حضرت روح الله از حواریین
 یک از چقا چو یهودا یک از صفا شمعون

بعهدِ حضرتِ ختمی مآب از آمت
 یکی بصدق ابو ذر یکی ابو شعیون
 بعهدِ حضرتِ اعلیٰ دو تن وحید شدند
 یکی شجاع امین و یکی جبارِ خُون
 بعهدِ طلعتِ ابسی هر اینچنین باید
 یکیست ثابتِ عهد و یکیست ناقصِ دون
 بلعن لب نکشایم ولی خدا گوید
 هر آنکه میشکند عهد من بود ملعون
 ۱۲۰ ز حق بعهد مر این فرقه چشم میبوشند
 که حق ز باطل پیداست در جمیع شؤون
 قسر بروی تو ای مقتدای کَلِّ اَمْر
 قسر بجوی تو ای پیشوای کَلِّ قرون
 قسر باصلِ تو یعنی بحضرتِ مطلق
 قسر بحق تو یعنی حقیقت بیچون
 قسر بوجه تو یعنی بوجه المشرق
 قسر بسر تو یعنی بسره المخزون
 بخاک پای تو یعنی بکیمیای مراد
 بگرد راه تو یعنی بتوتیای عیون
 ۱۳۰ بموطأ قلدیر تو بموطن وَاَلتَّین
 بسجده گاه خضایق بزرب وَاَلزَّیتون
 که بی ثنای توام مطمئن نگردد دل
 سر فراغ بهالین نمی نهد مدیون
 ولی نعیر کجا مدح تو تواند کرد
 نیازموده نهاده است پای در چیهون
 ۱۳۳ مطیع امر تو از کید نفس باد ایمن
 اسیر بند تو از شیخ دهر باد مصون

“HE IS GOD, EXALTED IS HIS STATE!

“Through the revolution of the Sphere I have a heart and an eye,
 the one like the Tigris in flood, the other like a gulf of blood.
 Why should I not mourn heavily, and why should I not weep bitterly,
 since I cannot make my way out of the narrows of the world?
 Within the circle I find not my object; I have neither foot to fare
 forth nor place within.
 What profiteth me if I be as Qâren³⁸¹ in rank? What gain to me if I
 be as Qârûn³⁸² in wealth?
 What fruit do farms and estates yield, since I must lay them aside?
 What effect have daughters and sons, since I must pass away? 5
 What pride have I in drinking wine or rose-water? What virtue have
 I in wearing silk or black brocade³⁸³?
 Since dominion and wealth remain not, what difference between
 wealthy and poor? Since time endureth not, what difference
 between the glad and the sorrowful?
 I take pride in my understanding while every animal is full of it;
 I glory in spirit when every place overflows with it.
 What is it to me that I should say what Alexander did? What is it
 to me that I should know who Napoleon was?
 What affair is it of mine that the moon becomes crescent or full

³⁸¹ One of the seven great noble houses of ancient Persia. See Nö1deke's *Sasaniden*, especially pp. 437 *et seqq.* These seven families constituted the *Bar-bitân* of the Pahlawî inscriptions, the *Ahlu'l-Buyûtât* of the Arab historians.

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

³⁸³ A short note on *aksûn*, "a black brocade worn by the rich for ostentation," will be found on p. 108 of my translation of the *Chahâr Maqâla* (Gibb Series, xi, 2).

because it shows its face in proportion to the shining of the sun
upon it? 10
What advantage is it that I should know about the eclipses of the
sun and moon, or that the sun is darkened³⁸⁴ through the moon,
and the moon through the shadow of the earth?
What need is there for me to say that the fixed stars and planets are
all suns and spheres in the vault of heaven?

[page 210]

What do I gain by knowing that these spheres are poised and
revolving round suns, and are subject to two attractions?
What affair is it of mine that the wind, that undulating air, is light
and dry above, and dense and moist below?
What have I to say to this, that the moon marches round the earth,
the earth round the sun, and the sun in turn round another sun? 15
What should I say as to this *ramal*-metre being ‘sound’ or ‘apocopated,’
or this *rajaz*-metre *maṭwī* or *makhbūn*³⁸⁵?
Or of accident, syntax, the letters, the correct and solemn intonation
[of the Qur’án], or of the pauses of the Kúfans or the
junctions of the Baṣra school³⁸⁶?
Or of etymology, rhetoric, eloquence, style, expression, calligraphy,
prosody or the varieties of poetical criticism?
Or of biography³⁸⁷, jurisprudence, principles [of Law], controversy,
deduction, tradition, proof, exegesis, the Code and the Law?
Or of drawing, geometry, algebra, observations, chronology, arithmetic,
mathematics and geography in all their aspects? 20
Or of Politics, the Religious Law, agriculture, mining, philology,
National Rights, expenditure, taxation, loans and armies?
Or of medicine, symptoms, anatomy, the pulse and the stools, the
properties of all the drugs, whether simple or compound?
Or of talismans, incantations, interpretation of dreams, alchemy,
mechanics, astrology, ascendants, [magic] numbers, geomancy,
cyphers and spells?
Or of the philosophical sciences, and logic, ancient and modern, or
of cautionary glosses and the sophistries of texts?
O waste not the coin of your life on such sciences, for a whole
world of men have suffered disappointment through such trans-
actions! 25
Turn from these sciences to knowledge of the Religion of the Truth³⁸⁸,
for, save knowledge of the Truth, all is deceit and vanity.

[page 211]

Hearken not to the spells of Philosophy, which from end to end is
folly³⁸⁹; the themes of the materialist and the cynic are all
ignorance and madness.
Why dost thou consider the fancies of the naturalist as sciences?
Why dost thou assume the Divine sciences to be mere fancies?
What is the talk of these philosophers? All doubtful! What is the
speech of these ignorant men? All conjecture!
Their sciences are [designed] to dispose of modesty, sincerity and
purity; their arts are for [the promotion of] sin, mischief, guile

³⁸⁴ Literally, made the colour of indigo.

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

³⁸⁶ The two great rival philological schools of early Islám.

³⁸⁷ *‘Ilmu’r-Rijál* (“the science of notable men”) means particularly the biography and authority of the transmitters of religious traditions.

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

³⁸⁹ There is a word-play here, of the kind called *tajnis-i-zá’id*, between *falsafah* (philosophy) and *safah* (folly).

and wantonness! 30
 Their whole [idea] is the socialization of the earth and the communizing³⁹⁰
 of property; their whole [aim] is the diffusion of sin and
 the filling of their bellies!
 Their ideas are all short-sighted and their outlook narrow; their
 arts are all phantasy, and their conditions vile!
 Had it not been for the barrier of the Holy Law against this
 Gog³⁹¹, no one would have been secure of honour, property, or life.
 By God's Truth, the talk of this gang of materialists is the worst
 pestilence in the body of the Nation and the Kingdom!
 By the Divine Knowledge thou wilt become the choicest product of
 the two worlds; by the cynic's philosophy thou wilt become
 the grandchild of an ape³⁹²! 35
 Behold manifest today whatever the Prophet hath said, but whatever
 the philosopher hath said behold at this time discredited!
 All their sciences are [derived] from the Prophets, but imperfectly;
 all their arts are from the Saints, but garbled.
 But, regarded fairly, man in this world is distinguished by science
 and knowledge from all beside.

[page 212]

By knowledge and learning he finds his way to the Eternal Essence;
 by understanding and thought he attains to the Presence of the
 Why-less³⁹³.
 It is Study of which He says 'It is the most excellent of actions'
 it is Thought whereof an hour 'is better than seventy [years].'
 The great sages, such as Socrates, Hippocrates, Aristotle and Zeno,
 confess His Eternal Essence, 41
 And so also Abú 'Alí [Avicenna], Euclid, Ptolemy, Thales, Plato,
 Hermes and Solon³⁹⁴.
 These sanctify Him at dusk and at dawn; these glorify Him in the
 morning and in the evening.
 The world is a head wherein the sage is the intelligence; time is a
 body wherein the sciences are in place of the eyes.
 But thou ridest with a slack rein, and the steed of the arts is restive;
 thou art weak and inexperienced, and the dappled charger of
 the sciences is vicious. 45
 Not having read a line thou hast doubts as to the Eternal Lord:
 wonderful the constitution in which antimony produces constipation!
 'Seek learning from the cradle to the grave, even in China³⁹⁵,' from
 the knowledge of God, whereon trust and reliance may be placed.
 Sages are dumbfounded at His wise aphorisms; men of letters are
 indebted to His pregnant sayings.
 Natural laws are like bodies in manifestation and emergence;
 Divine Truths are like spirits in occultation and latency.
 In this illimitable expanse for lack of space illimitable worlds are
 buried in one another. 50
 Common people see ordinary things, and distinguished people
 special things, according to their own measure: and He 'knows
 best what they describe³⁹⁶.'
 A thousand Platos cannot fathom the essence of His humblest

³⁹⁰ The early Bábís were often accused of holding communistic views like the ancient Persian heresiarch Mazdak. Such views are here explicitly repudiated.

³⁹¹ Alexander the Great is supposed to have built the Great Wall of China (hence called *Sadd-i-Sikandar*, "the Barrier of Alexander") to prevent the tribes of Gog and Magog (*Yájúj wa Májúj*) from overrunning the world.

³⁹² An evident allusion to the Darwinian theory.

³⁹³ God is so called (*Bí-chún*) because none may question Him as to the reason of His actions.

³⁹⁴ Doubtful. The original has *Shilún*, an evident error.

³⁹⁵ A well-known tradition of the Prophet.

³⁹⁶ Cf. Qur'án, xxiii, 98.

temporal work; how much less His own Eternal Essence?
The sphere and the stars move by the command of God: yea, the
eyes and eyelids are affected by the soul.

[page 213]

Through whom, if not by His command, is the movement of bodies
By what, if not by the water, does the mill revolve?
For once in the way of wisdom look with the eye of reflection on
this abode whereof but one quarter is habitable³⁹⁷. 55
In each one of the mineral, vegetable and animal kingdoms are a
thousand unseen worlds, manifest and hidden.
Beyond thy intelligence is another over-ruling Intelligence; within
thy soul is another soul concealed.
Behold the grain, which stands shoulder to shoulder with past
Eternity: behold the egg, which is conjoined with Eternity to come!
Hidden yet manifest in this latter are a hundred worlds of fowls and
chickens; eternal yet temporal in that former are a hundred
groves of fruit and branches.
How canst thou pass through the street of Truth, thou, who comest
not forth from the mansion of Nature? 60,
Even as thou seest how the flow of life from this world reaches the
child's inward parts through its mother's aid,
So, if aid come not from the Supernatural to this world, by God,
this world will be ruined!
For within the narrow straits of this world God hath worlds from
the Supernatural beyond limit or computation.
Contrary to universal custom, behold a group of intelligent men
voluntarily and naturally plunging into blood³⁹⁸;
Contrary to nature, a company content with pain and grief; contrary
to nature, a party gladly enduring the cruelty of spite. 65
Behold a community renouncing the world by natural inclination;
see a people contentedly suffering exile from their native land!
Behold a party all slain eagerly and joyfully; behold a throng all
imprisoned with alacrity and delight;
A whole series [of victims] voluntarily enduring various torments;
a whole class by natural inclination [involved] in afflictions of
every kind;
All intoxicated and singing songs³⁹⁹, but not from wine; all self-
effaced and dissipated, but not from opium!

[page 214]

How hath Daniel given news of today! How hath the word of
Isaiah taken effect now⁴⁰⁰! 70
How hath the promise of all the Scriptures been fulfilled, precisely
in conformity with the Qur'án, the Pentateuch, the Books of the
Prophets and the Gospels!
Now in the Abode of Peace [Baghdád], now in Jerusalem, now in
Mount Carmel, now in Edom, and now in Sion,
The Holy and Fortunate Land hath been determined, the Blessed
and Auspicious Day hath been fixed.
'How came the Truth [God] to us? Even as our Arabian Prophet
and our guides the Imáms indicated to us⁴⁰¹.

³⁹⁷ *I.e.* the world, whereof but one quarter is supposed to be capable of sustaining human life.

³⁹⁸ This and the following verses refer to the readiness with which the Bábís suffer martyrdom.

³⁹⁹ Like Sulaymán Khán, for instance. See p. 196 *supra*, and my *Year amongst the Persians*, p. 102.

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

⁴⁰¹ This verse is entirely in Arabic.

How according to promise did the Eternal Beauty⁴⁰² reveal His
 beauty, from whose Blessed Beauty the whole world augured
 well? 75

How did God become apparent in the Valley of ‘the Fig’? How
 did He become visible in the Mount of ‘the Olive’⁴⁰³?

How does He conquer without an army while all [others] are conquered?
 How does He triumph unaided while mankind are
 helpless [before Him]?

Without the aid of learning He intones the sweetest verses⁴⁰⁴; without
 the help of others He lays down the Best Law.

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

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

[page 215]

The turbans of the doctors⁴⁰⁵ did not extinguish His Torch; the
 hosts of the captains did not overthrow His Standard.

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

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

The duration of His command in the heart keeps company with the
 Spirit⁴⁰⁶; the continuance of His authority in the world is coeval
 with the ages.

What a fire hath He kindled in [men’s] hearts, such that no water
 can quench this furnace! 85

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

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

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

He sought help from none to found His Law; yea, God did not
 raise up the heavens on pillars⁴⁰⁷.

When, when wilt thou admit His Grace and Mercy? How, how
 canst thou deny His Knowledge and Power? 90

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

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

Thou dost dispute with thy father about a farthing’s damage;
 these⁴⁰⁹ surrender life and wealth for His sake, and deem themselves
 favoured.

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

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

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

⁴⁰³ The reference is to Súra xciv of the Qur’án, entitled “the Fig.”

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

⁴⁰⁵ *I.e.* of Law and Religion. It is, I think, misleading to translate ‘*Ulamá*’ as “clergy.”

⁴⁰⁶ *I.e.* lasts as long as life endures.

⁴⁰⁷ See Qur’án, xiii, 2 and xxxi, 9.

⁴⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, ii, 111; iii, 42, etc.

⁴⁰⁹ *I.e.* the followers of Bahá’u’lláh.

[page 216]

In this chameleon-like⁴¹⁰ age I have a heart led astray by all kinds of trifles.
 The time preens itself like a peacock in varied hues ; the sphere displays its blandishments like a chameleon in divers colours.
 Sufficient is thy burning, O Sun, for my heart is roasted! sufficient is thy turning, O Heaven, for my body is ground to powder!
 I have a head, but what can it do with all this passion? I have a heart, but what can it do with all this trickery?
 Where can the soul find endurance and steadfastness except in the Beloved? Where can the heart find patience and rest save in the Heart's Desire? 100
 At one time I say to myself, 'Perfection is a disaster'⁴¹¹: at another I laugh to myself, 'Madness is of many kinds.'
 At one time my fancy rushes through the plain like an engine; at another my desire soars in the air like a balloon.
 I have broken away from the body, but life will not leave the body; I have abandoned life, yet the heart is not tranquil.
 My heart is wearied of this ruined mansion of merit and talent welcome the kingdoms of Love! welcome the realms of Madness⁴¹²!
 'The hobble of understanding hath snapped on the leg of the dromedary of my luck'⁴¹³: O God, where is my Laylá, for I have become Majnún (mad)? 105
 Save the Divine Will [exercised] through the channel of Omnipotence, who can drag me forth from this whirlpool?
 Behold, the Will of God is 'He whom God willeth'⁴¹⁴, with whose will the Will of God is conjoined;

[page 217]

The unique Servant of Bahá ('Abdu'l-Bahá), made such by the Will of God, Who 'When He willeth aught, saith "Be!" and it is'⁴¹⁵;
 A King to whom God shows us the way; a Moon who guides us towards God;
 'God's Secret,' the fortunate Pearl of the Ocean of Union, who is the Pearl concealed in the shell of God's Knowledge; 110
 Beside his excellence, excellence lacks its excellency; beside his bounty Ma'n⁴¹⁶ is a withholder of benefits.
 His enemy is a foe unto himself whom even his friends renounce; he who obeys him is secure of himself and trusted by mankind.
 In praise of the countenance of Him round whom the [Divine] Names revolve I would sing psalms, were I granted permission by Him.
 I continued to utter in praise of His Essence what God [Himself] hath said, not the verse of 'the poets whom the erring follow'⁴¹⁷.
 O Vice-gerent [Khalífa] of the All-merciful, O Ark of Noah, be not

⁴¹⁰ *I.e.* ever changing, inconstant.

⁴¹¹ Perfection exposes the owner to special risks, and the Evil Eye is called by the Arabs '*Aynu'l-Kamál*' because it especially menaces, whatever is perfect of its kind. Cf. p. 117, n. 2 *supra*.

⁴¹² So Háfiz: "If the understanding knew how happy the heart is under the locks of the Beloved, the intelligent would go mad for the sake of our chains." (Ed. Rosenzweig-Schwannau, vol. i, p. 28, ll. 7-8.)

⁴¹³ It is impossible to render the word-plays between '*aql*' (understanding) and '*iqál*' (hobble, tether, shackle fastened round a camel's knee to keep it from straying), and '*bakhti*' (dromedary) and '*bakht*' (fortune). Even when treating of the most solemn themes few Persian poets can resist such echolalia.

⁴¹⁴ This is one of the titles given by the followers of Bahá'u'lláh to his son 'Abbás Efendí, also called *Sirru'lláh* ("God's Secret"), and after his father's death 'Abdu'l-Bahá

⁴¹⁵ See the note on verse 92 above (p. 215, n. 4).

⁴¹⁶ Ma'n ibn Záhida is proverbial for his courage, virtue and generosity. For an account of him, see Zotenberg's *Chronique de Tabari* (1874), vol. iv, pp. 373 *et seqq.* This verse affords another instance of echolalia (Ma'n, máni', má'ún).

⁴¹⁷ Qur'án, xxvi, 224, on account of which the whole *Súra* is entitled the "Chapter of the Poets."

grieved because the Truth hath been weakened by violation [of
the Covenant]. 115
In the Dispensation of Adam, Qábíl [Cain] cruelly and despitefully
shed his brother's blood without fault or sin [on his part].
In the Dispensation of Noah, when Canaan⁴¹⁸ broke his father's
Covenant, by the disgrace of a repudiated affiliation he was
drowned in the Sea of Shame.
In the Dispensation of Jacob, Joseph the faithful was imprisoned
in the bonds of servitude by the wiles of his brethren.
In the Dispensation of Moses from amongst the children of Israel
one was such as Aaron and another such as Qárún⁴¹⁹.
In the Dispensation of the Spirit of God [Jesus Christ] from amongst

[page 218]

the Disciples one in cruelty became like Judas [Iscariot] and
one in sincerity like Simon [Peter]. 120
In the Dispensation of His Holiness the Seal of the Prophets
[Muḥammad] one of his people was in faithfulness Abú Dharr and
another Abú Sha'yún⁴²⁰.
In the Dispensation of His Holiness the Supreme [the Báb] two
persons were [entitled) Waḥíd⁴²¹; one was faithful and brave,
the other a cowardly traitor.
In the Dispensation of the Most Splendid Countenance [Bahá'u'lláh]
it must likewise needs be so, one faithful to the Covenant,
the other a vile violator thereof⁴²².
I will not open my lips to curse, but God says, 'Whosoever breaketh
my Covenant is accursed.'
This people wilfully shut their eyes to the Truth, for the Truth is
apparent from the False in all circumstances. 125
I swear by Thy Face, O Exemplar of all peoples! I swear by Thy
Hair, O Leader of all the ages!
I swear by Thy Substance, to wit the Majesty of the Absolute! I
swear by Thy Truth, to wit the Reality of the Why-less⁴²³!
I swear by Thy Countenance, to wit His [God's] dawning Countenance!
I swear by thy Secret, to wit His Treasured Secret!
By the earth at Thy Feet, to wit the Alchemy of Desire! By the
dust on Thy Road, to wit the tutty of [our] eyes!

[page 219]

By the spot pressed by Thy foot in the Land of 'the Fig'! By the
place of adoration of mankind adorned by 'the Olive⁴²⁴! 130
[By all these I swear] that my heart cannot remain tranquil without
praising Thee, for the debtor cannot lay his head tranquilly on
the pillow.
Yet how can Na'im utter Thy praises? [He is as one] unproved who
steps into the Oxus.

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

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

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

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

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

⁴²³ See p. 212, n. 1 *supra*.

⁴²⁴ See p. 214, n. 4 *supra*.

May he who obeys Thy command be secure from the deceits of the
Flesh! May he who is the captive of Thy thralls be protected
from the delusions of the time!"

133

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

Analysis of Na'im's Poem.

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

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

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

[page 220]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[page 221]

under the *Šafawís* at any rate circumstances were particularly unfavourable to the expression of this class of ideas. The beautiful *Tarjī'-band* of Hátif of Işfahán, which will be given at the end of the next chapter, is the only masterpiece of *Šúfí* poetry produced in the eighteenth century with which I am acquainted.

(5) *The Taşníf or Ballad.*

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

دلگشارا ساخت زیر سُرُسَرَكْ
دلگشارا ساخت با چوب و فلکْ
حیفِ دلگشا حیفِ دلگشاْ

("He made [the garden of] Dil-gushá under 'the Slide';
He made Dil-gushá with the sticks and the stocks:

was the most popular ballad when I was in Shíráz in the spring of 1888⁴²⁵, but it is probably now as little remembered as an almost contemporary ribald English satire on a certain well-known Member of Parliament who "upset the milk in bringing it home from Chelsea." I have no doubt that the *tašníf* or ballad sung by the troubadour and wandering minstrel existed in Persia from very early — perhaps even from pre-Islamic-times. Bárbad and Sakísá may have sung such topical songs to Khusraw Parwíz the Sásánian thirteen hundred years ago, as Rúdagí almost certainly did four centuries later to the Sámánid prince who was his patron⁴²⁶; and a fragment of a

[page 222]

typical *tašníf* (called by the curious name of *harára*) sung in Işfahán on the occasion of the capture and execution of the heretic and assassin Aĥmad ibn 'Attásh⁴²⁷, is recorded in the history of the Saljúqs composed by Abú Bakr Najmu'd-Dín Muĥammad ar-Ráwandí early in the thirteenth century of our era, under the title of *Ráĥatu's-Sudúr wa Áyatu's-Surúr*.

The authorship of these *tašníf*s is seldom known, and they are hardly ever committed to writing, though my friend the late George Grahame, when Consul at Shíráz in 1905, very kindly caused a small selection of two score of those most popular at the time in that city and in Tíhrán, Işfahán, Rasht, Tabríz, and elsewhere, to be written down for me; and a selection, adapted as far as possible to the piano, was published in or about 1904 under the title of *Twelve Persian Folk-Songs collected and arranged for voice and pianoforte by Blair Fairchild: English version of the words by Alma Strettell* (Novello & Co., London and New York). In this excellent little book the songs are well set, well rendered into English, and intelligibly if not ideally transliterated, and the following sentence from the short prefatory note shows how sensible the compiler was to the indescribable charm of Persian minstrelsy:

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

Most of these *tašníf*s are very simple love-songs, in which lines from Háfíz and other popular poets are sometimes

[page 223]

incorporated; the topical, polemical and satirical class is much smaller, though in some ways more interesting as well as more ephemeral. A parody or parallel of such a *tašníf* may be produced to accord with fresh circumstances, as happens nearer home with the Irish *an t-gean beán bóco* and the Welsh *mochyn du*. An instance of such an adaptation is afforded by the second poem cited in my *Press and Poetry of Modern Persia* (pp. 174-9). Of course in the *tašníf* the air is at least as important as the words, and a proper study of them would require a knowledge of Persian music, which, unhappily, I do not possess. Indeed I should think that few Europeans had mastered it both in practice and theory, or could even enumerate the twelve *maqáms* and their twenty-four derivatives (*shu'ba*)⁴²⁸.

(6) Modern political verse.

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

CHAPTER VI.

⁴²⁵ See my *Year amongst the Persians*, p. 283.

⁴²⁶ Cf. vol. i of my *Lit. Hist. of Persia*, pp. 14-18.

⁴²⁷ *Lit. Hist. of Persia*, vol. ii, pp. 313-16; and *Ráĥatu's-Sudúr* (E. J. W. Gibb Memorial, New Series, vol. ii), pp. 161 and 497-8 (note on *harára*).

⁴²⁸ One of the clearest and most concise treatises on this subject which I have seen is contained in a manuscript from the library of the late Sir A. Houtum-Schindler (now in my possession) entitled *Bahjatu'r-Rawáj*.

POETS OF THE CLASSICAL TRADITION.
PRE-QÁJÁR PERIOD (A.D. 1500-1800).

Almost any educated Persian can compose tolerable verses, and the great majority do so, while the number of those who habitually indulge in this pastime on a considerable scale and have produced *díwáns* of poetry has been at all times fairly large. Moreover this poetry is as a rule so conventional, and the language in which it is written so unchanged during the period under discussion, that if a hundred *ghazals*, or odes, by a hundred different poets who flourished during the last four centuries were selected, avoiding those which contained any reference to current events, and omitting the concluding verse of each, wherein the poet generally inserts his *takhalluṣ*, or *nom de guerre*, it is extremely doubtful whether any critic could, from their style, arrange them even approximately in chronological order, or distinguish the work of a poet contemporary with Sháh Isma'íl the Šafawí from one who flourished in the reign of Náširu'd-Dín Sháh Qájár. Nor do the *tadhkiras*, or Memoirs of Poets, give us much help in making a selection, for when discussing contemporaries the author is very apt to make mention of his personal friends, and to ignore those whom he dislikes or of whom he disapproves. Thus influential or amiable rhymsters of mediocre ability are often included, while heretics, satirists and persons distasteful or indifferent to the author, though of greater talent, are often omitted. When Riḏá-qulí Khán "Hidáyat," author of that great modern anthology entitled

[page 225]

Majma'u'l-Fuṣahá ("the Concourse of the Eloquent")⁴²⁹, comes to speak of his contemporaries, we constantly come across such expressions as

با منش ارتباطی خاص بود و مرا بجنابش اخلاص

"He had a special connection with me, and I a sincere regard for him"⁴³⁰; "I saw him in Shíráz"⁴³¹; "I repeatedly called on him and he used to open the gates of conversation before my face"⁴³²; "I sometimes get a talk with him"⁴³³; "for a while he established himself in Fárs, where at that time the writer also was living; I used constantly to have the honour of conversing with him, for he used to open the gates of gladness before the faces of his friends"⁴³⁴; and so forth. How many of the 359 "contemporary poets" mentioned in this work⁴³⁵ were included on such personal grounds rather than on account of any conspicuous merit? I once went through the list with my excellent old friend Hájji Mírzá Yaḥyá Dawlatábádí, a man of wide culture and possessing a most extensive knowledge of Persian poetry, of which he must know by heart many thousands of verses, and asked him which of them he considered really notable. Out of the whole 359 he indicated five (Šabá of Káshán, Furúghí of Bistám, Qá'ání of Shíráz, Mijmar of Iṣfahán, and Nasháṭ of Iṣfahán) as of the first class; two (Wiṣál of Shíráz, and the author himself, Hidáyat) as of the second; and two (Surúsh of Iṣfahán and Wiqár of Shíráz) as of the third;

[page 226]

that is, he regarded about one out of every forty mentioned as having a claim to real distinction.

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

⁴²⁹ Composed in 1284/1867-8 and lithographed in 2 vols. at Tíhrán in 1295/1878.

⁴³⁰ Vol. ii, p. 64, s.v. Ágah-i-Shírází.

⁴³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 67, s.v. Ázád.

⁴³² *Ibid.*, p. 68, s.v. Mírzá Abu'l-Qásim-i-Shírází.

⁴³³ *Ibid.*, s.v. Ummíd of Kirmánsháh.

⁴³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 72, s.v. Ulfat of Káshán.

⁴³⁵ They occupy pp. 58-679 of vol. ii, but were not all strictly contemporary, a few being as early as the first half of the eighteenth century.

⁴³⁶ New ed., London, Macmillan & Co., 1890, pp. 86-94.

Byron and Tennyson. How *could* he hear their music, he to whom our English sounds were all unknown?" Transform this Frenchman into an Indian or a Turk, and substitute "Persian" for "English" and "Qá'ání" for "Byron and Tennyson," and the above remarks admirably apply to most Turkish and Indian appreciations of Persian poetry.

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

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

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

1. Hátifí (d. 927/Dec. 1520 or Jan. 1521).

Mawláná 'Abdu'lláh Hátifí of Kharjird in Khurásán derives his chief fame from the fact that he was the nephew of the great Jámí, who, according to the well-known story⁴³⁷, tested his poetical talent before allowing him to write by bidding him compose

a "parallel" to the following verses in Firdawsí's celebrated satire⁴³⁸ on Sulţán Maḥmúd of Ghazna:

درختی که تلخ است وی را سرشت
گوش در نشانی قباغ بهشت
ور از جوی خُلدش بهنگام آب
به بیخ انگبین ریزی و شهید ناب
سر انجام گوهر بکار آورد
همان میوه تلخ بار آورد

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

Hátifí produced the following "parallel," which his uncle Jámí approved, except that he jocularly observed that the neophyte had "laid a great many eggs on the way"⁴⁴⁰:

اگر بیضه زاغ ظلمت سرشت، نهی زیر طاوس باغ بهشت
بهنگام آن بیضه پروردنش، ز انجیر جنت دهی ارزش
دهی آبش از چشمه سلسبیل، بدان بیضه دمدر دم جبرئیل
شود عاقبت بیضه زاغ زاغ، برد رنج بیوده طاوس باغ

"If thou -should'st place an egg of the crow compounded of darkness
under the Peacock of the Garden of Paradise,

⁴³⁷ See, besides the Persian *tadhkiras*, Sir Gore Ouseley's *Biographical Notices of Persian Poets* (London, 1846), pp. 143-5.

⁴³⁸ The satire is given at the end (pp. 63-6) of the Persian Introduction to Turner Macan's edition of the *Sháh-náma* (Calcutta, 1829). These verses occur on p. 66, ll. 5-7.

⁴³⁹ Probably the celestial river of Salsabíl is intended.

⁴⁴⁰ *Majma'u'l-Fuṣṣahá*, vol. ii, p. 54. Hátifí's verses are given on the last page (436) of vol. iii of Ziyá Bey's *Kharábát*.

And if at the time of nourishing that egg thou should'st give it grain
from the Fig-tree of the Celestial Gardens,

[page 229]

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

Hátifi was one of the innumerable poets who strove to compose a “Quintet” (*Khamsa*) rivalling that of Nizámí of Ganja. Two of his five subjects were the same, the romances of *Laylá* and *Majnún*⁴⁴¹ and of *Shírín* and *Khusraw*; the *Haft Manzar* formed the parallel to the *Haft Paykar*; while the *Tímúr-náma*⁴⁴² formed the counterpart to the *Sikandar-náma*, except that, as Hátifi boasts⁴⁴³, his poem was based on historical truth instead of on fables and legends. He also began, but did not complete, a similar historical poem on the achievements of Sháh Isma‘íl the Şafawí, who paid him a surprise visit as he was returning from a campaign in Khurásán in 917/1511-12. This poem is in the style and metre of the *Sháh-náma* of Firdawsí, and is entitled *Sháh-náma-i-Hazrat-i-Sháh Isma‘íl*⁴⁴⁴.

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

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

Fighání appears to be one of those poets who are much more highly esteemed in India than in their own country, for while Shibli in his *Shi‘ru‘l-‘Ajám* (vol. iii, pp. 27-30), like Wálih in his *Riyádu‘sh-Shu‘ará*⁴⁴⁵, deems him the creator of a new style of poetry,

[page 230]

Riḍá-qulí Khán only accords him a brief mention in his *Riyádu‘l-‘Arifín*⁴⁴⁶ and entirely omits him in his larger *Majma‘u‘l-Fuṣahá*, while the notices of him in the *Átash-kada* and the *Tuḥfa-i-Sámí* are very brief. He was of humble origin, the son of a cutler⁴⁴⁷ or a vintner according to different accounts, and seems to have lived the life of a somewhat antinomian dervish. In Khurásán, whither he went from Shíráz, he was unappreciated, even by the great Jámí, with whom he forgathered; but at Tabríz he subsequently found a more appreciative patron in Sulṭán Ya‘qúb the Prince of the “White Sheep” Turkmáns. He repented in later life and retired to the Holy City of Mashhad, so that perhaps this verse of his ceased to be applicable:

آوده شراب فغانی بخاک رفت ‘ آه ارملائکش کفن تازه بو کنند‘

Stained with wine Fighání sank into the earth: alas if the Angels
should sniff at his fresh shroud⁴⁴⁸!”

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

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

Little is known of Umídí except that his proper name was Arjás⁴⁴⁹, that he was a pupil of the celebrated philosopher

⁴⁴¹ Published at Calcutta by Sir W. Jones in 1788.

⁴⁴² Lithographed at Lucknow in Oct. 1869. It comprises about 4500 verses.

⁴⁴³ Rieu's *British Museum Persian Catalogue*, p. 654.

⁴⁴⁴ There is another similar and homonymous poem by Qásimí. See *R.M.P.C.*, pp. 660-1. The Library of King's College, Cambridge, possesses a MS. of this latter (*Pote Collection*, No. 238).

⁴⁴⁵ See Rieu's *Pers. Cat.*, p. 651.

⁴⁴⁶ Lithographed at Tīhrán, 1305/1887-8, p. 122.

⁴⁴⁷ On this account he originally wrote verse under the “pen-name of Sakkákí.

⁴⁴⁸ Lest they should by the smell of the wine know him for the toper he was.

⁴⁴⁹ One is tempted to conjecture from this name that he may have been a Zoroastrian, but I have found no further evidence to support this supposition.

Jalálu'd-Dín Dawání, that his skill was in the *qaṣída* rather than the *ghazal*, that he was on bad terms with his fellow-townsmen, on whom he wrote many satires, and that he was finally killed in Tíhrán in a quarrel about a piece of land, at the instigation of Qiwámu'd-Dín Núr-bakhshí. Námí, one of his pupils, composed the following verses and chronogram on his death:

نادرِ عصرِ اُمیدِیِ مظلومِ ' كَو بِنَا حَقِّ شَهِیدِ شَد نَاگَهِ
 شَبِ بَخَوَابِ مَن آمَدِ و فَرمودِ ' كَی زِ حَالِ دَرَوِنِ مَن آگَهِ
 بَهِرِ تَارِیخِ قَتْلِ مَن بِنوِیسِ ' آهِ ازِ خَوْنِ نَا حَقِّ مَن آهِ

“The much-wronged Umídí, wonder of the Age, who suddenly and
 contrary to right became a martyr,
 Appeared to me at night in a dream and said, ‘O thou who art
 aware of my inward state,
 Write for the date of my murder⁴⁵⁰: “Alas for my blood unjustly shed, alas!” ’ ”

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

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

رواقِ مدرسه گر سرنگون شود سهل است
 قصورِ میكده عشق را مباد قصور
 بنایِ مدرسه از جنسِ عالی و سافل
 خراب گشت و خرابات همچنان معمور

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

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

⁴⁵¹ Or. 3642, ff. 180-197. See Rieu's *Persian Supplement*, p. 269. The author of the *Haft Iqlím*, writing more than seventy years after the death of Umídí, his fellow-townsmen and apparently kinsman, says that in his day the well-known verses of the poet consisted of 17 *qaṣídas*, 3 *ghazals*, a few fragments and quatrains, and the *Sáqi-náma*.

تو تركِ نیمِ مستی من مرغِ نیمِ بسمل،
 کارِ تو از من آسان کارِ من از تو مشکل،
 تو پا نهی به میدان من دست شویر از جان،
 تو خوی چکانی از رخ من خون فشانم از دل،
 دنبال آن مسافر از ضعف و نا توانی،
 بر خیزم و نشینم چون گرد تا بمنزل،
 کو بخت آنکه گیرم مستش ز خانه زین،
 و آن ساعدِ بلورین در گردنم حمایل،
 خنجر کشی و ساغر اهلِ وفا سراسر،
 خون خورده در برابر جان داده در مقابل،
 مداحیم چو شد طی بشنو حکایتِ ری،
 ویرانه ایست در وی دیوانه ایست عامل،
 دیوانه که تدبیر در وی نکرده تأثیر،
 دیوانه که زنجیر اورا نکرده عاقل،
 دیوانه ایست پُر فن دیرینه دشمن من،
 از وی مباش ایمن وز من مباش غافل،

[page 233]

بر داورِ سخندان این نکته ایست پنهان،
 کاندیشه پربشان نبود بمنظم مایل،
 طبعم ز هرکه بودی گوی سخن ربودی،
 اما اگر نبودی در خانه ام محصل،

Thou art a half-drunk Turk, I am a half-slain bird⁴⁵²; thy affair with
 me is easy, my desire of thee is difficult.
 Thou settest thy foot in the field, I wash my hands of life; thou
 causest sweat to drip from thy cheek, I pour blood from my heart.
 Behind that traveller in weakness and helplessness I rise up and
 subside like the dust until the halting-place [is reached].
 When shall the luck be mine to lift him drunken from the saddle,
 while that crystal-clear arm embraces my neck like a sword-belt?
 Thou bearest a dagger and a goblet: the faithful with one accord
 drink blood beside thee and give their lives before thee.
 Now that my scroll of praise is rolled up, hearken to the tale of Ray:
 it is a ruin wherein a madman is governor:
 A madman on whom counsel produced no effect; a madman whom
 chains did not render sensible.
 He is a madman full of craft, my old enemy; be not secure of him,
 and be not heedless of me.
 From the arbiter of eloquence this point is hidden, that a distracted
 mind is not disposed to verse.
 My genius would snatch the ball⁴⁵³ of verse from all and sundry, if
 only the bailiff were not in my house!"

4 and 5. The two Ahlís.

These two homonymous poets, the one of Turshíz in Khurásán (d. 934/1527-8) and the other of Shíráz (d. 942/1535-6), of both of whom the names are more familiar than the works, must, as Rieu has pointed out⁴⁵⁴, be carefully distinguished. Both are ignored by Ridá-qulí Khán, and both belong,

⁴⁵² See p. 166, n. i *supra*.

⁴⁵³ This common simile is derived from the game of polo.

the former actually, the latter spiritually, to the Herát school which gathered round Sulţán Ḥusayn and Mír ‘Alí Shír. This school, to which also belonged Żuhúrí (d. 1024/1615), likewise of Turshíz, seems never to have been popular in Persia, except, perhaps, in their own day in Khurásán, but enjoys a much more considerable reputation in India, where Żuhári, whose very name is almost unknown in Persia, enjoys an extraordinary, and, as I think, quite undeserved fame, especially as a writer of extremely florid and bombastic prose. Ahlí of Shíráz excelled especially in elaborately ingenious word-plays (*tajnísát*) and other rhetorical devices.

6. Hilálí (killed in 935/1528-9).

Hilálí, though born in Astarábád, the chief town of the Persian Province of Gurgán, was by race a Chaghatáy Turk, and was in his youth patronized by Mír ‘Alí Shír Nawá’í. His most famous poem, entitled *Sháh u Darwish*, or *Sháh u Gadá* (“the King and the Beggar”), has been harshly criticized by Bábur himself⁴⁵⁵ and in later times by Sprenger⁴⁵⁶, but warmly defended by Ethé, who translated it into German verse⁴⁵⁷. He composed another *mathnawí* poem entitled *Şifátu’l-‘Ashiqín* (“the Attributes of Lovers”) and a number of odes collected into a *Díwán*. Riđá-qulí Khán says⁴⁵⁸ that in Khurásán he was regarded as a Shí‘a, but in ‘Iráq as a Sunní. Unhappily for him ‘Ubaydu’lláh Khán, the fanatical Uzbek, took the former view, and caused him to be put to death as a “*Ráfiđí*.” It is curious, in view of this, that he is not mentioned in the *Majálisu’l-Mú’minín* amongst the Shí‘a poets; and perhaps, as asserted in the *Haft Iqlím*, the

envy of two of his rivals at the Uzbek Court, Baqá’í and Shamsu’d-Dín Kúhistání, rather than his religious views, may have caused his execution, which ‘Ubaydu’lláh Khán is said to have subsequently regretted. The following verses, however, seem to indicate Shí‘a propensities:

مُحَمَّدِ عَرَبِيٍّ أَبْرَوِيٍّ هَر دُو سَرَايِ
 كَسِي كِه خَاكِ دَرَش نِيَسْتِ خَاكِ بَرِ سِرِ اَوِ
 شَنِيدِه اَمْر كِه تَكَلَّمِ نَمُودِ هِمچُو مَسِيحِ
 بَدِينِ حَدِيثِ لَبِ لَعَلِ رُوحِ پَرُورِ اَوِ
 كِه مِنْ مَدِينِهٖ عَلِمِرِ عَلِيٍّ دَرِ سْتِ مَرَا
 عَجَبِ حُجْسْتِهٖ حَدِيثِ سْتِ مِنْ سَكِّ دَرِ اَوِ

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

7. Lisání (d. 940/1533-4).

Lisání of Shíráz is the last of the twenty-two Persian Shí‘a poets mentioned in the *Majálisu’l-Mú’minín* and deserves mention rather on account of his devotion to that faith than by reason of his poetic talent; for, although he is said to have produced more than 100,000 verses, they are little known and seldom met with⁴⁶⁰, and, though mentioned in the *Átash-kada* and the *Haft Iqlím*, he is ignored by Riđá-qulí Khán. Most of his life was spent at Baghdád and Tabríz, in which latter

⁴⁵⁴ *Persian Catalogue*, pp. 657-8. See also Ethé’s *India Office Persian Catalogue*, col. 785, No. 1432, where a very valuable autograph MS., made in 920/1514, is described.

⁴⁵⁵ See my *Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion*, p. 459.

⁴⁵⁶ *Oude Catalogue*, p. 427.

⁴⁵⁷ *Morgenländische Studien*, Leipzig, 1870, pp. 197-282.

⁴⁵⁸ *Majma’u’l-Fuṣahá*, vol. ii, p. 55.

⁴⁵⁹ I.e. the dog of ‘Alí. *Kalb-‘Alí* is not uncommon as a name amongst the Shí‘a, and, as we have seen, the Şafawí kings gloried in the title “Dogs of the Threshold of ‘Alí ibn Abí Tálíb.” These verses are taken from the *Majma’u’l-Fuṣahá*.

⁴⁶⁰ There is a copy of his *Díwán* (Or. 307) in the British Museum. See Rieu’s *Persian Catalogue*, pp. 656-7.

town he died just before it was taken by the Ottoman Sultán Sulaymán. “On account of his devotion to the Twelve Imáms,” says the author of the *Majális*, “Lisání would never remove from his head the twelve-gored kingly crown⁴⁶¹ until, when Sultán Sulaymán the Turk was advancing to occupy Tabríz, it happened that news of his near approach reached Lisání when he was engaged in prayer in the great Mosque of Tabríz. On hearing this news, he raised his hands in prayer, saying, ‘O God, this usurper is coming to Tabríz: I cannot remove this crown from my head, nor reconcile myself to witnessing his triumph, therefore suffer me to die, and bring me to the Court of Thy Mercy!’ He then bowed his head in prayer, and in that attitude surrendered his soul to the Beloved.” The following quatrain is characteristic:

گر بندِ لسانی گسلد از بندش ' در خاک شود وجودِ حاجتمندش
 بالله که ز مشرقِ دلش سر نزند ' جز مهرِ علی و یازده فرزندش

“If the joints of Lisání break apart, and his needy body passes into the dust,
 By God, from the horizon of his heart naught will appear save the love [or sun]
 of ‘Alí and his eleven descendants!”

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

8. Fuḍúlí (Fuḷúlí) of Baghdád (d. 970/1562-3).

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

where he was probably born, and where he spent nearly all his life, was taken from the Persians by the Turks in 940/1535; but, as Gibb says⁴⁶², “he composed with equal ease and elegance in Turkish, Persian, and Arabic.” He is described by the same scholar⁴⁶³ as “the earliest of those four great poets who stand pre-eminent in the older literature of Turkey, men who in any age and in any nation would have taken their place amongst the Immortals.” That his status in the Persian Parnassus is so much lower is due rather to the greater competition and higher standard of excellence prevailing there than to any lack of skill on his part in the use of the Persian language.⁴⁶⁴ That he was of the Shí‘a faith is clear from several of his verses, and from his *Ḥadíqatu’s-Su‘adá*⁴⁶⁵, a Turkish martyrology modelled on the Persian *Rawḍatu’sh-Shuhadá* of Ḥusayn Wá‘iz-i-Káshifi.

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

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

شهر آشوبی جهت آنجا (یعنی گیلان) و مردم آنجا گفته و اورا
 با مریدی متهم ساخته زبانش را بُریدند اما این جائزه اورا از
 برای اشعار دیگرش میبایست نه جهتِ هجوِ اهلِ گیلان

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

⁴⁶² *Loc. cit.*, p. 72.

⁴⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

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

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

⁴⁶⁶ Vol. ii, p. 232.

9. Waḥshí of Báfq (d. 991/1583).

Though born at Báfq, a dependency of Kirmán, Waḥshí spent most of his life at Yazd. His poetry, especially his *Farhád u Shirín* and his *ghazals*, are highly praised in the *Ta'rikh-i-'Álam-árá-yi-'Abbásí*, the *Átash-kada*, and the *Majma'u'l-Fuṣṣahá*⁴⁶⁷. He also wrote panegyrics on Sháh Ṭahmásp and his nobles, concerning which the author of the work last-named remarks that in this branch of the poetic art none of the poets of the middle period can compare with the ancients. He did not finish the *Farhád u Shirín*, which was completed long afterwards (in 1265/1848-9) by Wiṣál. He wrote two other *mathnawi* poems, the *Khuld-i-Barín* ("Supreme Abode of Bliss") and *Názir u Manzúr*, besides *ghazals* (odes) and *qit'as* (fragments), a large selection of which are given in the *Majma'u'l-Fuṣṣahá* and the *Átash-kada* (pp. 111-120)⁴⁶⁸. The following *murabba'*, or "foursome," given in both these anthologies, is rather pretty and unusual.

دوستان شرح پویشانی من گوش کنید
داستان غیر پنهانی من گوش کنید
قصه بی سر و سامانی من گوش کنید
گفتگوی من و حیرانی من گوش کنید
شرح این قصه جانسوز نهفتن تا کی
سوخته سوخته این راز نگفتن تا کی

[page 239]

روزگاری من و دل ساکن کوهی بودیم
ساکن کوی بت عریده جوئی بودیم
دین و دل باخته ویرانه روئی بودیم
بسته سلسله سلسله موئی بودیم
کس در آن سلسله غیر از من و دل بند نبود
یک گرفتار ازین جمله که هستند نبود
نوکس غمزه زنش این همه بیمار نداشت
سنبیل پر شکنش هیچ گرفتار نداشت
این همه مشتری و گرمی بازار نداشت
یوسفی بود ولی هیچ خریدار نداشت
اول آن کس که خریدار شدم من بودم
باعث گرمی بازار شدم من بودم
عشق من شد سبب خوبی و رعنائی او
داد رسوائی من شهرت زیبائی او
بسکه کردم همه جا شرح دلآرائی او
شهر پر گشت ز غوغای تماثائی او
این زمان عاشق سرگشته فراوان دارد
کی سر و برک من بیسر و سامان دارد
چون چنین است پی کار دگر باشیم به
مرغ خوش نغمه گلزار دگر باشیم به
عندلیب گل رخسار دگر باشیم به
چند روزی پی دلدار دگر باشیم به
نو کلی کو که شور بلبل داستان سازش
سازم از تازه جوانان چمن ممتازش
گرچه از خاطر وحشی هوس روی تو رفت
وز دلش آرزوی قامت دلجوی تو رفت

[page 240]

⁴⁶⁷ Vol. ii, pp. 51-4.

⁴⁶⁸ See Rieu's *Persian Catalogue*, pp. 663-4.

شده دل آزرده، آزرده از گوی تو رفت،
 با دل پرگله از ناخوشی روی تو رفت،
 حاش لله که وفای تو فراموش کنر،
 سخن مصلحت آمیز کسان گوش کنر،

“O friends, hearken to the account of my distraction! Hearken to the tale of my hidden sorrow! Hearken to the story of my disordered state! Hearken to my description of my bewilderment! How long shall I hide the account of this grievous story? I burn! I burn! How long shall I refrain from telling this secret?”

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

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

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

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

Although the fancy for thy face hath passed away from Waḥshí’s mind, and the desire for thy charming figure hath departed from his heart, and one vexed in heart hath departed in vexation from thy street, and with a heart full of complaints hath departed from the displeasure of thy countenance, God forbid that I should forget thy constancy, or should listen to man’s counsels of expediency!”

[page 241]

**10. Maḥmúd Qárí of Yazd (d. 993/1585).
 11. Muḥtasham. of Káshán (d. 996/1587-8).**

Maḥmúd Qárí of Yazd, the poet of clothes, who died two years after Waḥshí and three years before Muḥtasham, was mentioned in the preceding volume of this work⁴⁶⁹ in connection with the two earlier parodists ‘Ubayd-i-Zákání and Bushāq (Abú Ishāq) of Shíráz; while the far more notable Muḥtasham has been already discussed at some length in the preceding chapter⁴⁷⁰ in connection with the religious poetry on which his fame chiefly rests. Of the erotic verse of his early youth and of his panegyrics on Sháh Ṭahmásp copious specimens are given in the *Átash-kada*, but these are neither so distinguished nor so characteristic as his elegies (*maráthi*) on the martyrdom of Ḥusayn and the other Imáms, from which the extracts given in the *Majma‘u’l-Fuṣṣahá*⁴⁷¹ are chiefly taken.

12. ‘Urfí of Shíráz (d. 999/1590-1) and his circle.

Though less highly appreciated in his own country than in Turkey and India, ‘Urfí is probably on the whole the most famous and popular poet of his century⁴⁷². Though born and brought up in Shíráz, his short life was chiefly spent in India, where he died in 999/1590-1 at the early age of thirty-six, some say of dysentery, others of poison. He is one of the three poets of this century (A.D. 1500-1600) discussed by Shibli Nu‘mání in his *Shi‘ru’l-‘Ajám*⁴⁷³, the other two being his

[page 242]

fellow-townsmen Bábá Fighání, already mentioned⁴⁷⁴, and Faydí (Fayzí), brother of Akbar’s celebrated minister Abu’l-Faḍl (Abu’l-Faḍl), who, in Shibli’s opinion, was one of the two Indian poets who wrote Persian verse which would pass as the work of a genuine Persian⁴⁷⁵. ‘Abdu’l-Qádir Badá‘uní says⁴⁷⁶ that ‘Urfí and Thaná’í were the two most popular Persian poets

⁴⁶⁹ *Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion*, pp. 257 and 351-3. Maḥmúd is not mentioned in the *Átash-kada*, the *Haft Iqlím*, or the *Majma‘u’l-Fuṣṣahá*; no particulars of his life are known to me, and the date of his death must be regarded as uncertain.

⁴⁷⁰ Pp. 172-7 *supra*.

⁴⁷¹ Vol. ii, pp. 36-38.

⁴⁷² See Rieu’s *Persian Catalogue*, p. 667.

⁴⁷³ Vol. iii, pp. 82-133.

⁴⁷⁴ Pp. 229-230 *supra*.

⁴⁷⁵ The other was Amír Khusraw of Dihlí.

in India in his time, and that manuscripts of their works were to be found in every bazaar and book-shop, while Faydí's poems, in spite of the large sums of money which he had expended in having them beautifully copied and illuminated, were little sought after. Gibb says⁴⁷⁷ that, after Jámí, 'Urfí and Faydí were the chief Persian influences on Turkish poetry until they were superseded by Şá'ib, and that "the novelty in this style lay, apart from the introduction of a number of fresh terms into the conventional vocabulary of poetry, in the deposition of rhetoric from the chief seat, and the enthronement of loftiness of tone and stateliness of language in its stead"⁴⁷⁸. Ziyá (Diyá) Pasha, in that portion of his metrical Introduction to the *Kharábát* which discusses the Persian poets, after praising Jámí, proceeds to speak of 'Urfí and Faydí as follows:

فیضی ایله عُرفی همعاندِرْ	سِرْ جَمَلِهْ آخِرِ الزَّمَانِدِرْ
فیضیده بلاغت و طراوتْ	عُرْفیدِه عذوبت و حلاوتْ
فیضیده مواعظ آتشیندِرْ	عُرْفیدِه قصیده لر متیندِرْ
اَمَّا آرَانُورِسِه اَو.وِیْتْ	فیضیده قالورینه فضیلتْ
فیضی معجر ایکن سراپا،	تفسیرینه نقطه قونماز اصلا،
بولدی او یگانه، فضیلتْ	شاگردی یدی ایله شهادتْ

[page 243]

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

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

فیضی بیدین چو مُرد سالِ وفاتش فصیحْ
گفت سگی از جهان رفته بحالِ قبیحْ

"When infidel Faydí died, Faşih said as the date of his death, 'A dog departed from the world in a foul fashion.'"

The simplest of them all are "Faydí was a heretic," (بود فیضی ملحدی) "he died like a dog-worshipper" (چه سگ پرستی مرد) and "the rule of heresy broke" (الحاد شکست قاعده) all of which yield the required date A.H. 1004 (A.D. 1595). Badá'úní also says that, with a view to restoring his shattered religious reputation, he composed a commentary on the *Qur'án* consisting entirely of undotted letters, adding unkindly that he was drunk and in a state of legal uncleanness when he wrote it. The author of the *Majma'u'l-*

[page 244]

*Fuṣaḥá*⁴⁸¹ in alluding to this book (which he only knew by repute) says that the author "troubled himself to no purpose" (كلفتی بی حاصل کشیده) and has no word of praise for his poems, on which the author of the *Átash-kada* has the tepid encomium that "they are not bad." The fullest and most appreciative account of him which I have met with is that given by Shibli Nu'mání in his *Shi'ru'l-'Ajam*⁴⁸². He composed a *Khamsa* ("Quintet") in imitation of Nizámí, the titles of these five poems being *Markaz-i-Adwár*, *Sulaymán u Bilqís*, *Nal u Daman* (the most celebrated), *Haft Kishwar*, and *Akbar-náma*, but

⁴⁷⁶ *Muntakhabu't-Tawárikh*, vol. iii, p. 285 (Calcutta, 1869).

⁴⁷⁷ *Hist. of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. i, pp. 51 127, 129.

⁴⁷⁸ *Loc. cit.* p. 129.

⁴⁷⁹ *Muntakhabu't-Tawárikh*, vol. iii, pp. 299-310, especially p. 300.

⁴⁸⁰ This took place on 10 Safar, 1004 (October 15, 1595). See Rieu's *Persian Catalogue*, p. 450, where the chief sources are fully enumerated.

⁴⁸¹ Vol. ii, p. 26. This commentary was entitled, according to Shibli Nu'mání (*loc. cit.*, p. 65), *Sawáti'u'l-Ilhám*.

⁴⁸² Vol. iii, pp. 31-81.

some of them remained incomplete. He also wrote many *qaṣīdas* and *ghazals*, and produced several translations from the Sanskrit. None of his verses quoted by Shibli appear to me so affecting as the following on the death of his child

ای روشنی دیدہ روشن چگونہ
 من بی تو تیرہ روز تو بی من چگونہ
 ماتمہ سراسر خانہ من در فراق تو
 تو زیر خاک ساخته مسکن چگونہ
 بر خار و خس کہ بستر و بالین خواب تست
 ای یاسمین عذار سمن تن چگونہ

“O brightness of my bright eyes, how art thou?
 Without thee my days are dark; without me how art thou?
 My house is a house of mourning in thine absence;
 thou hast made thine abode beneath the dust: how art thou?
 The couch and pillow of thy sleep is on thorns and brambles:
 O thou whose cheeks and body were as jasmine, how art thou?”

[page 245]

Fayḍī was a man of varied learning and a great lover of books. His library contained four thousand six hundred choice manuscripts, mostly autographs or copied during the authors’ lifetimes⁴⁸³. He was generous and hospitable, and amongst those who enjoyed his hospitality was ‘Urfī of Shīrāz, to whom we now turn.

‘Urfī, whose proper name was Jamālu’d-Dīn Muḥammad and whose father was named Badru’d-Dīn, was born and educated at Shīrāz, but at an early age migrated to India, and, as already mentioned, attached himself to Fayḍī, with whom, however, he presently quarrelled. Badā’ūnī says⁴⁸⁴ that one day he called on Fayḍī and found him caressing a puppy, whereupon he enquired what the name of “the young master” (*makhḍūm-zāda*) might be. “‘Urfī,” replied Fayḍī, to which ‘Urfī promptly replied, “*Mubārak bāshad!*” which means “May it be fortunate!” but may be taken as alluding to Fayḍī’s father Shaykh Mubārak and as meaning, “It should be Mubārak!”

‘Urfī next won the favour of the Ḥakīm Abu’l-Faḥḥ of Gilān⁴⁸⁵, by whom he was introduced to that great nobleman and patron of letters ‘Abdu’r-Raḥīm, who succeeded to the title of Khān-Khānān borne by his father Bayram Khān on the assassination of the latter in 968/1560-1. In due course he was presented to the Emperor Akbar himself, whom he accompanied on his march to Cashmere in 997/1588-9.

In spite of his opportunities and undoubted talents, ‘Urfī’s intolerable conceit and arrogance prevented him from being popular, and made him many enemies. Riḍā-qulī Khān accords him but a brief notice⁴⁸⁶, and observes that “the style of his poems is not admired by the people of this age.” Criticism

[page 246]

and disparagement are, indeed, courted by a poet who could write⁴⁸⁷:

نازش سعدی بُمَشَّتِ خَاكِ شيراز از چه بود
 گر نمی دانست باشد مولد و مأوای من

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

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

⁴⁸³ *Shi’ru’l-‘Ajam*, iii, p. 50, and *Muntakhabu’t-Tawārikh*, iii, p. 305.

⁴⁸⁴ *Muntakhabu’t-Tawārikh*, iii, p. 285.

⁴⁸⁵ *Muntakhabu’t-Tawārikh*, iii, p. 167. He died in 997/1588-9.

⁴⁸⁶ *Majma’u’l-Fuṣṣahā*, vol. ii, pp. 24-5.

⁴⁸⁷ *Shi’ru’l-‘Ajam*, iii, p. 88.

of which he was fully aware, as appears from the following poem⁴⁸⁸, wherein he complains of the hypocritical sympathy of the so-called “friends” who came to visit him when he was confined to bed by a severe illness:

تن اوفتاد درین حال و دوستان فصیح
 بدور بالش و بستر ستاده چون منبر
 یکی بریش کشد دست و کج کند گردن
 که روزگار وفا با که کرد جان پدر
 بجاه و مال فرومایه دل نباید بست
 کجاست دولت جمشید و نام اسکندر

[page 247]

یکی بنرمی آواز و گفتگوی حزین
 کند شروع و کشد آستین بدیده تر
 که جان من همه را این رهست و باید رفت
 تمام راه روانم و دهر را کب بر
 یکی بچرب زبانی سخن طراز شود
 که ای وفات تو تاریخ انقلاب خبر
 فراهم آی و پریشان مدار دل زنهار
 که نظمو نثر تو من جمع میکنم یکسر
 پس از نوشتن و تصحیح میکنم انشا
 بهدعای تو دیجاچه چو درج گهر
 چنانچه هستی فهرست دانش و فرهنگ
 چنانچه هستی مجموعه صفات و هنر
 بنظرم و نثر در آویزم و فرو ریزم
 اگرچه حصر کمال تو نیست حد بشر
 خدای عز و جل صحتم دهد بینی
 که این منافقان را چه آورم بر سر

“My body hath fallen into this state, and my eloquent friends stand
 like pulpits round my bed and pillow.
 One draws his hand through his beard and cocks his neck, saying,
 ‘O life of thy father! To whom is fortune constant?
 One should not set one’s heart on ignoble rank and wealth: where is the
 Empire of Jamshid and the name of Alexander?’
 Another, with soft voice and sad speech, begins, drawing his sleeve across his moist eyes:
 ‘O my life! All have this road by which they must depart: we are all travellers
 on the road, and time bears forward the riders.’
 Another, adorning his speech with smooth words, says, ‘O thou whose
 death is the date of the revolution of news (*inqiláb-i-khabar*)!’⁴⁸⁹

[page 248]

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

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

⁴⁸⁸ *Shi’ru’l-‘Ajam*, iii, pp. 92-3.

⁴⁸⁹ I think the words *انقلاب خبر* must be taken as a chronogram, giving the date 986/1578-9, in which case this cannot, as Shiblí suggests (*loc. cit.*, p. 92), have been ‘Urfi’s last illness, since he did not die until 999/1590-1.

⁴⁹⁰ This final verse is, of course, spoken by the poet himself.

Space does not allow us to follow in detail Shibli's interesting and exhaustive study of this poet, to whose verse he assigns six salient merits, such as "forceful diction" (زورِ کلام), new and original combinations of words, fine metaphors and comparisons, and continuity or congruity of topics (مسلسل مضامین). Except for a little-known prose treatise on Šúfism entitled *Nafsiyya* all his work was in verse, and included, according to Shibli, two mathnawí poems in imitation of Nizámí's *Makhzanu'l-Asrár* and *Khusraw wa Shirín*, and a *Díwán*, compiled in 996/1588, only three years before his death, containing 26 *qaşidas*, 270 *ghazals*, and 700 fragments and quatrains. The following chronogram gives the date of its compilation⁴⁹¹:

این طرفه نکاتِ بحری و اعجازی
چون گشت مکمل برقم بردازی
مجموعه طرازِ قدس تاریخش یافت
اول دیوان عرفی شیرازی

One of his most famous *qaşidas*, given in the *Kharábát* (vol. i, pp. 169-174), is in praise of 'Alí ibn Abí Tálíb, and contains 181 verses. It begins:

[page 249]

جهان بگشتم و دردا که هیچ شهر و دیار
ندیده‌ام که فروشند بخت در بازار

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

'Urfí is not, however, included amongst the Persian Shí'a poets to whom notices are consecrated in the *Majálisu'l-Mú'mínin*.

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

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

The third volume of Badá'úní's *Muntakhabu't-Tawárikh*, which is entirely devoted to the biographies of the poets and men of learning who adorned Akbar's court, contains notices of 38 *Shaykhs* (religious leaders), 69 scholars, 15 philosophers and phy-

[page 250]

sicians, and no fewer than 167 poets, most of whom, however, though they wrote in Persian and were in many cases Persians by birth, are unknown even by name in Persia.

Amongst the most eminent names belonging, in part at any rate, to the century which we here conclude, are those of Shaykh Bahá'u'd-Dín 'Amílí, Mullá Muhsin-i-Fayz (Fayz) of Káshán, Mír Dámád, and Mír Abu'l-Qásim-i-Findariskí, who, however, will be more suitably considered amongst the theologians or philosophers.

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

Four of the seven poets discussed at length by Shibli in the third volume of his *Shi'ru'l-'Ajam* fall within the period indicated above. These are Nazírí (d. 1021/1612-13), Tálíb-i-Ámulí (d. 1036/1626-7), Abú Tálíb Kalím (d. 1061/1651), and

⁴⁹¹ *Shi'ru'l-'Ajam*, iii, p. 95.

⁴⁹² *Akbar the Great Mogul*, 1542-1605 (Oxford, 1917).

⁴⁹³ "*Á'in(-i-Akbarí)*, translated by H. Blochmann and H. S. Jarrett, Calcutta, 1873-1894 in 3 volumes, vol. i, pp. 548, 611."

Şá'ib (d. 1088/1677-8)⁴⁹⁴. Ridá-qulí Khán in the enumeration of eminent contemporaries of the Şafawí kings with which he concludes the supplementary eighth volume written by him in continuation of Mírkhwánd's *Rawḍatu 'ş-Şafá* mentions not one of these, but, in the period now under consideration, names only Zuhúrí (d. 1024/1615) and Shifá'í (d. 1037/1627). Another poet ignored by both these writers but highly esteemed in Turkey, where, according to Gibb⁴⁹⁵, "he continued for more than half a century to be the guiding star for the majority of Ottoman poets," being "deservedly famous for his marvellous ingenuity and fertility in the invention of fresh and picturesque images and similes," is Shawkat (or Shevket, according to the Turkish pronunciation) of Bukhárá (d. 1107/1695-6). To these seven we may add, besides four or five⁴⁹⁶ who, though

[page 251]

they wrote occasional verse, were primarily philosophers, and will be discussed in connection with that class, the following six, who were, perhaps, a trifle more distinguished than their innumerable competitors: Saḥábí of Astarábád (d. 1010/1601-2), Zulálí of Khwánsár (d. about 1024/1615), Jalál Asír (d. 1049/1639-40), Qudsí of Mashhad (d. 1056/1646-7), Salím of Tíhrán (d. 1057/1647-8), and Amání of Mázandarán (d. 1061/1651). Although I think that Rieu⁴⁹⁷ goes too far when he describes Şá'ib as "by common consent the creator of a new style of poetry, and the greatest of modern Persian poets," he is without doubt the greatest of those who flourished in the seventeenth century of our era, and, I think, the only one deserving a detailed notice in this volume, notwithstanding Ridá-qulí Khán's remark that "he had a strange style in the poetic art which is not now admired⁴⁹⁸."

Here follows a list of these seventeen poets, arranged chronologically according to the dates of their deaths, with brief references to the authorities who may be consulted for further particulars concerning them. These are, besides Rieu's incomparable Persian Catalogue, Shibli's *Shi 'ru 'l- 'Ajam*, vol. iii (*Sh.*), the *Átash-kada* (*A. K.*), the *Haft Iqlím* (*H. I.*, available in manuscript only), the *Rawḍatu 'l-Jannát* (*R. I.*), the *Rawḍatu 'ş-Şafá* (*R. S.*), the *Majma 'u 'l-Fuṣṣahá* (*M. F.*), and the *Riyádu 'l- 'Árifín* (*R. 'A.*).

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

[page 252]

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

ز هنر بخود ننگم چو بخمر می مغانی،
 بدرّ لباس بر تن چو بجوشدم مغانی،
 همه عیش این جهانی بعنایت تو دیدم،
 چه عجب اگر بیایم ز تو زاد آن جهانی،

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

In matters of religion he was something of a fanatic, and wrote verses attacking "the heretic" Abu'l-Faḍl. He also wrote verses in praise of tobacco, some of which are quoted by Shibli (p. 134).

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

⁴⁹⁴ Other dates, e.g. 1080/1669-70, are also given. See Rieu, *op. cit.*, p. 693.

⁴⁹⁵ *History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. i, p. 130. See also vol. iv, p. 95, of the same.

⁴⁹⁶ Namely, Mír Dámád, Shaykh Bahá'u'd-Dín, Abu'l-Qásim Findariskí, Muḥsin-i-Fayd and 'Abdu'r-Razzáq-i-Láhiǵí, called *Fayyáǵ*.

⁴⁹⁷ *Persian Catalogue*, p. 693.

⁴⁹⁸ *Majma 'u 'l-Fuṣṣahá*, vol. ii, p. 24, بازی در طریق شاعری طرزى
 غریب داشته كه اکنون پسندیده نیست'

1024/1615), shortly before his death, is the most popular. Two others mentioned by Rieu are “the Wine-Tavern” (*May-khána*), and “the Mote and the Sun” (*Dharra u Khurshíd*).

[page 253]

(4) **Zuhúrí of Turshíz** (d. 1024/1615, murdered in an affray in the Deccan together with his fellow-poet and father-in-law Malik of Qum). Rieu, pp. 678-9; *A. K.*, pp. 68-70; *R. S.*, at end of vol. viii. He is, as Rieu observes, little known in Persia, though much admired in India, especially as a writer of extremely florid prose. The author of the *A. K.* says that in his opinion this poet’s *Sáqí-náma* (“Book of the Cupbearer”) has no great beauty, in spite of the fame which it enjoys.

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

(6) **Tálib-i-Ámulí** (d. 1036/1626-7). Rieu, p. 679; *Sh.* iii, pp. 165-188; *A. K.*, pp. 155-6, where it is said that “he had a peculiar style in verse which is not sought after by eloquent poets.” In India, whither he emigrated in early life, he was so highly appreciated that Jahángir made him his poet-laureate (*Maliku’s-Shu’ará*) in 1028/1619. He was far from modest, for he

[page 254]

boasts that before he reached his twentieth year he had mastered seven sciences⁴⁹⁹:

پا بر دومین پایه اوج عشراتم
و اینک عددِ فنم از آلف زیادست
بر هندسه و منطقی و هئیت و حکمت
دستی است مرا کش ید بیضا ز عبادت
وین جمله چو طی شد نمکین علمِ حقیقت
کاستادِ علومست برین جمله مزادست
در سلسله وصفِ خط این بس که ز کلکمر
هر نقطه سویدای دل اهلِ سوادست
پوشم نَسبِ شعر چو دانه که تو دانی
کاین پایه مرا نامِ این سبعِ شادست

“My foot is on the second step of the zenith of the decades, and behold the number of my accomplishments exceeds the thousands!
In mathematics, logic, astronomy and philosophy I enjoy a proficiency which is conspicuous⁵⁰⁰ amongst mankind.
When all these are traversed the savoury knowledge of the Truth⁵⁰¹, which is the Master of the Sciences, is added to the sum total.
In the concatenated description of my writing this is enough, that every dot from my pen is the heart’s core of men of letters⁵⁰².
I put on the attribute of poetry, for I know that thou knowest that this step is to me the eighth of these ‘seven severe ones.’⁵⁰³”

In the following quatrain, also cited by Shibli (p. 168), he alludes to his proposed journey to India and bids himself

[page 255]

“leave his black (*i.e.* bad) luck in Persia, because no one would take a Hindú as a present to India”:

⁴⁹⁹ The verses are given by Shibli, *op. cit.*, p. 166.

⁵⁰⁰ Literally “which has the White Hand,” in allusion to one of the miracles of Moses.

⁵⁰¹ That is, Śūfiism, as explained by Shibli.

⁵⁰² The word-play between *suwaydá* and *sawád* cannot be reproduced in translation.

⁵⁰³ This expression occurs in *Qur’án* xii, 48, where it denotes the “seven lean years.”

طالب گلِ این چمن بیستان بگذار
 بگذار که می شوی پریشان بگذار
 هندو نبرد تحفه کسی جانب هند
 بخت سیه خویش به ایران بگذار

He had an elder sister to whom he was deeply attached and after a long separation she came from Persia to Ágra to see him. He thereupon sought leave of absence from the Emperor Jahángír in the following verses⁵⁰⁴:

صاحباً ذرّه پروزا عرضی، بزبان سخن و درست مرا
 پیر همشیره ایست غم خوارم، که باو مهرِ مادرست مرا
 چارده سال بلکه بیش گذشت، کز نظر دور منظرست مرا
 دور گشته ز خدمتش بعراق، وین گنه چرّ منکرست مرا
 او نیاورد تابِ دوری من، که بمادر برابرست مرا
 آمد اینک باکِره وز شوقش، دل طهان چون کبوترست مرا
 می کند دل بسوی او آهنگ، چه کنر شوق رهبرست مرا
 گر شود رخصتِ زیارت او، به جهانی برابرست مرا

“O Master, Patron of the humble⁵⁰⁵! I have a representation [to make] in eloquent language.
 I have an old and sympathetic sister, who entertains for me a mother’s love.
 Fourteen years or more have passed since my eyes were parted from the sight of her face.
 I was removed from her service in ‘Iráq, and this sin is a grievous fault of mine.

[page 256]

She could not bear to remain far from me, for she is as a mother to me.
 Lo, she bath come to Ágra, and in longing for her my heart flutters like a pigeon.
 My heart craves after her: what can I do? Yearning impels me on the road.
 If leave should be granted me to visit her, it would be worth a world to me.”

Of love-poems there are only too many in Persian, but poems such as this, testifying to deep and sincere family affection, are rare enough to make them worthy of record.

(7) **Shifá’í** (d. 1037/1627). There exists in the British Museum (Or. 1372, f. 7^a) a portrait of this poet, as well as one of his satires, entitled *Sízdah-band*⁵⁰⁶ (Add. 12560, ff. 134-140): see Rieu, pp. 786 and 822. I cannot find in my manuscript of the *Ta’rikh-i-‘Álam-árá-yi-‘Abbási*, either amongst the poets or the physicians of the court of Sháh ‘Abbás, the notice of him to which Rieu refers, but there is a long account of him in *M. F.* (Vol. ii, pp. 21-23) and in the *R. ‘Á.* of the same author (pp. 213-218), as well as in *A. K.* (pp. 168-9). His proper name was Ḥakím (Doctor) Sharafu’d-Dín Ḥasan, and he was court-physician and boon companion to Sháh ‘Abbás the Great. Riḍá-qulí Khán says that “his medicine eclipsed his scholarship, as his poetry eclipsed his medicine”:

فضلِ حکیمِ را طبابت و طبابتِ اورا شاعریِ محبوب داشته

Besides satires and odes he composed a *mathnawí* poem entitled *Namakdán-i-Ḥaḳíqat* in imitation of Saná’í’s *Ḥadíqatu’l-Ḥaḳíqat*.

(8) **Mír Muḥammad Báqir-i-Dámád of Astarábád** (d. 1040/1630-1). The title *Dámád* (“Son-in-law”) really applies to his father, who was the son-in-law of the celebrated *mujtahid* Shaykh ‘Alí ibn Abdu’l-‘Al al-‘Ámilí. Mír Dámád, who wrote

[facing page 256]

[Picture: SHIFÁ’Í, POET AND PHYSICIAN]
 1920. 9. 17-0298 [2] (Brit. Mus.)

⁵⁰⁴ Shibli, *op. cit.*, pp. 179-180.

⁵⁰⁵ *Dharra* means a mote, then metaphorically any very small thing or person, so that *dharra-parwar* is equivalent to the common Indian *gharīb-parwar*, “protector of the poor.”

⁵⁰⁶ So called, I suppose, because it contains 13 strophes.

verse under the pen-name of *Ishráq*, was more notable as a theologian and philosopher than as a poet. See Rieu, p. 835; *M. F.*, ii, p. 7; *R. 'Á.*, pp. 166-7; *Á. K.*, p. 159. There are long notices of him in the *Rawḍātu'l-Jannát* (pp. 114-116), and in the *Ta'rikh-i-'Álam-árá-yi-'Abbásí*, written in 1025/1616, while he was still living. He is there described as skilled in most of the sciences, especially philosophy, philology, mathematics, medicine, jurisprudence, exegesis and tradition, and about a dozen of his prose works are mentioned. He was one of the teachers of the great philosopher Mullá Şadrá of Shiráz.

(9) **Mír Abu'l-Qásim-i-Findariskí** (d. about 1050/1640-1) was also more notable as a philosopher than as a poet, but is mentioned in *M. F.*, vol. ii, pp. 6-7; *R. 'Á.*, p. 165-6; *A. K.*, pp. 143-4; and Rieu, pp. 815-816. One poem of his, written in imitation of Násir-i-Khusraw, is cited in all the *tadhkiras*, and is therefore, presumably, his best known if not his, best production. It begins:

چرخ با این اختران نغزو خوش زیباستی
 صورتی در زیر دارد هرچه بر بالاستی
 صورت زیرین اگر با نردبان معرفت
 بر رود بالا همان با اصل خود یکتاستی
 این سخن را در نیاید هیچ فہر ظاہری
 گر ابو نصرستی و گر بو علی سیناستی

“The heaven with these fair and pleasant stars should be beautiful;
 it hath an aspect beneath, whatever there may be above.
 If this lower aspect should ascend by the ladder of knowledge, it
 would indeed be at one with its original.
 No exoteric understanding can comprehend this speech, though it
 be Abú Naşr [al-Fárábí] or Abú ‘Alí [ibn] Síná (Avicenna).”

Abu'l-Qásim was extraordinarily careless of appearances, dressing like a *darwish*, avoiding the society of the rich

and the respectable, and associating with disreputable vagabonds. One day Sháh ‘Abbás, intending to rebuke him for keeping such low company, said to him, “I hear that certain students cultivate the society of vagabonds and look on at their degrading diversions.” “I move constantly in those circles,” replied Mír Abu'l-Qásim, “but I have never seen any of the students there.” He made a journey to India, and there, according to the *Dabistán*⁵⁰⁷, came under the influence of certain disciples of Ádhar Kaywán and imbibed Zoroastrian and Hindú or Buddhist ideas which led him to declare that he would never perform the pilgrimage to Mecca, since it would involve his taking the life of an innocent animal. Though his attainments are rated high by Riḍá-qulí Khán, very meagre details are given concerning his life; perhaps because, while more a philosopher than a poet, and more a *darwish* than a philosopher, he does not exactly fall into any one of these three classes, and is consequently apt to be omitted from the special biographies of each.

Among the better-known minor poets of this period are Jalál Asír (d. 1049/1639-40), Qudsí (d. 1056/1646-7), Salím of Tíhrán (d. 1057/1647-8), Abú Tálíb Kalím and Amání of Mázandarán (both died in 1061/1651), Muḥammad Tāhir Waḥíd (d. about 1120/1708-9), and Shawkat of Bukhárá (d. 1107/1695-6). Besides Şá'ib (d. 1088/1677-8), the greatest of them all, only the fourth, the sixth and the last of these demand any separate notice.

(10) **Abú Tálíb Kalím** (d. 1061/1651) was born at Hamadán, but, until he went to India, lived chiefly at Káshán (whence he is often described as “Káshání”) and Shiráz. Riḍá-qulí Khán (*M. F.*, ii, p. 28) gives a very meagre notice of him, but Shibli (*Shi'ru'l-'Ajam*, iii, pp. 205-230) discusses him at some length.

About 1028/1619 he paid a visit to his native country, but after remaining there for about two years, he again returned to India, where he became poet-laureate to Sháh Jahán. He accompanied that monarch to Cashmere and was so charmed with that country that he remained there until his death. He was a man of genial disposition, free from jealousy, and consequently popular with his fellow-poets, of whom Şá'ib and Mír Ma'şúm were his special friends, so that Şá'ib says:

⁵⁰⁷ Shea and Troyer's translation, vol. i, pp. 140-1.

بغیر صائب و معصوم نکته سنج و کلیم
 دیگر که ز اهل سخن مهربان یكدگرند

Except Šá'ib, the epigrammatic Ma'súm, and Kalím,
 who of all the poets are kind to one another?"

When the poet Malik of Qum died, Abú Tálíb composed the following verses giving the date of his death:

مَلِكِ آن پادشاه مُلْكِ معنی ' که نامش سَنَه' نقد سخن بود
 چنان آفاق کبر از مُلْكِ معنی ' که حدّ ملکش از قمر تا دکن بود
 بچسّتم مالِ تاریخش ز آیام' بگفتا او سرِ اهل سخن بود

"Malik, that king of the realm of ideas, whose name is stamped on the coin⁵⁰⁸ of poetry,
 So enlarged the horizons of this realm of ideas that the frontiers of his domains extended
 from Qum to the Deccan.

I sought for the date of the year [of his death] from the days: they said 'He was the chief of
 the Masters of Speech'" (*ú Sar-i-ahl-i-sukhun búd* = 1025/1616)⁵⁰⁹.

Most of the Persian poets who went to India to seek a fortune, or at least a livelihood, had, according to Shibli⁵¹⁰, nothing
 but evil to say of the country, but Kalím speaks of it with appreciations⁵¹¹:

[page 260]

توان بهشتِ دوم گفتش باین معنی ' که هر که رفت ازین بوستان پشیمان شد

"One can call it the second Paradise, in this sense, that whoever
 quits this garden departs with regret."

On one occasion the Sultán of Turkey wrote a letter to the Emperor Sháh Jahán reproaching him with arrogance in
 calling himself by this title, which means "King of the World," when he was in reality only king of India. Kalím justified his
 patron in the following verse:

هند و جهان ز روی عدد هر دو چون یکیست
 شه را خطاب شاه جهانی مبرهن است

"Since both Hind (India) and Jahán (world) are numerically identical⁵¹²,
 the right of the king to be called 'King of the World' [and not
 merely 'King of India'] is demonstrated."

Shibli discusses Kalím's merits very fully, and cites many of his verses to illustrate them. He includes amongst them
 especially novelty of topics (مضمون آفرینی), original conceits (خیال بندی), aptness of illustration (مثالیّه). In this last
 respect, illustrated by the following amongst other verses, Kalím resembles the more famous Šá'ib:

روزگار اندر کمین بخت ماست ' دزد دایم در پی خوابیده است

"Fate sets an ambush against our luck: the thief always pursues the sleeper⁵¹³."

دل گمان دارد که پوشیده است رازِ عشق را
 شمع را فانوس پندارد که پنهان کرده است

⁵⁰⁸ *Malik* is, of course, the Arabic equivalent of *Pádisháh*, "king," and one of the two distinctive symbols of kingship is the imposition of
 the royal name on the current coin of the realm.

⁵⁰⁹ *Shi'ru'l-'Ajam*, iii, p. 209.

⁵¹⁰ *Shi'ru'l-'Ajam*, iii, p. 209.

⁵¹¹ He also learned more of the vernacular than most of his countrymen. See a poem full of Hindi words cited by Shibli (*op. cit.*, p. 211).

⁵¹² Both words yield the numerical equivalent 59.

⁵¹³ Luck is called *bídár* ("awake") when it is good, and *khwábida* ("asleep") when it is bad.

“The heart imagines that it has hidden the secret of love: the lantern imagines that it has hidden the candle.”

[page 261]

از خاک برگرفته دوران چو نی سوار
دایر پیاده رفت اگرچه سوار شد

“He who has been raised up from the dust by fortune, like the rider of the hobby-horse, always goes on foot, although he is mounted.”

از هنر حال خرابر نشد اصلاح پذیر
همچو ویرانه که از گنج خود آباد نشد

“My desolate state is not mended by my virtues, just like the ruin, which does not prosper through its treasure⁵¹⁴.”

سفله از قرب بزرگان نکند کسب شرف
رشته پُر قیمت از آمیزش گوهر نشود

“The mean man does not acquire nobility by proximity to the great: The thread does not become precious through its connection with the pearls.”

دست هر کس را بسان سبزه بوسیدم چه سود
هیچ کس نکشود آخر عقده کار مرا

“What profits it that I, like the rosary, kissed the hands of all? After all, no one loosed the knots of my affair.”

با من آمیزش او الفت موجست و کنار
دمدم با من و پیوسته گریزان از من

“Her converse with me is as the association of the wave and the shore, Ever with me, yet ever fleeing from me.”

چو هست قدرت دست و دل توانگر نیست
صدف کشاده کف است آن زمان که گوهر نیست

“Where there is power, the hand and heart are not able [to use it]: The oyster-shell opens its palm when there is no pearl therein.”

(This last verse is very similar to one by Šá'ib which runs:

شکوفه با ثمر هرگز نگرود جمع در یک جا
مخالست آنکه باهر نعمت و دندان شود پیدا

“Flowers and fruit are never found together in one place: it is impossible that teeth and delicacies should exist simultaneously.”)

[page 262]

واصل ز حرف چون و چرا بسته است لب
چون ره تهاش گشت جرس بی زبان شود

“He who has reached [the goal] shuts his lips on ‘Why?’ and ‘Wherefore?’

⁵¹⁴ Treasures are popularly supposed to be found in ruins.

When the journey is finished the [camel-]bell becomes tongueless.”

گر بقسمت قانعی بیش و کمِ دنیا یکیست
تشنه چون یک جرعه خواهد کوزه و دریا یکیست

“If thou art satisfied with thy portion, the more or less of the world is the same:
When the thirsty man requires but one draught, the pitcher and the ocean are alike.”

ما ز آغاز و ز انجام جهان بیخبریم
اول و آخر این کُنه کتاب افتاده است

“We are without knowledge of the beginning and end of the world:
the first and last [pages] of this ancient book have fallen out.”

زود رفت آنکه ز اسرار جهان آگه شد
از دبستان برود هرکه سبق روشن کرد

“He who becomes acquainted with the mysteries of the world soon departs:
Whoever does his work brilliantly leaves the school.”

The following ode, cited by Shibli⁵¹⁵, is typical of Kalīm, and with it we may conclude this brief notice:

پیری رسید و مستی طبع جوان گذشت
ضعف تن از تحمّل رطلِ گران گذشت
وضع زمانه قابلِ دیدن دو باره نیست
رو پس نکرد هرکه ازین خاکدان گذشت
از دست بُردِ حسنِ تو بر لشکرِ بهار
یک نیمزه خونِ گل ز سرِ ارغوان گذشت

[page 263]

طبعی بهر رسان که بسازی بعالمی
یا همتی که از سرِ عالم توان گذشت
در گیش ما تجرّدِ عنقا تمام نیست
در فکرِ نام ماند اگر از نشان گذشت
بی دیده راه اگر نتوان رفت پس چرا
چشم از جهان چو بستی ازو می توان گذشت
بدنامی هیات دو روزی نبود بیش
آن هر کلمه با تو بگویم چسان گذشت
یک روز صرفِ بستن دل شد باین و آن
روزی دگر بکندن دل زین و آن گذشت

“Old age hath come, and the exuberance of the youthful temperament hath departed;
The weakness of the body can no longer support the heavy [wine-] cup.
The way of the world is not worth seeing a second time:
Whoever passes from this dust-heap looks not back.
Through the triumph of thy beauty over the army of Spring
The blood of the roses hath risen a fathom above the top of, the Judas-tree.
Acquire such a disposition that thou canst get on with the whole world,
Or such magnanimity that thou canst dispense with the world.
According to our creed the detachment of the *Anqá* is not complete,
For, though it retains no sign, it continues to think of name⁵¹⁶.
If one cannot travel the road without sight, then how
Canst thou forsake the world when thou hast closed thine eyes to it?
The ill repute of Life endureth no more than two days:

⁵¹⁵ *Shi'ru'l-'Ajam*, vol. iii, p. 229.

⁵¹⁶ The mythical bird called in Arabic *'anqá* and in Persian *simurgh* is often spoken of as “having name but not substance” (*mawjūdu'l-ism, mafūdu'l-jism*).

O Kalím, I will tell thee how these too passed:
One day was spent in attaching the heart to this and that,
And another day in detaching it from this and that.”

[page 264]

(11) **Muḥammad Ṭáhir Waḥíd of Qazwín** (d. 1120/1708-9)⁵¹⁷ was an industrious rather than a great poet: he is said by Riḏá-qulí Khán⁵¹⁸ to have left a *Díwán* containing 90,000 verses, which, however, were for the most part “tasteless” (*maláḥatí na-dásh*t), and of which only six are quoted as “the best of his poetry,” amongst them the following quatrain testifying to his Shí‘a proclivities:

از مہرِ علی طینتِ ہر کس کہ سرشتِ
ہر چند بود ہمیشہ در دیر و کنشتِ
در دوزخِ اگہر در آورندش بمثلِ
جا گرم نگرده میببرندش بیہشتِ

“Whosoever’s nature is leavened with the love of ‘Alí,
Though he be the constant frequenter of church or synagogue,
Even if, for example, they should bring him into Hell
They would bear him thence to Paradise ere his place there had been heated.”

The main facts of Waḥíd’s life are given by Rieu⁵¹⁹. He was secretary to two successive Prime Ministers of Persia, Mírzá Taqíyyu’d-Dín Muḥammad and Khalífa Sultán. In 1055/1645-6 he was appointed court-historiographer to Sháh ‘Abbás II, became a Minister in 1101/1689-90, retired eighteen years later into private life, and died about 1120/ 1708-9. Five manuscripts of his historical monograph are described by Rieu, one of which (Or. 2940) comes down to the twenty-second year of the reign, 1073-4/1663. The remark of the *Átash-kada*, that these poems were only

[page 265]

praised on account of the author’s rank, is probably justified. He was, according to Ethé, a friend of the poet Šá’ib.

(12) **Shawkat**⁵²⁰ **of Bukhárá** (d. 1107/1695-6) is at the present day almost unknown in Persia. He is not even mentioned in the *Majma‘u’l-Fuṣṣahá* and but briefly in the *Riyádu’l-‘Arifín*, where only two of his verses are cited, together with the description of his eccentric demeanour given by his contemporary Shaykh Muḥammad ‘Alí Láhijí, called Ḥazín, who saw him wandering about in mid-winter, bare-headed and bare-footed, with a piece of felt (*namad-pára*) over his shoulders and his head covered with snow, which he did not trouble to shake off. Shawkat only deserves mention because of the reputation which he enjoys in Turkey and the influence which he exerted over Turkish poetry, an influence which Gibb emphasizes in several places in his *History of Ottoman Poetry*⁵²¹.

(13) **Šá’ib of Tabríz**⁵²² (d. 1088/1677-8) is considered by Shibli⁵²³ as the last great Persian poet, superior in originality to Qá’ání, the greatest and most famous of the moderns, whom he regards as a mere imitator of Farrukhí and Minúchihrí. Riḏá-qulí Khán, on the other hand⁵²⁴, says that Šá’ib has “a strange method in the poet’s path, which is not now admired.” He is, in short, like ‘Urfí, one of those poets who, while greatly esteemed in Turkey and India, are without honour in their own country. I have already expressed⁵²⁵ my own personal opinion as to his high merits.

[page 266]

⁵¹⁷ The date of his death is uncertain. See Rieu’s Persian Supplement pp. 40-41, and Ethé’s India Office *Catalogue of Persian MSS*, cols. 900-1.

⁵¹⁸ *M. F.*, ii, p. 50.

⁵¹⁹ *Persian Catalogue*, pp. 180-190, and the *Supplement* cited in the last note but one.

⁵²⁰ See Rieu’s *Persian Cat.*, p. 698; Ethé’s India Office *Persian Cat.*, cols. 891-2.

⁵²¹ Vol. i, p. 130; vol. iv, pp. 96-7, 185. Cf. p. 250 *supra*.

⁵²² Though he was born in Tabríz he was educated and grew up in Iṣfahán, and is therefore often called “of Iṣfahán.”

⁵²³ *Shi‘ru’l-‘Ajám*, vol. iii, p. 189.


⁵²⁴ *M. F.*, vol. ii, p. 24. Cf. p. 251, n. 2 *supra*.

⁵²⁵ Pp. 164-5 *supra*.

According to the *Átash-kada*⁵²⁶, Šá'ib, whose proper name was Mírzá Muḥammad 'Alí, was born in the village of 'Abbás-ábád near Iṣfahán, whither his father's family had been transferred from Tabríz by Sháh 'Abbás. Having completed his studies in Iṣfahán, he visited Dihlí and other cities of India at an early age, certainly before 1039/1629-30, and was patronized by Zafar Khán and other nobles. He had only spent two years there, however, when his father, though seventy years of age, followed him to India in order to induce him to return home, for which journey he sought permission from his patron Zafar Khán in the following verses⁵²⁷:

شش سال بیش رفت که از اصفهان بهند
 افتاده است توسنِ عزیر مرا گذار
 آورده است جذبه گستاخ شوق من
 از اصفهان با گروه و لاهورش اشکبار
 هفتاد ساله والدِ پیوست بنده را
 کز تربیت بود بمنش حقّی بی شمار
 ز آن پیشتر کز آذر بمعموره دکن
 آید عنان گسسته تر از سیل بیقرار
 این راه دور را ز سر شوق طی کند
 با قامت خمیده و با پیکر نزار
 دارم امید رخصتی از آستان تو
 ای آستان کعبه امید روزگار
 مقصود او ز آمدنش بُردن منست
 لبراً بحرفِ رخصت من کن گهر نثار
 با جیبسه کشاده تر از آفتاب صبح
 دست دعا ببدرقه راه من بر آرا

[To face p. 266]



Autograph of the poet Šá'ib

⁵²⁶ Bombay lith. 1277/1860-1, pp. 30-31.

⁵²⁷ Shibli's *Shi'ru'l-'Ajam*, vol. iii, p. 194.

[page 267]

“More than six years⁵²⁸ have passed since the passage of the steed of my resolve from Işfahán to India took place. The bold attraction of my longing has brought him weeping from Işfahán to Agra and Lahore. I your servant have an aged father seventy years old, who has countless claims upon me by reason of the education [he gave me]. Before he comes from Agra to the flourishing land of the Deccan with reins looser than the restless torrent, And eagerly traverses this far road with bent body and feeble form, I hope for permission from thy O thou whose threshold is the Ka‘ba of the age’s hopes! His object in coming is to take me hence, therefore cause thy lips to scatter pearls [of speech] by [uttering] the word of permission, And, with a forehead more open than the morning sun, raise thy hand in prayer to speed me on my way.”

On his return to Işfahán, Şá‘ib became poet-laureate to Sháh ‘Abbás II, but had the misfortune to offend his successor Sulaymán. He died in Işfahán after an apparently uneventful life in 1080/1669-70. The words “Şá‘ib found death” (صائب وفات یافت) give the date of his decease⁵²⁹.

Amongst the merits ascribed to Şá‘ib by Shiblí is an appreciation of Indian poets rare with the Persians. Shiblí quotes thirteen verses in which Şá‘ib cites with approval, by way of *taḍmín* or “insertion,” the words of Fayḏí, Malik, Ṭálib-i-Ámulí, Naw‘í, Awḥadí, Shawqí, Fathí, Shápúr, Muṭí‘, Awjí, Adham, Ḥadhiq and Ráqim. In the following verses he deprecates the jealousy which-too often characterizes rival singers:

خوش آن گروه كه مستِ بيانِ يكدگرند
 ز جوشِ فكرِ مې ارغوانِ يكدگرند
 نمى زنند بستگِ شكستِ گوهرِ هر
 پى رواجِ متاعِ دكانِ يكدگرند

[page 268]

زنند بر سرِ هر كُله ز مصرعِ رنگين
 ز فكرِ تازه كُله بستانِ يكدگرند
 سخن تراش چو كردند تيغِ الحاسند
 زند چو طبع بئندى فسانِ يكدگرند
 بغير صائب و معصومِ نكته سنج و كالبر
 دگر كه ز اهلِ سخن مهربانِ يكدگرند

“Happy that company who are intoxicated with each other’s speech; who, through the fermentation of thought, are each other’s red wine. They do not break on the stone [of criticism] one another’s pearls [i.e. verses], but rather strive to give currency to the wares of one another’s shops. They pelt one another with tender-hued verses as with roses, with fresh ideas they become the flowers of one another’s gardens. When they shape their poetry it is with blades like diamonds, and when their genius tends to become blunted, they are each other’s whetstones. Except Şá‘ib, the epigrammatic Ma‘şúm, and Kalím, who of all the poets are kind to one another⁵³⁰”

Şá‘ib was a great admirer of Ḥáfiz, and is also complimentary to his masters Rukná and Shifá‘í. Of the latter he says

⁵²⁸ If, as Shiblí says, these verses were composed in or about 1041/1631-2, Şá‘ib must have come to India about 1035/1625-6.

⁵²⁹ These words, however, yield the number 1081, not 1080.

⁵³⁰ Cf. p. 259 *supra*.

در اصفهان که بدرِ سخن رسد صائب،
کنون که نبض شناسِ سخن شغائی نیست،

“Who will care for poetry in Işfahán, O Şá’ib,
Now that Shifā’i, whose discerning hand was on the pulse of poetry, is no more?”

He puts Nazírí not only above himself but above ‘Urfí. “So far,” says Shibli⁵³¹, “no objection can be made, but it is a pity that, yielding to popular approbation and fame, he makes himself also the panegyrist of Zuhúrí and Jalál-i-

[page 269]

Asír.... This was the first step in bad taste, which finally established a high road, so that in time people came to bow down before the poetry of Náşir ‘Alí, Bî-díl, and Shawkat of Bukhárá. ‘The edifice of wrong-doing was at first small in the world, but whoever came added thereunto⁵³².’”

Though Şá’ib tried his hand at all kinds of poetry, it was in the ode (*ghazal*) that he excelled. He was a ready wit. One of his pupils once composed the following absurd hemistich:

از شیشه بی می می نبی شیشه طلب کن

“Seek for the bottleless wine from the wineless bottle.”

Şá’ib immediately capped it with the following:

حقرا ز دلِ خالی از اندیشه طلب کن

“Seek for the truth from the heart which is empty of thought.”

On another occasion one of his friends produced the following meaningless hemistich and apparently invited Şá’ib to complete the verse and give it a meaning:

دویدن رفتن استاون نشستن خفتن و مردن

Şá’ib immediately prefixed the following hemistich:

بقدر هر سکون راحت بود بنگر تفاوت را

so that the completed verse runs in translation:

“Peace is in proportion to every pause: observe the difference between
‘to run, to walk, to stand, to sit, to lie, to die.’”

Şá’ib was a very careful student of the works of his predecessors, both ancient and modern, and himself compiled a great anthology of their best verses, of which, according to Shibli⁵³³, a manuscript exists at Haydar-ábád in the Deccan, and which appears to have been utilized by Wálih of Dághistán and other *tadhkira*-writers. Shibli

[page 270]

compares Şá’ib to Abú Tammám, the compiler of the great anthology of Arabic poetry called the *Hamása*, inasmuch as his taste is shown even more in his selective than in his creative powers. The following are the verses by Şá’ib which I selected from the *Kharábát* and copied into a note-book many years ago⁵³⁴. They pleased me when I was a beginner, they still please me, and I hope that some of them at any rate may please my readers.

چو شد زهر عادت مضرت نبخشد، بمرگ آشنا کن بتدریج جان را

⁵³¹ *Shi’ru’l-‘Ajam*, vol. iii, p. 198.

⁵³² This is a quotation from the *Gulistán* of Sa’dí (ed. Platts, p. 32).

⁵³³ *Op. cit.*, p. 201.

⁵³⁴ See pp. 164-5 *supra*. My copy of these selected verses was completed on Sept. 4, 1885.

“When poison becomes a habit it ceases to injure: make thy soul gradually acquainted with death.”

ریشه نخلِ کهن سال از جوان افزونترست
بیشتر دلبستگی باشد بدنیای پیررا

“The roots of the aged palm-tree exceed those of the young one; the old have the greater attachment to the world.”

هر سری دارد درین بازار سودائی دگر
هر کسی بندد بآئینِ دگر دستاررا

“In this market every head has a different fancy: everyone winds his turban in a different fashion.”

تهی دستانِ قسمت‌را چه سود از رهبرِ کامل
که خضر از آبِ حیوان تشنه باز آرد سگندررا

“What profit accrues from a perfect guide to those whom Fate hath left empty-handed, for even Khidr brings back Alexander athirst from the Water of Life?”

سبحه بر کف توبه بر لب دل پُر از شوقِ گناه
معصیت‌را خنده می آید ز استغفارِ ما

“The rosary in the hand, repentance on the lips, and the heart full of sinful longings — sin itself laughs at our repentance!”

[page 271]

مقامِ گوهرِ شہوار در کنجینه می باید
بیاض از سینه باید ساخت شعرِ انتخابی‌را

“The place of a royal pearl should be in a treasury: one should make one’s breast the common-place book for chosen verses.”

گفتگوی کُفر و دین آخر بیکجا میکشد
خواب یک خوابست اما مختلف تعبیرها

“All this talk of infidelity and religion finally leads to one place: The dream is the same dream, only the interpretations differ.”

از تیرِ آه مظلومِ ظالمِ امان نیابد
پیش از نشانه خیزد از دل فغانِ کمان‌را

“The tyrant finds no security against the arrows of the victim’s sighs: Groans arise from the heart of the bow before [they arise from] the target.”

چاره ناخوشی وضعِ جهان بیخبر است
اوست بیدار که در خواب گرانست اینجا

“The cure for the unpleasant constitution of the world is to ignore it: Here he is awake who is plunged in heavy sleep.”

شگوفه با ثمر هرگز نگرود جمع در یکجا،
مُحالست آنکه با هر نعمت و دندان شود پیدا،

“Flowers and fruit are never combined in one place; it is impossible that teeth and delicacies should exist simultaneously.”

ده در شود کشاده اگر بسته شد دری،
انگشت ترجمان زبان است لال را،

“Ten doors are opened if one door be shut: the finger is the interpreter of the dumb man’s tongue.”

ساده لوحان زود میگیرند رنگِ همنشین،
صحبتِ طوطی سخنور میکند آئینه را،

“The simple-minded quickly acquire the colour of their companions: The conversation of the parrot makes the mirror [seem to] speak.”

[page 272]

گردش اقبال دارد لغزشِ ادبارها،
یک دو خطوه باز رفتن پر دهد و تاب را،

“The march of good fortune has backward slips: to retreat one or two paces gives wings to the jumper.”

موج از حقیقتِ کُبرِ بحرِ غافلست،
حادث چگونه درک نماید قدیر را،

“The wave is ignorant of the true nature of the sea: how can the Temporal comprehend the Eternal?”

معیار دوستان دغل روز حاجتست،
قرضی بر سر تجربه از دوستان طلب،

“The touchstone of false friends is the day of need: by way of proof, ask a loan from your friends.”

در میانِ اهل دنیا مردمِ دانا غریب،
همچو انگشتِ شهادت در کفِ ترسا غریب،

“The learned man is a stranger amidst the people of the world, just as the ‘witness-finger’ [i.e. the index-finger] appears strange on the Christian’s band.”

چه سود ازین که کتبخانه جهان از تست،
نه علم هرچه عمل میکنی همان از تست،

“What doth it profit thee that all the libraries of the world should be thine? Not knowledge but what thou dost put into practice is thine.”

هستی دنیای فانی انتظار مُردنست،
ترك هستی ز انتظارِ نیستی وا رستن است،

“The life of this transitory world is the expectation of death: to renounce life is to escape from the expectation of annihilation.”

ترا ز جان غیر مال ای عزیز بیشترست،
علاقه تو بدستار بیشتر ز سرست،

“O my dear friend! thou hast more care for wealth than for life: Thy attachment to the turban is greater than to the head.”

[page 273]

با کمالِ قُرب از جانان دلِ ما غافلست،
زنده از دریاست ماهی و ز دریا غافلست،

“Our heart is heedless of the Beloved, notwithstanding our complete proximity: The fish lives through the sea, yet heeds not the sea.”

گریه شمع از برای ماتم پروانه نیست،
صُبح نزدیکست در فکرِ شبِ تارِ خودست،

“The weeping of the candle is not in mourning for the moth: the dawn is at hand, and it is thinking of its own dark night.”

رفتن از عالمِ پُرشور به از آمدنست،
غنچه دلتنگ بباغ آمد و خندان بر خاست،

“To quit this troubled world is better than to enter it: the rose-bud enters the garden with straitened heart and departs smiling.”

اگر میانِ دو دل هست دوستی بقرار،
نمی شوند بآمد شدِ خبر محتاج،

“If friendship is firmly established between two hearts, they do not need the interchange of news.”

آدمی پیر چو شد حرص جوان میگردد،
خواب در وقتِ سحرگاه گران میگردد،

“When a man becomes old, his greed becomes young: sleep grows heavy at the time of morning.”

خموشی حُجَّتِ ناطق بود جوپای گوهر را،
که از غواص در دریا نفس بیرون نمی آید،

“To the seeker after pearls silence is a speaking argument, for no breath comes forth from the diver in the sea.”

یا سبو یا خُمِ مِی یا قدحِ باده کنند،
يك كَفِ خَاكِ دَرِيْنِ مِيكَدِه ضَايِعِ نَشُوْدِ

“Not one handful of earth is wasted in this tavern: they make it either into a pitcher, a wine-jar, or a wine-cup.”

[page 274]

حَرِيصِ رَا نَكَنْدِ نَعْمَتِ دُو عَالَمِ سِيْرِ هَمِيْشَهٗ آتَشِ سُوَزَنْدِهٗ اَشْتِهَا دَارِدِ

“The enjoyments of both worlds will not satisfy the greedy man: Burning fire has always an appetite.”

پِيْرَانِهٗ سَرِ هَمَايِ سَعَادَتِ بَمِنْ رَسِيْدِ
وَقْتِ زَوَالِ سَايَهٗ دَوْلَتِ بَمِنْ رَسِيْدِ
شَدِ مَهْرَبَانَ سَهْرِ بَمِنْ آخِرِ حَيَاتِ
دَرِ وَقْتِ صُبْحِ خَوَابِ فَرَاغَتِ بَمِنْ رَسِيْدِ

“The *humá*⁵³⁵ of happiness came to me in old age; the shadow of fortune came to me at the time of [the sun's] decline: Heaven became kind to me at the close of my life: peaceful slumber visited me at morning-time.”

اَزِ پَشِيْمَانِي سَخْنِ دَرِ عَهْدِ پِيْرِي مِيْزَنْمِ
لَبِ بَدَنْدَانِ مِيْزَنْمِ اَكْنُونِ كِه دَنْدَانْمِ نَمَانْدِ

“I talk of repentance in the days of old age; I bite my lip [in remorse] now that no teeth remain to me.”

مِيْشُوْدِ غَارْتَكُوْرِ جَانِ چَوْنِ كَمَالِ اَفْتَدِ زِيَادِ
شَاخِ نَازَكِ بَشَكَنْدِ چَوْنِ بِيْشْتَرِ بَارِ اَوْرِدِ

“When perfection⁵³⁶ is unduly increased it becomes the destroyer of life: The tender branch breaks when it bears too much fruit.”

اَكْرِ مَجْنُونِ مَنْهَرِ پَسِ كِيْسْتِ دَرِ رُوِي زَمِيْنِ عَاقِلِ
اَكْرِ عَاقِلِ تُوْتِي دِيْوَانِهٗ دَرِ عَالَمِ نَمِي بَاشْدِ

“If I am mad, then who on the face of the earth is sane? If thou art sane, then there is no madman in the world.”

مَرَا بَرُوْزِ قِيَامَتِ غَمِي كِه هَسْتِ اِيْنَسْتِ
كِه رُوِي مَرْدَمِ عَالَمِ دُو بَارِهٗ نَابِيْدِ دِيْدِ

[page 275]

“The only thing which troubles me about the Resurrection Day is this, That one will have to look once again on the faces of mankind.”

⁵³⁵ The *humá* is a mythical bird of whom it is supposed that if its shadow falls on anyone he will become a king.

⁵³⁶ As already pointed out, perfection is regarded as a danger because it is specially obnoxious to the Evil Eye, which the Arabs call ‘*Aynu'l-Kamál*, “the Eye of Perfection.” See *supra*, p. 117, n. 2, and p. 216, n. 2.

لا مکانی شو که تبدیل مکانِ آب و گِل،
نقل کردن باشد از زندان بزندانی دیگر،

“Become placeless, for to change this place of water and clay is but
to move from one prison to another.”

نگویمت که دل از حاصلِ جهان بردار،
بهرچه دست رست نیست دل از آن بردار،

“I do not bid thee detach thy heart from the sum of the world:
detach thy heart from whatever lies beyond thy reach.”

انجام بت پرست بود به ز خود پرست،
در قیدِ خود مباش و بقیدِ فرنگ باش،

“In the end the idolator is better than the worshipper of self:
better be in bondage to the Franks than in the bondage of self.”

گر پُشتِ پا بعالمِ صورت نمی زنی،
تا حشر در شکنجه این کفش تنگ باش،

“If thou dost not trample under foot this world of form, then suffer
until the Resurrection the torments of this tight boot.”

درون خانه خود هر گدا شهنشاهیست،
قدم برون منه از حدِ خویش و سلطان باش،

“Within his own house every beggar is an emperor: do not overstep
thine own limit and be a king.”

گر سجودِ گل کنم بر سُنَّتِ بلبل خطاست،
من که در آتش پرستی اُمّتِ پروانه‌ام،

“If I worship the rose according to the rites of the nightingale, it is
a fault — I, who in the worship of fire am of the religion of the moth.”

[page 276]

چون شمع هر که افراشت کردن بافسرِ زر،
در اشکِ خود نشیند بسیار تا بگردن،

“Everyone who like the candle exalts his head with a crown of gold
will oft-times sit [immersed] in his tears up to the neck.”

پیش ازین بر رفتگان افسوس می خوردند خلق،
می خوردند افسوس در ایامِ ما بر ماندگان،

“Formerly people used to grieve over the departed, but in our days
they grieve over the survivors.”

یا ز سیلابِ حوادث رو نباید تافتن،
یا نباید خانه در صحرائی امکان ساختن،

Either one should not avert one's face from the torrent of vicissitudes,
Or one should not make one's home in the plain of the Phenomenal World."

هر لوح مزاری ز قرامشکده خاک،
دستیست برون آمده بهر طلب تو،

"Every tombstone is a hand stretched forth from the house of oblivion
of the earth to search for thee."

شد از فشارِ گردون موی سفید و سر زو،
شیری که خورده بودم در روزگارِ طفلی،

"The hair has become white through the squeezing of the sphere, and
the milk which I had drunk in the time of childhood has
reappeared [on my head]."

در وطن گر میشدی هر کس بآسانی عزیز،
کی ز آغوشِ پدر یوسف بزندان آمدی،

"If everyone could easily become honoured in his own country,
How would Joseph have passed from his father's embrace to a prison?"

[page 277]

III. Between A.D. 1700 and 1800 (A.H. 1111-1215).

From the literary point of view this century is perhaps the most barren in the whole history of Persia⁵³⁷, so much so that the only notable poem produced by it is, so far as I know, the celebrated *tarji'-band* of century. Hâtif-i-Işfahání, of which I shall speak presently. On the other hand we have two full and authoritative accounts of the period by two men of letters who were personally involved in the disastrous events which befell Persia during and after the Afghán invasion, and who have left us a fairly clear and detailed picture of that sad and troubled epoch. These men were Shaykh 'Alí Ḥazín (b. 1103/1692, d. 1180/1766-7), and Luṭf 'Alí Beg poetically surnamed Ádhar (b. 1123/1711, d. 1195/1781). Both were poets, and the former even a prolific poet, since he composed three or four *diwáns*, but their prose writings are, from our point of view, of much greater interest and value than their verse.

Shaykh 'Alí Ḥazín, whose proper name was Muḥammad ibn Abí Ṭálib of Gílán, is best known by his "Memoirs" (*Tadhkiratu'l-Ahwál*), which he composed in India in 1154/1741-2, twenty years after he had become an exile from his native land, and which are easily accessible to students in the text and English translation published by F. C. Belfour in 1830-31. He was born, as he himself tells us, on Monday the 27th of Rabí' ii, 1103 (Jan. 19, 1692) at Işfahán, and was directly descended in the eighteenth degree from the famous Shaykh Záhíd of Gílán, of whom some account was given in a previous chapter⁵³⁸. The family continued to reside in Gílán, first at Astará and then at Láhiján, until the author's

[page 278]

father, Shaykh Abú Ṭálib, at the age of twenty, went to Işfahán to pursue his studies, and there married and settled. He died there in 1127/1715 at the age of sixty-nine, leaving three sons, of whom our author was the eldest, to mourn his loss⁵³⁹. Shaykh 'Alí Ḥazín speaks in the highest terms of his father's character and ability, and quotes a few lines from an elegy

⁵³⁷ Cf. p. 168 *supra*.

⁵³⁸ See pp. 38-43 *supra*.

⁵³⁹ A fourth son died in infancy. The mother survived the father by two years.

which he composed on this mournful occasion. He also mentions that, amongst other final injunctions, his father addressed to him the following remarkable words⁵⁴⁰: “If you have the choice, make no longer stay in Işfahán. It were meet that some one of our race should survive.” “At that time,” the author continues, “I did not comprehend this part of his address, not till after some years, when the disturbance and ruin of Işfahán took place⁵⁴¹.”

Since the “Memoirs” can be read in English by anyone interested in their contents, it is unnecessary to discuss or analyse them here, and it will be sufficient to emphasize their importance as a picture of the author’s times, and to note a few points of literary interest. In 1135/1722-3 he began to compile a kind of literary scrap-book or magazine (*majmú‘a*), probably somewhat similar in character to the *Kashkúl* of Shaykh Bahá’u’d-Dín ‘Ámilí, and entitled *Muddatu’l-‘Umr*⁵⁴² (“Lifetime”), but it was lost with the rest of his library in the sack of Işfahán by the Afgháns a few months later. About the same time or a little earlier he wrote, besides numerous philosophical commentaries, a book on the Horse (*Faras-náma*), and

[page 279]

published his second *Díwán* of poetry, and soon afterwards his third⁵⁴³.

The Afghán invasion and the misery which it caused, especially in Işfahán, put a stop to Shaykh ‘Alí Ḥazín’s literary activities for some time. “During the latter days of the siege,” he says⁵⁴⁴, “I was attacked by severe illness; and my two brothers, my grandmother, and the whole of the dwellers in my house died, so that my mansion was emptied of all but two or three infirm old women-servants, who attended me till my disorder began to abate.” Being somewhat recovered, he escaped from Işfahán early in Muḥarram, 1135 (October, 1722), only a few days before it surrendered to, and was entered by, the Afgháns. During the next ten years he wandered about in different parts of Persia, successively visiting or residing at Khurramábád in Luristán, Hamadán, Niháwand, Dizful, Shúshtar (whence by way of Başra he made the pilgrimage to Mecca and on his return journey visited Yaman), Kirmánsháh, Baghdád and its holy places, Mashhad, Kurdistán, Ádharbáyján, Gílán and Tíhrán. From the last-named city he returned once more to Işfahán to find “that great city, notwithstanding the presence of the King⁵⁴⁵, in utter ruin and desertion. Of all that population and of my friends scarcely anyone remained.” It was the same at Shíráz, whither he made his way six months later. “Of all my great friends there,” he says⁵⁴⁶ “the greatest I had in the world, not one remained on foot; and I met with a crowd of their children and relatives in the most melancholy condition and without resource.” From Shíráz he made his way by Lár to Bandar-i-‘Abbás, intending to go thence in

[page 280]

a European ship to the Híjáz, “because their ships and packets are very spacious and are fitted up with convenient apartments, and their navigators also are more expert on the sea and more skilful in their art than any other nation⁵⁴⁷.” He was, however, prevented by illness and poverty (caused partly by the loss of his patrimony in Gílán, partly by the exorbitant and oppressive taxation which now prevailed) from carrying out this plan. A subsequent attempt carried him in a Dutch vessel as far as Muscat, which he found little to his liking, so that after a stay of rather more than two months he returned again to Bandar-i-‘Abbás. He next visited Kirmán, but, finding “the affairs of that ruined country in utter confusion by reason of the insurrection of a body of the Balúch tribe and other accidents⁵⁴⁸,” he returned thence after a few months’ stay to Bandar-i-‘Abbás in the hope of being able to go thence once again to Baghdád and the Holy Shrines. Finding this impracticable owing to Nádir’s operations against the Turks, and unable to endure any longer the sight of the misery prevailing throughout Persia, he embarked on the 10th of Ramaḍán, 1146 (Feb. 14, 1734) for India, where, in spite of the deep dislike which he conceived for that country, he was destined to spend the remaining forty-five years of his long life. “To me,” he says⁵⁴⁹, “who do not reckon the time of my residence in this country as a portion of my real life, the beginning of my arrival on the shores of this empire appears as it were the end of my age and vitality.” A little further on he says, “Altogether my nature had no agreement with the fashions and manners of this country, nor any power of patiently enduring them,” and adds a few lines lower “the sight of these dominions became more and more hateful to me, and being continually in hope of escape from them, I reconciled

[page 281]

⁵⁴⁰ Belfour’s text, p. 16; translation, p. 14.

⁵⁴¹ Compare text, p. 107; translation, p. 117.

⁵⁴² See pp. 93-4 of Belfour’s translation, to which henceforth references will be given. There is a Ms. of this work in the British Museum. See Rieu’s *Persian Catalogue*, p. 483, where two other works by the same author, one on wine and measures and another on beasts of venery, are mentioned.

⁵⁴³ See Belfour’s translation, pp. 106 and 111, and for his fourth *Díwán*, which was published somewhat later, p. 176.

⁵⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

⁵⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 205. This was after the expulsion of the Afgháns by Nádir.

⁵⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 207.

⁵⁴⁷ See Belfour’s translation, p. 215.

⁵⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 240.

⁵⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 253.

my mind to the incidents in the affairs of Persia, and bent my thoughts on my return thither⁵⁵⁰.” Although unhappily disappointed in this hope, and compelled to spend the long remainder of his days in “a country traced...with foulness and trained to turpitude and brutality⁵⁵¹,” where “all the situations and conditions...are condemned by fate to difficulty and bitterness of subsistence⁵⁵²,” he declined to include in his “Memoirs” any account of his personal experiences in India, save in so far as they were connected with such important historical events as Nádír Sháh’s invasion and the terrible massacre he made in Dihlí on March 20, 1739. So, though the “Memoirs” were penned at “the end of the year [A.H.] 1154⁵⁵³” (beginning of A.D. 1742), they deal chiefly with the author’s personal history before he left Persia twenty years earlier. The accounts of contemporary scholars and men of letters (many of whom perished during the siege of Işfahán in A.D. 1722) with whom he was personally acquainted constitute one of the most valuable features of this interesting book.

Eleven years later (1165/1752) Shaykh ‘Alí Ḥazín composed an account of about a hundred contemporary poets entitled *Tadhkiratu’l-Mu’ásirín*, which is included in the lithographed edition of his complete works published at Lucknow in 1293/1876, and of which MSS. exist in the British Museum and elsewhere⁵⁵⁴.

[page 282]

Another and more accessible contemporary account of the poets of this period forms the last portion of the well-known *Átash-kada* (“Fire-temple”) of Luţf ‘Alí Beg *Adhar*. The greater part of this book deals with the Persian poets who flourished before the author’s time, arranged in alphabetical order under the various towns and countries which gave birth to them, including Túrán and Hindustán. This is followed by an account of sixty of the author’s contemporaries, which begins with a brief historical survey of the misfortunes of Persia during the fifty years succeeding the Afghán invasion down to the re-establishment of security and order in the South by Karím Khán-i-Zand⁵⁵⁵. The author recognizes the dearth of poets and men of letters during this period and ascribes it to the prevalent chaos and misery, “which,” he says, “have reached such a point that no one has the heart to read poetry, let alone to compose it”:

تفریقِ بال و اختلالِ حالِ بحدیست که کسی را حالِ خواندنِ
شعر نیست تا بگفتنِ شعر چه رسد‘

To most of these poets the author devotes only a few lines. The longer notices include Mullá Muḥammad Mú’min, poetically surnamed *Dá’i*, who died in 1155/1742-3 at the age of ninety; Mullá Ḥusayn *Rafiq* of Işfahán; Sayyid Muḥammad *Shu’la* of Işfahán; Sayyid Muḥammad Şádiq of Tafirish; Mírzá Ja’far *Şáfi* of Işfahán; a young friend of the author’s named Sulaymán, who wrote under the name *Şabáhi*, and to whose poems he devotes no less than thirteen pages; Mírzá Muḥammad ‘Alí *Şubúh* of Işfahán;

[page 283]

Áqá Taqí *Şahbá* of Qum; Sayyid ‘Abdu’l-Báqí *Tabíb* (“the physician”), whose father Mírzá Muḥammad Raḥím was court-physician to Sháh Sulţán Ḥusayn, as he himself was to Nádír Sháh; *Túfan* of Hazár-jaríb, whose death was commemorated by the author in a chronogram giving the date 1190/1776-7; Áqá Muḥammad ‘*Ashiq* of Işfahán (d. 1181/1767-8), to whom he devotes eight pages; and his own younger brother Işhâq Beg, who wrote under the pen-name of ‘*Udhri* and died in 1185/1771-2, according to the chronogram:

بادا در تہشت جاودان اسحق بیگ‘

Other poets noticed are Muḥammad ‘Alí Beg the son of Abdál Beg, a Frankish painter who embraced Islám, Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn *Ghálíb*, who spent fourteen years of his earlier life in India and married the daughter of the Nawwáb Sar-afráz Khán; Mír Sayyid ‘Alí *Mushtáq* of Işfahán; Sayyid Muḥammad Şádiq, nephew of the above-mentioned court-physician Mírzá Muḥammad Raḥím, who, besides several *mathnawí* poems dealing with the somewhat threadbare romances of Laylá and Majnún, Khusraw and Shírín and Wámiq and ‘Adhrá, was engaged on a history of the Zand dynasty; Mírzá

⁵⁵⁰ See Belfour’s translation, p. 255.

⁵⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 256.

⁵⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 261.

⁵⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 257.

⁵⁵⁴ See Rieu’s *Pers. Cat.*, p. 372, and Sprenger’s *Catalogue*, pp. 135-141, where the contents are fully stated. Through the kindness of my friend Professor Muḥammad Shafi‘ of the Oriental College, Lahore, I have recently (September, 1923) received a copy of the *Kulliyát*, or Complete Works, of Shaykh ‘Alí Ḥazín, lithographed at Kánpúr in 1893. It comprises 1032 pp., of which this *Tadhkira* occupies pp. 931-1025. I make the number of biographies contained in it 96, and of all these poets there are only about four of whom I ever heard even the names, to wit, Táhir of Qazwín, Shawkat of Bukhárá, Shafi‘á Athar of Shíráz, and Luţf ‘Alí Beg Shámí.

⁵⁵⁵ “That peerless Prince of happy fortune Abu’n-Naşr Sulţán, Karím.”

Naşır, son of the physician Mírzá ‘Abdu’lláh (d. 1192/1778); and Sayyid Aḥmad *Hátif*, the most notable of all these poets, of whom we shall shortly have to speak.

Luţf ‘Alí Beg concludes his *Átash-kada* with an autobiography of himself, from which we learn that he was born on the 20th of Rabí‘ i, A.H. 1123 (June 7, 1711) at Işfahán, but spent fourteen years of his earlier life at Qum, whither his family migrated in consequence of the Afghán menace. At the beginning of Nádir Sháh’s reign his father was made governor of Lár and the coasts of Fárs, and he resided in Shíráz. On the death of his father two years later he accompanied his uncle Hájji Muḥammad Beg on the

[page 284]

pilgrimage to Mecca, and, after visiting that and the other holy places, returned to Persia, and was at Mashhad when Nádir’s victorious army returned from India. After accompanying them to Mázandarán he returned to Işfahán, and, after the assassination of Nádir Sháh, was attached for a while to the service of ‘Alí Sháh, Ibráhím Sháh, Sháh Isma‘íl and Sháh Sulaymán. He then seems to have retired from public life and devoted himself to the cultivation of poetry under the guidance and tuition of Mír Sayyid ‘Alí Mushtáq. With selections of this poetry, largely drawn from his *Yúsun u Zulaykhá*, he concludes the book⁵⁵⁶.

Of Sayyid Aḥmad *Hátif* of Işfahán, though he was the contemporary and friend of Luţf ‘Alí Beg, no biographical particulars are given in the *Átash-kada*, but only praises which appear somewhat exaggerated, since he is described as “in Arabic and Persian verse and prose the third after A‘shá and Jarír, and second only to Anwarí and Żahír.” Nearly ten pages are filled with citations from his poems, but of all these we need only concern ourselves with the beautiful and celebrated *tarjî‘-band* by which alone *Hátif*’s name has been immortalized.

(بند اول)
ای فدای تو هر دل و هر جان،
وی نثارِ رخت هر این و هر آن،
دل فدای تو چون توئی دلبر،
جان نثارِ تو چون توئی جانان،
دل رهندن ز دستِ تو مشکل،
جان فشاندن بپای تو آسان،

[page 285]

⁵⁵⁶ I have used the *Átash-kada* in the Bombay lithographed edition of 1277/1860. It has three defects: the numeration of the pages stops at 189; the dates are often omitted; and the accuracy of the text leaves a good deal to be desired.

راه وصل تو راه پُر آسیب
 درد عشق تو درد بی درمان
 • بندگانیم جان و دل در کف
 چشم بر حکم و گوش بر فرمان
 گر سر صلح داری اینک دل
 و سر جنگ داری اینک جان
 دوش از شور عشق و جذبه شوق
 هر طرف می شتافتیم حیران
 آخر کار شوق دیدارم
 سوی دیر مغان کشید عنان
 چشم بد دور خلوتی دیدم
 روشن از نور حق نه از نیران
 ۱۰ هر طرف دیدم آتشی کآن شب
 دید در طور موسی عمران
 پیری آنجا بآتش افروزی
 بادب کرد پیر مغبچگان
 همه سیمین عذار و گل رخسار
 همه شیرین زبان و تنگ دهان
 عود و چنگ و نی و دف و بربط
 شمع و نقل و گل و می و ربان
 ساقی ماهروی و مشکین موسی
 مطرب بذله گوی خوش الحان
 ۱۰ مغ و مغ زاده موبد و دستور
 خدمتش را تمار بسته میان
 من شرمنده از مسلمانی
 شدم آنجا بگوشه پنهان

[page 286]

پیر پرسید کیست این گفتند
 عاشقی بی قرار و سرگردان
 گفت جامی دهیدش از می ناب
 گرچه ناخوانده باشد این مهمان
 ساقی آتش دست و آتش پرست
 ریخت در ساغر آتش سوزان
 ۲۰ چون کشیدم نه عقل ماند و نه هوش
 سوخت هر کفر از آن و هر ایمان
 مست افتادم و در آن مستی
 بزبانی که شرح آن نتوان
 این سخن می شنیدم از اعضا
 همه حتی الوری و الشربان
 که یکی هست و هیچ نیست جز او
 وحده لا اله الا هو
 (بند دوم)
 از تو ای دوست نگسلم پیوند
 ورت بتیغم بُرنند بند از بند
 ۳۰ الحق ارزان بود از ما صد جان
 وز دهان تو نیر شکر خند
 ای پدر پند کم ده از عشقم
 که نخواهد شد اهل این فرزند
 پند آنان دهند خلق ای کاش
 که ز عشق تو میدهند پند
 من ره کوی عافیت دانم
 چکنم کاوفتاده ام بگنند

[page 287]

در کلیسا بدلبری ترسا'
 ۳۰. گفتم ای دل بدام تو در تند'
 ای که دارد بتار زتارت'
 هر سر موی من جدا پیوند'
 ره بوحسدت نیافتن تا کی'
 ننگ تلیث بر یکی تا چند'
 نام حق یگانه چون شاید'
 که اب و ابن و روح قدس نهند'
 لب شیرین کشود و با من گفت'
 وز شکرخند ریخت از لب قند'
 که گر از سر وحدت آگاهی'
 تهمت کافری بما میسند'
 ۳۰. در سه آئینه شاهد ازلی'
 پرتو از روی تابناک افگند'
 سه نگرده پریشم از او را'
 پرنیان خوانی و حریر و پرند'
 ما درین گفتگو که از یکسو'
 شد ز ناقوس این ترانه بلند'
 که یکی هست و هیچ نیست جز او'
 وحده لا اله الا هو'
 (بند سوم)
 دوش رفتهم تکوی باده فروش'
 ز آتش عشق دل بجوش و غروش'
 ۴۰. مجلسی لغز دیدم و روشن'
 میسر آن بزم پیر باده فروش'

[page 288]

چاکران ایستاده صف در صف'
 باده خواران نشسته دوش بدوش'
 پیر در صدر و میکشان گردش'
 پاره مست و پاره مدهوش'
 سینه بی کینه و درون صافی'
 دل پر از گفتگو و لب خاموش'
 همه را از عنایت ازلی'
 چشم حق بین و گوش راز نبوش'
 ۴۰ سخن این بآن هفتاً لك'
 پاسخ آن باین که بادت نوش'
 گوش بر چنگ و چشم بر ساغر'
 آرزوی دو کون در آغوش'
 بادب پیش رفتهم و گفتم'
 ای ترا دل قرارگاه سروش'
 عاشقم دردمند و حاجتمند'
 درد من بنگر و بدرمان گوش'
 پیر خندان بطنز با من گفت'
 ای ترا پیر عقل حلقه بگوش'
 ۵۰. تو کجا ما کجا ای از شرمت'
 دختر رز نشسته برقع پوش'
 گفتمش سوخت جانم آبی ده'
 و آتش من فرو نشان از چوش'
 دوش میسوختم ازین آتش'
 آه اگر امشب بود چین دوش'

گفت خندان که هین پیاله بگهر
ستدمر گفت هان زیاده منوش
چرعه در کشیدم و گشتم
فارغ از رنج عقل و محنت هوش
.. چون بهوش آمدم یکی دیدم
ما بقی را همه خطوط و نقوش
ناگهان در صوامع ملکوت
این حدیثم سرش گفت بگوش
که یکی هست و هیچ نیست جز او
وحده لا اله الا هو

(بند چهارم)

چشم دل باز کن که جان بینی
آنچه نا دیدنیست آن بینی
گر باقلیم عشق رو آری
همه آفاق گلستان بینی
۶۰ بر همه اهل این زمین بمراد
گردش دور آسمان بینی
آنچه بینی دلت همان خواهد
و آنچه خواهد دلت همان بینی
بی سر و پا گدای آنچارا
سر ز ملک جهان گران بینی
هم در آن پا برهنه قومی را
پای بر فرق فرقدان بینی
هم در آن سر برهنه جمعی را
بر سر از عرش سایبان بینی

۶۰ گاه وجد و سماع هر یکی را
 بر دو کون آستین نشان بینی
 دل هر ذره که بشگافی
 آفتابیش در میان بینی
 هر چه داری اگر بعشق دهی
 کافر هر کوی زبان بینی
 جان گدازی اگر بآتش عشق
 عشق را کیمیای جان بینی
 از مضیقِ جهات در گذری
 وسعت ملک لا مکان بینی
 ۷۰ آنچه نشنیده گوش آن شنوی
 و آنچه نا دیده چشم آن بینی
 تا بجائی رساندت که یکی
 از جهان و جهانیان بینی
 با یکی عشق ورزی از دل و جان
 تا بعین الیقین عیان بینی
 که یکی هست و هیچ نیست جز او
 وحده لا اله الا هو
 (بند پنجم)
 یار بی پرده از در و دیوار
 در تجلی است یا اولو الابصار
 ۷۰ شمع جوئی و آفتاب بلند
 روز بس روشن و تو در شب تار
 گر ز ظلمات خود رهی بینی
 همه عالم مشارق النوار

[page 291]

کوروش قاید و عصا طلبی
 بهر این راه روشن و هموار
 چشم بکشا بگلستان و ببین
 جلوه آب صاف در گل و خار
 ز آب بیرنگ صد هزاران رنگ
 لاله و گل نگر درین گلزار
 ۸۰ پا براه طلب نه و از عشق
 بهر این راه توشه بر دار
 شود آسان ز عشق کاری چند
 که بود پیش عقل بس دشوار
 یار گو بالفرد و الاصل
 یار جو بالعشقی و الایثار
 صد رخت کن ترانی ار گویند
 باز میدار دیده بر دیدار
 تا بجائی رسی که می نرسد
 پای اوهارم و دیده افکار
 ۸۰ بار یابی بمسئلی کآنجا
 جبرئیل امین ندارد بار
 این ره این توشه تو این منزل
 سرد راهی اگر بیا و بیمار
 و نه مرد راه چون دگران
 یار میگوی و پشت سر میخار
 هاتف ارباب معرفت که گهی
 مست خوانندشان و گه هشبار
 از می و جام و مطرب و ساقی
 از مغ و دیر و شاهد و زُتار

۹. قصیدِ ایشان نهفته اسرارِ است
 که بایما کنند گاه اظهار
 می بری گر برآزشان دانی
 که همین است سر آن اسرار
 که یکی هست و هیچ نیست جز او
 وحده لا اله الا هو

(Strophe I)

“O Thou to whom both heart and life are a sacrifice, and O Thou in
 whose path both this and that are an offering!
 The heart is Thy sacrifice because Thou art a charmer of hearts; life
 is Thine offering because Thou art the Life of our lives⁵⁵⁷.
 Hard it is to deliver the heart from Thy hand; easy it is to pour out
 our life at Thy feet.
 The road to union with Thee is a road full of hardships; the pain of
 Thy love is a pain without remedy.
 We are servants holding our lives and hearts in our hands, with eyes
 [fixed] on Thy orders and ears [waiting] on Thy command. 5
 If Thou seekest peace, behold our hearts; and if Thou seekest war,
 behold our lives!
 Last night, [impelled] by the madness of love and the impulse of
 desire, I was rushing in bewilderment in every direction.
 At last desire for the [Beatific] Vision turned my reins towards the
 temple of the Magians.
 Far from it be the Evil Eye! I beheld a secret gathering bright with
 the Light of Truth, not with the Flames [of Hell].
 On every side I beheld that fire which Moses the son of ‘Imrān saw
 that night on Sinai. 10
 There was an elder [busied] with tending the fire, round about whom
 respectfully stood the young Magians,
 All silver-skinned and rose-cheeked, all sweet-tongued and narrow-
 mouthed.
 [There were] lute, harp, flute, cymbals and barbiton; candles, desert,
 roses, wine and basil;
 The moon-faced and musky-haired cup-bearer; the witty and sweet-
 voiced minstrel.

Magian and Magian boy, Fire-priest and High Priest, all with loins
 girt up for His service. 15
 I, ashamed of my Muhammadanism, stood there concealed in a
 corner.
 The elder enquired, ‘Who is this?’ They answered, ‘A restless and
 bewildered lover.’
 He said, ‘Give him a cup of pure wine, although he be an unbidden
 guest.’
 The fire-handed and fire-worshipping cup-bearer poured into the
 goblet the burning fire.
 When I drained it off, neither reason remained nor sense; thereby
 were consumed both Infidelity and Faith. 20
 I fell down intoxicated, and in that intoxication, in a tongue which
 one cannot explain,
 I heard this speech from [all] my limbs, even from the jugular vein
 and the carotid artery:

⁵⁵⁷ It is impossible adequately to preserve in English the play between *dil* and *dilbar*, *ján* and *jánán*.

‘He is One and there is naught but He:
There is no God save Him alone!’

(*Strophe II*)

O Friend, I will not break my ties with Thee, even though with a
sword they should hew me limb from limb!
Truly a hundred lives were cheap on our part [to win] from Thy
mouth a sweet half-smile. 25
O Father, counsel me not against love, for this son [of thine) will
not prove susceptible [to counsel]!
People counsel these [others]: O would that they would counsel
me concerning Thy love!
I know the road to the street of safety, but what can I do? for I am
fallen into the snare.
In the church I said to a Christian charmer of hearts, ‘O thou in
whose net the heart is captive!
‘O thou to the warp of whose girdle each hair-tip of mine is sepa-
rately attached! 30
‘How long [wilt thou continue] not to find the way to the Divine
Unity? How long wilt thou impose on the One the shame of the Trinity?
How can it be right to name the One True God “Father,” “Son,”
and “Holy Ghost”?’
She parted her sweet lips and said to me, while with sweet laughter
she poured sugar from her lips:

[page 294]

‘If thou art aware of the Secret of the Divine Unity, do not cast on
us the stigma of infidelity!
‘In three mirrors the Eternal Beauty cast a ray from His effulgent
countenance. 35
‘Silk does not become three things if thou callest it *Parniyán*,
Harír and *Parand*⁵⁵⁸.’
Whilst we were thus speaking, this chant rose up beside us from
the church-bell:

‘He is One and there is naught but He:
There is no God save Him alone!’

(*Strophe III*)

Last night I went to the street of the wine-seller, my heart boiling
and seething with the fire of love.
I beheld a bright and beautiful gathering presided over by the wine-
selling elder. 40
The attendants stood row on row, the wine-drinkers sat shoulder
to shoulder.
The elder sat in the chief seat and the wine-drinkers around him,
some drunk and some dazed,
With breasts devoid of malice and hearts pure, the heart full of talk
and the lips silent.
The eyes of all, by the Eternal Mercy, beholding the Truth, and
their ears hearkening to secrets.
The greeting of this one to that one, ‘Wassail!’ the response of that
one to this one, ‘Drink-hale’! 45
With ears for the harp and eyes on the goblet, and the desire of both
worlds in their embrace.
Advancing respectfully, I said, ‘O thou whose heart is the abode of
the Angel *Surúsh*⁵⁵⁹,

⁵⁵⁸ All these words, of which the first and last are Persian and the other Arabic, mean silk.

I am an afflicted and needy lover: behold my pain and strive to
remedy it!
The elder, smiling, said to me mockingly: ‘O thou to whom the
Guide of Reason is a devoted⁵⁶⁰ slave!

[page 295]

‘Where art thou, and where are we⁵⁶¹, O thou for shame of whom the
daughter of the grape⁵⁶² sits with veiled face?’ 50
I said to him, ‘My soul is consumed! Give me a draught of water,
and abate my fire from its vehemence!
‘Last night I was consumed by this fire: alas if my to-night be as
my yestere’en!’
He said smiling, ‘Ho! Take the cup!’ I took it. He cried, ‘Ha!
Drink no more!’
I drained a draught and became free from the pain of understanding
and the trouble of sense.
When I came to my senses I saw for a moment One, and all else
mere lines and figures. 55
Suddenly in the temples of the Angelic World the *Surúsh*⁵⁶³ whispered
these words into my ear:

‘He is One and there is naught but He:
There is no God save Him alone!’

(*Strophe IV*)

Open the eye of the heart that thou mayst behold the spirit, that
thou mayst see that which is not to be seen.
If thou wilt turn thy face towards the Realm of Love thou wilt see
all the horizons a garden of roses.
Thou wilt behold the revolution of the cycle of heaven favourable to
all the people of this earth. 60
That which thou seest thy heart will desire, and that which thy heart
desireth thou wilt see.
The headless and footless beggar of that place thou wilt see heavy-
headed with the dominion of the world⁵⁶⁴.
There also thou wilt see a bare-footed company with their feet set
on the summit of the Guard-stars⁵⁶⁵.

[page 296]

There also thou wilt see a bare-headed assembly canopied overhead
by the throne of God.
Each one at the time of ecstasy and song thou wilt see shaking his
sleeves over the two worlds⁵⁶⁶. 65
In the heart of each atom which thou cleavest thou wilt behold a sun
in the midst.
If thou givest whatsoever thou hast to Love, may I be accounted an
infidel if thou shouldst suffer a grain of loss!
If thou meltest thy soul in the fire of Love, thou wilt find Love the

⁵⁵⁹ *Surúsh* with the Zoroastrians, like *Jibrá’il* (Gabriel) with the Muhammadans, is the Angel who brings revelation.

⁵⁶⁰ Literally “with a ring in the ear,” a sign of servitude.

⁵⁶¹ That is, how far apart are we.

⁵⁶² Wine, who must veil her face before the stranger (*ná-mahram*).

⁵⁶³ See p. 294 *supra*, n. 2 *ad calc.*

⁵⁶⁴ *I.e.* even the veriest beggar in the Realm of Love exercises in this lower world such authority as do the kings and rulers of earth, and is as much preoccupied by his responsibility as they are.

⁵⁶⁵ *Farqadán*, two bright stars in Ursa Minor, called “the Guards” or “Guardians” (from the Spanish word *guardare*, “to behold”) because of their “singular use in navigation.” See vol. ii of my *Traveller’s Narrative*, p. 125, *ad calc.*

⁵⁶⁶ *I.e.* snapping his fingers at them, taking no account of them.

Alchemy of Life;
 Thou wilt pass beyond the narrow straits of dimensions, and wilt
 behold the spacious realms of the Placeless;
 Thou shalt hear what ear hath not heard, and shalt see what eye
 hath not seen; 70
 Until they shall bring thee to a place where of the world and its
 people thou shalt behold One alone.
 To that One shalt thou make love with heart and soul, until with
 the eye of certainty thou shalt clearly see

‘That He is One and there is naught but He:
 There is no God save Him alone!’

(*Strophe V*)

From door and wall, unveiled, the Friend shines radiant, O ye who
 have eyes to see!
 Thou seekest a candle whilst the sun is on high: the day is very
 bright whilst thou art in darkest night. 75
 If thou wilt but escape from thy darkness thou shalt behold all the
 universe the dawning-place of lights.
 Like a blind man thou seekest guide and staff for this clear and level
 road.
 Open thine eyes on the Rose-garden, and behold the gleaming of
 the pure water alike in the rose and the thorn.
 From the colourless water [are derived] a hundred thousand colours:
 behold the tulip and the rose in this garden-ground.
 Set thy foot in the path of search, and with Love furnish thyself with
 provision for this journey. 80
 By Love many things will be made easy which in the sight of Reason
 are very difficult.

[page 297]

Speak of the Friend in the mornings and the evenings: seek for
 the Friend in the gloaming and at dawn.
 Though they tell thee a hundred times ‘*Thou shalt not see me*⁵⁶⁷,’ still
 keep thine eyes fixed on the Vision,
 Until thou shalt reach a place to which the foot of Fancy and the
 eye of Thought cannot attain.
 Thou shalt find the Friend in an assembly whereunto not even
 Gabriel the trusted hath access. 85
 This is the Road, this thy Provision, this the Halting-place: if thou
 art a roadsman, come and bring!
 And if thou art not equal to the Road, then, like the others, talk of
 the Friend and scratch the back of thy head⁵⁶⁸!
 O Hátif, the meaning of the Gnostics, whom they sometimes call
 drunk and sometimes sober,
 [When they speak] of the Wine, the Cup, the Minstrel, the Cup-
 bearer, the Magian, the Temple, the Beauty and the Girdle,
 Are those hidden secrets which they sometimes declare in cryptic
 utterance. 90
 If thou shouldst find thy way to their secret thou wilt discover that
 even this is the secret of those mysteries,

‘He is One and there is naught but He:
 There is no God save Him alone!’

⁵⁶⁷ *Lan taránti*, the answer given to Moses when he desired to see God face to face. See *Qur’án*, vii, 139.

⁵⁶⁸ Like one bewildered or undecided.

CHAPTER VII.

POETS OF THE QÁJÁR PERIOD.

The Qájár rule was strong though severe, and, in spite of its harshness, was, perhaps, welcome on the whole to a country which had suffered seventy years of anarchy and civil war. The brief and bloody reign of the eunuch Áqá Muḥammad Khán⁵⁶⁹, who once more carried the Persian standards into Georgia and captured Tiflís, was followed by the milder administration of his nephew Fath-‘Alí Sháh (A.D. 1797-1834), to whose influence Riḏá-qulí Khán, in the Introduction to his *Majma‘u‘l-Fuṣaḥá*, ascribes the revival of poetry and the restoration of a better literary taste. He himself wrote verses under the pen-name of Kháqán, and gathered round him a host of poets to whose lives and work several monographs are devoted, such as the *Zínatu‘l-Madá‘ih*, the *Anjuman-i-Kháqán*, the *Gulshan-i-Maḥmúd* and *Safí-natu‘l-Maḥmúd*, the *Nigáristán-i-Dárá*, and the *Tadhkira-i-Muḥammad-Sháhi*, all of which are described by Rieu in his *Supplementary Catalogue of the Persian MSS. in the British Museum* (pp. 84-91), and most of which were utilized by the above-mentioned Riḏá-qulí Khán. One of them, the *Gulshan-i-Maḥmúd*, contains notices of forty-eight of Fath-‘Alí Sháh’s sons who wrote poetry, and at a later date the Royal Family supplied Persia with another verse-making autocrat in Náṣiru‘d-Dín Sháh (A.D. 1848-1896), but these kingly outpourings need detain only those who accept the dictum *Kalámu‘l-Mulúk Mulúku‘l-Kálám* (“the Words of Kings are the Kings of Words”).

[page 299]

These poets of the earlier Qájár period might very well have been included in the preceding chapter, but for the inordinate length which it has already attained. The only respect in which they differed from their immediate predecessors was in their reversion to earlier models and their repudiation of the school typified by ‘Urfí, Šá‘ib, Shawkat, and their congeners. This fact is established from two opposite quarters. On the one hand Shiblí, as we have seen⁵⁷⁰, takes the view that Persian poetry, which began with Rúdakí, ended with Šá‘ib, and that Qá‘ání and the moderns did but imitate the older classical poets, especially Farrukhí and Minúchihrí. Riḏá-qulí Khán takes the same view of the facts, but puts on them a quite different interpretation. According to him⁵⁷¹, Persian poetry had long been on the decline and at the end of the pre-Qájár period had become thoroughly decadent, so that the early Qájár poets did well to break away from the ideals of their immediate predecessors and revert to earlier models, amongst which he especially mentions the poems of Kháqání, ‘Abdu‘l-Wási‘-i-Jabalí, Farrukhí, Minúchihrí, Rúdakí, Qatrán, ‘Unṣurí, Mas‘úd-i-Sa‘d-i-Salmán, Saná‘í, Jalálu‘d-Dín Rúmí, Abu‘l-Faraj-i-Rúní, Anwarí, Asadí, Firdawsí, Nizámí, Sa‘dí, Azraqí, Mukhtári, Mu‘izzí, Lámi‘í Náṣir-i-Khusraw and Adíb Šábir, all of whom flourished before the Fall of the Caliphate and the Mongol Invasion in the middle of the thirteenth century. Of the later poets Ḥáfiz was perhaps the only one who retained an undiminished prestige in the eyes of his countrymen, and it is doubtful how far even he served as a model, though this was perhaps rather because he was inimitable than because he was out of fashion, like Jámí, ‘Urfí and Šá‘ib, who lost and never regained the

[page 300]

position they had once held in their own country. Henceforth, therefore, the divergence between Turkish and Indian taste on the one hand and Persian taste on the other increases, while the action of the British rulers of India⁵⁷² in substituting Urdú for Persian as the polite language of that country in 1835-6 tended still further to cut off India from the intellectual and literary currents of modern Persia.

It would be easy with the help of the Biographies of Poets mentioned above and others of a later period to compile a list of a hundred or two more or less eminent poets of the Qájár period, but it will be sufficient for our purpose to mention ten or a dozen of those who followed the classical tradition. Nor is it necessary to group them according to the reigns in which they flourished, though it will be convenient to arrange them in chronological order. Of one great family of poets, the sons and grandsons of Wiṣál (Mírzá Shafí‘, commonly called Mírzá Kúchuk) who died in 1262/1846, it was my privilege to meet several, including the brothers Farhang and Yazdání, at Shíráz in the spring of 1888⁵⁷³. The latter was accompanied by his own son and the son of his deceased brother who wrote under the pen-name of Himmat. Of the three elder brothers, sons of Wiṣál, the eldest, Wiqár, was about forty-two years of age when Riḏá-qulí Khán⁵⁷⁴ met him in Ṭihrán in 1274/1857-8, while the second, Mírzá Maḥmúd the physician, who adopted the *takhalluṣ* of Ḥakím, died in 1268/1851. Of the third, Dáwarí, a specimen of whose work is quoted in translation in vol. ii of my *Literary History*, pp. 41-42, I do not know the date of decease. As his poems have not, I think, been published, I here give the Persian text on which the trans-

⁵⁶⁹ Though practically supreme for eighteen years (A.D. 1779-1797), he was not crowned until 1796 and was assassinated in the following year.


⁵⁷⁰ Pp. 164 and 265 *supra*, and *Shi‘ru‘l-‘Ajam*, vol. iii, p. 189.

⁵⁷¹ Fifth (unnumbered) page of the Introduction to the *Majma‘u‘l-Fuṣaḥá*.

⁵⁷² At or about the same time they ceased to subsidise the publication of Oriental texts, thus inflicting a great injury on Oriental studies.

⁵⁷³ See my *Year amongst the Persians*, pp. 267-8, and also p. 119.

⁵⁷⁴ *Majma‘u‘l-Fuṣaḥá*, vol. ii, p. 548.



Autograph of the poet Wişál

Or. 4936 (Brit. Mus.), 20

[page 301]

lation above mentioned is based. It is taken from a small manuscript selection of his poems⁵⁷⁵ given to me in Tihrán in the winter of 1887-8 by my late friend the Nawwáb Mirzá Ḥasan ‘Alí Khán, one of his admirers and patrons.

Two stanzas of a *musammaʿ* by Dáwari.

ای بچه عرب صَبَحَكَ اللهُ بِخَيْرِا،
صبح است صبحی بده آن ساغر می‌را،
زآن می که بقطب از بدهی جرعه ویرا،
بر پات بساید سر اکلیل جُدی‌را،
کردند بناتش بغدا چون تو بُنی‌را،
چون چرخ زنی گرد خیر باده جُدی وار،
گر نیست ترا باده یکی شیشه ببر کش،
بر خیز و عبارا عربی وار بسر کش،
همچون عربان دامن خود تا بکمر کش،
یکدست عبا شیشه بدان دست دگر کش،
با دامن ترممت از آن دامن ترکش،
وز خانه برو تا بدر خانه خمار،

⁵⁷⁵ These selections are now bound up in my MS. bearing the class-mark Y. I. The whole *musammaʿ* contains eight strophes, of which only the first two are here given.

This mention of my kind friend the Nawwáb reminds me of a quaint incident which occurred while I was his guest at Tihrán in the early part of the year 1888, and which shows how relatively unprofitable is the profession of a Persian poet now compared to what it was in the “good old days” when a poet’s mouth was sometimes filled with gold or pearls as the reward of a successful poem which hit the taste of his patron. A minor poet, whose name I forget, if ever I knew it, came one day to the Nawwáb’s house and

[page 302]

asked and obtained permission to recite a poem which he had composed in his praise. On its conclusion he received the sum of one *túmán* (at that time worth about six shillings), with which he departed, apparently very well contented. But so far from the gift being deemed insignificant, the Nawwáb was subsequently reproached by some of his friends for turning the poet’s head and making him imagine that he could earn an honest livelihood by writing poetry!

This is no doubt one of the causes which are tending to put an end to the old style of poetry, especially the panegyric *qaşıda*. Another still more potent one is the position attained by the Press since the Revolution of 1905-6, for the poet now tends more and more to write for the people as a whole rather than for some special patron. The transition can be very well seen in the case of poets like the unfortunate Mírzá Jahángír Khán of Shíráz, the proprietor and editor of that remarkable product of the Revolution the weekly *Şúr-i-Isráfil*, whose life, death, and literary activities in connection with that great national upheaval are fully discussed in my previous works, the *Persian Revolution* and the *Press and Poetry of Modern Persia*. As a poet and writer of the Revolution only did I know him until lately, when I received from my accomplished friend and former pupil Mr W. A. Smart, one of the most sympathetic Consular officers ever sent to Persia from this country, a large fragment (292 pages) of an untitled, anonymous, acephalous and incomplete Persian manuscript work⁵⁷⁶ containing accounts of thirty-eight poets, mostly of Fárs, who were either still living in A.D. 1910 or who had died in the course of the preceding forty years. Amongst these mention is made of Mírzá Jahángír Khán (pp. 74-77), and specimens are given of his earlier pre-revolutionary poems, including one addressed to his friends at Shíráz from

[page 303]

Tihrán, which are quite in the classical style, and bear no traces of the modern peculiarities. Two other not less eminent “transition poets” mentioned in this extraordinarily interesting volume are Abu’l-Ĥasan Mírzá, a grandson of Fath-‘Alí Sháh, born in 1264/1848, and commonly entitled Ĥájji Shaykhu’r-Ra’is, chiefly known as a philosophical and political writer and a strong advocate of Pan-Islamism, who also wrote poetry, mostly topical, but in the classical forms, under the pen-name of Ĥayrat (pp. 102-121 of my MS.); and the eminent journalist *Adibu’l-Mamálik*⁵⁷⁷ (born in 1277/1860-1), a descendant in the third degree of Mírzá ‘Ísá the *Qá’im-Maqám*, who composed verse under the pen-name of Amírí of Faráhán (pp. 39-50 of my MS.). The new poets of the Revolution were therefore, except in the case of the younger ones who have appeared since that epoch-making event, to a large extent the poets of the old school who had sufficient enthusiasm and flexibility to adapt themselves to the new conditions. But the transition itself is marked by as hard and fast a line as can mark any such historical transition, that line lying in the years 1906-7. Of course an abundance of poetry of the old type is still being produced, and I myself was gratified and honoured on the occasion of my sixtieth birthday (February 7, 1922) by receiving an album of verses contributed by sixteen of the most notable contemporary poets, besides a separate *qaşıda* from ‘Imádu’l-Kuttáb, that Benvenuto Cellini of contemporary Persia. Nor is there any reason to apprehend the early disappearance of the old verse-forms. The panegyric (as opposed to the philosophical and didactic) *qaşıda* will probably become rarer for the reasons given above, but the mathnawí, *ghazal* and rubá’í will survive as long as mysticism, love and epigram continue to interest the Persians.

[page 304]

After these preliminary general remarks on the poetry of the latest epoch, we may pass to the consideration of some of its chief representatives. For information as to those who flourished before about A.D. 1870 my chief sources have been the three works of that industrious writer Riđá-qulí Khán, poetically surnamed Hidáyat, to wit the large general biography of Persian poets entitled *Majma’u’l-Fuṣaḥá* (“the Concourse of the Eloquent”); the smaller biography entitled *Riyádu’l-‘Arifín* (“Gardens of the Gnostics”), which deals chiefly with the mystical poets; and the Supplement to Mírkhwánd’s *Rawđatu’ş-Şafá*, which carries that well-known general history down to about 1857 and was already well advanced in 1272/1855-6, when the author returned from the embassy to Khwárazm described in his *Safárat-náma*, of which the Persian text was published by the late M. Ch. Schefer with a French translation in 1876-9⁵⁷⁸. At the end of the ninth volume of the *Rawđatu’ş-Şafá* (the second of the Supplement), which concludes the reign of Fath-‘Alí Sháh, several pages (unfortunately unnumbered, so that exact references are impossible) are devoted to the notable statesmen, poets, theologians and other eminent men of that period which sometimes contain biographical material lacking in the two earlier monographs. From these three sources,

⁵⁷⁶ It bears the class-mark J. 19 in my library.

⁵⁷⁷ See pp. 37-39 of my *Press and Poetry in Modern Persia*.

⁵⁷⁸ Brief notices of these and other published works of the same author will be found in Mr E. Edwards’s excellent *Catalogue of the Persian printed books in the British Museum* (London, 1922), columns 631-2.

so far as they extend, the following particulars are chiefly drawn, but I have also made use of a rare manuscript work (possibly an autograph) entitled *Tadhkira-i-Dilgushá*, a biography of contemporary poets by Mírzá ‘Alí Akbar of Shíráz, who himself wrote poetry under the pen-name of

[page 305]

Bismil, composed about 1237/1821-2. This fine MS., written throughout in a large, clear *naskh* with rubrications, formerly belonged to the late Sir Albert Houtum-Schindler, and now bears in my library the class-mark J. 18. Mention is made of this author and his work by Riḏá-qulí Khán (who in his youth used to see him at Shíráz) both in the *Majma‘u’l-Fuṣaḥá* (ii, pp. 82-3) and the *Riyádu’l-‘Arifin* (pp. 243-4).

(1) *Saháb* (d. 1222/1807-8).

Sayyid Muḥammad of Iṣfahán, poetically surnamed *Saháb*, was the son of that Sayyid Aḥmad *Hátif* mentioned at the end of the preceding chapter as almost the only notable Persian poet of the eighteenth century. Riḏá-qulí Khán (*M.F.*, ii, 207-11) says that he was held in high honour by Fath-‘Alí Sháh, for whom he composed, besides numerous panegyrics, a book of memoirs (presumably of poets) entitled *Rashaḥát-i-Saháb*, which I have never met with, and that his *Díwán* comprises only some five thousand verses. The following, censuring the conceit and arrogance of certain poets, are of some interest⁵⁷⁹:

كس را كمالِ نفس بجز حُسنِ حال چيست
و آن را كه حسنِ حال نباشد كمال چيست
شعرست هيچ و شاعری از هيچ هيچ تر
در حيرت كه در سر هيچ اين جدال چيست
يك تن نبرد از پی ترتيبِ چند لفظ
ای ابلهانِ بی هنر این قیل و قال چيست
از بهر مصرعی دو كه مضمونِ ديگر است
چندین خیالِ جاه و تمّای مال چيست

[page 306]

شعر اصلش از خیال بود حُسنش از مُحال
تا از خیالِ این همه فکرِ مُحال چيست
از چند لفظِ يابوه نَزْدَ لَافِ برتری
هر كس كه یافت شرم چه و انفعال چيست
صد نوع از این كمال بر اهلِ رای و هوش
با حُسنِ ذاتِ عامی نيكو خصال چيست
گيرم كه نظيرِ بحرِ دُر و كانِ گوهر است
با نثرِ كلكِ داورِ دریا نوال چيست

“Wherein save in good nature lies anyone’s ‘perfection’⁵⁸⁰, and what ‘perfection’ can there be to him who has not good nature?

Poetry is naught, and the poet’s vocation less than naught: I wonder what is all this quarrel about nothing!

No one will ask about the arrangement of a few words: O fools devoid of merit, what is all this talk?

On account of one or two hemistichs expressing some one else’s ideas, what is all this thought of position and hope of wealth?

The root of poetry is phantasy, and its beauty lies in the impossible⁵⁸¹: what can result from the imagining of all these impossible ideas?

Whoever has discovered what shame and modesty are will not boast of superiority on account of a few silly words.

⁵⁷⁹ *M.F.*, ii, p. 211.

⁵⁸⁰ *Kamál* (“Perfection”) means especially literary attainments. Cf. pp. 26-7 *supra*.

⁵⁸¹ The Arabs say “the best poetry is that which contains most lies,” and the exaggeration characteristic of most Persian panegyrists is notorious. Cf. *Lit. Hist. Persia*, ii, pp. 69-70.

What in the eyes of men of judgment and sense are a hundred sorts of such 'perfection' compared with the good nature of an ordinary well-disposed man?

I grant that the *naẓm* (arrangement, or verse) of the ocean is pearls and mines of precious stones: but what is it compared with the *nathr* (scattering, or prose) of the pen of that Lord whose bounty is as that of the ocean?"

[page 307]

(2) Mijmar (d. 1225/1810-11).

Sayyid Ḥusayn-i-Ṭabāṭabā'ī of Ardistān near Iṣfahān, who earned the title of *Mujtahidu'sh-Shu'arā*, is noticed by Riḍā-qulī Khān in all three of his above-mentioned works. He owed his introduction to the Persian Court to his fellow-townsmen and fellow-poet Mīrzā 'Abdu'l-Wahhāb *Nashāt*, who survived him by eighteen or nineteen years. He appears to have died young, for Riḍā-qulī Khān, after praising his verse, of which but a small collection was left, says that "had he lived longer, he would probably have attained the utmost distinction," but even as it is he is one of the five poets of this period whom my accomplished old friend Hājji Mīrzā Yaḥyā of Dawlatābād placed in the first class⁵⁸². Copies of his poems are rare, but the British Museum possesses a manuscript of his *Kulliyāt*, or collected works⁵⁸³. I can find nothing very noteworthy in Riḍā-qulī Khān's selections, but the two following riddles, the first on the Wind and the second on the Pen, taken from the *Tadhkira i-Dilgushā*, may serve as specimens of his work.

نُغز باد

چیست آن بیکِ مبارکِ مقدرِ فرخِ جناب
روز و شب اندر تحرکِ سال و مه اندر شتاب
نافه‌اش در دامن و اندر گریبان‌ش عبیر
عنبرش در جیب و اندر آستینش مشکِ ناب
رهروی بی پا و سر دیوانه بی عقل و هوش
عاشقی بی خان و مان آواره بیخورد و خواب

[page 308]

کس نمیداند که از عشقِ که باشد بیقرار
کس نمی یابد که از هجرِ که دارد اضطراب
آب از او چون دلِ عشاقِ از زلفِ بستان
گاه باشد در سلاسل که بود در پیچ و تاب
مُرده که از او زمین و زنده که از او جهان
چون قوی از بیری و همچون طبیعت از شباب

"What is that messenger of auspicious advent and fortunate presence who is moving every day and night and hastening every year and month?

Who carries musk-pods in his skirt and perfume in his collar, ambergris in his pocket, and pure musk in his sleeve?

A traveller without foot or head, a madman without sense or reason, a lover without abode or habitation, a wanderer without food or sleep.

None knoweth for love of whom he is so restless ; none discovereth through separation from whom he is so troubled.

Through him water becomes, like the hearts of lovers through the tresses of their idols, now wreathed in chains, now twisted and tormented.

Now the earth dies through him, and again the world lives through him, like the faculties through old age and like the nature through youth."

⁵⁸² See p. 225 *supra*. The others are *Furūghī*, *Ṣabā* (not *Ṣafā*), *Nashāt*, and *Qā'āni* in the first class; *Wiṣāl* and Riḍā-qulī Khān *Hidāyat* in the second; and *Wiqār* and *Surūsh* in the third.

⁵⁸³ Or. 3543. See *B.M.P.S.*, No. 354, pp. 222-3.

لُغْزِ قَلَمِ

كُلِّينِ بَاغِ نَفْسِ نَاطِقِه‌رَا ' مَن بَسْكَى اِبْرِ كُوهرِ افشَانِه‌رَا
 هَم‌شَكْر رِيْزِ وَ هَم‌عَبِيْر افشَانِ ' لَسِبْ دِل‌دَارِ وَ زَلْفِ جَانَانِه‌رَا
 دَر دُرِ افشَانِي وَ كُمُرِ رِيْزِي ' طَبِيْعِ دَسْتُوْرِ وَ دَسْتِ سُلْطَانِه‌رَا

“To the rose-bush of the garden of the reasoning faculty I am a cloud
 raining down pearls,
 Both pouring forth sugar and diffusing perfume [like] the darling’s
 lips and the sweetheart’s tresses.
 In scattering pearls and pouring forth jewels I am [like] the nature
 of the Minister and the hand of the King.”

[page 309]

(3) Şabá (d. 1238/1822-3).

Fath-‘Alí Khán of Káshán, with the pen-name of Şabá, was poet-laureate (*Maliku’sh-Shu‘arâ*) to Fath-‘Alí Sháh. Ridá-qulí Khán, who mentions him in all three of his works, says that no poet equal to him had appeared in Persia for nearly seven hundred years, and that some critics prefer his *Shahinsháh-náma* to the *Sháhnáma* of Firdawsi⁵⁸⁴. He also composed a *Khudáwand-náma*, an *Ibrat-náma*, and a *Gulshan-i-Şabá*, while his *Díwán* is said to comprise ten or fifteen thousand verses. He was for a time governor of Qum and Káshán, but latterly devoted himself entirely to the Sháh’s service. In his youth he was the pupil of his fellow-townsmen the poet Şabáhí, who was a contemporary of Hátif and Ádhar, and died, according to the *Majma‘u’l-Fuṣahá*, in 12006/1791-2. His eldest son Mírzá Ḥusayn Khán, poetically surnamed ‘Andalíb (“Nightingale”), succeeded him in the laureateship. His poetry, being mostly panegyric, has little attraction for us, but is extraordinarily melodious, as the following extract from a *qaṣída* quoted in the *Tadhkira-i-Dilgúshá* (which I think it unnecessary to translate, since the beauty lies in the form only) will show:

عِيدَسْتِ وَ عَشْرَتِ رَا بَقَا بَرِ دَرِگَهْ شَهْ رَهْ نِمَا
 دَرِ دَمِ نَوَايِ مَرْحَبَا بَرِ لَسِبِ سُرُوْدِ آفْرِيْنِ
 عِيدَسْتِ وَ شَاهَانِ جِهَانِ كُويَانِ بَهْمِ دَرِ آسْتَانِ
 بَرِ خَاسْتِ بَاذِكِ بَارِهَانِ بِنَشَسْتِ شَاهِ رَادِ هِيْنِ
 عِيدَسْتِ وَ اَزِ نُوْبَتِ سُرَا آوَاژِ كُوْسِ وَ بَانِگِ نَايِ
 دَرِ كَاخِ هَفْتِ اِخْتِرَصَدَا دَرِ كَاسِ نُهْ كَرْدُوْنِ طَنِينِ
 شَهْرَاوُكَانِ خُوْرَشِيْدِ فَرِ بَرِ كَلْتَهْ پَرُوِيْنِ سِيْرِ
 بَرِ جَانَشَانِ بِا تَا بَسِرِ دَرِ آفْرِيْنِ جَانِ آفْرِيْنِ

[page 310]

⁵⁸⁴ *Riyádu’l-‘Árifín*, p. 264. The *Shahinsháh-náma* was lithographed in Bombay in 1890.

بر ز آسمان‌شان پایگه بل آسمان‌شان خاك ره،
 دیدار رشكِ مهبر و مه گفتار رازِ داد و دین،
 شهرا مهین بر آستان با شه سرایان داستان،
 گوهر فشان بر آستان چندانکه شه از آستین،
 فضل و هنر آب و گلش آسان از آن هر مشککش،
 گنج جوهر در دلش گنجورِ قدرت‌را دفین،
 در پیشداهی کآسمان بنهاده سر در آستان،
 عکسی از آن باغِ جنان فرشی بر آن عرشِ برین،
 شاهنشہ فرخنده خو با صدرِ اعظمِ رازِ گو،
 گلبرگِ رو کافورِ مو آن پس نگر این پیش بین،
 برجیس مان خورشید سا آن در سخن این درسنا،
 چون پورِ پیر برخیا چون رودِ رادِ آبتمین،
 کار آگهی فرسخ لقا از آن صفاهان در صفا،
 بر رنجِ درویشی دوا بر گنجِ سلطانی امین،
 برتر ز گردون پایه‌اش افزون ز آنچهر مایه‌اش،
 زین دو بهین پیرایه‌اش روی نکو رای رزین،
 زیبِ بساط شه نشاط آری نشاط و انبساط،
 اطفالِ معنی‌را قماط از کلک و از حبر انگبین،
 هر طفلِ معنی کآورد کر بخردش از جان خرد،
 ندهد بلی چون بگذرد ناقص ثمنِ ثمنِ ثمین

585

[page 311]

(4) Nashát (d. 1244/1828-9).

Passing over Mírzá Muḥammad-qulí Afshár *Ulfat* (d. 1240/1824-5) and Áqá ‘Alí Ashraf *Ágáh* (d. 1244/1828-9), the younger brother of the poet *Bismil*, both of whom were personally known to Riḏá-qulí Khán, we come to Mírzá ‘Abdu’l-Wahháb of Isfahán, celebrated as a calligraphist as well as a poet, and master of the three languages, Arabic, Persian and Turkish. After nearly ruining himself by his prodigal hospitality and liberality to poets, mystics and men of letters, he gained the favour of Fath-‘Alí Sháh, who conferred on him the title of *Mu‘tamadu’-d-Dawla*. He excelled in the *ghazal*, and his best-known work is entitled *Ganjína* (the “Treasury”). The following chronogram gives the date of his death (A.H. 1244):

از قلب جهان نشاط رفته،

“Nashát (joy) hath departed from the heart of the world.”

(5) Mírzá Abu’l-Qásim Qá’im-maqám (put to death in 1251/1835).

Two eminent men, father and son, bore this title (of which the literal meaning is exactly equivalent to “lieutenant,” in the sense of vicar or deputy), Mírzá ‘Ísá of Faráhán, called Mírzá Buzurg, who acted as Deputy Prime Minister to Prince ‘Abbás Mírzá and died in 1247/1831-2; and his son Mírzá Abu’l-Qásim, who, on the death of Fath-‘Alí Sháh, fell into disgrace, and was put to death by his successor Muḥammad Sháh on June 26, 1835⁵⁸⁶. The latter was, from the literary point of view, the more remarkable, but though he wrote

[page 312]

poetry under the pen-name of *Thaná’í*, he is more celebrated as a prose-writer, his numerous published letters being regarded by his countrymen as models of good style. I possess a collection of his writings, both prose and verse, compiled at the

⁵⁸⁵ The “aged son of Barkhiyá” is Ásaf, Solomon’s *Wazír*; the “noble son of Ábtín” is the legendary King Firidún. I have made a slight but necessary emendation in the penultimate and antepenultimate words of this line.

⁵⁸⁶ See R. G. Watson’s *History of Persia*, pp. 271-2 and 287-8. His estimate of this Minister’s character differs very widely from that of Riḏá-qulí Khán.

instance of the late Prince Farhád Mírzá in 1281/1864-5, and lithographed at Tabríz in 1282/1865-6, of which the letters, addressed to various more or less eminent contemporaries but only occasionally bearing dates⁵⁸⁷, occupy by far the larger portion. Many of them are diplomatic documents of some historical importance, e.g. the apology addressed to the Tsar of Russia for the murder of the Minister Grebaiodoff and his staff at Tīhrán on February 11, 1829⁵⁸⁸, which is here given as a specimen of the Qá'im-maqám's much admired style.

نامه شاهشاهی بامپراطور اعظم در باب گذشتن خون ایلچی
بآن طور که خواهش کرده بودند
اول دفتر بنام ایزد دانا صانع پروردگار حقّ و توانا
وجودی بی مثل و مانند میرا از چون و چند که عادل و عالم
است و قاهر هر ظالم پاداش هر نیک و بد را اندازه و حدّ نهاده
بحکمت بالغه خود بدکاران را زجر و عذاب کند و نیکوکاران را
اجر و ثواب بخشد و درود نامعدود بر روان پیغمبران راست
کار و پیشوایان فرخنده کردار باد و بعد بر رای حقایق
نمای پادشاه ذی جاه انصاف کیش عدالت اندیش تاجدار با
زیب و فر شهباز بحر و بر برادر والا کهر خجسته اختر امپراطور
ممالک روسیه و مضافات که دولتش با جاه و خطر است و
رایتش با فتح و ظفر مخفی و مستور نماناد که ایلچی آن

[page 313]

دولت را در پای تخت این دولت باقتضای حوادث دهر و غوغای
کسان او با جهال شهر آسیمی رسید که تدبیر و تدارک آن
بر ذمه کارگزاران این دوست واقعی واجب و لازم افتاد لهذا
اول برای تمهید مقدمات عذرخواهی و پاس شوکت و احترام آن
برادر گرامی فرزند ارجمند خود عسرو میرزا را بهای تخت دولت
بهیه روسیه فرستاد حقیقت ناگاهی این حادثه و نا آگاهی
امنای این دولت را در تلو نامه صادقانه مرقوم و معلوم داشتیم
و ثانیاً نظر بکمال یگانگی و اتفاق [که] ما بین این دو حضرت
آسمان رفعت هست انتقام ایلچی مزبور را بر ذمت سلطنت خود
ثابت دانسته هر کرا از اهالی و سگان دار الخلافه گمان میرفت
که درین کار زشت و کردار ناسزا اندک مداخلتی تواند داشت
باندازه استحقاق مورد سیاست و حد و اخراج بلد نمودیر حتی
داروغه شهر و کدخدای محله را نیز بهیچن جریمه که چرا دیر
خبردار شده و قبل از وقوع این حادثه ضابطه شهر و محله را
محکم نداشته اند عزل و تنبیه و ترجمان کردیم بالاتر از
اینها همه پاداش و سزائی بود که نسبت بعالیجناب میرزا
مسیح وارد آمد با مرتبه اجتهاد در دین اسلام و اقتفا و اقتدائی
که زمره خواص و عوام باو داشتند بواسطه اجتماعی که مردم
شهر هنگام حدوث غایله ایلچی در دایره او کرده بودند گذشت
و اغماض را نظر باتحاد دولتین شایسته ندیدیم و شفاعت هیچ
شفیع و توسط هیچ واسطه در حقّ او مقبول نیفتاد پس چون
اعلام این گذارش بآن برادر نیکو سیر لازم بود بتحریر این نامه
دوستی علامه پرداخته اعلام تفصیل اوضاع را بفرزند مؤید موقت
نایب السلطنه عباس میرزا محول داشتیم امید از درگاه پروردگار
داریم که در بدم مراتب واد این دو دولت ابدیت بنیاد در

[page 314]

ترقی و ازدیاد باشد و روابط دوستی و یگانگی حضرتین پیوسته
بآمد و شد رسل و رسائل متأكد و متضاعف گردد و العاقبة
بالعاقبه
تحریراً فی شهر ربیع الاول ۱۲۸۳هـ

⁵⁸⁷ Shawwāl, 1239 (June-July, 1823), is the earliest date I have noticed.

⁵⁸⁸ The circumstances are fully given by R. G. Watson, *op. cit.*, pp. 247-57.

“The Royal Letter to the Most Great Emperor concerning the reparations for the murder of the Envoy in such wise as was desired.

“The beginning of the record is in the Name of the All-Knowing God, The Living and, All-Powerful Creator and Provider, —

— that Peerless and Incomparable Being, exempt from every ‘how’ and ‘how much’⁵⁸⁹, Who is just and wise, and subdueth every wrongdoer, Who hath set a measure and limit to the recompense of every good and evil deed, and Who, by His far-reaching wisdom, reproveth and punisheth the doers of evil, and rewardeth and recompenseth the well-doers. And countless blessings be upon the spirits of the righteous Prophets and beneficent Leaders⁵⁹⁰.

But to proceed. Be it not bidden and concealed from the truth-discerning judgment of that most eminent, equitable, and just King, that brilliant and glorious Sovereign, that Lord of land and sea, my noble-natured and fortunate-starred brother, the Emperor of the Russian domains and their dependencies, whose rule is mighty and glorious, and whose standards are triumphant and victorious, that a disaster hath overtaken the Envoy of that State in the capital of this, by impulse of the vicissitudes of the time and the quarrels of his people with certain ignorant townfolk, for which it is incumbent and obligatory on the acting officials of this Government to make reparation and give satisfaction. Therefore, in order to express our preliminary apologies and to satisfy the self-respect and honour of that esteemed brother, I have sent my dearly beloved son Khusraw Mírzá⁵⁹¹ to the capital of the glorious Russian State. In the course of a friendly letter we have expressed and explained the truth as to the suddenness of

[page 315]

this tragedy and the non-complicity of those responsible for the conduct of our Government; and secondly, having regard to the perfect accord and agreement existing between these two Heaven-high Courts, we have recognized it as incumbent on Our Royal Person to avenge the above-mentioned Envoy, and, according to his deserts, have chastised, punished or expelled from the country everyone of the inhabitants and dwellers in our Capital who was suspected of having participated in the slightest degree in this foul deed and improper action. We have even reprimanded and dismissed the chief constable of the city and the headman of the quarter, merely for the crime of being informed too late and of not having established a firmer control over the town before the occurrence of this catastrophe. Beyond all this was the retribution and punishment which befel His Reverence Mírzá Masîh, notwithstanding the rank of *mujtahid* which he holds in the religion of Islám and the respect and influence which he enjoys alike with gentle and simple, by reason of the assembly made by the townfolk in his circle. Having regard to the concord of our two Governments, we have regarded as improper any overlooking of, or connivance at, such matters, nor hath the intercession or intervention of anyone been admitted in regard to him. Wherefore, since it was necessary to make known this procedure to that brother of goodly disposition, we have applied ourselves to the writing of this friendly letter, committing the elucidation of the details of these events to our divinely aided and favoured son Prince ‘Abbás Mírzá, our Viceroy. The hope which we cherish from the Court of God is that every moment the extent of the mutual affection of these two States of ancient

⁵⁸⁹ *I.e.* transcending quality and quantity.

⁵⁹⁰ As the letter is addressed to a Christian sovereign, the usual specific mention of Muḥammad is replaced by this more general phrase.

⁵⁹¹ See R. G. Watson, *op. cit.*, pp. 254-6. He was the son of ‘Abbás Mírzá and therefore the grandson of Faṭḥ-‘Alí Sháh.

foundation may expand and increase, and that the bonds of friendship and unity of these two Courts may be continually confirmed and multiplied by the interchange of messengers and messages: and may the end be in welfare!

“Written in the month of the First Rabi’, 1245” (September, 1829).

This letter, although professedly from Fath-‘Alí Sháh, was, of course, really written by the Qá’im-maqám. It must have been gall and wormwood to him to be compelled to write so civilly, indeed so humbly, to the Russians, of whom he says in a poem commemorating a Persian victory by ‘Abbás Mírzá over them and the Turks⁵⁹²:

[page 316]

رومِ شوم و روسِ منحوس از دو جانب،
قصدشان تسخیرِ آذربایجان شد،

“The unlucky Turks and the ill-starred Russians on either side attempted the subjugation of Ádharbáyján,”

and in one of his letters to Mírzá Buzurg of Núr, written after the conclusion of peace with Russia (probably in 1243/1828), he laments that he no longer dares speak of the “*Rús-i-manhús*” (the “sinister” or “ill-starred Russians”):

تالان سیر که در مقدمهٔ روس میترسیر بگویم منحوس

A later, greater, and more virtuous, but equally unfortunate, Persian Prime Minister, Mírzá Taqí Khán *Amir-i-Kabir*⁵⁹³, still further simplified the style of official correspondence; but the *Qá’im-maqám*’s letters, though they may not strike one unused to the flowery effusions of the preceding age as very simple, mark an immense advance on the detestable rhodomontades which had for too long passed as eloquent and admirable, and probably deserve the high esteem in which, as already mentioned, they are held by the best contemporary Persian taste and judgment. A critical annotated edition of these letters would be of considerable literary and historical value, and might with advantage engage the attention of some Persian scholar whose interests are not confined to a remote past.

(6) Wişál (d. 1262/1846) and his sons.

I have already mentioned Wişál, some of whose gifted sons and grandsons I was privileged to meet at Shíráz in the spring of 1888. He is generally regarded by his countrymen as one of the most eminent of the modern poets, and both Riḏá-qulí Khán who devotes lengthy notices to him in all three of his works:

[page 317]

and the poet Bismil, the author of the *Tadhkira-i-Dilgushá*, were personally acquainted with him, the latter intimately. His proper name was Mírzá [Muḥammad] Shafi’, but he was commonly entitled “Mírzá Kúchuk,” and he was a native of Shíráz. Bismil speaks in the most glowing terms of his skill in calligraphy and music as well as in verse, wherein he holds him “incomparable” (*‘adimu’l-mithál*), and praises his lofty character and fidelity in friendship, but describes him as “rather touchy” (*andak zúd-ranj*), a description illustrated by Riḏá-qulí Khán’s remark (in the *Rawḏatu’š-Şafá*) that he was much vexed when the Sháh, meaning to praise him, told him that he was “prodigal of talents⁵⁹⁴.” He is said to have written twelve thousand verses, which include, besides *qaşidas* and *ghazals*, the *Bazm-i-Wişál* and the continuation and completion of Waḥshí’s *Farhád u Shirín*, described as “far superior to the original⁵⁹⁵.” He also translated into Persian the *Aṭwáqu’dh-Dhabab* (“Collars of Gold”) of Zamakhsharí. Bismil, who professes to have read all his poems, only cites the relatively small number of 213 couplets, of which the following are fairly typical, and afford a good instance of what Persian rhetoricians call the “attribution of praise in the form of blame,” for the *qaşida* begins:

“The sea, the land, heaven and the stars —
Each one of them declares the King a tyrant —

⁵⁹² *Majma’u’l-Fuṣṣahá*, ii, p. 88.

⁵⁹³ For a most favourable sketch of his character, see R. G. Watson, *op. cit.*, pp. 404-6.

⁵⁹⁴ باسراف در كجالات نسبت داو’

⁵⁹⁵ فرهاد و شیرین وحشی را تمام فرموده و كجالات فصاحت ظاهر نموده و برآب به از وحشی گفته

an opening calculated to cause consternation to courtiers, until it is stated that the sea considers itself wronged by his liberality, the mountain because he has scattered its hoarded gold like dust, the stars because they are eclipsed in number and splendour by his hosts, and so forth. As

[page 318]

such far-fetched conceits can hardly be made attractive in translation, I again confine myself to quoting a few lines of the original:

هرکس شها ز بحر و بر و چرخ و اخترست
اقرار میکنند که خسرو ستمگوست
ز آنها یکیست بحر که نالد ز دست شاه
کآبر ازو برفت و کنون خاک بر سرست
اندخته‌ام تمار بپردخت و خود نگفت
کاین سنگریزه نیست که مرجان و گوهرست
دریا نشست و کوه بر آورد سر که داد
زین شاه جود همیشه مرا دل پر آذرت
بر من هر آنچه رفت بدریا ز شه نرفت
مرجان کجا بپایه یا قوت اجمرت
لعلی که جز بر افسر شاهان حرار باد
بی آب تر ز افسر شاهانش بر دست
زیر مرا ندیدی و آن عزتی که داشت
تا خاک ره ز جود وی اکنون برابرت
کوه است و سنگ خویشت کنون از سخای شاه
و آن نیز پیش حلیه وی از گاه کتورت
افراخت چرخ سر که مرا شکوه بیشتر
برفش غزون توست که بامش غزون توست
اختر مرا شمار نه و پیش لشکرش
اختر مگو که مهربه چندم بشش دست
خورشیدرا که چشم و چراغ زمانه بود
آتش بدل ز مجر شاهش چو مجمرست

[page 319]

تا کرد شیر رایتش آهنک آسمان
شیر من از هراس چو روباه لاغرست
از پیش نسر گرسنه چشمم بیاز شاه
صد عجز نامه بیش ببال کبوترست
این شاه نیست دشمن بحرست و معدنست
این شاه نیست آفت چرخ است و اخترست

Wişál's *Farhád u Shírín* has been lithographed, and ample selections from his poems are given by Riđá-qulí Khán in his *Riyádu'l-'Árifín* (pp. 337-50) and *Majma'u'l-Fuṣṣahá* (ii, pp. 528-48), which latter work also contains (pp. 548-58) an ample notice of his eldest son Wiqár, who was presented to Náşiru'd-Dín Sháh in 1274/1857-8 at Tíhrán, where his biographer met him again "after twenty years' separation." The same work contains notices of Wiqár's younger brothers, Mírzá Maḥmúd the physician, poetically named Ḥakím (d. 1268/1851-2: pp. 102-5), and Mírzá Abu'l-Qásim Farhang, of whom I have already spoken (p. 300 *supra*), but not of the three other brothers Dáwarí, Yazdání and Himmat. The following fine *musammaṭ* by Dáwarí, describing one of the Sháh's hunting parties, I copied for myself in the house of the late Nawwáb Mírzá Hasan 'Alí Khán at Tíhrán early in the year 1888, and, as it has never been published, and I know of no other copy in Europe, I cannot resist the temptation of here assuring a survival hitherto so precarious, for it was copied on a loose half-sheet of note-paper which I only accidentally came across just now while searching for something else.

يك چند جدا از بربر آن شوخ پسر بود
از وی نه نشان بود مرا و نه خبر بود

[page 320]

با موکب منصور همانا بسفر بود،
 از حسرت او آتش شوقم بجگر بود،
 شبهای فراقم ز شب گور بتر بود،
 روزم ز غمِ هجر سیه‌تر ز شبِ تار،
 دوشینه همان و اولِ شب ناشده پاسی،
 زنگی شب افکنده برخ تیره پلاسی،
 با قیر بیندوده و پوشیده لباسی،
 مه بر سرگردون شده چون سیمین طاسی،
 آمد ز در آن دلبر بی ترس و هراسی،
 یکباره ببرد از دل من انده و تیمار،
 بر بسته میان و زده خنجر بکمر بر،
 مسکین دلم از خنجر تیزش بحد بر،
 سرداری سنجاب پوشیده بب بر،
 چو خای خراسانی آنرا بزیر بر،
 از بس هوس دیدن من داشت بسر بر،
 از ره سوی من آمده با چکمه و شلوار،
 پر خاک سر و زلف و رخ از گرد سپاهش،
 خشکیده دو عتاب تر از صدمه راهش،
 از بس نرده شانه بزلغین سپاهش،
 درهم شده و ریخته بر گرد کلاهش،
 چون کاسه خون سرخ شده چهر سپاهش،
 از صدمه بیخوابی و از زحمت بسیار،
 یک دسته کُلی سرخ ره آورد سفر داشت،
 از سنبلی تر نیز یکی دسته بسر داشت،

از لعلِ بدخشانی يك حَقَّة گهر داشت،
 از حَقَّة عجبتر كه يكي تنگ شکر داشت،
 چون از دلِ بیمارِ من خسته خبر داشت،
 در تنگ شکر داشت دواي دل بیمار،
 گفتم صفا گرچه بسی رنج کشیدی،
 صد شکر كه شاد آمدی و نيك رسیدی،
 جانِ رهی از دستِ غمان باز خریدی،
 برگو كه در این راه چه كردی و چه دیدی
 در موكب منصور چه دیدی و شنیدی،
 چون بود سرانجام و چه شد عاقبتِ كار،
 گفتا كه نبودى و ندیدى كه چه سان بود،
 نخجیرگه شاه يكي لاله‌ستان بود،
 هر گوشه ز خون دجله بغداد روان بود،
 تا چشمه‌ی كار كند تیر و كمان بود،
 تا ابره‌ی جای دهد گرز و سنان بود،
 نه دشت پدیدار بُد از لاش و نه كُپسار،
 دلها همه آسوده ز رنج و ز حزن بود،
 در دشت و بیابان همه گل بود و سمن بود،
 كيكِ درى از هر طرفی قهقهه زن بود،
 نخجیرگه از آهو چون دشتِ خُتن بود،
 اینها همه از بختِ شه شیرشكن بود،
 كاقبالِ وی افزوده بُد بختش بیدار،
 بخِ بخ چه تماشاى و وه وه چه شكاری،
 آراسته صحرا و بیابان چو نگاری،

[page 322]

گیتی بزمستان شده چون تازه بهاری،
 هر گوشه ز آهو و ز نخجیر قطاری،
 هر آهوئی آویخته از ترك سواری،
 چون لاش بقناره قصابِ نگويسار،

This poem is simple, sonorous and graphic; the court page, who has just returned from accompanying the Sháh on a winter hunting-expedition, and is in so great a hurry to visit his friend the poet that he enters in his riding-breeches and boots (*bá chakma wa shalwár*), with hair still disordered and full of dust, and eyes bloodshot from the glare of the sun, the hardships of exposure, and lack of sleep, bringing only as a present from the journey (*raháward-i-safar*) roses and hyacinths (his cheeks and hair), rubies of Badakhshán (his lips), and a casket of pearls (his teeth), is a vivid picture; and if a description of the Royal massacre of game reminds us of the immortal Mr Bunker's Bavarian battue⁵⁹⁶, we must remember that the wholesale slaughters of game instituted by Chingíz Khán the Mongol in the thirteenth century, whereof the tradition still survives to some extent, were on a colossal scale, altogether transcending any European analogy⁵⁹⁷.

In 1887, the year before I met Dáwari's brother Farhang at Shíráz, two of his unpublished poems were shown to and copied by me in London. One was a *qaṣida* in praise of Queen Victoria, composed on the occasion of her Jubilee, which I was asked to translate so that it might perhaps be brought to her notice, a hope not fulfilled. The other, composed in May of the same year (Sha'bán, 1304), contained a quaint description

[page 323]

of Paris, laudatory for the most part, but concluding with some rather severe reflections on the republican form of government. It differs widely from the poems of Farhang cited in the *Majma'u'l-Fuṣahá* (ii, pp. 384-8), is full of French words, and produces, as was probably intended, a somewhat comic and burlesque effect. It contains 78 verses and is too long to be cited in full, but I here give the opening and concluding portions:

⁵⁹⁶ See J. Storer Clouston's *Lunatic at Large* (shilling edition, 1912, p. 241).

⁵⁹⁷ See Baron d'Ohsson's *Histoire des Mongols* (the Hague and Amsterdam, 1834), vol. i, pp. 404-6; and p. 59, n. 2 *supra*.

چشم بکشا بیآ ببین انوار / سوی پاریس از در و دیوار
دیده راز بین خود بکشای / تا ببینی ز هر طرف اسرار
سر آزادگان و آزادی / حق نهوده برایشان اظهار
همگی خواجه‌های آزادند / نیست مملوک جمله شان احرار
همه شهر پادشاه و شنند / هم زن و مرد و هر صغار و كبار
همه دارای مکتب و ثروت / همه با مال و دولت بسیار
همه دارای شغل و کار خودند / نیست در ملک يك نفر بیگار
همگی صاحبان منصب و شغل / همه سر کرده و همه سالار
شهر آراسته چو خلد برین / باغی آراسته چو باغ بهار
شب زبس مشعل است و شمع چراغ / نیست فرقی میان لیل و نهار
ماه رویان و گلعدازان را / بنگر از هر طرف قطار قطار
کوچه‌هایی همه چو باغ ارم / هر طرف بر نشسته سرو و چنار
در خیابان و کوچه‌ها بینی / کرسی و صندلی دویست هزار
همه کالسکه‌های پُر دلبر / همه واتورها پُر از دلدار
وَه چه کالسکه‌ها چو حجله حور / وه چه واتورها های خوش رفتار
از ترم و آمانیوس بسی / هست چندان که ناید او بشمار
ز اول شهر تا باخر شهر / در خیابان و کوچه و بلوار
گوئیا حجله ز قصر بهشت / می بردش همی یمین و یسار

598 599 600 601

[page 324]

حجله پُر ز حوربان بهشت / دور آن حجله بر نشسته قطار
هر طرف بگذری گل و نسرين / هر طرف بنگری گل و گلزار
* * * * *
از گل و عطر و بوی ریحانها / گشته پاریس طبله عطار
* * * * *
تا نهائی و خود نه بینی تو / نکنی بر کلام من اقرار
* * * * *
راست گویند و راست کردارند / راستیشان شده همیشه شعار
هرچه گیرند و هرچه بفروشند / راست گویند در همه بازار
کس نکوید کلام نا مربوط / نشود کس کلام نا هنجار
مهربانی و لطف و خوشخوئی / همه با یکدگر کنند ایثار
همه خلق عیسوی مذهب / همه ملک عیسوی آثار
همه روحانی و مسیحائی / همه در کیش و دین خود هشیار
در کلیسا برای خدمت دین / هر کشیشی نموده استظهار
آن یکی طیلسان کشیده سر / آن یکی بسته بر کمر زَنار
در کلیسای اَنتر دام دیدم / معتکف مردی نماز گذار
صورتی نقش کرده بر لوحی / شکل عیسی کشیده بر سر دار
سجده گاه همه همان صورت / قبله گاه همه همان دیوار
از سر صدق و از سر اخلاص / همه در دین خویش برخوردار
همه پاک و منزّه و خوشخوی / همه عیسی صفت همه احرار
همه در کار خویشان محکم / همه در شغل خویشان مختار
همه در مشورت بهر هر رای / همه در گفتگوی بهر همکار
همه با عقل و هوش و با تدبیر / همه با علم و دانش و افکار
ليک با این همه صنایع و علم / رمزکی گویند بسکن اقرار

602

[page 325]

598 Voiture.
599 Tramway.
600 Omnibus.
601 Boulevard.
602 Notre-Dame.

حکمت و طبّشان دروغ بود'	کس ندیده که به شود بیمار'
همه شان پادشاه و سلطانند'	زین سبب نیست سلطنت درکار'
شهرشان منضبط نه با سلطان'	فوجشان منتظر نه با سردار'
قومی از عاقلان و دانایان'	متفق میروند در دربار'
محفلی منعقد برای همه'	می نشینند متحد گفتار'
گفتگوی میکنند در هر امر'	مشورت میزنند در هر کار'
مجلسی منعقد ز هفت صد تن'	همگان عاقلان و کار گزار'
متفق قول و متفق کارند'	متفق رای و متفق گفتار'
نامر این جمع و نامر این مجلس'	گشته جمهور در همه اقطار'
همه دولت فرانسه را'	قوم جمهور می دهند مدار'
بعد لوثی فلیپ و ناپلیان'	کس نکرده بسلطنت اقرار'
همه سلطان دولت خویشند'	همگی پادشاه ملک مدار'
از ره علم و از ره دانش'	نیست کاری برایشان دشوار'
هرچه این گوید آن دگر شنود'	نبودشان به قبل هر انکار'
گفتم این شعرها مه شعبان'	سال هجری هزار و سیصد و چار'

Lack of space compels me to pass over several poets of some note, such as Áqá Muḥammad Ḥasan *Zargar* (“the Goldsmith”) of Iṣfahán, who died in 1270/1853-4⁶⁰³; Áqá Muḥammad ‘*Ashiq*, a tailor, also of Iṣfahán, who died at the age of seventy in 1281/1864⁶⁰⁴; Mírzá Muḥammad ‘Alí *Surúsh* of Sidih, entitled *Shamsu’sh-Shu’ará*, who died in 1285/1868-9⁶⁰⁵; and Áqá Muḥammad ‘Alí *Jayhún* of Yazd, of whose life I can find no particulars save such as can be gleaned from his verses, but who composed, besides numerous poems of

[page 326]

various types, a prose work entitled *Namakdán* (“the Salt-cellar”) on the model of the *Gulistán*, and whose complete works were lithographed at Bombay in 1316/1899, making a volume of 317 pp. Others who are reckoned amongst the poets were more distinguished in other fields of literature, such as the historians Riḍá-qulí Khán *Hidáyat*⁶⁰⁶, so often cited in this chapter (born 1215/1800, died 1288/1871-2), and Mírzá Muḥammad Taqí *Siphir* of Káshán⁶⁰⁷, entitled *Lisánu’l-Mulk* (“the Tongue of the Kingdom”), author of the *Násikhu’t-Tawárikh* (“Abrogator of Histories”) and of another prose work entitled *Baráhinu’l-‘Ajám* (“Proofs of the Persians”); the philosopher Ḥájji Mullá Hádí of Sabzawár, who was born in 1212/1797-8, wrote a small amount of verse under the pen-name of *Asrár* (“Secrets”), and died in 1295/1878⁶⁰⁸; and others. Of the remaining modern representatives of the “Classical School” Qá’ání is by far the most important, and after him Yaghmá, Furúghí and Shaybání, of whom some account must now be given.

(7) Qá’ání (d. 1270/1853-4).

Qá’ání is by general consent the most notable poet produced by Persia in the nineteenth century. He was born at Shiráz about 1222/1807-8, for, according to his own statement at the end of the *Kitáb-i-Parishán*, he completed that work on Rajab 20, 1252 (October 31, 1836), being then two or three months short of thirty years of age:

[page 327]

⁶⁰³ See *Majma’u’l-Fuṣṣahá*, ii, pp. 151-2.

⁶⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 346-9.

⁶⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 184-95.

⁶⁰⁶ His autobiography concludes the *Majma’u’l-Fuṣṣahá*, ii, pp. 581-678.

⁶⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, ii, pp. 156-81.

⁶⁰⁸ See my *Year amongst the Persians*, pp. 131-4; and the *Riyádu’l-‘Árifín*, pp. 241-2, which, however, puts his birth in 1215/1800-1, and adds that he was sixty-three years of age at the time of writing (1278/1861-2).

شکر که از یاری یزدانِ من
جمع شد اوراقِ پریشانِ من
نیست درو عاریتِ هیچ کس
خاصّ منست آنچه درو هست و بس
چُو دو سه بیتی ز عرب و ز عجم
کآمده جاری بزبانِ قلم
خاصه که در طّی عبارت همی
رفته بدانجمله اشارت همی
تا ز حسودان نرسد ذق مرا
سخره باطل نشود حقی مرا
رفته ز ماهِ رجب ایامِ بیست
پنجه و دو سال و هزار و دو بیست
کمربود از سی دو سه ماه سالِ من
لیک بسی خسته بود حالِ من
بسکه ز غیر کوؤتر از هاله‌ام
راست چو پیرانِ نود ساله‌ام
لیک غیر من غیر عشقست و بس
ز آنکه چُو او نیست کسبِ داد رس
شادی عالم همه در این غیر است
عاشق ازین غیر بجان خرم است
غیر اگر اینست فزونتتر خوش است
بر صفتِ قند مکرر خوش است
هر که ازین غیر بدیش پرتوی است
در نظرش مُلکِ دو عالم چوی است
نارِب ازین غیر دل من شاد کن
و ز غیر دنیا دلبر آزاد کن

[page 328]

His proper name was Ḥabīb, under which he originally wrote, and which he uses as his *takhalluṣ*, or *nom de guerre*, in many of his earlier poems. Later when he and Mīrzá ‘Abbás of Bīṣṭām, who originally wrote under the pen-name of *Miskīn*, had attached themselves to Ḥasan ‘Alī Mīrzá *Shujá ‘u’s-Sulṭāna*, for some time Governor of Khurāsān and Kirmān, that prince changed their pen-names respectively to Qá’ání and Furúghī, after his two sons Ogotáy Qá’án and Furúghu’d-Dawla⁶⁰⁹.

Qá’ání was born at Shīrāz. His father, Mīrzá Muḥammad ‘Alī, was also a poet who wrote under the pen-name of Gulshan. Though Qá’ání was but a child when he died, his statement in the *Kitāb-i-Parīshān*⁶¹⁰ that “though thirty complete years have elapsed since the death of my father, I still imagine that it was but two weeks ago” cannot be reconciled with the other statement quoted above that he was not yet thirty when he completed the book in question. The *Tadhkira-i-Dilgushā* consecrates articles to both father and son, but unfortunately in my manuscript the last two figures of the date of Gulshán’s death are left blank, while it is also omitted in the notice contained in the *Majma ‘u’l-Fuṣṣahá*⁶¹¹, which is very meagre.

About Qá’ání’s seemingly uneventful life there is not much to be said. He appears to have spent most of it at Shīrāz, where in the spring of 1888 I had the honour of occupying the room in the house of the Nawwáb Mīrzá Ḥaydar ‘Alī Khán which he used to inhabit and, as we have seen, he resided for some time at Kirmān. The latter part of his life, when he had established himself as a recognized Court poet, was spent at Tīhrán, where he died in

[to face p. 328]

[Hájji Mīrzá Áqásí]

Or. 4938 [Brit. Mus.], 9

[page 329]

1270/1853-4. Two of his latest poems must have been those which he wrote to celebrate the escape of Nāṣiru’d-Dín Sháh from the attempt on his life made by three Bábís on August 15, 1852, quoted in my *Traveller’s Narrative*⁶¹².

⁶⁰⁹ *Majma ‘u’l-Fuṣṣahá*, ii, p. 394.

⁶¹⁰ Tīhrán lithographed edition of Qá’ání’s works of 1302/1884-5, p. 35.

⁶¹¹ Vol. ii, p. 426.

⁶¹² Vol. ii, pp. 325-6.

Qá'ání' is one of the most melodious of all the Persian poets, and his command of the language is wonderful, but he lacks high aims and noble principles. Not only does he flatter great men while they are in power, and turn and rend them as soon as they fall into disgrace, but he is prone to indulge in the most objectionable innuendo and even the coarsest obscenity. In numerous *qasidas* he extols the virtues and justice of Hájji Mírzá Áqásí⁶¹³, the Prime Minister of Muḥammad Sháh, but in a *qasida* in praise of his successor Mírzá Taqí Khán *Amir-i-Kabir* he alludes to the fallen minister thus:

بجای ظالمی شقی نشسته عادلِ تقی'
 که مؤمنانِ متقی کنند افتخارها'

“In the place of a vile tyrant is seated a just and God-fearing man,
 In whom pious believers take pride.”

Of his innuendo the following is a good specimen:

خندان خندان دوید و پیش من آمد'
 دوخت دو لب بر لبم که بوسه بزن ها'
 الحق شرر آمدم بدین لب منکر'
 بوسه زدن بر لبی چو لاله' همرا'
 کاین لب همچون زلوی من نه سزا بود'
 بر لبیکی سرخ تر ز خونِ مصفا'

[page 330]

گفتمش ای تُرك داده گیر دو صد بوس'
 كز لب لعل تو قانعم بتماشا'
 روی ترش كرد و گفت كُبر فرو هل'
 كز تو توّلًا نكو بود نه تپرا'
 شاعر و آنگاه رَد بوسه' شیرین'
 كودك و آنگاه تُرك چوز مُنقا'
 مادح شاهى تورا رسد كه بروبد'
 خاك رهِترا بزلّف تافتنه حورا'
 بوسه بزن مر مرا ؛ لطف و كزنه'
 نزد بُتان سوشكسته كردم و رسوا'
 در همه عُضوم مخبّرى پى بوسه'
 از سرم اينك بگير و بوسه بزن تا ...
 بوسه هم باشد كه مستحقّ كنارى'
 شاكرم اينك ببوسه' تو ولى با ...
 روى و لبم هر دو نيك درخور بوسند'
 اين من و اينك تو يا ببوس لبم يا ...
 گفتمش ای تُرك تُرك اين سخنان گوى'
 بس كن ازین غمزو رمزو عشوه و ايما'

The beauty of Qá'ání's language can naturally only be appreciated by one who can read his poems in the original, which is fortunately easily accessible, as his works have been repeatedly published⁶¹⁴. I have chiefly used the Tihrán lithographed edition of 1302/1884-5, and in a lesser degree the Tabríz lithographed edition of 1273/1857, and the "Selections...recommended for the Degree of Honour

[page 331]

Examination in Persian" printed at Calcutta in A.D. 1907. Like most of the Qájár poets, he excels chiefly in the *qasida*, the *musammat* and the *tarkib-band*, but the following *ghazal*⁶¹⁵ is extraordinarily graceful and melodious:

⁶¹³ Tihrán ed. of 1302/1884-5, pp. 19, 35, 40, 41, 43, 70, 82, 94, 95, 115, 123, 130 etc.

⁶¹⁴ See E. Edwards's *Catalogue of the Persian printed books in the British Museum*, 1922, columns 237-9.

⁶¹⁵ Tihrán ed. of 1302, p. 355.

یارکی مرادت رند و بذله‌گو،
 شوخ و دلربا خوب و خوش سرشت،
 طره‌اش عبیر پیکرش حریر،
 عارضش بهار طلعتش بهشت،
 نقش‌بند روح گوئی از نخست،
 صورت و لبش تا کشد درست،
 لعل‌پاره‌ها ز آب غضر سُست،
 پس نمود حل با شکر سرشت،
 در قمارِ عشق از مس آن پسر،
 برده عقل و دین جسم و جان و سر،
 هوش و صبر و تاب مال و سیر و زر،
 قولِ لوطیان هرچه بود گُشت،
 پیش از آنکه خط رویدش ز روی،
 بود آن پسر سخت و تند خوی،
 وینک از رخس سرزدست سوی،
 تا از آن خطم‌چیست سر نوشت،
 چون خطش دمید خاطر فرود،
 کآن صفای حسن شد بدل بدرد،
 نکبتِ رخس باغ ورد بُرد،
 غنچه از لبش داغ و درد هشت،
 سوی عارضه داشت رنگ قیر،
 در فراقِ او شد برنگِ شیر،

[page 332]

در جوانی‌م عمر گشت پیر،
 دهر پنبه کرد چرخ هرچه رشت،
 خواهر از خدا در همه جهان،
 يك قفس زمین يك نفس زمان،
 تا بکامِ دل می خورم در آن،
 بی حریفِ بد بی نگارِ زشت،
 خوش دهد بهار نشأ سرخ مُل،
 گه کنار رود گه فرازِ پُل،
 گه بزیر سرو گه بهای کُل،
 گه بصرین باغ گه بطرفِ کُشت،
 مرد چون شناخت مغز را ز پوست،
 هرچه بنگرد نیست غیر دوست،
 هر کجا رود ملک ملک اوست،
 خواه در حرور خواه در کنشت،
 چون ملک مرا گفت کای حبیب،
 يك غزل بگو نغز و دلفریب،
 پس از آن غزل او برد نصیب،
 زرع زان کس است کز نخست کُشت،
 زین عابدین زیب مجد و جاه،
 بنده امیر نیک‌خواه شاه،
 مُلک را شرف خلیق را پناه،
 هر مَلِک لقا هم مَلِک سرشت،

Wonderful also is the swing and grace of the poem in praise of the Queen-mother (*Mahd-i-'Ulyá*) beginning⁶¹⁶:

بنفشه رُسته از زمین بطرفِ جویبارها،
 و یا گُسته حورِ عین ز زلفِ خویش تارها،

[page 333]

⁶¹⁶ Tihrán ed. of 1302, p. 309.

ز سنگ اکر ندیده چه سان جهد شرارها
 ببرکهای لاله بین میان لاله زارها
 که چون شراره میجهد ز سنگ کوهسارها

“Are these violets growing from the ground on the brink of the streams,
 Or have the houris [of Paradise] plucked strands from their tresses?
 If thou hast not seen how the sparks leap from the rock,
 Look at the petals of the red anemones in their beds
 Which leap forth like sparks from the crags of the mountains!”

Not inferior to this is another similar poem in praise of Mīrzá Taqí Khán *Amīr-i-Kabir*, beginning⁶¹⁷:

نسیم خُاند میوزد مگر ز جویبارها
 که بوی مشک میدهد هوای مُرغزارها
 دراز خاک و خشتها دمیده سبزه کشتها
 چه کشتها بهشتها نه ده نه صد هزارها

Instead of the far-fetched and often almost unintelligible conceits so dear to many Persian poets, Qá'ání prefers to draw his illustrations from familiar customs and common observances, as, for example, in the following verses⁶¹⁸, wherein allusion is made to various popular ceremonies connected with the *Naw-rúz*, or Persian New Year's Day:

عید شد ساقی بیآ در گردش آور جامرا
 بُشتِ پا زن دورِ چرخ و گردشِ آیامرا
 سین ساغر بس بود ای تَرکِ مارا روزِ عید
 گو نباشد هفت سین⁶¹⁹ رندانِ دُرد آشامرا

619

[page 334]

خلقرا بر لب حدیث جامه نو هست و من
 از شرابِ کهنه میجویر لبالب جامرا
 هر کسی شکر نهد بر خوان و بر خواند دعا
 من ز لعلِ شکرینت طالبم دشنامرا
 هر تنی را هست سیر و دانه گندم بدست
 مایلر من دانه خال تو سیر اندامرا
 سیر بر خوانست مردمرا و من از عمر سیر
 بی دلآرامی که برده است از دلر آرامرا
 پسته و بادام نقل روزِ نوروزست و من
 با لب و چشمت نخواهم پسته و بادامرا
 عود اندر عید میسوزند و من نالان چو عود
 بی بُتی کز خال هندو ره زند اسلامرا
 یگدگرا خلق میبوسند و من زین غم هلاک
 کزچه بوسد دیگری آن شوخ شیرین کامرا
 سرکه بردستار خوان خلق و همچون سرکه دوست
 میکند بر ما تَرش رنگین رخ گلغامرا
 خلقرا در سال روزی عید و من از چهر شاه
 عید دارم سال و ماه و هفته صبح و شامرا⁶²⁰
 لا جرر این عیدِ خاص من که بادا پایدار
 کَر و فَرش بشکنند بازارِ عیدِ عامرا

620 621

⁶¹⁷ Tihrán ed. of 1302, p. 16.

⁶¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

⁶¹⁹ *Haft Sín*. It is customary at the *Naw-rúz* to collect together seven objects whereof the names begin with the letter S, such as *sunbul*, (hyacinth), *sib* (apple), *súsan* (lily), *sím* (silver), *sír* (garlic), *sirka*, (vinegar), and *sipand* (rue).

⁶²⁰ All the people put on new clothes at this great national festival, distribute sugar-plums amongst their friends, fill their hands with silver and corn, eat pistachio-nuts and almonds, burn aloe-wood and other fragrant substances, and greet one another with kisses.

Qá'ání is also one of the very few Persian poets who has condescended to reproduce actual peculiarities of speech or enunciation, as in his well-known dialogue between an old man and a child both of whom are afflicted with a stammer. This poem, which may more conveniently be transcribed into the Roman character, is as follows⁶²²:

“Pírákí lál saḥar-gáh bi-ṭiflí alkan
 Mí-shunídám ki badín naw‘ hamí-ránd sukhan:
 ‘K’ay zi zulfat ṣa-ṣa-ṣubḥam sha-sha-shám-i-tárík,
 W’ay zi chihrat sha-sha-shámam ṣa-ṣa-ṣubḥ-i-rawshan!
 Ta-ta-tiryákiyam, u az sha-sha-shahd-i-la-labat
 Ṣa-ṣa-ṣabr u ta-ta-tábam ra-ra-raft az ta-ta-tan.’
 Ṭifl guftá, ‘Ma-ma-man-rá tu-tu taqlíd ma-kun!
 Ga-ga-gum shaw zi baram, ay ka-ka-kamtar az zan!
 Mí-mí-khwáhí mu-mu-mushtí bi-ka-kallat bi-zanam,
 Ki biyuftad ma-ma-maghzat ma-mayán-i-da-dihan?’
 Pír guftá, ‘Wa-wa-wa’lláhi ki ma‘lúm-ast ín
 Ki-ki zádám man-i-bíchára zi mádar alkan!
 Ha-ha-haftád u ha-hashtád u si sál-ast fuzún
 Ga-ga-gung u la-la-lálam ba-bi-Khalláq-i-Zaman!’
 Ṭifl guftá: ‘Kha-khudá-rá ṣa-ṣa-ṣad bár sha-shukr
 Ki bi-rastam bi-jahán az ma-la-lál u ma-miḥan!
 Ma-ma-man ham ga-ga-gungam ma-ma-mithl-i-tu-tu-tú:
 Tu-tu-tú ham ga-ga-gungí ma-ma-mithl-i-ma-ma-man!’”

Besides his poems, Qá'ání wrote a collection of stories and maxims in the style of Sa'dí's *Gulistán* entitled *Kitáb-i-Parishán*, comprising one hundred and thirteen anecdotes, and concluding with thirty-three truly Machiavellian counsels to Kings and Princes. This book, which contains a certain amount of autobiographical material, occupies pp. 1-40 of the Ṭihrán lithographed edition of Qá'ání's works, and numerous other editions exist, several of which are mentioned by Mr Edwards in his *Catalogue*⁶²³.

(8) Furúghí (d. 1274/1858).

Mention has already been made of Mírzá ‘Abbás, son Áqá Músá of Bistám, who wrote verse first under the pen-name of Miskín and later of Furúghí. He is said to have written some twenty thousand verses, of which a selection of some five thousand is placed at the end (pp. 4-75) of the Ṭihrán edition (1302/1884-5) of the works of Qá'ání, with whom he was so closely associated. Unlike him, however, he seems to have preferred lyric to elegiac forms of poetry; at any rate the selections in question consist entirely of *ghazals*. According to the brief biography prefixed to them he adopted the Šúfí doctrine in the extremer forms which it had assumed in ancient times with Báyzíd of Bistám and Ḥusayn ibn Manšúr al-Ḥalláj, and so incurred the suspicion and censure of the orthodox. Nāširu’-d-Dín Sháh, in the beginning of whose reign he was still flourishing, once sent for him and said, “Men say that like Pharaoh thou dost advance the claim ‘I am your Lord the Supreme⁶²⁴,’ and that thou dost openly pretend to Divinity.” “This assertion,” replied Furúghí, touching the ground with his forehead, “is sheer calumny.... For seventy years I have run hither and thither, and only now have I reached the Shadow of God!⁶²⁵” The first three verses from the first ode cited seem to me as good and as typical as any others. They run as follows:

كى رفته ز دل كه تمنا كنم ترا
 كى بوده نهفته كه پيدا كنم ترا
 غيبت نكرده كه شور طالب حضور
 پنهان نكشته كه هويدا كنم ترا
 با صد هزار جلوه برون آمدى كه من
 با صد هزار دیده تماشا كنم ترا

⁶²¹ The first verse of a poem by Imámí of Herát cited on p. 116 of my *Persian Literature under Tartar dominion* contains a very similar thought.

⁶²² See my *Year amongst the Persians*, pp. 118-19, and pp. 345-6 of the edition of Qá'ání cited above.

⁶²³ Columns 237-9.

⁶²⁴ *Qur'án*, lxxix, 24.

⁶²⁵ *I.e.* the King.

“When didst thou depart from the heart that I should crave for Thee?
 When wert thou hidden that I should find Thee?
 Thou hast not disappeared that I should seek Thy presence:
 Thou hast not become hidden that I should make Thee apparent.
 Thou hast come forth with a hundred thousand effulgences
 That I may contemplate Thee with a hundred thousand eyes.”

(9) Yaghmá of Jandaq.

Mírzá Abu'l-Ḥasan of Jandaq, chiefly celebrated for his abusive and obscene verses (*Hazaliyyát*), and commonly known, from his favourite term of coarse invective, as *Zan-qahba*, is the last poet mentioned by the author of the *Majma'u'-Fuṣṣahá*⁶²⁶ before the autobiography with which he concludes. He was for some time secretary to a very violent and foul-mouthed nobleman named Dhu'l-Fiqár Khán of Samnán, for whose amusement he is said to have written these offensive poems, collectively known as the *Sardáriyya*⁶²⁷. Though he wrote a quantity of serious verse and a number of elegant letters in prose, which are included in the large Ṭihrán edition of his works lithographed in 1283/1866-7, it is on his *Hazaliyyát*, or “Facetiae,” that his fame or infamy is based. The author of the *Tadhkira-i-Dilgushá*⁶²⁸ devotes but three lines to him, and was not personally acquainted with him, but had heard him well spoken of as “an amiable and kindly man and a good-natured and eloquent youth, who did not believe in making a collection of his poems.” Qá'ání attacked him in his own style in the following abusive verses⁶²⁹:

هفت اختر ز نقحبه و نه گنبد دوار
 پُر گشته ز ز نقحبگی مرشدِ اشار

آن شاعرِ ز نقحبه که یغماش ستایند
 شعرش همه ز نقحبه و ز نقحبگیش کار
 گوئی همه ز نقحبه و از خویش نگوئی
 خوانی همه ز نقحبه و از خود نه خبردار
 ز نقحبه تو ز نقحبه‌تری از همه مردم
 عالم همه ز نقحبه مجبول و تو مختار
 عکسِ تو فتاده است در آینه عالم
 تا آنکه بز نقحبگی خود کنی اقرار

Yaghmá's *Kulliyát*, or Complete Works, as represented in the Ṭihrán lithographed edition above mentioned, comprise the following:

A. *Prose writings* (pp. 2-145), consisting of numerous letters written to friends and acquaintances, unfortunately, so far as I have seen, undated. A careful examination of these letters would undoubtedly furnish abundant materials for the poet's biography. Many of them are addressed to unnamed friends, acquaintances or patrons, but some were written to his sons, Mírzá Isma'íl who wrote poetry under the pen-name of *Hunar*, Mírzá Aḥmad *Şafá'í*, Mírzá Muḥammad 'Alí *Khaṭar*, and Mírzá Ibráhím. *Dastán*, while others were written to men of more or less note whose names are given. In many of these letters he elects to write in pure Persian (*Pársi-nigári*), avoiding all Arabic words, while others, called *náma-i-basít*, are written in a very simple style.

B. *Verse*.


1. Early odes (*ghazaliyyát-i-qadíma*), pp. 46-183.
2. Later odes (*ghazaliyyát-i-jadída*), pp. 184-203.
3. The *Sardáriyya* mentioned above (pp. 204-217), written in the *ghazal* form with the pen-name *Sardár*.

⁶²⁶ Vol. ii, p. 580.

⁶²⁷ These poems, which occupy pp. 204-217 of the Ṭihrán lithographed edition of 1283/1866-7, are, however, only a fraction of the *Hazaliyyát*.

⁶²⁸ F. 53^b of my MS.

⁶²⁹ P. 372 of the lithographed Ṭihrán edition of 1302/1884-5.



Autograph of the poet Yaghma

Or. 4936 (Brit. Mus.), 19

[page 339]

4. The *Qaṣṣābiyya* (pp. 218-231), similar to the last-mentioned work in form and contents, but with the pen-name *Qaṣṣāb* ("Butcher").
5. The *Kitāb-i-Aḥmad* (pp. 232-247), similar to the two last, but with the pen-name *Aḥmad*.
6. The *Khulāṣatu'l-Iftidāḥ* ("Quintessence of Disgrace," pp. 248-265), an account in *mathnawī* verse of a scandalous incident fully described in a marginal note on p. 248.
7. The *Kitāb-i-Šukūku'd-Dalīl* (pp. 266-280), another *mathnawī* in the metre of the *Shāhnāma* outwardly praising but inwardly satirizing a certain Sayyid Qanbar-i-*Rawḍa-khwān*, entitled, by Yaghma *Rustamu's-Sādāt*.
8. *Marāthī* or Elegies on the deaths of the Imāms (pp. 282-301).
9. *Tarjī'-bands* and *Tarkīb-bands* (pp. 302-331), mostly of a ribald character.
10. *Qīṭa'āt* or Fragments (pp. 332-355), mostly ribald and satirical.
11. *Rubā'īyyāt* or Quatrains (pp. 356-389). also ribald.

The odes, old and new, and the elegies (Nos. 1, 2 and 8 in the above list) constitute the respectable, part of Yaghma's verse, in all about one-third of the whole. As for the rest, with the possible exception of No. 7, it is for the most part not fit to print, much less to translate. The poet's favourite term of abuse *Zan-qahba*, by which he himself is commonly known, is by no means a nice expression, but, it is delicacy itself compared with much of the language he employs. On the other hand, his serious odes and elegies show that he can write fine poetry, while his command of language is almost greater than that of

Qá'ání, even though the melody of his verse be less. He also appears to have invented a type of *marthiya* or elegy which he calls *Núḥa-i-Sína-zaní*, or Lamentation accom-

[page 340]

panied by beating of the breast. This I supposed till lately to have been one of the new models which sprang into existence after the Revolution of 1905-6, and I gave several specimens of it in my *Press and Poetry of Modern Persia*⁶³⁰. The following are the initial lines of eight of Yaghmá's elegies of this type:

نوحهٔ سینه زنی'
میرسد خشك لب از شطِّ فرات اكبرِ من'
نو جوان اكبرِ من'
سیلانی بكن ای چشمهٔ چشمِ ترِ من'
نو جوان اكبرِ من'
كسوتِ عمرِ تو تا این خمرِ فیروزه نمون'
لعلی آورد بخون'
گیتی از نیلِ عزا ساخت سیه معجزِ من'
نو جوان اكبرِ من'
تا ابد داغِ تو ای زادهٔ آزاده نهاد'
نتوان برد ز یاد'
از ازل كاش نمیزاد مرا مادرِ من'
نو جوان اكبرِ من، آخ

وله ایضاً'
شكوه از چرخِ ستمگرِ چكنمِ كو نكنم'
كله از گردشِ اخترِ چكنمِ كو نكنم'
غیر عباسِ بلاکش چكشمرِ كو نكشمر'
ناله بر حسرتِ اكبرِ چكنمِ كو نكنم'
چكنمِ كو نكنم'
چكنمِ كو نكنم'
چكشمرِ كو نكشمر'
چكنمِ كو نكنم، آخ

[page 341]

⁶³⁰ See No. 19 (pp. 216-218) and No. 31 (pp. 246-248).

و له ایضاً

در شبت پوشیده بنم روز محشر آفتاب
آفتاب باز سرکش آفتاب
وز صباحت آشکارا شام دیگر آفتاب
آفتاب باز سرکش آفتاب
سُت ازین سخت ابتلا ذرات را بالا و پست
هرچه هست بازراه از کار دست
شوم کن آخر نه از ذره کمتر آفتاب
آفتاب باز سرکش آفتاب آخ

و له ایضاً

کوه و صحرا خصم و شاه کمر سپه تنها دریغ
وا دریغ نصرت اعدا دریغ
قلب ایمان را شکست و نصرت اعدا دریغ
وا دریغ نصرت اعدا دریغ
آه کز بیدولتان دین بدنیا باخته
تاخته گشت کارش ساخته
پادشاه کشور دین خسرو دنیا دریغ
وا دریغ نصرت اعدا دریغ آخ

و له ایضاً

محشری بینم عیان در هفت کشور آسمان
آسمان شرمی آخر آسمان
شام عاشوراست این یا صبح محشر آسمان
آسمان شرمی آخر آسمان

[page 342]

آفتابی شد ز دُور تیره اختر آسمان

آسمان شرمی آخر آسمان

با چنین دوران نکردی کاش دیگر آسمان

آسمان شرمی آخر آسمان آخ

و له ایضاً

زین مصیبت نه همین از خاکیان ماهر بهاست
کی رواست سرنگون گردی فلک
چار ارکان شش جهت تا نه فلک ماهر سراسر
کی رواست سرنگون گردی فلک
نعره جن و ملک در ماتم فخر اُمر
از قدم تا دم شام عدم
از نری هم تا نریا از نریا تا نراسر
کی رواست سرنگون گردی فلک

و له ایضاً

هفته کین مه نر سال دغل قرن دغااست
خون هدر مال هباست
شب غم روز ستم شام البر صبح عزاست
خون هدر مال هباست
فتنه بیدار و امان خفته و خصم از در کین
ترکتازان بگمین
رسته بی شهنه و خوان چیده فرمان یغماست
خون هدر مال هباست آخ

وله ایضاً

زاده زهرا بکام زاده مروان نگر
 آه آه گردش دوران نگر
 این بخواری آن بعزت این بهین و آن نگر
 آه آه گردش دوران نگر
 آل مروان تیغ بر کف آل یس نقد جان
 زین و آن کور نظرداری عیان
 نفی حق اثبات باطل کفر بین ایمان نگر
 آه آه گردش دوران نگر آخ

This last poem in form most closely approaches No. 19 in my *Press and Poetry of Modern Persia*.

The above poems are interesting as regards their form. The following, an ordinary *Nūḥa*, or "Lamentation," without refrain, partly in colloquial dialect, is simple and rather beautiful. I quote only the first six of the nineteen verses which it comprises:

دلیر از زندگانی سخت سیره
 زنان را دل سرای درد و ماتم
 بمیرم هرچه زوتر باز دیره
 تن مردان نشان تیغ و تیره
 پسو در خون تپان دختر عزادار
 برادر گشته و خواهر اسیره
 بکام مادران نخت جگر خون
 بخلق کبودکان خوناب شیره
 اسیران را بجای اشک و افغان
 شرور در چشم و آتش در ضمیره
 خروش تشنه کامان زیر و بالا
 ز خاک تیره تا چرخ ائیره

"My heart is very weary of life; however soon I die, it is still too late.
 The women's hearts are the abode of grief and mourning; the men's
 bodies are the target of swords and arrows.
 Their sons welter in their blood; their daughters mourn; the brother
 is slain; the sister is a captive.
 The morsel in the mothers' mouths is their own heart's blood; the
 milk in the children's throats is liquid gore.

[page 344]

The captives, in place of tears and lamentations, have sparks in
 their eyes and fire in their souls.
 The outcry of the thirsty reaches down and up from the dark earth
 to the Sphere of the Ether."

It is curious to find in two such ribald poets as Yaghmá and Qá'ání⁶³¹ so deep a religious sense and sympathy with the martyrs of their faith as are manifested in a few of their poems. Verlaine, perhaps, offers the nearest parallel in modern European literature.

Of the remaining poets who flourished during the long reign of Náşiru'd-Dín Sháh, whose assassination on May 1, 1896, may be regarded as the first portent of the Revolution which bore its full fruit ten years later, two, Mírzá Muḥammad Taqí of Káshán with the pen-name of *Sipih*r, and Mírzá Riḍá-qulí Khán *Hidáyat*, are better known as historians and will be mentioned as such in a later chapter, though notices of both are given by the latter in his often-quoted *Majma'u'l-Fuṣṣahá*⁶³². Another poet of some note is Abu'n-Naşr Fathu'lláh Khán *Shaybání* of Káshán, a copious selection of whose poems was printed by the *Akhtar* Press at Constantinople in 1308/1890-1⁶³³, and of whom a long notice (pp. 224-245) is also given in the *Majma'u'l-Fuṣṣahá*. The list might be increased almost indefinitely, did space permit, but the most notable names have been mentioned, and even to them it has been impossible to do justice.

[to face p. 344]

⁶³¹ For his beautiful *marthiya* on the tragedy of Karbalá, see pp. 177-181 *supra*.

⁶³² See vol. ii, pp. 156-181: for *Sipih*r, and pp. 581-678 for the autobiography of *Hidáyat*. This great anthology was concluded in 1288/1871-2.

⁶³³ It was edited by Isma'il Naşírí Qarája-Dághí, published at the instigation of Mírzá Riḍá Khán, afterwards entitled Arfa'u'd-Dawla, and comprises 312 pp.

[MUẒAFFARU'D-DÍN MÍRZÁ (afterwards SHÁH) seated, with his tutor (*Lala-báshí*) RIDÁ QULÍ KHÁN, poet and historian, standing on his right (the reader's left)]

Or. 4938 (Brit. Mus.), 14

[page 345]

Of the new school of poets produced by the Revolution in 1906 and the succeeding years I have treated in a separate work, the *Press and Poetry in Modern Persia*⁶³⁴, more fully than would have been possible in this volume. The most eminent of these contemporary poets are, perhaps, Dakhaw (Dih-Khudá) of Qazwín, 'Árif of Qazwín, Sayyid Ashraf of Gilán, and Bahár of Mashhad. Dakhaw is probably the youngest and the most remarkable of them, though I do not think he has produced much verse lately. The versatility of his genius is illustrated by two of his poems (Nos. 3 and 14) cited in my above-mentioned work, on the one hand the riotous burlesque of "*Kabláy*," and on the other the delicate and beautiful *In Memoriam* addressed to his former colleague Mírzá Jahángír Khán of Shiráz, editor of the *Šúr-i-Isráfil*, of which the former was published in that admirable paper on November 20, 1907, and the latter on March 8, 1909. Bahár, entitled Maliku'sh-Shu'ará, "King of the Poets," or Poet Laureate, was the editor of the *Naw Bahár* (which after its suppression reappeared under the title of *Táza Bahár*), and was the author of several fine poems (Nos. 20, 34 and 36-47) published in my book, while 'Árif is represented by No. 33, and Ashraf by Nos. 4-7, 9-13, 16-19, and 27. I do not think that the works of these or any others of the post-Revolution poets have been published in a collected form. They appeared from time to time in various newspapers, notably the *Šúr-i-Isráfil*, *Nasím-i-Shimál* and *Naw Bahár*, and must be culled from their pages. Many of the now numerous Persian papers contain a literary corner entitled *Adabiyyát* in which these poems appear. The importance of the fact that their aim must now be to please

[page 346]

the increasing public taste and reflect the growing public opinion, not to gratify individual princes, ministers and noblemen, has been already emphasized⁶³⁵.

Of one other poet, lately deceased, who is very highly esteemed by his countrymen, but whose writings are not yet readily accessible, something more must be said. This is Mírzá Šádiq Khán, a great-grandson of the celebrated Qá'im-maqám⁶³⁶, best known by his title *Adibu'l-Mamálik*, who died on the 28th of Rabi' ii, 1335 (Feb. 21, 1917). Three sources of information about him are at my disposal, viz. (1) a notice in my MS. marked J. 19⁶³⁷ on modern Persian poets (pp. 39-50); (2) an obituary notice in No. 20 of the old *Káwa* of April 15, 1917; and (3) a pamphlet published at the "Kaviani Press" in 1341/1922 by Khán Malik-i-Husayni-i-Sásáni, a cousin of the poet, announcing his intention of collecting and publishing his poems, and asking help from those who possess copies of verses not in his possession. Some particulars concerning him are also given in my *Press and Poetry of Modern Persia* in connection with the various papers he edited or wrote for at different times, viz. the *Adab* of Tabríz (pp. 37-8) Mashhad (p. 38) and Tihrán (p. 39), which extended over the period 1316-1322/1898-1905; the Turco-Persian *Irshád* (p. 39), which he edited in conjunction with Aḥmad Bey Aghayeff of Qarábágh at Bákú in 1323/1905-6; the *Rúz-náma-i-Írán-i-Sultání* (pp. 88-91), to which he contributed in 1321/1903-4; the *Íraq-i-'Ajam* (pp. 118-19), which he edited in 1325/1907; and the *Majlis* (pp. 132-3), for

[page 347]

which he wrote in 1324/1906. One of the most celebrated of his poems is also given on pp. 300-302 of the same work.

The *Adibu'l-Mamálik* was born in 1277/1860-1, and was a descendant in the third degree of Mírzá 'Ísá Qá'im-maqám, and in the thirty-fifth degree of the Imám Zaynu'l-'Ábidín. In 1307/1889-90 he was at Tabríz in the service of the Amír Nizám (Ḥasan 'Alí Khán-i-Garrúsi), in honour of whom he changed his pen-name from *Parwána* ("Moth") to *Amírí*. In 1311/1893-4 he followed the Amír Nizám to Kirmánsháh and Kurdistán. During the two following years (1894-6) he was employed in the Government Translation Office (*Dáru't-Tarjuma-i-Dawlati*) in Tihrán, but in Šafar 1314/July-August, 1896, he returned with the Amír Nizám to Ádharbáyján, where, in 1316/1898-9, he adopted the turban in place of the *kuláh*, became Vice-master of the Luqmániyya College at Tabríz, and founded the *Adab* newspaper, which, as stated above, he afterwards continued at Mashhad and Tihrán. During the years 1318-20/1900-02 he travelled in the Caucasus and Khwárazm (Khiva), whence he came to Mashhad, but at the end of A.H. 1320 (March, 1903) he returned to Tihrán, and for the next two years, 1321-2/1903-5, was the chief contributor to the *Rúz-náma-i-Írán-i-Sultání*. In 1323/1905-6 he was joint editor of the *Irshád* at Bákú; in 1324/1906 he became chief writer for the *Majlis*, edited by Mírzá Muḥammad Šádiq-i-Ṭabátabá'í; and in

⁶³⁴ Camb. Univ. Press, 1914, pp. xl + 357, with a Persian foreword of 5 pp. The poems (originals and translations) occupy pp. 168-308, comprise 61 separate pieces, and can be obtained separately for 5s.

⁶³⁵ See p. 302 *supra*.

⁶³⁶ See pp. 311-316 *supra*.

⁶³⁷ See p. 302 *supra*. Since writing this, my attention has been called by my friend Mírzá Salmán-i-Asadí to an interesting article on the *Adibu'l-Mamálik* in the periodical entitled *Armaghán* (No. 1 of the third year, pp. 15-25).

1325/1907 he founded the *'Irāq-i-'Ajām*. In July, 1910, he took part in the capture of Tīhrán by the Nationalists, and subsequently held the position of President of the High Court of Justice (*Ra'is-i-Adliyya*) in 'Irāq and afterwards at Samnán. He lost his only daughter in 1330/1912. Two years later he was appointed editor of the semi-official newspaper *Āftāb* ("the Sun"). In 1335/1916-17 he was appointed President of the High Court of Justice at

[page 348]

Yazd, but soon afterwards, as we have seen, he died at Tīhrán, aged fifty-eight⁶³⁸.

The special value and interest of his poems, according to Khán Malik, his cousin and intimate friend, lie not only in their admirable and original style, but in their faithful reflection of the varying moods of the Persian people during the fateful years 1906-1912. In satire it is said that no Persian poet has equalled him since the time of old Súzání of Samarqand⁶³⁹, who died in 569/1173-4. In his pamphlet Khán Malik gives the opening verses of all the poems in his possession, with the number of verses in each, and invites those who possess poems lacking in his collection to communicate them to him before Jumáda i, 1342 (December, 1923), when he proposes to publish as complete an edition as possible. The *Káwa* quotes the following verses from one of his poems on the Russian aggressions in Persia, which it compares with the celebrated poems of Sa'dí on the destruction of the Caliphate by the Mongols⁶⁴⁰, Anwari on the invasion of the Ghuzz Turks⁶⁴¹, and Háfiz on Timúr's rapacity⁶⁴²:

چون بره' بیچاره بچوپانش نهیوست'
از بیمر بصحرا در نه خفت و نه بنشست'
خرسی بشكار آمد و بازوش فرو بست'
شد بره' ما طعمه' آن خرس زبردست'

[page 349]

افسوس بر آن بره' نوزاده' سرمست'
فرياد از آن خرس كهن سالِ شكر خوار

"Since the poor lamb did not forgather with its shepherd, through fear it neither slept nor rested in the plain. A bear came forth to hunt, and bound its limbs: our lamb became the prey of that high-handed bear. Alas for that new-born and bemused lamb! Alack for that aged and greedy bear!"

My manuscript J. 19⁶⁴³ (p. 44) enumerates twelve of his works, which include an Arabic and a Persian *Díwán*, a collection of *Maqámát*, a rhymed vocabulary, a volume of travels, and several books on Astronomy, Geography, Prosody, and other sciences.

PART III.

PERSIAN PROSE DURING THE LAST FOUR CENTURIES

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ORTHODOX SHÍ'A FAITH AND ITS EXPONENTS,

⁶³⁸ These dates are taken from Khán Malik's pamphlet, pp. 4-6.

⁶³⁹ See *Lit. Hist. Persia*, ii, pp. 342-3.

⁶⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 29-30.

⁶⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 384-9.

⁶⁴² The reference here is to the well-known verse —

فغان كين لوليان شوخ شيرين كار شهر آشوب'
چنان بردند صبر از دل كه تركان خوان يغمارا'

It is, however, but a vague and casual allusion.

⁶⁴³ See p. 302 *supra*.

One of the chief results of the Shí'a revival effected by the Şafawí dynasty was the establishment of the powerful hierarchy of *mujtahids* and *mullás*, often, but not very accurately, described by European writers as "the clergy." This title is, however, more applicable to them than to the *'ulamá*, or "doctors," of the Sunnis, who are simply men learned in the Scripture and the Law, but not otherwise possessed of any special Divine virtue or authority. The great practical difference between the *'ulamá* of the Sunnis and of the Shí'a lies in their conception of the doctrine of *Ijtihád*, or the discovery and authoritative enunciation of fresh religious truths, based on a comprehensive knowledge of the Scripture and Traditions, and arrived at by supreme effort and endeavour, this last being the signification of the Arabic word. One who has attained to this is called a *mujtahid*, whose position may be roughly described as analogous to that of a Cardinal in the Church of Rome. No such dignitary exists amongst the Sunnis, who hold that the *Bábu 'l-Ijtihád*, or "Gate of Endeavour" (in the sense explained above), was closed after the death of the founders of their four "orthodox" schools or sects, Abú Ḥanifa (d. 150/767), Málík ibn Anas (d. circa 179/795), ash-Sháfi'í (d. 204/820), and Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855). Thus the "Gate of Endeavour," which, according to the Shí'a view, is still open, has for the Sunnis been closed for more than a thousand years; and in this respect the Shí'a doctrine must be credited with a greater flexibility and adaptability than that of the

[page 354]

Sunnis, though in other respects narrower and more intolerant.

As will appear in the course of this chapter, the power and position attained by these prelates tended to divert the ambitions of young men who possessed, or believed themselves to possess, the necessary intellectual qualifications from poetry, *belles lettres*, and other forms of mental activity to theology, and from this tendency in part resulted the dearth of poets and abundance of divines under the Şafawís. Those were spacious times for the "turbaned classes" (*ahlu 'l-'amá'im*) and every poor, half-starved student who frequented one or other of the numerous colleges (*madrása*) founded, endowed and maintained by the piety of the Şafawí Sháhs, who delighted to call themselves by such titles as "Dog of the Threshold of the Immaculate Imáms," or "Promoter of the Doctrine of the Church of the Twelve," dreamed, no doubt, of becoming at last a great *mujtahid*, wielding powers of life and death, and accorded honours almost regal.

No class in Persia is so aloof and inaccessible to foreigners and non-Muslims as that of the *mullás*. It is easy for one who has a good knowledge of Persian to mix not only with the governing classes and officials, who are most familiar with European habits and ideas, but with merchants, tradesmen, artisans, landowners, peasants, *darwishes*, Bábis, Bahá'ís, Şúfis and others; but few Europeans can have enjoyed intimacy with the "clergy," whose peculiar, exclusive, and generally narrow life is, so far as my reading has gone, best depicted in an otherwise mediocre and quite modern biographical work entitled *Qišáshu 'l-'Ulamá* ("Tales of the Divines")⁶⁴⁴ by Muḥammad

[page 355]

ibn Sulaymán of Tanukábun, who was born in 1235/1819-20, wrote this book in three months and five days, and concluded it on the 17th of Rajab, 1290 (Sept. 10, 1873). It contains the lives of 153 Shí'a doctors, ranging from the fourth to the thirteenth centuries of the Muhammadan (tenth to nineteenth of the Christian) era, arranged in no intelligible order, either chronological or alphabetical. To his own biography, which he places fourth in order, the author devotes more than twenty pages, and enumerates 169 of his works, besides various glosses and other minor writings. From this book, which I read through during the Easter Vacation of 1923, having long ago made use of certain parts of it bearing on the Shaykhís and Bábis, I have disentangled from much that is tedious, trivial or puerile, a certain amount of valuable information which is not to be found in many much better biographical works, whereof, before proceeding further, I shall here speak briefly.

What is known as *'Ilmu 'r-Rijál* ("Knowledge of the Men," that is of the leading authorities and transmitters of the Traditions) forms an important branch of theological study, since such knowledge is necessary for critical purposes. Of such *Kutubu 'r-Rijál* ("Books of the Men") there are a great many. Sprenger, in his edition⁶⁴⁵ of one of the most important of these, the *Fihrist*, or "Index," of Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn 'Alí of Tús, entitled *Shaykhu 't-Tá'ifa*, who died in 460/1067, ranks with it in importance four other works, the *Asmá 'u 'r-Rijál* ("Names of the Men") of Shaykh Aḥmad ibn 'Alí an-Najáshí⁶⁴⁶ (d. 455/1063); the *Ma 'álimu 'l-'Ulamá* of Muḥammad ibn 'Alí ibn Shahr-áshúb of Mázandarán,

[page 356]

who died in 588/1192; the *Ídáhu 'l-Ishtibáh* ("Elucidation of Confusion") of Ḥasan ibn Yúsuf ibn Muṭahhar al-Hillí (b. 648/1250; d. 726/1326); and the *Lú 'lú 'atu 'l-Baḥrayn*⁶⁴⁷, a work of a more special character, dealing especially with the

⁶⁴⁴ I possess two lithographed editions of this book, the (second) Tíhrán edition, published in Şafar, 1304 (Nov. 1886), and another published (apparently) in Lucknow in 1306/1888-9.

⁶⁴⁵ Printed in the *Bibliotheca Indica*.

⁶⁴⁶ Lithographed at Bombay in 1317/1899-1900. In the *Kashfu 'l-Hujub* (see pp. 357-8 *infra*) the date of the author's death is given as 405/1014.

⁶⁴⁷ Lithographed in Bombay, n. d.

'*ulamá* of Baḥrayn, by Yúsuḥ ibn Aḥmad ibn Ibráhím al-Baḥrání (d. 1187/1773-4). Another work, similar to the last in dealing with a special region, is the *Amalu'l-Ámil fí 'Ulamá'i Jabal-'Ámil*, composed by Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn 'Alí... al-Ḥurr al-'Ámilí (b. 1033/1623-4) in 1097/1686. All these works are written in Arabic, but of the older books of this class there is one in Persian (compiled in 990/1582) which must on no account be overlooked. This is the *Majálisu'l-Mú'minín* ("Assemblies of Believers") of Sayyid Núru'lláh ibn Sharíf al-Mar'ashí of Shúshtar, who was put to death in India on account of his strong Shí'a opinions in 1019/1610-11. This book is both of a wider scope and a more popular character than those previously mentioned, since it contains, in twelve chapters, notices of eminent Shí'as of all classes, not merely theologians, and includes not only those who adhered to the "Sect of the Twelve" (Ithná-'ashariyya) but all those who held that 'Alí should have immediately succeeded the Prophet.

Of modern works of this class, composed within the last sixty years, three, besides the above-mentioned *Qišaṣu'l-'Ulamá*, deserve special mention. The most general in its scope, entitled *Rawḍātu'l-Jannát fí Ahwáli'l-'Ulamá wa's-Sádát* ("Gardens of Paradise: on the circumstances of Divines and Sayyids"⁶⁴⁸), was composed in Arabic by Muḥammad Báqir ibn Hájji Zaynu'l-'Ábidín al-Músawí al-Khwánsári, whose auto-

[page 357]

biography is given on pp. 126-8 of vol. i, in 1286/1869-70. The biographies, which are arranged alphabetically, include learned Muslims of all periods, and are not confined to theologians or members of the Shí'a sect. Thus we find notices of great Mystics, like Báyazíd of Bisṭám, Ibráhím ibn Adham, Shiblí and Ḥusayn ibn Manṣúr al-Ḥalláj; of Arabic poets, like Dhu'r-Rumma, Farazdaq, Ibnu'l-Fáriḍ, Abú Nuwás and al-Mutanabbí; of Persian poets, like Saná'í, Farídu'd-Dín 'Aṭṭár, Násir-i-Khusraw, and Jalálu'd-Dín Rúmí; and of men of learning like al-Bírúní, Thábit ibn Qurra, Ḥunayn ibn Isháq and Avicenna, etc., besides the accounts of Shí'a theologians down to comparatively modern times which give the book so great a value for our present purpose.

Another important work, composed in the same year as that last mentioned (1286/1869-70) but in Persian, is entitled *Nujúmu's-Samá* ("Stars of Heaven")⁶⁴⁹. It deals with Shí'a theologians of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries of the *hijra* (A.D. 1592-1882), and the biographies are arranged on the whole chronologically. The author was Muḥammad ibn Ṣádiq ibn Mahdí. Like most of these books its utility is impaired by the lack of an Index or even a Table of Contents, but it contains a great deal of useful information.

The third work of which I desire to make special mention here is primarily a bibliography, though it also contains a good deal of biographical matter. It is entitled *Kashfu'l-Ḥujub wa'l-Astár 'an Asmá'i'l-Kutub wa'l-Asfár* ("the Removal of Veils and Curtains from the Names of Books and Treatises"), contains notices of 3414 Shí'a books arranged alphabetically, and was composed in Arabic by Sayyid I'jáz Ḥusayn, who was born in 1240/1825, and died in 1286/1870. The editor, Muḥammad Hidáyat Ḥusayn, discovered the manuscript in the excellent

[page 358]

Bankipore Library, and, encouraged by Sir E. Denison Ross, prepared the text for publication at the expense of the Asiatic Society of Bengal⁶⁵⁰.

Mention must also be made of another Arabic work on Shí'a poets entitled *Nasimatu's-Saḥar fí-man tashayya'a wa sha'ar* ("the Morning Breeze, on those who held the Shí'a faith and composed poetry") compiled by Yúsuḥ ibn Yahyá al-Yamaní as-Ṣan'ání, a rare book, hitherto, so far as I know, unpublished, of which I am fortunate enough to possess a manuscript of the second half, containing the letters ط to □⁶⁵¹. Only poets who wrote in Arabic are noticed.

Of these books the *Rawḍātu'l-Jannát* is the most scholarly and comprehensive, but those who read Persian only will derive much instruction and some amusement from the *Majálisu'l-Mú'minín*, *Nujúmu's-Samá*, and *Qišaṣu'l-'Ulamá*. The older "Books of the Men," such as the works of at-Ṭúsí and an-Najáshí, are generally very jejune, and suited for reference rather than reading. As it is with the theologians of the Ṣafawí and subsequent periods that we are chiefly concerned here, a very few words about the older '*ulamá* of the Shí'a will suffice, though with their names, titles and approximate dates the student should be familiar. The most important of these earlier divines are "the three Muḥammads"⁶⁵², al-Kulayní (Muḥammad ibn Ya'qúb, d. 329/941), Ibn Bábawayhi (Muḥammad ibn 'Alí ibn Músá, d. 381/991-2), and the already-mentioned Ṭúsí (Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan, d. 460/

[page 359]

1067). Of these the first composed the *Káfi*, the second *Man lá yaḥḍuruḥu'l-Faqíh* (a title which approximates in sense to our familiar "Every man his own Lawyer"), and the third the *Istibṣár* and the *Tahdhíbu'l-Aḥkám*, which are known collectively

⁶⁴⁸ An excellent lithographed edition (four vols. in one, containing in all about 750 pp. and 713 biographies) was published at Ṭíhrán in 1306/1888.

⁶⁴⁹ Lithographed at Lucknow in 1303/1885-6 (pp. 424).

⁶⁵⁰ It was printed at the Baptist Mission Press at Calcutta in 1330/1912, and comprises 607 pp.

⁶⁵¹ For description of another copy see Ahlwardt's *Berlin Arabic Catalogue*, vol. vi, pp. 502-3, No. 7423.

⁶⁵² See the *Qišaṣu'l-'Ulamá*, p. 221 of the Lucknow edition, s.v. Muḥammad Báqir-i-Majlisí.

amongst the Shí‘a as “the Four Books” (*al-Kutubu’l-arba‘a*)⁶⁵³, and of which full particulars will be found in the above-mentioned *Kashfu’l-Hujub*. More modern times also produced their “three Muḥammads,” namely Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan Ibn ‘Alí...al-Ḥurr al-‘Ámilí (author of the above-mentioned *Amalu’l-Ámil*); Muḥammad ibnu’l-Murtaḍá, commonly known as Mullá Muḥsin-i-Fayḏ (Fayḏ), who died about 1090/1679; and Muḥammad Báqir-i-Majlisí (d. 1111/1699-1700)⁶⁵⁴. Each of these also produced a great book, the first the *Wasá’il*, the second the *Wáfi*, and the third the *Biháru’l-Anwár* (“Oceans of Light”), which constitute the “Three Books” of the later time. These seven great works on Shí‘a theology, jurisprudence and tradition are, of course, like the great bulk of the works of the Muhammadan Doctors -and Divines, written in Arabic, which language occupies no less a position in Islám than does Latin in the theological literature of the Church of Rome. Of them space will not permit me to speak further; it is the more popular Persian manuals of doctrine, whereby the great theologians of the Şafawí period sought so successfully to diffuse their religious teachings, which must chiefly concern us here, and even of these it will be impossible to give an adequate account. According to the *Rawḍātu’l-Jannát*⁶⁵⁵, Kamálu’d-Dín Ḥusayn of Ardabil, called “the Divine Doctor” (*al-*

[page 360]

Iláhi), a contemporary of Sháh Isma‘íl I, “was the first to compose books in Persian on matters connected with the Holy Law according to the doctrine of the Shí‘a”:

نُقلَ أَنَّهُ أَوَّلُ مَنْ صَنَّفَ فِي الشَّرْعِيَّاتِ عَلَى مَذْهَبِ الشَّيْخَةِ بِالْفَارِسِيَّةِ

We have already seen⁶⁵⁶ what difficulty Sháh Isma‘íl experienced on his capture of Tabríz in finding teachers or books to inculcate the doctrines of the creed which he was determined to impose throughout his dominions, and it is not strange, though the fact is often overlooked, that it became necessary to introduce into Persia learned Arabs of the Shí‘a persuasion, where such were obtainable. Two districts furnished the bulk of these: Baḥrayn, across the Persian Gulf, and Jabal ‘Ámil in Syria⁶⁵⁷. To the divines furnished by each of these two localities a special biographical work has, as we have seen, been devoted, namely the *Lú’lú’atu’l-Baḥrayn* and the *Amalu’l-Ámil*. Some of them came to Persia totally ignorant of the Persian language, like Sayyid Ni‘matu’lláh al-Jazá’irí, who, on reaching Shiráz with his brother, had to obtain from a Persian acquaintance the sentence “*Madrasa-i-Manşuriyya-rá mi-khwáhím*” (“We want the Manşuriyya College”), and even then each learned only half of this simple phrase and spoke alternately⁶⁵⁸.

[page 361]

It is the autobiography of this same Sayyid Ni‘matu’lláh, as given in the *Qişáşu’l-‘Ulamá*, which furnishes us with so unusually vivid a picture of the privations and hardships experienced by a poor student of Divinity. He was born in 1050/1640-1 and wrote this narrative when he was thirty-nine years of age⁶⁵⁹, “in which brief life,” he adds, “what afflictions have befallen me!” These afflictions began when he was only five years old, when, while he was at play with his little companions, his father appeared, saying, “Come with me, my little son, that we may go to the school-master, so that thou mayst learn to read and write, in order that thou mayst attain to a high degree.” In spite of tears, protests, and appeals to his mother he had to go to school, where, in order the sooner to escape and return to his games, he applied himself diligently to his lessons, so that by the time he was aged five years and a half he had finished the *Qur’án*, besides learning many poems. This, however, brought him no relief and no return to his childish games, for he was now committed to the care of a blind grammarian to study the Arabic paradigms and the grammar of Zanjání. For this blind teacher he had to act as guide, while his next preceptor

⁶⁵³ Or *al-Uşúlu’l-arba‘a* (“the Four Principles”). See *Nujúmu’s-Samá*, p. 75.

⁶⁵⁴ See p. 120 *supra*.

⁶⁵⁵ Vol. i, p. 185.

⁶⁵⁶ Pp. 54-5 *supra*.

⁶⁵⁷ See G. le Strange’s *Palestine under the Moslems*, pp. 75-6 and 470.

⁶⁵⁸ *Qişáşu’l-‘Ulamá* (ed. Lucknow, p. 229; ed. Ṭihrán, p. 333):

... پس با پای برهنه آن راه را طی کردیم و من یازده ساله بوده
و در وقت نماز صبح بشیواز رسیدیم پس بخانه آن شیخ که
با ما بود رفتیم و منزلش از مدرسه منصوریه دور بود و ما می
خواستیم که در آن مدرسه منزل کنیم زیرا که بعضی از اقارب
ما در آنجا بود پس آن شیخ گفت که این راه را بگیر و بگوئید که
مدرسه منصوریه را میخواستیم و ما فارسی نمی دانستیم پس ما
رفتیم و سخن را تقطیع کردیم پس يك كلمه را من ضبط کردم
و كلمه دیگری آن دیگری ضبط کرد پس هرکس که می دیدیم
یکی میگفت مدرسه منصوریه آن دیگری میگفت که میخواستیم
تا بآن مدرسه رسیدیم

⁶⁵⁹ He died, according to the *Kashfu’l-Hujub*, p. 70, No. 328, in 1130/1718. Since writing this, I have found the Arabic original of this autobiography in one of my MSS. (C. 15) entitled *Kitábu’l-Anwári’n-Nu’maniyya*, composed by Sayyid Ni‘matu’lláh in 1089/1678. It concludes the volume, and occupies ff. 329-34.

[page 362]

compelled him to cut and carry fodder for his beasts and mulberry-leaves for his silk-worms. He then sought another teacher with whom to study the *Káfiya* of Ibnu'l-Hájib, and found an imposing personage dressed in white with an enormous turban "like a small cupola," who, however, was unable to answer his questions. "If you don't know enough grammar to answer these questions, why do you wear this great load on your head?" enquired the boy; whereupon the audience laughed, and the teacher rose up ashamed and departed, "This led me to exert myself to master the paradigms of grammar," says the writer; "but I now ask pardon of God for my question to that believing man, while thanking Him that this incident happened before I had attained maturity and become fully responsible for my actions."

After pursuing his studies with various other masters, he obtained his father's permission to follow his elder brother to Húwayza. The journey thither by boat through narrow channels amongst the weeds, tormented by mosquitoes "as large as wasps" and with only the milk of buffaloes to assuage his hunger, gave him his first taste of the discomforts of travel to a poor student. In return for instruction in Jámí's and Járbardí's commentaries and the *Sháfiya*, his teacher exacted from him "much service," making him and his fellow-students collect stones for a house which he wished to build, and bring fish and other victuals for him from the neighbouring town. He would not allow them to copy his lecture-notes, but they used to purloin them when opportunity arose and transcribe them. "Such was his way with us," says the writer, "yet withal we were well satisfied to serve him, so that we might derive benefit from his holy breaths."

He attended the college daily till noon for instruction and discussion, and on returning to his lodging was so hungry

[page 363]

that, in default of any better food, he used to collect the melon-skins cast aside on the ground, wipe off the dust, and eat what fragments of edible matter remained. One day he came upon his companion similarly employed. Each had tried to conceal from the other the shifts to which he was reduced for food, but now they joined forces and collected and washed their melon-skins in company. Being unable to afford lamps or candles, they learned by heart the texts they were studying, such as the *Alfiyya* of Ibn Málík and the *Káfiya*, on moonlight nights, and on the dark nights repeated them by heart so as not to forget them. To avoid the distraction of conversation, one student would on these occasions often bow his head on his knees and cover his eyes, feigning headache.

After a brief visit to his home, he determined to go to Shiráz, and set out by boat for Bašra by the Shaṭṭu'l-'Arab. He was so afraid of being stopped and brought back by his father that, during the earlier part of the voyage, he stripped off his clothes and waded behind the boat, holding on to the rudder, until he had gone so far that recognition was no longer probable, when he re-entered the boat. Farther on he saw a number of people on the bank, and one of his fellow-passengers called out to them to enquire whether they were Sunnis or Shí'a. On learning that they were Sunnis, he began to abuse them and invoke curses on the first three Caliphs, to which they replied with volleys of stones.

The writer remained only a short while at Bašra, then governed by Húsayn Páshá, for his father followed him thither to bring him home, but he escaped privily with his brother, and, as already narrated⁶⁶⁰, made his way to Shiráz and established himself in the Manšúriyya College, being then only eleven

[page 364]

years of age. He found one of the tutors lecturing on the *Alfiyya* of Ibn Málík, who, on the conclusion of the lecture, questioned him as to his aims and adventures, and finally, seizing him by the ear and giving it a sharp twist, said, "O my son, do not make thyself an Arab Shaykh or seek for supremacy, and do not waste thy time! Do not thus, that so perchance thou mayst become a scholar."

In this college also the life was hard and the daily allowance of food inadequate, and the writer's brother wished to return home, but he himself determined to remain, copying books for a pittance, and working almost all night through the hot weather in a room with closed doors while his fellow-students slept on the roof. Often he had neither oil for his lamp nor bread to eat, but must work by moonlight, faint with hunger, while in the winter mornings his fingers often bled with the cold as he wrote his notes. Thus passed two or three years more, and, though his eyesight was permanently affected by the strain to which it was subjected, he began to write books himself, a commentary on the *Káfiya*, and another, entitled *Miftáhu'l-Labib*, on the *Tahdhib* of Shaykh Bahá'u'd-Dín Muḥammad⁶⁶¹. He now began to extend the range of his studies beyond Arabic grammar, and to frequent the lectures of more eminent teachers from Baghdád, al-Aḥsá and Baḥrayn, amongst them Shaykh Ja'far al-Baḥrání. One day he did not attend this Shaykh's lecture because of the news which had reached him of the death of certain relatives. When he reappeared on the following day the Shaykh was very angry and refused to give him any further instruction, saying, "May God curse my father and mother if I teach

[page 365]

⁶⁶⁰ P. 360 *supra*.

⁶⁶¹ See the *Kashfu'l-Hujub*, p. 146, No. 725. The author died in 1031/1621-2. He was one of the most notable theologians of the reign of Sháh 'Abbás the Great, and is commonly called in Persia "Shaykh-i-Bahá'í." See p. 407 *infra*.

you any more! Why were you not here yesterday?” And, when the writer explained the cause of his absence, he said, “You should have attended the lecture, and indulged in your mourning afterwards”; and only when the student had sworn never to play the truant again whatever might happen was he allowed after an interval to resume his attendance. Finally he so far won the approval of this somewhat exacting teacher that the latter offered him his daughter in marriage; an honour from which he excused himself by saying, “If God will, after I have finished my studies and become a Doctor (*‘ālim*), I will marry.” Soon afterwards the teacher obtained an appointment in India, at Ḥaydarābād in the Deccan.

Sayyid Ni‘matu’llāh remained in Shīrāz for nine years, and for the most part in such poverty that often he swallowed nothing all day except water. The earlier part of the night he would often spend with a friend who lived some way outside the town so as to profit by his lamp for study, and thence he would grope his way through the dark and deserted bazaars, soothing the fierce dogs which guarded their masters’ shops, to the distant mosque where he lectured before dawn. At his parents’ wish he returned home for a while and took to himself a wife, but being reproached by a learned man whom he visited with abandoning his studies while still ill-grounded in the Science of Traditions, he left his parents and his wife (he had only been married for three weeks) and returned to the Maṣūriyya College at Shīrāz. Soon afterwards, however, it was destroyed by a fire, in which one student and a large part of the library perished; and about the same time he received tidings of his father’s death. These two misfortunes, combined with other circumstances, led him to leave Shīrāz and go to Iṣfahān.

During his early days at Iṣfahān he still suffered from the same poverty with which he had been only too familiar

[page 366]

in the past, often eating salted meat to increase his thirst, so that the abundance of water he was thereby impelled to drink might destroy his appetite for solid food. The change in his fortune took place when he made the acquaintance and attracted the notice of that great but fanatical divine Mullā Muḥammad Bāqir-i-Majlisī, perhaps the most notable and powerful doctor of the Shī‘a who ever lived. He was admitted to the house of this famous man and lived with him for four years studying theology, and especially the Traditions⁶⁶². Yet in this case familiarity did not breed contempt, for, as the author mentions in his *Anwāru’-n-Nu‘māniyya*⁶⁶³, though specially favoured by this formidable “Prince of the Church,” he often, when summoned to his library to converse with him, or to help in the compilation of the *Bihāru’l-Anwār*, would stand trembling outside the door for some moments ere he could summon up courage to enter. Thanks to this powerful patronage, however, he was appointed lecturer (*mudarris*) in a college recently founded by a certain Mīrzā Taqī near the Bath of Shaykh-i-Bahā’ī in Iṣfahān, which post he held for eight years, when the increasing weakness of his eyes and the inability of the oculists of Iṣfahān to afford him any relief determined him to set out again on his travels. He visited Sāmarrā, Kāzimayn, and other holy places in ‘Irāq, whence he returned by way of Shūshtar to Iṣfahān. In 1079/1668-9 his brother died, and ten years later, when he penned this autobiography, he still

[page 367]

keenly felt this loss. After visiting Mashhad he returned to Ḥuwayza, where he was living a somewhat solitary and disillusioned life at the time of writing (1089/1678-9). Of his further adventures I have found no record, but his death did not take place until 1130/1718, only four years before the disaster which put an end to the Ṣafawī Dynasty.

I have given in a somewhat compressed form the whole of this illuminating narrative, one of those “human documents” which are so rare in Persian books (though indeed, as already noted on p. 361, it was originally written in Arabic), because it throws so much light on the life of the Persian student of theology, which, for the rest, *mutatis mutandis*, closely resembles that of the mediaeval European student. We see the child prematurely torn from the games and amusements suitable to his age to undergo a long, strenuous, and arid course of instruction in Arabic grammar and philology, reading one grammar after another in an ascending scale of difficulty, with commentaries, supercommentaries, glosses and notes on each; we see him as a boy, now fired with ambition, pursuing his studies in theology and law, half-starved, suffering alternately from the cold of winter and the heat of summer, ruining his eyesight by perusing crabbed texts by the fitful light of the moon, and his digestion by irregular and unwholesome meals, varied by intervals of starvation; cut off from home life and family ties; submerged in an ocean of formalism and fanaticism; himself in time adding to the piles of glosses and notes which serve rather to submerge and obscure than to elucidate the texts whereon they are based; and at last, if fortunate, attracting the favourable notice of some great divine, and becoming himself a *mudarris* (lecturer), a *mutawallī* (custodian of a shrine), or even a *mujtahid*.

But if the poor student’s path was arduous, the possible prizes were great, though, of course, attained only by a few.

[page 368]

⁶⁶² As has been already mentioned (p. 359 *supra*), this powerful prelate was one of the “three Muḥammads” of the later time, and his great work on Shī‘a tradition, the *Bihāru’l-Anwār*, is still accounted in Persia the most authoritative work on this subject.

⁶⁶³ See the *Kashfu’l-Hujub*, p. 70, No. 328. I have a MS. of this work obtained from the late Ḥājjī ‘Abdu’l-Majīd Belshah and now bearing the class-mark C. 15. As already noted (p. 361), it concludes (ff. 329-34) with the Arabic original of the narrative here given.

In the eyes of the Şafawí kings the *mujtahid* was the representative of the Expected Imám, whose name they never mentioned without adding the prayer, “M ay God hasten his glad advent!” (*‘ajjala ‘lláhu faraja-hu!*). He had power of life and death. Hájji Sayyid Muḥammad Báqir ibn Muḥammad Taqí of Rasht, entitled *Hujjatu ‘l-Islám* (“the Proof of Islám”), is said to have put to death seventy persons for various sins or heresies. On the first occasion, being unable to find anyone to execute his sentence, he had to strike the first ineffective blow himself, after which someone came to his assistance and decapitated the victim, over whose body he then recited the funeral prayers, and while so doing fainted with emotion⁶⁶⁴.

Another *mujtahid*, Áqá Muḥammad ‘Alí, a contemporary of Karim Khán-i-Zand, acquired the title of *Şúfi-kush* (“the Şúfi-slayer”) from the number of *‘urafá* and *darwishes* whom he condemned to death⁶⁶⁵.

Another, Mullá ‘Abdu’lláh-i-Túní, induced Sháh ‘Abbás the Great to walk in front of him as he rode through the *Maydán-i-Sháh*, or Royal Square, of Işfahán⁶⁶⁶, with the object of demonstrating to all men the honour in which learning was held.

Mullá Ḥasan of Yazd, who had invited his fellow-townsmen to expel, with every circumstance of disgrace, a tyrannical governor, was summoned to Tíhrán by Fath-‘Alí Sháh to answer for his actions, and threatened with the bastinado unless he disavowed responsibility for this procedure. As he refused to do this, and persisted that he was entirely responsible for what had happened, he was actually tied up to receive the bastinado, though it was not actually inflicted. That night the Sháh was notified in a dream of the extreme displeasure with which the Prophet regarded

[page 369]

the disrespect shown by him to the exponent of his doctrine and law, and hastened next morning to offer his apologies and a robe of honour, which last was refused by the indignant ecclesiastic⁶⁶⁷.

Mullá Aḥmad of Ardabíl, called *Muqaddas* (“the Saint,” died in 993/1585), being asked by one of the King’s officers who had committed some fault to intercede for him, wrote to Sháh ‘Abbás the Great in Persian as follows⁶⁶⁸:

بانی* ملك عاریه عباس بدانند كه اگر این مرد اول ظالم بود
 اکنون مظلوم مینماید چنانچه از تقصیر او بگذری شاید حق
 سبحانه و تعالی از پاره* تقصیرات تو بگذرد
 کتبه بنده* شاه ولایت احمد اردبیلی*

“Let ‘Abbás, the founder of a borrowed empire⁶⁶⁹, know that this man, if he was originally an oppressor, now appears to be oppressed; so that, if thou wilt pass over his fault, perhaps God (Glorious and Exalted is He) may pass over some of thy faults.

“Written by Aḥmad al-Ardabílí, servant of the Lord of Saintship⁶⁷⁰.”

To this the Sháh ‘Abbás replied:

بعرض میرساند عباس كه خدماتيكه فرموده بودند بجان منّت
 دانسته بتقدیر رسانید كه این محبّرا از دعای خیر فراموش
 نكند
 كتبه كلب آستان علی عباس*

“‘Abbás makes representation that he accepts as a spiritual favour and has fulfilled the services which you enjoined on him. Do not forget [me] your friend in your prayers!

“Written by ‘Abbás, the dog of ‘Alí’s threshold.”

[page 370]

Another *mujtahid* of Ardabíl entitled *Muhaqqiq* (“the Investigator” or “Verifier”) wrote on behalf of certain Sayyids to Sháh Ṭahmásp, who, on receiving the letter, rose to his feet, placed it on his eyes, and kissed it, and gave the fullest satisfaction to its demands. Then, because the letter addressed him as “O brother” (*Ayyuha ‘l-Akh*), the Sháh caused it to be

⁶⁶⁴ *Qiṣaṣu ‘l-‘Ulamá* (Lucknow ed.), p. 138.

⁶⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 210.

⁶⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, part ii, p. 54.

⁶⁶⁷ *Qiṣaṣu ‘l-‘Ulamá* (Lucknow ed.), pp. 99-100.

⁶⁶⁸ This and the following anecdote are from the *Qiṣaṣu ‘l-‘Ulamá* (Tíhrán ed., p. 260; Lucknow ed., p. 132).

⁶⁶⁹ Because it really belongs to the Expected Imám, and is only held by the Sháh as his trustee and vice-gerent.

⁶⁷⁰ *I.e.* ‘Alí ibn Abí Ṭálib, the First Imám.

placed with his winding-sheet and ordered that it should be buried with him, “in order that,” said he, “I may argue with the Angels of the Tomb, Munkir and Nakir, that I should not be subjected to their torment.”

Still more extraordinary is another anecdote in the same work⁶⁷¹ of how Prince Muḥammad ‘Alí Mírzá gave a thousand *túmáns* to each of two *mujtahids* in return for a paper, duly signed and sealed, promising him a place in Paradise. One of them (Sayyid Riḍá ibn Sayyid Mahdí) hesitated to do this, but the Prince said, “Do you write the document and get the doctors of Karbalá and Najaf to witness it, and I will get it (*i.e.* the mansion in Paradise) from God Most High.”

Many similar anecdotes might be cited, besides numerous miracles (*karámát*) ascribed to most of the leading divines, but enough has been said to show the extraordinary power and honour which they enjoyed. They were, indeed, more powerful than the greatest Ministers of State, since they could, and often did, openly oppose the Sháh and overcome him without incurring the fate which would almost inevitably have overtaken a recalcitrant Minister. Nor is this a thing of the past, as is abundantly shown by the history of the overthrow of the Tobacco Concession in 1890-1, which was entirely effected, in the teeth of the Nāširu’-d-Dín Sháh and his Court, and the British Legation, by the *mujtahids*, headed by Hájji Mírzá Ḥasan-i-Shírání and Hájji Mírzá Ḥasan-i-Ashtiyání

[page 371]

inspired and prompted by that extraordinary man Sayyid Jamálu’-d-Dín miscalled “the Afghán⁶⁷².” Dr Feuvrier, the Sháh’s French physician, who was in Tíhrán at the time, gives a graphic account of this momentous struggle in his *Trois Ans à la Cour de Perse*⁶⁷³. I have described it fully in my *Persian Revolution of 1905-1909*⁶⁷⁴, and also the still more important part played by Mullá Muḥammad Kázim of Khurásán and other patriotic *mujtahids*⁶⁷⁵ in the Persian struggle for freedom and independence in the first decade of this century of our era. Mullá Muḥammad Kázim, a noble example of the patriot-priest, deeply moved by the intolerable tyranny and aggression of the then government of Russia, formally proclaimed a *jihád*, or religious war, against the Russians on December 11, 1911, and was setting out from Karbalá for Persia in pursuance of this object when he died very suddenly on the following day, the victim, as was generally believed, of poison⁶⁷⁶. He was not the only ecclesiastical victim of patriotism, for the *Thiqatu’l-Islám* was publicly hanged by the Russians at Tabríz on the ‘*Ashúrá*, or 10th of Muḥarram, 1330 (January 1, 1912)⁶⁷⁷, a sacrilegious act only surpassed by the bombardment three months later of the shrine of the Imám Riḍá at Mashhad, which many Persians believe to have been avenged by the fate which subsequently overtook the Tsar and his family at the hands of the Bolsheviks.

The *mujtahids* and *mullás*, therefore, are a great, though probably a gradually decreasing force, in Persia and concern themselves with every department of human activity,

[page 372]

from the minutest details of personal purification to the largest issues of politics. It is open to any Shí’a Muslim to submit any problem into the solution of which religious considerations enter (and they practically enter everywhere) to a *mujtahid*, and to ask for a formal decision, or *fatwá*, conformable to the principles of Shí’a doctrine. Such *fatwá* may extend to the denunciation of an impious or tyrannical king or minister as an infidel (*takfír*), or the declaration that anyone who fights for him is as one who fights against the Hidden Imám. The fact that the greatest *mujtahids* generally reside at Najaf or Karbalá, outside Persian territory, greatly strengthens their position and conduces to their immunity. To break or curb their power has been the aim of many rulers in Persia before and after the Šafawís, but such attempts have seldom met with more than a very transient success, for the *mullás* form a truly national class, represent in great measure the national outlook and aspirations, and have not unfrequently shielded the people from the oppression of their governors. And although their scholarship is generally of a somewhat narrow kind, it is, so far as it goes, sound, accurate, and even in a sense critical. The finest Persian scholar I know, Mírzá Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdu’l-Wahháb of Qazwín, is one who has superimposed on this foundation a knowledge of European critical methods acquired in England, France and Germany.

On the other hand, apart from corruption, fanaticism and other serious faults, many of the ‘*ulamá* are prone to petty jealousy and mutual disparagement. A well-known anecdote, given by Malcolm⁶⁷⁸ and in the *Qiṣaṣu’l-‘Ulamá*⁶⁷⁹, shows that great doctors like Mír Dámád and Shaykh Bahá’u’-d-Dín al-‘Ámilí could rise

[page 373]

⁶⁷¹ *Qiṣaṣu’l-‘Ulamá*, ed. Lucknow, p. 32.

⁶⁷² For a full account of him, see my *Persian Revolution*, ch. i, pp. 1-30 etc.

⁶⁷³ Paris, n.d., ch. v, pp. 307-349.

⁶⁷⁴ Ch. ii, pp. 31-58.

⁶⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 262 etc. For facsimiles of *fatwá* and letter, see pp. 421-4.

⁶⁷⁶ See my *Press and Poetry, of Modern Persia*, p. 334.

⁶⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 335-6, and also my pamphlet entitled *The Reign of Terror at Tabríz* (October, 1912).

⁶⁷⁸ *History of Persia* (ed. 1815), vol. i, pp. 258-9.

⁶⁷⁹ Lucknow ed., second part, pp. 26-7; Tíhrán ed., p. 181.

above such ignoble feelings; but, as the author of the latter work complains, their less magnanimous colleagues were but too prone to call one another fools and asses, to the injury of their own class and the delight of irreligious laymen. Nor was this abuse rendered less offensive by being wrapped up in punning and pedantic verses like this⁶⁸⁰:

و لستَ جديرًا أن تكونَ مقدّمًا ، وما أنت إلا نصف ضدَّ المقدّم

“Thou art not worthy to be advanced; nay, thou art nothing more than half of the opposite of ‘advanced’!”

The opposite of “advanced” (*muqaddam*) is “postponed” (*mu’akhhkar*), and the second half of the latter word, *khar*, is the Persian for an ass. This is a refined specimen of mullás’ wit: for a much coarser one the curious reader may refer to an interchange of badinage between Mullá Mírzá Muḥammad-i-Shírwání the Turk and Áqá Jamál of Ísfahán recorded in the *Qīṣaṣu’l-‘Ulamá*⁶⁸¹. That some mullás had the sense to recognize their own rather than their neighbours’ limitations is, however, shown by a pleasant anecdote related in the same work⁶⁸² of Jamálu’d-Dín Muḥammad ibn Ḥusayn-i-Khwánsárí. As a judge he was in receipt of a salary of four thousand *túmáns* a year. One day four persons successively put to him four questions, to each of which he replied, “I do not know.” A certain high official who was present said to him, “You receive from the King four thousand *túmáns* to know, yet here to everyone who asks you a question you reply ‘I do not know.’” “I receive these four thousand *túmáns*,” replied the *mullá*, “for those things which I do know. If I required a salary for what I do not know, even the Royal Treasury would be unable to pay it.”

[page 374]

Jurisprudence (*fiqh*) and theology (*‘aqá’id*), with the ancillary sciences, all of which are based on a thorough knowledge of the Arabic language, normally constitute the chief studies of the “clergy,” though naturally there is a certain tendency to specialization, the *qádl*, or ecclesiastical judge, being more concerned with *fiqh*, and the theologian proper with doctrine. We must also distinguish between the prevalent *Uṣúli* and the once important but now negligible *Akhhbári* school, between whom bitter enmity subsisted. The former, as their name implies, follow the general “principles” (*uṣúli*) deducible from the *Qur’án* and accredited traditions, and employ analogy (*qiyás*) in arriving at their conclusions. The latter follow the traditions (*akhhbár*) only, and repudiate analogical reasoning. Mullá Muḥammad Amín ibn Muḥammad Sharíf of Astarábád, who died in 1033/1623-4, is generally accounted the founder of the *Akhhbári* school, and was, according to the *Lú’lú’atu’l-Baḥrayn*⁶⁸³, “the first to open the door of reproach against the *Mujtahids*, so that the ‘Saved Sect’ (*al-Firqatu’n-Nájiya*, i.e. the Shí’a of the Sect of the Twelve) became divided into *Akhhbáris* and *Mujtahids*,” and the contents of his book *al-Fawá’idu’l-Madaniyya*⁶⁸⁴ consist for the most part of vituperation of the *Mujtahids*, whom he often accused of “destroying the true Religion.” A later doctor of this school, Mírzá Muḥammad *Akhhbári* of Baḥrayn, entertained so great a hatred for the *Mujtahids* that he promised Fath-‘Alí Sháh that he would in forty days cause to be brought to Tíhrán the head of a certain Russian general who was at that time invading and devastating the frontier provinces of Persia, on condition that Fath-‘Alí Sháh would, in case of his success, “abrogate and abandon the *Mujtahids*,

[page 375]

extirpate and eradicate them root and branch, and make the *Akhhbári* doctrine current throughout all the lands of Persia.” The Sháh consented, and thereupon the *Akhhbári* doctor went into retirement for forty days, abstained from all animal food, and proceeded to practise the “envoûtement” of the Russian general, by making a wax figure of him and decapitating it with a sword. According to the story, the head was actually laid before the Sháh just as the period of forty days was expiring, and he thereupon took council with his advisers as to what he should do. These replied, “the sect of the *Mujtahids* is one which hath existed from the time of the Imáms until now, and they are in the right, while the *Akhhbári* sect is scanty in numbers and weak. Moreover it is the beginning of the Qájár dynasty, You might, perhaps, succeed in turning the people from the doctrine [to which they are accustomed], but this might be the cause of disastrous results to the King’s rule, and they might rebel against him. Moreover it might easily happen that Mírzá Muḥammad should be annoyed with you, arrive at an understanding with your enemy, and deal with you as he dealt with the Russian *‘Ishpukhtur*⁶⁸⁵.” The wisest course is that you should propitiate him, excuse yourself to him, and order him to retire to the Holy Thresholds (Karbálá or

⁶⁸⁰ *Qīṣaṣu’l-‘Ulamá*, Lucknow ed., second part, p. 165; Tíhrán ed., p. 281.

⁶⁸¹ *ibid.*, Lucknow ed., second part, p. 52; Tíhrán ed., pp. 200-1.

⁶⁸² *Ibid.*, Lucknow ed., second part, p. 50; Tíhrán ed., p. 199.

⁶⁸³ Bombay lith., p. 122.

⁶⁸⁴ See the *Kashfu’l-Ḥujub*, p. 406, No. 2242. The author wrote the book at Mecca two years before his death.

⁶⁸⁵ *Qīṣaṣu’l-‘Ulamá*, Tíhrán ed., p. 132; Lucknow ed., pp. 188-9. The Russian general is here called *Ishpukhtur* (ايشپختور) which, as my friend M. V. Minorsky informs me, represents “Inspector” (pronounced *Išpex̄tor*), and is, perhaps, influenced in its form by the popular etymology ايشى بوخ دور (in Ottoman Turkish = ايشى بوق در) invented by the Turkish-speaking Ádharbáyjánis, meaning “his work is dirt.” M. Minorsky further informed me that this general’s real name was Tsitsianoff, that he was a Georgian, and that the phrase “Have you

[page 376]

Najaf) and stay there; for it is not expedient for the State that such a person should remain in the capital.” This advice Fath-‘Alí Sháh decided to follow.

The very dry, narrow and formal divines are called by the Persians *Qishrí* (literally “Huskers,” *i.e.* externalists), and to these the *Akhbáris* in particular belong, but also many of the *Uşúlis*, like Mírzá Ibráhím, the son of the celebrated Mullá Şadrá, one of the teachers of Sayyid Ni‘matu’lláh Jazá’irí, who used to glory in the fact that his belief was that of the common people, and Mullá ‘Alí Núrí, who used to pray that God would keep him in the current popular faith⁶⁸⁶. On the other hand we have the more liberal-minded divines, whose theology was tinctured with Philosophy or Şúfiism, the *Mutakallimún*, who strove to reconcile Philosophy with Religion and closely resemble the School-men of mediaeval Europe, and finally the pure philosophers, like the celebrated Mullá Şadrá of Shíráz, who, however little their ultimate conclusions accorded with orthodox theology, had generally had the training of the ‘*ulamá* and were drawn from the same class.

The literature produced by this large and industrious body of men, both in Arabic and Persian, is naturally enormous, but the bulk of it is so dull or so technical that no one but a very leisured and very pious Shí‘a scholar would dream of reading it. The author of the *Qişaşu’l-‘Ulamá* remarks⁶⁸⁷ that the ‘*ulamá* often live to a very advanced age, and as their habits are, as a rule, sedentary and studious, and they devote a large portion of their time to writing, it is not unusual to find a single author credited with one or two hundred books

[page 377]

and pamphlets. Thus the author of the *Qişaşu’l-‘Ulamá* enumerates 169 of his own works, besides glosses, tracts and minor writings⁶⁸⁸, of those of Mullá Muhsin-i-Fayd (Fayz), 69 by name, but he adds that the total number is nearly 200⁶⁸⁹; of those of Muḥammad ibn ‘Alí...ibn Bábawayhi, entitled *aş-Şadıq*, 189⁶⁹⁰, and so on. Many of these writings are utterly valueless, consisting of notes or glosses on super-commentaries or commentaries on texts, grammatical, logical, juristic or otherwise, which texts are completely buried and obscured by all this misdirected ingenuity and toil. It was of this class of writings that the late Grand Muftí of Egypt and Chancellor of al-Azhar Shaykh Muḥammad ‘Abduh, one of the most able and enlightened Muhammadan divines of our time, was wont to say that they ought all to be burned as hindrances rather than aids to learning.

The works on jurisprudence (*Fiqh*) also, even the best, are as a rule very unreadable to a non-Muslim. What is taught in English universities as “Muhammadan Law” is, of course, only a portion of the subject as understood in the Lands of Islám. The *Sharí‘at*, or Holy Law, includes not only Civil and Criminal Law, but such personal religious obligations as Prayer and the Purifications necessary for its due performance; Alms; Fasting; Pilgrimage; and the Holy War (*Jihád*), which subjects, with their innumerable ramifications and the hair-splitting casuistry applied to all sorts of contingencies arising from them, constitute perhaps one half of the whole. It is curious that, in spite of the neglect of Shí‘a theology by European Orientalists, one of the best European books on Muhammadan Jurisprudence treats of Shí‘a Law. This is M. Amédée Querry’s *Droit Musulman: Recueil de Lois*

[page 378]

*concernant les Musulmans Schyites*⁶⁹¹; and the European reader who wishes to form an idea of the subject, with all its intricate, and, to the non-Muslim mind, puerile and even disgusting details, cannot do better than consult this monumental work, which is based on the *Sharáyi ‘u’l-Islám fi masá‘ili ‘l-Ḥalál wa ‘l-Ḥarám*⁶⁹² of the celebrated Shí‘a doctor Najmu’d-Din Abu’l-Qásim Ja‘far ibn al-Ḥasan...al-Hillí, commonly called *al-Muḥaqqiq al-Awwal* (“the First Verifier” or “Investigator”), who died in 676/1277-8. Other works of authority, enumerated in the Preface (vol. i, p. vii) were also consulted, as well as leading contemporary Persian jurists, by M. Querry, whose twenty-five years’ sojourn in Turkey and Persia, where he occupied important official positions, such as counsellor of the French Legation at Tíhrán, singularly fitted him for the arduous task which he so ably accomplished. An excellent Index of Arabic technical terms explained in the course of the book greatly enhances its value.

Mention should be made in this connection of a Persian catechism on problems of jurisprudence (*fiqh*) entitled *Su‘ál u Jawáb* (“Question and Answer”), by the eminent *mujtahid* Hájji Sayyid Muḥammad Báqir, whose severity in enforcing the

brought the Inspector’s head?” (مگوسر اشیختررا آوردی) is still used proverbially to one who presents himself in great hurry and excitement, as though in fulfilment of some very important commission.

⁶⁸⁶ *Qişaşu’l-‘Ulamá*, Tíhrán ed., p. 248; Lucknow ed., second part p. 107.

⁶⁸⁷ Lucknow ed., p. 65.

⁶⁸⁸ *Qişaşu’l-‘Ulamá*, Lucknow ed., pp. 77-85.

⁶⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, second part, pp. 112-16.

⁶⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, second part, pp. 183-6.

⁶⁹¹ Two vols. of pp. viii + 768 and 669 respectively (Paris, Maisonneuve, 1871-2).

⁶⁹² See p. 54, n. 3, *supra*.

death-penalty in cases where it is enacted by the Ecclesiastical Law has been already mentioned⁶⁹³. This work, composed subsequently to 1236/1820, was very beautifully printed in 1247/1832, apparently at Işfahán, under the supervision of Mirzá Zaynu'l-Ábidín of Tabríz, “the introducer of this art into Persia.” It comprises 162 ff. of 29'6 x 20'5 c. and 28 lines, and the letters س (*su'ál*, “question”) and ج (*jawáb*, “answer”)

[page 379]

are throughout inserted by hand in red. I possess only one volume, which was to have been followed by a second, but whether this was ever completed I do not know⁶⁹⁴. The topics are arranged in the usual order, beginning with the personal obligations of purification, prayer, alms, fasting and pilgrimage, and ending with the *Kitábu'l-Wadí'at*, dealing with objects deposited in trust in the hands of another. An Introduction on “Principles” (*Uşúl*) is prefixed to the whole, and in each book, or section, various problems connected with the topic in question are propounded, with the author's decisions, the whole in the form of dialogue. Thus the Introduction begins abruptly, without any doxology, with the following question:

Q. “If a person follows the opinions of one of the *mujtahids* (may God increase the like of them!) during the life of that *mujtahid*, is it lawful after his death for that person to continue to follow him and act according to his sayings, or not?”

The answer, which fills nearly a page, is to the effect that it is not lawful so to do, and that the person in question should transfer his allegiance to some other *mujtahid*. Numerous authorities are cited in support of this view, amongst them Muḥammad Báqir (presumably al-Majlisi), Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdí, the “Second Martyr” (*ash-Shahidu'th-Thání*), and the “Second Verifier” or “Investigator” (*al-Muḥaqqiqu'th-Thání*).

The “books,” or sections, are of very unequal length, that on Prayer occupying nearly 70 ff., and other “books,” including the last, on Trusts, only half a page. Of the latter, which contains only two questions and their answers, the full translation is as follows:

[page 380]

Q. — “Zayd⁶⁹⁵ sends an article in trust to a trustee, bidding him give it to So-and-so. After the arrival of the article, the trustee learns for certain that the article entrusted to him belongs to 'Amr⁶⁹⁶, and that the hand of the sender, etc., is the hand of borrowing and usurpation. Moreover 'Amr lays claim to the trust, saying, ‘This trust committed to thee is my property.’ The trustee also admits the validity of his claim to the property, but says, ‘He sent it to me to give it to So-and-so; I will not give it to thee.’ Has 'Amr legally power to assume possession of the property and take it from the trustee, or not? And to whom should the trustee surrender the trust, so that he may be cleared of all further responsibility?”

A. — “If what has been penned actually corresponds with the facts of the case, that is to say, if the trustee knows that the property belongs to 'Amr, and that the hand of the sender of it is the hand of usurpation and violence, it is incumbent on the said trustee to surrender such property to its owner, whether the sender gives permission for such surrender or not. For such trustee to say to 'Amr, having knowledge of the fact that the said property really belongs to him, ‘I will not give it to thee, in view of the fact that the sender of it bade me give it to So-and-so, not to thee,’ is incompatible with the functions of a trustee, and is not conformable to the Holy Law.”

Q. — “If Zayd shall have deposited an article in trust with 'Amr, and if nearly seventeen years shall have passed, and if, notwithstanding 'Amr's urgent insistence with Zayd that he should remove the said article, he neglects to do so, and the said article, without any excess or defect of action⁶⁹⁷ [on 'Amr's part], perishes, is 'Amr liable to any penalty, or not?”

A. — “Provided the details as set forth in writing correspond with the facts, there will be no penalty.”

This sample of Shí'a jurisprudence must suffice, but such as desire a further illustration of the matters which preoccupy the minds of these jurisconsults and doctors may with profit read the narrative of the trial of the Báb at Tabríz for heresy about A.D. 1848, of which an account,

[page 381]

based on the principal Persian narratives, will be found in vol. ii of my *Travellers Narrative*, pp. 277-90.

We turn now to the more interesting subject of Shí'a theology, which has hitherto hardly attracted the attention it deserves from European Orientalists, and can only receive brief and inadequate treatment here. It must suffice to sketch in outline the current popular creed, without considering its evolution from early times, and to mention a few of the chief doctrinal works written in Persian during or since the Şafawí period. For the purpose of this outline, however, I choose not

⁶⁹³ See p. 368 *supra*. His life is given very fully in the *Qişáşu'l-'Ulamá* (Lucknow ed., pp. 129-78).

⁶⁹⁴ The British Museum Library also possesses only this one volume. See E. Edwards's *Catalogue* (1922), col. 458. The *Qişáşu'l-'Ulamá* gives 1227/1812 as the date of composition, but on f. 28^b of the text, line 2, Muḥarram 1236/Oct. 1820 is mentioned as the current date.

⁶⁹⁵ 'Amr and Zayd in Muslim jurisprudence correspond to “John Doe” and “Richard Roe” of English law-books; in grammar to Balbus and Caius; and in common speech to “Tom, Dick, and Harry.”

⁶⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁹⁷ *I.e.* without any fault of commission or omission on his part.

one of the larger, more authoritative and more famous books like the *Ḥaqqu'l-Yaqīn* (“Certain Truth”) of Mullá Muḥammad Báqir-i-Majlisí, but a little manual entitled *‘Aqá’idu’sh-Shí‘a* (“Beliefs of the Shí‘a”) composed during the reign of Muḥammad Sháh Qájár (before the middle of the nineteenth century of our era) by a certain ‘Alí Aṣghar ibn ‘Alí Akbar, and lithographed in Persia without indication of place or date. This work, comprising 438 (unnumbered) pages, consists of an Introduction (*Muqaddama*), five sections called *Mishkát*, and a Conclusion (*Khátima*). The contents are briefly as follows:

Introduction (*Muqaddama*).

Sets forth that God has not created mankind in vain, but that they should worship and serve Him, and reap the recompense of their actions in the next world. He has sent, to make known to them His Will and Law, numerous prophets, of whom Muḥammad is the last and greatest. He left behind him the Scripture (the *Qur’án*) and his holy descendants and representatives for the continued guidance of mankind. In these days of the Greater Occultation (*Ghaybat-i-Kubrā*)⁶⁹⁸ wherein we live, the true faith is deduced

[page 382]

from the *Qur’án* and the sayings and traditions of the Holy Imáms. According to these, three things are required of us: (1) heartfelt belief; (2) oral confession; (3) certain prescribed acts. These are ascertained either by personal investigation and “endeavour” (*ijtihád*), or by adopting the opinions of such investigator (*mujtahid*) by conformity to his authority (*taqlid*). The author concludes by enumerating a number of heresies to be avoided, such as Pantheism (*waḥdatu'l-wujúd*); Apotheosis and Incarnation (*ittihád wa ḥulúl*); Determinism or Fatalism (*jabr*); Antinomianism (*suqút-i-‘ibádát*) consequent on self-mortification and discipline (*riyáqát*); Communism (*ibáhat*)⁶⁹⁹; Deification and adoration of the Imáms; denial of the Resurrection of the body, or of any future life; sanction of the use of musical instruments, and of narcotic or intoxicating substances; Metempsychosis (*tanásukh*); Anthropomorphism (*tashbíh*), and the like.

Mishkát I (pp. 7-28), in four sections (*Miṣbáḥ*). *What is to be believed concerning the Essence and Attributes of God.*

Belief in the Unity of God (*tawḥíd*) is fourfold, namely:

Section i. *Unity of the Divine Essence (Tawḥíd-i-Dhátí)*. God is One, without partner, peer or equal; Holy; Perfect; Free from defect; not composite, or capable of being so conceived, imagined, or apprehended; neither Body, nor Light, nor Substance, nor Accident; not located, nor born, nor producing offspring; Invisible both in this world and the next⁷⁰⁰, even to the

[page 383]

Prophets, Imáms and Saints, but known to us only by His acts and the signs of His Power; neither eating, nor drinking, nor clothing Himself; exempt from anger, vexation, pain, joy, height, depth, change, progression, or retrogression; Eternal and absolutely independent of all else. His Attributes are identical with His Essence, not added to or superimposed on His Essence. These Attributes are for the most part negative, and are called *Ṣifát-i-Salbiyya* or “Privative Attributes.”

Here again the author digresses to denounce various heresies of the Ṣúfís, especially the idea that beautiful persons are especially the Mirrors or Tabernacles of God, and the doctrine of Pantheism (*Waḥdatu'l-Wujúd*), according to which the relation of Phenomena to Absolute Being is similar to that between the Waves and the Sea, or to sunlight passing through windows of variously coloured glass.

Section ii. *Unity of the Divine Attributes (Tawḥíd-i-Ṣifátí)*. These Attributes are of several kinds, namely (1) “Essential Attributes” (*Ṣifát-i-Dhátí*)⁷⁰¹, to wit, Life, Power, with its derivative Speech, and Knowledge, with its derivatives Will and Comprehension. To these six some theologians add Eternity and Truth, but these, like Speech, Will and Comprehension, are Secondary Attributes, while Life, Power and Knowledge are primary. (2) The “Privative” or “Negative Attributes” (*Ṣifát-i-Salbiyya*), also called the “Attributes of Glory” (*Jalál*) as opposed to “Perfection” (*Kamál*) and

⁶⁹⁸ This began in 260/873-4, when the Twelfth and last Imám disappeared, to return in “the Last Time.”

⁶⁹⁹ Communism was preached in Persia in Sásánian times (sixth Christian century) by Mazdak. From his time until that of the Bábis this accusation has been brought against many heterodox sects.

⁷⁰⁰ Ḥáfiz has accordingly been blamed by one of his critics for the verse:

این جانِ عاریت که بحافظ سپرد دوست

روزی رخس ببینم و تسلیم وی کنم

“This borrowed spirit which the Friend hath entrusted to Ḥáfiz,
one day I shall see His Face and surrender it to Him.”

⁷⁰¹ Or “Positive” (*Thubútiyya*), or *Ṣifát-i-Kamál*, “Attributes of Perfection.”

[page 384]

“Beauty” (*Jamál*), are seven qualities from which God is exempt, namely, Compositeness, Corporeality, Visibility, Locality, Association or Partnership, Unreality, and Need. (3) “Effective Attributes” (*Ṣifāt-i-Fi’lī*), or “Attributes of Beauty” (*Ṣifāt-i-Jamál*), are acts which may be ascribed or not ascribed to God at different times and in different circumstances, like “the Provider” (*Rāziq*), “the Creator” (*Khāliq*), “the Merciful, the Compassionate” (*Rahmán, Rahīm*), “the Bounteous” (*Jawād*), and so forth. In this section reference is made to other views entertained by the Ash‘arīs, the Mu‘tazila, the Kirámīs, al-Balkhī, an-Najjār, Ḥasan of Baṣra, etc.

Section iii. *Creative Unity of God (Tawḥid-i-Khalqī)*. God alone can create, and it is heresy to believe with the Zoroastrians that God creates only what is good, and the Devil what is evil. But God can and does use means to this end, and can delegate His creative powers to Angels or other agents. “The good or evil manifested through God’s plenipotentiary servants⁷⁰² is not God’s act but their act, wherefore they are the recipients of reward or punishment, by reason of the option which they enjoy, so that they themselves, by their own

[page 385]

volition, do those things which God hath commanded or forbidden. For although they act by virtue of a power and strength which they do not in themselves possess, but which God hath conferred upon them, yet, since He hath given them this option, He hath also assigned to them rewards and punishments. Yet God is the Creator of Good and Evil, while His servant is but the agent and doer thereof. Since, however, this treatise is designed for the common people, it would be out of place for us to discuss this matter [more fully] here.”

The author next proceeds to refute certain opinions entertained by the extreme Shí‘a (Ghulát), such as that ‘Alí can create, with or without God’s permission; or that he is the “Assigner of Daily Bread” (*Qásimu’l-Arzáq*); or that God obtained his permission to create the universe; or that he put his hand under his prayer-mat and brought forth in it the heavens and the earth. It may, however, be believed, as is implied in sundry traditions, that on the Day of Judgement God will leave “the Reckoning” with ‘Alí or other of the Imáms, and will accept their intercession, and the like. Hence ‘Alí is entitled “the Face of God” (*Wajhu’lláh*), “the Hand of God” (*Yadu’lláh*), “the Gate of God” (*Bábu’lláh*), and the like.

It is also necessary to believe in *al-Bidá*, or God’s sovereign Will, that He does what He pleases; and that He can create what He pleases “without material or period” (*bilá mádda wa mudda*), that is, from nothing in the twinkling of an eye.

Section iv. *Unity of Worship (Tawḥid-i-’Ibádātī)*. Worship is the exclusive prerogative of God, and of the Divine Essence, not of the Attributes. To worship an Attribute or Name (such as “the Word of God”) apart from the Essence is unbelief, while to worship an Attribute in conjunction with the Essence is polytheism. This is of two sorts, patent and latent. The

[page 386]

former includes the external worship of idols, trees, stars, the sun and moon, fire and human beings; or of symbols, such as crucifixes or pictures of holy persons; the latter includes excessive devotion to wife or child, or worldly wealth, or ambition, or hypocritical ostentation of piety. The visitation of the Ka‘ba at Mecca and the Tombs of the Holy Imáms is, however, permitted; as also bowing down before kings or holy and learned men, provided there be not actual prostration (*sujúd*), and that no worship be intended.

Mishkát II (pp. 28-31).

What is to be believed concerning the justice of God.

“It is necessary to believe that God is just, not a tyrant and that at no time hath He acted, or doth He or will He act, unjustly towards any one. This is a fundamental article of our Faith, and whosoever holds the contrary is eternally damned.” Thus begins this section, of which the most interesting portion again deals with the question of Free Will and Predestination. “It is also necessary to believe that God neither compels His creatures to act in a given way (*jabr*, ‘compulsion’), nor allows

⁷⁰² This passage is so important in connection with the doctrine of Free Will and Predestination that I give it in the original:

وَأَمَّا خَيْرٌ وَ شَرٌّ أَوْ بِنْدُكَانٍ مُخْتَارٍ ظَاهِرٌ مِشْوَدٌ كَارِ خُدَا نِيسْت بَلَكِه
كَارِ بِنْدِه اِسْت لِهِنَا مُوَرِّدٌ ثَوَابٍ وَ عِقَابٍ مِشْوَدٌ بَاخْتِيَارِيكِه دَارِنْد
وَ بَخْوَاهِشِ خُودِ بَخُودِ مِكَنِنْدِ اَنبِهَارَا كِه خُدَاوِنْدِ اَمْرٍ وَ نِهِي
نِمُوْدِه اِسْت اِكْرَجِه اَيْشَانِ هِرِ بَقْدِرْتِ وَ قُوْتِي كِه نَدَارِنْدِ بَايْشَانِ
عَطَا فَرْمُوْدِه اِسْت مِكَنِنْدِ لَكِنِ چُونِ اَخْتِيَارَا هِرِ بَايْشَانِ دَادِ پَسِ
ثَوَابٍ وَ عِقَابَا هِرِ فَرَارِ دَادِ وَ اَمَّا خُدَا خَالِقِ خَيْرِ وَ شَرِّ اِسْت وَ
بِنْدِه فَاعِلِ وَ كُنِنْدِه اَوْسْت ‘ بَارِي چُونِ [اَيْنِ] رَسَالِه بَهْجِه عَوَامِرِ اِسْت
مَحَلِّ كَلَامِ بَا [مَا؟] اَيْنِجَا نِيسْت ‘

them unrestricted choice (*tafwīd*), but pursues a course intermediate between these two: that is to say that He has created them equally capable of both good and evil, so that they neither act under such compulsion that their deeds are in reality God's deeds, nor can they do what they do by their own strength and power without God's assistance. The former belief is Determinism or Fatalism (*jabr*) and the latter Free Will (*tafwīd*). The correct view is that, whatever they do, they do voluntarily, not by compulsion and constraint, although God furnishes them with the power, means, and instruments, and has indicated to them the paths of good and evil, so that whoever elects to do good becomes deserving of reward, while he who elects to do evil becomes deserving of punishment."

[page 387]

The author illustrates this by the example of a carpenter's apprentice, who, having been taught his craft and furnished with the necessary tools, is bidden by his master to make a window of a certain size and description. If instead of this he makes a door, he cannot excuse himself by pleading that his master taught him the craft and gave him the tools which enabled him to make the door. Such is the case of man if he misuses the powers and limbs which God hath given him. Here follows the well-known story⁷⁰³ of the sceptic whose three questions were answered by a *darwish* who struck him on the head with a clod, but here Abú Ḥanīfa and Buhlúl (the "wise fool") take the parts of the sceptic and the *darwish* respectively.

The author's theory that God created the hearts of believers, unbelievers, and waverers each from a different clay, "Knowing before He created them that the believer by reason of his belief would be good, and the unbeliever by reason of his unbelief bad, and so creating each of the appropriate substance, so that there might be no question of compulsion" (*jabr*), is not very convincing.

Mishkát III (pp. 32-45).

On the Prophetic Function, general and special.

Section i. *The general Prophetic Function (Nubuwwat-i-'amma).* The number of the true prophets antecedent to Muḥammad, "the Seal of the Prophets and the last of them," is variously stated as from 140 to 124,000. It is necessary to believe that these, whatever their actual number, were true and immaculate (*ma'súm*), that is, that during the whole of their lives they were guilty of no sin, major or minor; that they all enunciated the same essential truths; and that the revela-

[page 388]

tions which they received were essentially identical, though in detail the later abrogate the earlier, to wit, the *Qur'án* the Gospel, and the Gospel the Pentateuch (*Tawrá*) These three, together with the Psalms of David (*Zubúr*) and the Books of Abraham (*Shuḥuf*), are the principal Scriptures, but the total number of revealed books is estimated by some as 104 and by others as 124. Of the Prophets sent to all mankind (*mursal*) four (Adam, Seth, Enoch or Idris and Noah) were Syrians; five (Húd, Šálih, Shu'ayb, Ishmael and Muḥammad) were Arabs, and the remainder of the Children of Israel. The five great Prophets called *Ulu'l-'Azm* are Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Muḥammad.

Section ii. *The Special Prophetic Function [of Muḥammad] (Nubuwwat-i-Kháṣṣa).* It is necessary to believe that Muhammad was the last of all the Prophets, and that anyone after him who claims to be a prophet is an unbeliever and should be killed by the Muslims. Also that in every virtue and excellence he surpasses all other beings; that his "Light" (Núr-i-Muḥammad) was created thousands of years before all other creatures; that he was sent not only to all mankind but to the *Jinn*; and that his doctrine and law abrogate all preceding ones.

Section iii. *What is to be believed touching the Qur'án.* It is the last and greatest of revealed Scriptures, abrogating all others, and is the miracle of Muḥammad, though not the product of his mind; it is temporal (*ḥadīth*), not eternal (*qadīm*); was revealed in the pure Arabic language (as were all the Scriptures, though each prophet received his revelation in the language of his people), and was sent down on the *Laylatu'l-Qadr* ("Night of Worth") in its entirety from the Preserved Tablet (*Lawḥ-i-Mahfūz*), but was revealed by Gabriel in instalments, as occasion arose, over a period of 23 years.

[page 389]

Neither men nor *Jinn*, though all should combine, can produce the like of the *Qur'án*, or even one chapter or verse of it. It contains all truth and all knowledge, and the full interpretation of it is known only to God, the Prophet, and the Imáms, and those "firmly established in Knowledge" to whom they have imparted it. The original *Qur'án* is in the keeping of the Hidden Imám, and has undergone no change or corruption.

Section iv. *The Prophet's Attributes.* He was "illiterate" (*ummi*), having never studied or received instruction from men or *Jinn*; he cast no shadow; a cloud used to overshadow his head; he could see behind his back as well as before his face; he was luminous to such a degree that in his presence on the darkest night his wives could find a lost needle without the aid of lamp or candle. His birth was heralded and accompanied by miracles, enumerated in detail. He was immaculate (*ma'súm*), and the most excellent of all beings. Gabriel was really his servant, and 'Azrá'il (the Angel of Death) could not approach him

⁷⁰³ It is included in the extracts at the end of Forbes's *Persian Grammar*, No. 67, pp. ۶۷-۶۸.

to receive his soul without his permission. He was neither a poet (*shá'ir*), nor a magician (*sáhir*), nor a liar (*kadhhab*), nor a madman (*díwána*), and to assert any of these things is blasphemy. He had five souls or spirits, of which the first three (called *Rúh-i-mudraj*, *Rúh-quwwat*, and *Rúh-i-shahwat*) are common to all men; the fourth, *Rúh-i-imán*, "the Spirit of Faith," is peculiar to true believers; while the last, "the Holy Spirit" (*Rúhu'l-Quds*), belongs to the Prophet alone, and his successors, the Holy Imáms.

Section v. *The Prophet's Miracles.* These included the Cleaving of the Moon (*shaqqu'l-qamar*); knowledge of the Past, the Future, and the Unseen; raising the dead; knowledge of 72 out of the 73 Names of God, whereof not more than twenty were known to any previous Prophet, and the like. He saw

[page 390]

Paradise and Hell with his own eyes, and ascended into Heaven in his material body, clad in his own clothes, and wearing his sandals, which he would have put off on approaching God's Throne, but was forbidden by God to do so.

Section vi. *The Prophet's Ascension (Mi'ráj).* He ascended in his material body to the Station of "Two bow-shots or less"⁷⁰⁴, a point nearer to God than that attained by Enoch or Jesus or any angel or archangel. To assert that this Ascension was allegorical, or within himself, or spiritual and esoteric, is heresy.

Section vii. *Sundry other beliefs concerning the Prophet.* He was "a mortal man to whom revelations were made"⁷⁰⁵ in various ways mediate and immediate. He combined in himself the functions of Apostle (*Rasúl*), Prophet (*Nabí*), *Imám*, and *Muḥaddith*, by which is here meant one who sees and holds converse with the Angels. His intercession for sinners will be accepted in the Day of Resurrection and God has bestowed on him, within certain limits, authority to command and prohibit, and to add to the obligations imposed by God in such matters as prayer and fasting. He explicitly appointed his cousin and son-in-law 'Alí ibn Abí Ṭálib to succeed him; but to assert that Gabriel took the Revelation from a well in a plain, and, receiving permission from God to see who was the author, looked into the well and saw that it was 'Alí; or that Gabriel mistook Muḥammad for 'Alí and brought the Revelation to him by mistake, are blasphemous heresies.

[page 391]

Mishkát IV (pp. 45-71). *On the Imámate.*

Section i. Enumeration of the Twelve Imáms of the *Ithná-'ashariyya* or "Sect of the Twelve," and refutation of the Sunnis, who recognize Abú Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmán as the *Khulafá*, or successors and vicegerents of the Prophet; of the Kaysániyya, who accept Muḥammad ibnu'l-Ḥanafíyya, a son of 'Alí by another wife than Fátima, as Imám; of the Zaydiyya, who accept Zayd ibn Ḥasan; of the Isma'íliyya, who accept Isma'íl in place of his brother Músá al-Kázim; of the Aftahiyya, who accept 'Abdu'lláh al-Aftah, another son of Ja'far aṣ-Ṣádiq the sixth Imám, and so forth. The Kaysánis, Zaydis, Isma'ílis, Ṭá'úsís, Aftahís and Wáqifis all belong to the Shí'a, but not to the "Sect of the Twelve," and they will all be tormented in Hell for their error, though they are Muslims, as are even the Sunnis, who are therefore pure, wherefore, according to the prevailing view, it is not lawful to interfere with their lives, wives or property, though some Shí'a doctors hold the contrary view.

Section ii. *Knowledge of the Prophet and Imáms.* This section is entirely historical or quasi-historical, giving the dates of the births, deaths, and chief events in the lives of Muḥammad and the Twelve Imáms.

The Prophet Muḥammad was born on Friday 17th (or 12th) of Rabí' i in the "Year of the Elephant," in the year 1021 of Alexander, and in the Seventh year of the reign of Anúsharwán "the Just." He lived 63 years, of which 53 were spent at Mecca and ten at al-Madína, and his "Mission" began when he was forty years old. He had nine (or 12, or 15) wives and two concubines; four sons, Qásim, Ṭáhir and Ṭayyib by Khadíja, and Ibráhím by Mary the Copt; and three

[page 392]

daughters, Fátima (who married 'Alí), and Zaynab and Ruqayya, who were married to 'Uthmán. He died (poisoned by a Jewess of Khaybar, as asserted) on Monday the 27th or 28th of Ṣafar, and was buried at al-Madína.

'Alí ibn Abí Ṭálib was the immediate legitimate successor of the Prophet and the First Imám though not formally recognized as Khalífa until after the deaths of Abú Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmán (whom the Shí'a regard as usurpers). He waged three great wars, with the *Qásitín* ("wrong-doers"), i.e. Mu'áwiya the Umayyad and his partisans; the *Nákithín* ("troth-breakers"), i.e. 'Á'isha, Ṭalḥa and Zubayr; and the *Máriqín* ("rebels"), i.e. the Khárijites. He was assassinated by Ibn Muljam on Ramaḍán 21 at the age of sixty-three. He married twelve wives after the death of Fátima and had seventeen sons and nineteen daughters. His father Abú Ṭálib was inwardly a believer, though he made no outward profession of Islám. 'Alí is supposed to have been the twelfth of the *Awṣiyá* (executors, trustees, or vicegerents) of Jesus Christ.

⁷⁰⁴ *Qur'án*, liii, 9.

⁷⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, xviii, 110.

Fāṭima was the daughter of the Prophet by Khadīja, and the wife of ‘Alī, to whom she bore three sons (al-Ḥasan, al-Ḥusayn and Muḥassin), and two daughters (Zaynab the elder and Umm Kulthūm). She died, aged about eighteen, on the 3rd of Jumádá ii, A.H. 11 (26 August, 632).

Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī, the Second Imám, was born in Sha‘bān or Ramaḍān, A.H. 3 (January or March, 625), resigned the position of Khalīfa to Mu‘āwiya, to safeguard himself and his followers, after he had held it for ten years and a half, and died of poison administered to him by Ja‘da the daughter of al-Ash‘ath ibn Nafis, known as Asmá, at the instigation of Mu‘āwiya, nine years and a half later. He is said to have had 60 wives, besides concubines, but others say 300 or even 600,

[page 393]

of whom he divorced so many that he earned the nick-name of *al-Miṭlāq* (“the great divorcer”); and to have had fifteen sons and two daughters, though here again there is much difference of opinion. The best known of his numerous titles is *al-Mujtabá*.

Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī, the Third Imám, was born only six months (*sic*) after his brother Ḥasan; had five wives besides concubines; six sons, ‘Alī Akbar, who succeeded him as Imám, ‘Alī Awsaṭ, ‘Alī Aṣghar, Muḥammad, Ja‘far and ‘Abdu’llāh; and three daughters, Fāṭimatu’l-Kubrā, Sakína and Faṭimatu’ṣ-Ṣuḡhrá. Account of his death at Karbalá on Muḥarram 10, A.H. 61 (October 10, 680) with 72 of his kinsmen and partisans at the age of 56, 57 or 58. Of his titles the best known is “the Chief of Martyrs” (*Sayyidu’sh-Shuhadá*).

‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn, the Fourth Imám, commonly known as *Zaynu’l-‘Abidin* and *Sayyid-i-Sajjád*. His mother was the daughter of Yazdigird, the last Sásánian King of Persia. Her name was Shahrbánú, or, according to others, Ghazála or Saláma. He was born in 36/656-7 or 38/658-9. He had one wife, his cousin Umm ‘Abdi’llāh, daughter of al-Ḥasan, besides concubines. He had sixteen children (seven or twelve sons, and nine or four daughters). One of his sons, Zayd, was killed by the Umayyad Caliph Hishám ibn ‘Abdu’l-Malik, who is also said to have poisoned him in 94/712 when he was fifty-seven years of age.

Muḥammad Báqir, the Fifth Imám, was born in A.H. 57 or 58 (A.D. 676-8), and is said to have been poisoned by the Umayyads in 104/722 or 107/726-7. [From this point onwards there are so many discrepancies and conflicting statements that a more rigorous abridgment seems desirable. Thus the age of this Imám is given as 57 or 58, or even 78, all of which,

[page 394]

especially the last, are absolutely incompatible with the dates given for his birth and death.]

Ja‘far aṣ-Ṣádiq, the Sixth Imám, born 80/699-700, poisoned by the ‘Abbásid Caliph al-Manṣúr in 148/765-6. He took advantage of the internecine strife between the Umayyads and ‘Abbásids to carry on an active propaganda for the Shí‘a doctrine, which is therefore often called after him “Ja‘farí.”

Músá al-Káẓim, the Seventh Imám, born 129/746-7, poisoned by Hárúnu’r-Rashíd in 180/796-7.

‘Alī ar-Riḍá, the Eighth Imám, poisoned by al-Ma‘mún in 203/818-9, and buried at Mashhad.

Muḥammad Taqí, the Ninth Imám, born 195/810-11, poisoned by his wife at the instigation of the Caliph al-Mu‘taṣim in 220/835.

‘Alī Naqí, the Tenth Imám, born in 212/827-8, poisoned in 245/868 at the instigation of the Caliph al-Mu‘tazz.

Ḥasan al-‘Askarí, the Eleventh Imám, born 232/846-7 poisoned in 260/873-4 at the instigation of the Caliph al-Mu‘tamid.

The **Imám Mahdí**, also called **Qá’imu ‘Alī Muḥammad**, **Ḥujjatu’llāh** and **Baqiyyatu’llāh**, the Twelfth and last Imám, born in 255/869 by Narjis Khátún to Ḥasan al-‘Askarí, disappeared in 260/873-4, is still living and will return “in the last Days” to establish the Shí‘a faith and “fill the earth with justice after it has been filled with iniquity.”

Section iii. Attributes of the Imáms. It is necessary to believe that the Imáms were created from one pre-existing Light; that all blessings and all knowledge of God come through them; that through them the universe lives and moves and has its being; and that they are in every respect the most excellent of beings after the Prophet Muḥammad, and superior to all other Prophets and to the Angels, though subject to all

[page 395]

human needs and functions. They are also immaculate (*ma‘ṣúm*), innocent of any sin, small or great, co-equal, endowed with every virtue, knowledge and power. Their birth was not as that of ordinary mortals, and, like the Prophet, they were born a circumcised. After many further amplifications of the Imáms’ perfections, the author proceeds to warn his readers against certain opinions of the *Ghulát*, or most extreme Shí‘a, who would put them above the Prophet and even deify them.

Mishkát V⁷⁰⁶ (pp. 71-85).

⁷⁰⁶ Like so many Persian books, the actual divisions of this book do not correspond with the Table of Contents, which indicates five main divisions, each called *Mishkát*, while only four such headings actually occur in the text. This section is described as Section (*Miṣbah*) iv of *Mishkát* IV, but it introduces a quite new topic and should, I am convinced, be called, as I have called it, *Mishkát* V.

Section i. Death. The Angels, the Prophet and the Imáms are present at every death-bed, whether of a believer or an unbeliever. When the spirit leaves the body, it attaches itself to a subtle invisible body (*qálib-i-mitháli-i-laṭíf*) which is a simulacrum of the material body in the intermediate world or “World of the Barrier” (*‘Álam-i-Barzakh*). To believe, as do some of the common people, that these disembodied spirits enter the crops of green birds or lamps attached to the Throne of God (*‘Arsh*) is an error. This disembodied spirit watches the body it has quitted and the preparations for its burial, urging haste if it be a believing spirit, and delay if unbelieving, but none hears or heeds its appeal. It also sees its place in Heaven or Hell, as the case may be. A believer’s death is not always easy, nor an unbeliever’s hard. The Prophet’s description of the Angel of Death, whom he saw during his Night Ascent to Heaven.

[page 396]

Section ii. The Questioning of the Tomb. When the body has been buried and the mourners have dispersed, the spirit returns to the body to undergo the Questioning of the Tomb (*Su’ál-i-qabr*) at the hands of the Angels Munkir and Nakir, whose terrible aspect is described. If the deceased is a believer and gives satisfactory answers to their questions on his beliefs, they leave him in peace, saying, “Sleep as the bride sleeps in her bridal chamber,” and they enlarge his Tomb as far as the eye can see, and open from it a door into Paradise, so that the air of Paradise enters it and gladdens the occupant. But if he is an unbeliever, they revile him and beat him with their clubs, and fill the tomb with fire; and he cries out in agony, so that if men and *Jinn* could hear, they would die of terror. But the animals hear, and that is why a sheep grazing or a bird gathering grain will suddenly stop and shiver and listen intently. Those of the Shí‘a who are buried at Karbalá are said to be exempt from this Questioning, and some believe that the whole plain of Karbalá, rid of all impurities, including the bodies of unbelievers and hypocrites, will be bodily transferred to Paradise. The good deeds and kindnesses of the dead may take the form of a beautiful companion who will bear them company in the tomb and dispel their loneliness⁷⁰⁷.

Section iii. The Squeezing of the Tomb. It is not certain whether all are subject to this, or only the unbelievers. This squeezing is not confined to those who are buried in the ground, for those who are hanged, drowned or eaten by wild beasts are equally subject to it. After the Questioning and the Squeezing, the spirit again leaves the material body and reunites with the subtle invisible body. Opinions differ as to whether this last always existed within the material body, or apart from

[page 397]

it in the “World of Similitudes,” or is specially created for each spirit at the moment of dissolution.

Section iv⁷⁰⁸. *Concerning the Intermediate World* (*‘Álam-i-Barzakh*). *Barzakh* means something intermediate between two other things, in this case a state or world between this life and the next, more subtle than the former and more gross than the latter. Some identify it with the World of Similitudes (*‘Álam-i-Mithál*), others believe it to exist in this world, but in a Eighth Clime outside the Seven Climes, called *Ard-i-Huwar-qilyá*⁷⁰⁹. The Terrestrial Paradise is in the *Wádi’s-Salám* in the western part of this region, and the Terrestrial Hell in the *Wádi Barahút*⁷¹⁰, in the eastern part. In these places respectively the souls of the Blessed and the Lost congregate and experience pleasure or pain, and when a new spirit arrives they let it rest for a while to recover from the “Questioning” and the “Squeezing,” and then interrogate it as to the friends who survived them on earth, whether they be still living or dead.

Section v⁷¹¹. The departed spirits visit their former homes on earth to watch their families and friends, some daily, some weekly, some monthly, some yearly, some only once in several years. Some say they come in the form of green birds and perch on the roof or walls of the house and talk, but the living do not notice or attend to them because of their preoccupation with the things of this world. The spirits of the Blessed see only the

[page 398]

good things which befall, or are wrought by, their families and friends. Some say that they come on a particular day, on Monday at noon, or on Thursday, or on Friday. If their friends remember them, offering good works, prayers or fasting as a present to them, they are pleased; the happiness of the Blessed is increased, and the torments of the Lost alleviated thereby. “Therefore, my dear friend,” says the author, “you must not forget the departed in this world, but must strive, so far as in you lies, to send presents to them.” The Earthly Paradise (*Bihisht-i-Dunyá*) is a place of rest and peace, there is no sorrow or weeping, nor any obligation to pray or fast.

⁷⁰⁷ This affords an interesting parallel to the Zoroastrian belief set forth in the *Arda Viráf náma*.

⁷⁰⁸ This is headed *Miṣbáh v* (of *Mishkát IV*), and the numbering of the sections begins again, but it appears to me really to constitute Section iv of *Mishkát V*.

⁷⁰⁹ Cf. the *Jism-i-Huwarqilyá’i* of the Shaykhís, mentioned in my *Traveller’s Narrative*, vol. ii, p. 236.

⁷¹⁰ See Qazwíni’s *Atháru’l-Bilád*, p. 25; also Halévy in the *Journal Asiatique* for Oct.-Dec. 1883, pp. 442-54; and Yáqút’s *Mu’jamu’l-Buldán*, vol. i, p. 598.

⁷¹¹ Entitled Section ii of *Miṣbáh v* (of *Mishkát IV*).

Section vi⁷¹². *On the spirits of the wicked*. These are also permitted from time to time to visit their homes, but they see only the evil done by their friends, and strive warn them, but cannot, and return to the Earthly Hell more miserable than before. Discussion as to the state after death of the children of believers and unbelievers, the ignorant and feeble-minded, and the insane; and concerning the Recording Angels. According to some, the male children of believers are, after their death, committed to the care of Abraham, and the female children to that of the Virgin Mary.

Conclusion (Khátima)⁷¹³ (pp. 85-132).
Beliefs connected with the Return of the Twelfth Imám.

Section i. *On his Occultation (Ghaybat)*. Three Occultations are distinguished, entitled “Lesser,” “Greater” and “Least.” The “Lesser Occultation” (*Ghaybat-i-Şughrá*) began on the 8th of Rabí‘ i, 260 (Jan. 1, 874), lasted 69 years, and ended with

[page 399]

the death of the last of the four *wakíls*⁷¹⁴ who maintained communication between the Hidden Imám and his followers in 329/940-1. Then began the “Greater Occultation” (*Ghaybat-i-Kubrá*), wherein no one has direct access to the “Hidden Imám⁷¹⁵,” and wherein we are now living. The “Least Occultation” (*Ghaybat-i-Aşghar*) will last only from noon on the Friday succeeding his “Return” (*Raj‘at*), when he will behead the preacher (*Khaţib*) at Mecca and forthwith disappear again, until the morning of the next day (Saturday). The time of the Advent or “Return” of the Imám is known to God alone, but it will be heralded by numerous signs, of which forty-eight or more are enumerated by our author, and of which the most celebrated are the coming of the wicked and hideous Sufyání, whose army the earth will finally swallow up; the appearance of a figure in the sun; the multiplication of misleading divines and lawyers and of poets; the abounding of tyranny and oppression; the appearance of Antichrist (*Dajjál*) riding on his Ass; the assembling of 313 chosen supporters of the Imám in ʾTáliqán of Khurásán, etc. After a “reign of the Saints” lasting seventy years, the Imám will die, poisoned by a woman named Maliha, and the Imám Husayn will return to earth to read the Burial Service over him. This is the beginning of what is called the “Lesser Resurrection” (*Qiyámat-i-Şughrá*), when the

[page 400]

Prophet and all the Imáms, as well as their chief antagonists, shall return to earth for a while, and fight their battles over again, but with a different result, since the unbelievers shall be uniformly defeated. In this first temporary Resurrection only those who are purely believers or unbelievers (*Mú‘min-i-Khális* or *Káfir-i-Khális*) will come to life. Then they will again disappear from the face of the earth, and, after forty days’ anarchy and confusion, the tribes of Gog and Magog (*Yájuj u Májuj*) will burst through the Wall (*Sadd*) which keeps them back, and will overrun the earth, and eat up all the grass and herbs, and drink up the rivers.

The “Greater Resurrection” (*Qiyámat-i-Kubrá*), when all the dead shall be raised to life in the same bodies they had while on earth, re-created by God’s Power as a broken brick can be re-made from its original materials, will be inaugurated by the blast of Isráfil’s trumpet, which shall draw into itself all the spirits of the quick and the dead, so that no living thing shall remain on earth save the “Fourteen Immaculate Ones” (*Chahárdah Ma‘şúm*)⁷¹⁶. Then, when their bodies have been re-created, Isráfil will again blow his trumpet, and the spirits will emerge from it like a swarm of bees, and fly each one to its own body. All animals will also be raised to life to undergo the Reckoning and be judged for their acts of violence towards one another. Then the Balance (*Mizán*) will be set up for the weighing of the good and bad acts of each soul, and the scroll of each man’s deeds, written down by the Recording Angels Sá‘iq and Shahíd, will be placed in his hand.

The Seven Hells (*Jihannam, Sa‘ír, Saqar, Jahím, Lazzá, Hutama* and *Háwiya*) are next enumerated, whereof the first is for Muslims who died in sin without repenting, and who will be released when adequately punished; the second for the Jews;

[page 401]

the third for the Christians; the fourth for the Sabaeans; the fifth for the Magians; the sixth for the idolatrous Arabs; and the seventh for the hypocrites. Unbelievers will remain in Hell for ever, but some, on account of their virtues, will remain there

⁷¹² Entitled Section iii etc., as in the preceding footnote.

⁷¹³ This, I believe, is how the title should stand, but it is actually described as *Mişbáh* vi of *Mishkát* IV. See p. 395, n. 1, *supra*.

⁷¹⁴ *I.e.* Agents or Representatives, also called “Gates” (*Báb*, pl. *Abwáb*). The avoidance of this last title by the author is probably intentional, for he wrote in 1263/1847, just when Mírzá ‘Alí Muḥammad’s claim to be the *Báb* was creating so great a stir in Persia. See my *Traveller’s Narrative*, ii, pp. 226-34 and 296-8.

⁷¹⁵ Many particulars concerning the “Occultations,” the “Gates,” and the claims to communicate with the Hidden Imám advanced by the Shaykhís and Bábis, denounced as heretics by our author, are given in the notes (especially D, E and O) at the end of vol. ii of my *Traveller’s Narrative*, to which the reader is referred.

⁷¹⁶ *I.e.* the Prophet, his daughter Fátima, and the Twelve Imáms.

without suffering torment, as, for example, Khusraw Anúsharwán on account of his justice, and Hátim of Tayy on account of his generosity.

Next follows a description of the Bridge of *Širát*, “finer than a hair, sharper than a sword, and hotter than fire,” which spans Hell, and over which everyone must pass, even the Prophets and Imáms and Saints, to reach Paradise. A detailed description of a very material Paradise succeeds, which in turn is followed by an account of the Purgatory or intermediate state called *al-A‘ráf*. This is said to be a beautiful meadow or high ground situated on the Bridge of *Širát*, and peopled by the spirits of the feeble-minded, illegitimate children, and those who are neither good enough for Heaven nor bad enough for Hell. By the intercession of the Prophet or the Imáms some of these will be subsequently admitted to Heaven. Other heavenly delights described, such as the Water of *Kawthar*, the “Lote-tree of the Limit” (*Sidratu‘l-Muntahá*), and the *Túbá*-tree. When every soul has been assigned its place in Heaven, Hell or *al-A‘ráf*, Death will be led forth in the form of a black sheep and slain, to show that henceforth there is neither fear nor hope of death.

Conclusion (*Khátima*)⁷¹⁷ (pp. 132-138).

[Section ii.] *On the meaning of Unbelief (Kufr) and Belief (Ímán)*. Five meanings of *Kufr* in the *Qur‘án* are distinguished, and three chief kinds in ordinary life, namely

[page 402]

spiritual (*qalbí*), verbal (*qawlí*), and actual (*fi‘lí*). Three kinds of *Ímán* are also distinguished, and *Ímán* is distinguished from *Islám*. Sunnís and Shí‘a not of the “Sect of the Twelve” are believers (*mú‘min*), but not Muslims; they are not unclean, but will remain for ever in Hell-fire. The apostate (*murtadd*) from *Islám* is deserving of death, nor is his repentance accepted in this world, though, according to some theologians, it may be accepted in the next. But from the convert to *Islám* who reverts to his original faith repentance may be accepted; and a woman who apostasizes should not be killed, but imprisoned and beaten until she repents or dies in prison. The book ends with a description of five kinds of Faith and six kinds of Repentance.

Such in outline is the Shí‘a creed of contemporary Persia in its crudest and most popular form. It would be interesting to trace the evolution of that creed from the earliest times of *Islám*, to compare (so far as the available materials allow) the historical with the legendary Imáms, and to contrast in detail the beliefs, both doctrinal and eschatological, of the Shí‘a and the Sunnís. This, however, transcends the scope of this book, even had the preliminary work indispensable to such a study been adequately done. Even amongst the orthodox and formal (*qishrí mujtahids* and *mullás*) these doctrines must often have been held in a form less crude and childish than that outlined above, though they may have deemed it wiser to leave the popular beliefs undisturbed, and to discourage speculations which might become dangerous amongst a people only too prone to scepticism and heresy. Taking only the broad divisions of theological and philosophical thought in Persia, we may distinguish in each field three main types; amongst the theologians the *Akhbáris*, the *Uşúlis* (or *Mujtahidís*), and the *Shaykhís*; amongst the philosophers the *Mutakallimún* or School-men,

[page 403]

the *Falásifa* or *Hukamá* (Philosophers pure and simple), and the philosophical *Şúfis*. Of all these Gobineau’s⁷¹⁸ account is still the most clear, lively and concise which I have met with in any European language, though it cannot be certainly affirmed that its accuracy is equal to its clarity. Thus he credits the *Akhbáris*, generally regarded as the strictest sect of the Shí‘a, with a certain latitudinarianism to which they can hardly lay claim; and describes the *Shaykhís* as “not altogether rejecting the idea of the Resurrection of the Body,” when it was precisely their doctrine of the “subtle body” (or *Jism-i-Huwarqilyá*)⁷¹⁹ which especially laid them under suspicion of heresy. The doctrines of the *Shaykhís*, moreover, definitely prepared the way for the still more heretical doctrines of the *Bábís*, who were outside the pale of *Islám* while the *Shaykhís* were just within it and counted many influential followers in high places. Of the Philosophers and *Şúfis* more will be said in another chapter, but as to the theologians we shall do well to bear in mind Gobineau’s dictum⁷²⁰: “Il ne faut pas perdre de vue que si l’on peut, approximativement, classer les trois opinions ainsi que je le fais, il est nécessaire pourtant d’ajouter qu’il est rare que, dans le cours de sa vie, un Persan n’ait point passé de l’une à l’autre et ne les ait point toutes les trois professées.” Mullá Muḥammad Báqir-i-Majlisí, one of the greatest, most powerful and most fanatical *mujtahids* of the Şafawí period, found it necessary to apologize for the tolerant and even sympathetic attitude assumed by his father Mullá Muḥammad Taqí-i-Majlisí, not less distinguished than himself as a theologian, towards

[page 404]

⁷¹⁷ This is so headed, but see pp. 381 and 398 *supra*. This section might be called “Epilogue.”

⁷¹⁸ *Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l’Asie Centrale* (2nd ed., Paris, 1866), pp. 28-33 for the three theological parties, pp. 63-111 (ch. iv) for the *Şúfis* and the Philosophers.

⁷¹⁹ See my *Traveller’s Narrative*, vol. ii, p. 236.


⁷²⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. 32-3.

the Šúfís. “Let none think so ill of my father,” he says⁷²¹, “as to imagine that he was of the Šúfís. Nay, it was not so, for I was intimately associated with my father in private and in public, and was thoroughly conversant with his beliefs. My father thought ill of the Šúfís, but at the beginning of his career, when they were extremely powerful and active, my father entered their ranks, so that by this means he might repel, remove, eradicate and extirpate the roots of this foul and hellish growth (*in Šhajara-i-Khabítha-i-Zaqqúmiyya*). But when he had extinguished the flames of their infamy, then he made known his inner feelings, for he was a man of the utmost virtue and piety, ascetic and devout in his life,” etc.

Yet Mullá Muḥammad Báqir, in spite of his formalism and fanaticism, his incredible industry in writing books in simple and easily intelligible Persian in order to popularize the Shí‘a doctrines, and his ruthless persecution of the Šúfís, is credited with posthumous gleams of a higher humanity⁷²². One saw him in a dream after his death and asked of him, “How fares it with you in that world, and how have they dealt with you?” He answered, “None of my actions profited me at all, except that one day I gave an apple to a Jew, and that saved me.”

The *Qišašu’l-‘Ulamá* contains 153 biographies of eminent divines, of whom the following twenty-five appear to me the most interesting and important. They are here arranged, as far as possible, chronologically, the serial number of each biography in the book being indicated in brackets after the name⁷²³.

[to face p. 404]



Autograph of Mullá Muḥammad Báqir-i-Majlisi

Or. 4937 (Brit. Mus.), p. 105

[page 405]

I. Pre-Šafawí divines.

1. *Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qúb al-Kulayní* (No. 96), entitled *Thiqatu’l-Islám*, author of the *Káfi*, d. 329/941.

2. *Muḥammad ibn ‘Alí ibn Ḥusayn ibn Músá* ibn Bábawayhi of Qum, called **Šadúq** (No. 95), d. 381/991-2. Of his works 189 are enumerated in the *Qišašu’l-‘Ulamá*, the most important being that entitled *Man lá yaḥḍuruhu’l-Faqih*, which, like the *Káfi* mentioned in the last paragraph, is one of the “Four Books.”

⁷²¹ *Qišašu’l-‘Ulamá*, Lucknow ed., part ii, p. 19.

⁷²² *Ibid.*, part i, p. 216. The author discredited the tale, which is described as widely current. As regards this theologian’s literary activity, he is said on the same page to have been accustomed to write 1000, “*bayts*,” i.e. 50,000 words, daily.

⁷²³ They are numbered in both editions in the *abjad* notation, e.g. Kulayní as ك م و (96); Najjáší as ق ت ب (132), etc.

3. *Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Nu'mán ibn 'Abdu's-Salám al-Ḥārithi* commonly called **Shaykh-i-Mufid** (No. 97), d. 413/1022. The *Qiṣaṣ* enumerates 171 of his works.

4. *Sayyid Murtaḍá*, entitled '**Alamu'l-Hudá**' (No. 98), d. 436/1044. He was the great-great-grandson of the Seventh Imám, Músá al-Kázim.

5. *Aḥmad ibn 'Alí an-Najjášhi* (No. 132), d. 455/1063. He was a disciple of the *Shaykh-i-Mufid*, and the author of the well-known *Kitábu'r-Rijál*.

6. *Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn 'Alí at-Ṭúsí*, called **Shaykhu'ṭ-Ṭá'ifa** (No. 100), d. 460/1067. He was the third of the older "three Muḥammads" (the others being Nos. 1 and 2 *supra*), and the author of two of the "Four Books," the *Tahdhíbu'l-Aḥkám* and the *Istibṣár*, and of the well-known *Fihrist*, or Index of Shí'a books.

7. *Naṣíru'd-Dín-i-Ṭúsí*, entitled **Muḥaqqiq** ("the Investigator"), even more celebrated as a philosopher and man of science than as a theologian (No. 90), d. 672/1274. His most famous works are the *Akhláq-i-Násirí* on Ethics, the Astronomical Tables called *Zij-i-Ilkhání*, compiled for Húlágú Khán the Mongol, and the *Tajrid* on Scholastic Philosophy, a favourite text for the countless host of commentators and writers of notes and glosses.

8. *Najmu'd-Dín Ja'far ibn Yahyá*, known as **Muḥaqqiq-i-Awwal** ("the First Investigator"), author of the *Shará-*

[page 406]

yi'u'l-Islám (No. 89), born 638/1240-1, died Muḥarram 726/Dec. 1325. As a youth he showed some poetic talent, which was, however, sternly repressed by his father, who told him that poets were accursed and poetry incompatible with a devout life.

9. *Ḥasan ibn Yúsuf ibn 'Alí ibnu'l-Muṭahhar al-Hillí*, commonly called '**Alláma-i-Hillí**' ("the Sage of Hilla") (No. 83), died in the same month and year as the above-mentioned *Muḥaqqiq-i-Awwal*, who was ten years his senior. Of his works 75 are enumerated in the *Qiṣaṣ*. '*Alláma-i-Hillí* came of a great family of theologians, which produced in a comparatively short period ten *mujtahids*. His father was one, and his son, entitled *Fakhr'u'l-Muḥaqqiqín* (No. 86), another.

10. *Shaykh Shamsu'd-Dín Muḥammad ibn Makki ... al-'Ámilí*, called **Shahíd-i-Awwal** ("the First Martyr") (No. 82), was put to death at Damascus about midsummer 786/1384⁷²⁴ by judgement of the two *Qádis* Burhánu'd-Dín the Málikí and Ibn Jamá'a the Sháfi'í.

II. Ṣafawí and post-Ṣafawí divines.

11. *Núru'd-Dín 'Alí ibn 'Abdu'l-'Alí*, known as **Muḥaqqiq-i-Thání** ("the Second Investigator") (No. 84), came to Persia from Karak, his native place, and was highly honoured and esteemed by Sháh Ṭahmásp I. He died in 940/1533-4.

12. *Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad*, called **Muqaddas-i-Ardabilí** "the Saint of Ardabil" (No. 83), was highly honoured by Sháh 'Abbás the Great. He died in 993/1585.

13. *Mír Muḥammad Báqir-i-Dámád* (No. 77), the grandson of *Muḥaqqiq-i-Thání* (No. 11 *supra*), also stood high in the favour of Sháh 'Abbás, and died in 1041/1631-2.

[page 407]

Concerning his book the *Ṣiráṭu'l-Mustaqím* ("the Straight Path") a Persian poet composed the following epigram:

صراط المستقيم مير داماد / مسلمان نشنود كافر مبیناد⁷²⁵

He himself wrote poetry under the *takhalluṣ*, or pen-name, of **Ishráq**.

14. *Shaykh Muḥammad Bahá'u'd-Dínal-'Ámilí*, commonly called **Shaykh-i-Bahá'í** (No. 37), was equal in fame, influence and honour with the above-mentioned *Mír Dámád*, these two being amongst the men of learning who gave most lustre to the court of Sháh 'Abbás the Great. The literary activities of *Shaykh-i-Bahá'í*, who was born near Ba'labakk in 953/1546, and died in 1031/1622, were not confined to theology. In that subject his best-known work is the *Jámi'-i-'Abbásí*, a popular Persian manual of Shí'a Law, which he did not live to complete. He also compiled a great collection of anecdotes in Arabic named the *Kashkúl* ("Alms-bowl"), a sequel to his earlier and less-known *Mikhlát*. He also wrote several treatises on Arithmetic and Astronomy, and composed the Persian *mathnawí* poem entitled *Nán u Ḥalwá* ("Bread and Sweetmeats").

15. *Muḥammad ibn Murtaḍá* of Káshán, commonly known as **Mullá Muḥsin-i-Fayḍ** (No. 76), though reckoned "a pure Akhbári" (اخباری صرف), and detested by *Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsá'í* the founder of the *Shaykhí* sect, who used to call him *Musi'* ("the Evil-doer") instead of *Muḥsin* ("the Well-doer"), was in fact more of a mystic and a philosopher than a theologian. His best-known theological work is probably the *Abwábu'l-Janán* ("Gates of Paradise"), composed in 1055/1645. Ten years later he went from Káshán to Shíráz to study philosophy with *Mullá Ṣadrá*, whose daughter he married. He was also a poet, and in the

⁷²⁴ This is the date given in the *Qiṣaṣ*, but the *Lú'lú'atu'l-Baḥrayn* gives 780/1378-9.

⁷²⁵ "May the Musulmán not hear nor the unbeliever see *Mír Dámád's Ṣiráṭu'l-Mustaqím*."


*Majma'u'l-Fuṣṣḥá*⁷²⁶ the number of his verses is said to amount to six or seven thousand.

16. *Mír Abu'l-Qásim-i-Findariskí* though omitted from the *Qīṣaṣu'l-'Ulamá*, was accounted “the most eminent philosopher and Šúfí of his time, and stood high in the estimation of Sháh ‘Abbás I, whom he is said, however, to have scandalized by his habit of mixing with the lowest orders and attending cock-fights⁷²⁷.” He spent some time in India in the reign of Sháh-Jahán and died in Iṣfahán about 1050/1640-1.

17. *Mullá Ṣadru'd-Dín Muḥammad ibn Ibráhīm* of Shíráz, commonly called **Mullá Ṣadrá**, is unanimously accounted the greatest philosopher of modern times in Persia. That in the *Qīṣaṣu'l-'Ulamá* no separate article should be devoted to one whose life was a constant conflict with the “clergy,” and whose clerical disguise was even more transparent than that of his teachers *Mír Dámád* and *Shaykh-i-Bahá'í*, is not surprising, but much incidental mention is made of him in this and other similar works, like the *Lú'lú'atu'l-Baḥrayn*, and his teaching affected theology, notably that of the Shaykhí school⁷²⁸, in no small degree. His death is placed by the *Rawḍātu'l-Jannát* about 1070/1660⁷²⁹, but by the *Lú'lú'atu'l-Baḥrayn* twenty years earlier.

18. *'Abdu'r-Razzáq-i-Láhiǰi*, like *Mullá Muḥsin-i-Fayḍ*, was a pupil of *Mullá Ṣadrá*. His two best-known works, both in Persian, are the *Sar-máya-i-Ímán* (“Substance of Belief”) and the *Gawhar-i-Murád* (“Pearl of Desire”). He

[to face p. 408]



Autograph of Mullá Ṣadrá of Shíráz, the Philosopher

Or. 4935 (Brit. Mus.), 1

shared with *Shaykh Ṭabarsí*, the author of the *Majma'u'l-Bayán*, the curious belief in the “essential meaning” of words, by which he meant that there existed a real relation between the sound and meaning of every word, so that having heard the sound of a strange word it was possible by reflection to conjecture the sense⁷³⁰.

⁷²⁶ Tīhrán lith. ed. of 1295/1878, vol. ii, pp. 25-6.

⁷²⁷ Rieu's *Persian Catalogue*, p. 815. See also p. 258 *supra*.

⁷²⁸ *Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsá'í* commentated his *Mashá'ir* and other works (*Rawḍātu'l-Jannát*, p. 331), but, according to the *Qīṣaṣu'l-'Ulamá* (Lucknow ed., p. 48), regarded him as an infidel.

⁷²⁹ This is given by the *Qīṣaṣu'l-'Ulamá* as the date of his son *Mírzá Ibráhīm*'s death. The earlier date 1050/1640-1 is therefore more probable for the father.

⁷³⁰ *Qīṣaṣu'l-'Ulamá*, Lucknow ed., second part, p. 123.

The last six persons mentioned were all philosophers as well as, or even more than, theologians. The following, except the last, Hájji Mullá Hádí, are all Shí'a divines of the strictest type.

19. *Mullá Muḥammad Taqí-i-Majlisí* (No. 36) is said to have been the first to compile and publish Shí'a traditions, which he received from the *Muḥaqqiq-i-thání*, in the Šafawí period. Allusion has already been made to his alleged Šúfí proclivities. He died in 1070/1659-60, a date expressed by the ingenious chronogram⁷³¹:

ا ف س ر ع ا و ت ا د ب ی س ر و پ ا گ ش ت ف ض ل

“The crown of the Holy Law fell: scholarship become headless and footless.”

By removing the “crown,” i.e. the initial letter, of ر ع, and the “head” and “foot,” i.e. the initial and final letters of □□□, we get the three letters □ ر ع = 800 + 200 + 70 = 1070.

20. *Mullá Muḥammad Bāqir-i-Majlisí* (No. 33), son of the above, who has been already mentioned repeatedly in this chapter, was even more famous than his father. His great work is the *Biháru'l-Anwár* (“Oceans of Light”), an immense compilation of Shí'a traditions; but he composed many other works, of which the following are in Persian: '*Aynu'l-Hayát* (“the Fountain of Life”); *Mishkátu'l-Anwár* (“the Lamp of Lights”); *Hilyatu'l-Muttaqín* (“the Ornament of the Pious”); *Hayátu'l-Qulúb* (“Life of Hearts”),

[page 410]

not completed; *Tuḥfatu'z-Zá'irín* (“the Pilgrims' Present”); *Jalá'u'l-'Uyún* (“the Clearing of the Eyes”)⁷³², etc. He died, as already stated, in 1111/ 1699-1700.

21. *Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdí* of Burújird, entitled **Baḥru'l-'Ulúm** (“the Ocean of Learning”) (No. 27), was born in 1155/1742-3, and appears to have died about 1240/1824-5.

22. *Sayyid Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Sayyid Muḥammad Taqí* of Rasht, entitled **Ḥujjatu'l-Islám** (No. 26), has been already mentioned for his severity in inflicting punishments for infractions of the Sharí'at. He was wealthy as well as influential, and, according to the *Rawḍātu'l-Jannát* (p. 125), spent 100,000 “legal *dinars*”⁷³³ in building a great mosque in the Bídábád quarter of Iṣfahán. He was born about 1180/1766-7, went to 'Iráq to pursue his studies at the age of sixteen or seventeen, returned to Iṣfahán in 1216 or 1217 (1801-3), and died on Sunday the 2nd of Rabí' i, 1260 (March 23, 1844). According to his namesake, the author of the *Rawḍātu'l-Jannát*, his death was mourned for a whole year by the people (presumably the devout and orthodox only!), because none after him dared or was able to enforce the rigours of the Ecclesiastical Law to the same extent. By a strange coincidence, the “Manifestation” of Mírzá 'Alí the *Báb*, and the subsequent rise of that heresy which did so much to weaken the power of the orthodox Shí'a faith, took place just two months after his death.

23. *Shaykh Aḥmad ibn Zaynu'd-Dín ibn Ibráhím al-Aḥsá'í*, the founder of the Shaykhí school or sect, spent most of his life at Yazd, whence he went by way of Iṣfahán to Kirmánsháh. There he remained until the death of the

[page 411]

governor of that city, Prince Muḥammad 'Alí Mírzá, son of Faṭḥ-'Alí Sháh, who favoured him and invited him to make his abode there. He then retired to the Holy Shrines of 'Iráq, where he composed most of his numerous works, of which the most famous are the *Sharḥu'z-Ziyáratu'l-Kabíra* and the *Sharḥu'l-Fawá'id*. He vehemently opposed Mullá Šadrá, Mullá Muḥsin-i-Fayḍ, and the Šúfís, but was himself denounced as a heretic by Hájji Mullá Muḥammad Taqí of Qazwín, whose death at the hands of a Bábí assassin about A.D. 1847 earned for him the title of “the Third Martyr” (*Shahíd-i-Thálith*). Shaykh Aḥmad died in 1243/1827-8, being then nearly ninety years of age⁷³⁴.

24. *Mullá Aḥmad-i-Niráqí*, who died of cholera in 1244/1828-9, was a poet as well as a theologian, and composed a Persian poem entitled *Táqdís* in imitation of the *Mathnawí* of Jalálu'd-Dín Rúmí. His poetical name was Šafá'í, and an article is consecrated to him in the *Majma'u'l-Fuṣahá* (vol. ii, p. 330).

25. *Hájji Mullá Hádí* of Sabzawár⁷³⁵, the last great Persian philosopher, also wrote poetry under the *nom de guerre* of Asrár. He was born in 1212/1797-8 and died in 1295/1878.

CHAPTER IX.

PROSE WRITERS UNTIL A.D. 1850.

⁷³¹ These data are from the *Rawḍātu'l-Jannát*, pp. 129-31. The notice in the *Qiṣaṣ* is very incomplete.

⁷³² *Rawḍātu'l-Jannát*, pp. 118-24.

⁷³³ The *dínár* in modern Persia is of merely nominal value, and 100,000 (= 10 *Túmáns*) are only worth £.2 to £.4, but originally the *dínár* was a gold coin worth about 10 francs, and this latter is presumably what is here intended.

⁷³⁴ Most of these particulars are taken from the *Rawḍātu'l-Jannát*, pp. 25-7.

⁷³⁵ For an account of his life furnished by one of his disciples, see my *Year amongst the Persians*, pp. 131-43.

The cloud contracted its brows, and drew Rustam-bows⁷⁴¹ for the contest;
 The flowering branches raised their standards, the basils prepared their cavalry and their hosts;
 The cloud in its skirts bore in every direction hail-stones for the head of Afrásiyáb —
 Khán Muḥammad Ustájlú encamped in summer quarters at Márdín.”

[page 415]

All this could much better be said in one line:

در بهار خان محمد استاجلو به ییلاقِ ماردین نزول فرمود

“In the spring Khán Muḥammad Ustájlú encamped in summer quarters at Márdín.”

Graceful poetic fancies are all very well in their proper place, but in a serious history they are inappropriate and irritating. The trouble is that, as has been remarked already, nearly all literary Persians, and consequently historians, are poets or poetasters, and they unhappily find it easier and more entertaining to mix poetry with their history than history with their poetry, even their professedly historical poetry. In discussing the later prose literature of Persia I shall therefore confine myself to what has substantial value apart from mere formal elegance, and shall treat of it, according to subject, under the five following headings:

- (1) Theology.
- (2) Philosophy.
- (3) The Sciences — mathematical, natural and occult.
- (4) History — general, special and local.
- (5) Biography and autobiography. including travels.

1. THEOLOGY.

Theology in Persia during the period with which we are dealing, that is from the establishment of the Şafawí dynasty to the present day, means Shí‘a theology, and by extension the semi-heterodox doctrines of the Shaykhís and the wholly heterodox doctrines of the Bábís and Bahá’ís. A large portion of this theological literature — in older times almost all, and even now a considerable amount — is in Arabic, the sacred language of Islám and of the *Qur‘án*, and much of it in all Muslim countries is almost unreadable, save for a few professional

[page 416]

theologians, and, it may be added, quite unprofitable. Some learned man writes a theological, philological, or logical treatise which achieves renown in the Colleges where the *‘ulamá* get their mediaeval training. Some one else writes a commentary on that treatise; a third produces a super-commentary on the commentary; a fourth a gloss on the super-commentary; a fifth a note on the gloss; so that at the end we are confronted with what the immortal Turkish wit Khoja Naşru‘d-Dín Efendí called “soup of the soup of the soup of the hare-soup,” a substance devoid of savour or nutriment, and serving rather to conceal than to reveal its original material. Shaykh Muḥammad ‘Abduh, late Grand Muftí of Egypt and Chancellor of the University of al-Azhar, than whom, perhaps, no more enlightened thinker and no more enthusiastic lover of the Arabic language and literature has been produced by Islám in modern times, used to say that all this stuff should be burned, since it merely cumbered bookshelves, bred maggots, and obscured sound knowledge. This was the view of a great and learned Muhammadan theologian, so we need not scruple to adopt it; indeed the more we admire and appreciate the abundant good literature of Islám, the more we must deplore, and even resent, the existence of this rubbish. In reading the lives of the *‘Ulamá* in such books as the *Rawḍātu‘l-Jannát* and the *Qişasu‘l-‘Ulamá* we constantly find a theologian credited with forty, fifty, or sixty works of this type, which nobody reads now, and which, probably, no one but his pupils ever did read, and they only under compulsion. Even to enumerate these treatises were it possible, would be utterly unprofitable.

The great achievement of the Shí‘a doctors of the later Şafawí period, such as the Majlisís, was their popularization of the Shí‘a doctrine and historical *Anschaung* in the vernacular. They realized that to reach the people they must employ the language of

[page 417]

the people, and that in a simple form, and they reaped their reward in the intense and widespread enthusiasm for the Shí‘a cause which they succeeded in creating. We have already seen⁷⁴² how few Shí‘a books were available when Sháh Isma‘íl first

⁷⁴¹ The rainbow is called “Rustam’s bow” (*Kamán-i-Rustam*) in Persian.

⁷⁴² Pp. 54-5 *supra*.

punishment and torment of the world, and to behold the double of that triumph which they did not wish to accrue to the Imáms, and that the Shí'a may avenge themselves on them. But all other men will remain in their tombs until they shall be raised up in the general Uprising; even as it has come down in many traditions that none shall come back in the 'Return' save he who is possessed of pure belief or pure unbelief, but as for the remainder of mankind, these will [for the time being] be left to themselves."

It is true that here the sentence most Arabian in construction may be the literal translation of a tradition not

[page 420]

given in the original Arabic, which must evidently run something like this:

لا يرجع فى الرجعة إلا من له محض الايمان او محض الكفر'

but the influence of Arabian syntax is constantly apparent.

Another class of Shí'a theological writings consists of polemical works directed against the Sunnis, the Šúfis, the Shaykhís, the Bábís and Bahá'ís, and the Christians. The Sunnis are naturally attacked in all manuals of doctrine with varying degrees of violence, for from Nádír Sháh downwards to Abu'l-Ĥasan Mírzá ("Hájji Shaykhu'r-Ra'ís"), an eager contemporary advocate of Islamic unity⁷⁴⁷, no one has been able to effect an appeasement between these two great divisions of Islám, and a more tolerant attitude in the younger generation of Persians, so far as it exists, is due rather to a growing indifference to Islám itself than to a religious reconciliation. Attacks on the Šúfis, especially on their Pantheism (*Wahdatu'l-Wujúd*), are also often met with in general manuals of Shí'a doctrine, but several independent denunciations of their doctrines exist, such as Áqá Muĥammad 'Alí Bihbihání's *Risála-i-Khayrátiyya*⁷⁴⁸, which led to a violent persecution of the Šúfis and the death of several of their leaders, such as Mír Ma'šúm, Mushtáq 'Alí and Núr 'Alí Sháh⁷⁴⁹; and the *Maṭá'ínu's-Šúfiyya* of Muĥammad Rafi' ibn Muĥammad Shafi' of Tabríz, composed in 1221/1806⁷⁵⁰. The latter even has recourse to the Gospels to prove his case, quoting Christ's saying "Beware

[page 421]

of them which come to you in sheep's clothing (*şuf*, wool), but within they are ravening wolves."

The Islamo-Christian controversy has also produced a considerable literature in Persian, which has been discussed by Professor Samuel Lee in his *Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism* (Cambridge, 1824). Several such works were written in the first quarter of the seventeenth century by Sayyid Aĥmad ibn Zaynu'l-'Ábidín al-'Alawí, one in refutation of Xavier's *Á'ina-i-Ĥaqq-numá* ("Truth-revealing Mirror"), and another directed against the Jews. Later the proselytizing activities of Henry Martyn the missionary called forth replies from Mírzá Ibráhím and others⁷⁵¹.

The Shaykhí sect or school derived its origin and its name from Shaykh Aĥmad ibn Zaynu'd-Dín al-Aĥsá'í, a native not of Persia but of Bahrayn, who died, according to the *Rawḍātu'l-Jannát*⁷⁵², at the advanced age of ninety in 1243/1827-8, and was succeeded by Sayyid Kázim of Rasht, who numbered amongst his disciples both Sayyid 'Alí Muĥammad the Báb, the originator of the Bábí sect, and many of those who subsequently became his leading disciples, and Hájji Muĥammad Karím Khán of Kirmán, who continued and developed the Shaykhí doctrine. This doctrine, essentially a rather extreme form of the Shí'a faith, was accounted heterodox by several eminent *mujtahids*, such as Hájji Mullá Muĥammad Taqí of Qazwín, the uncle and father-in-law of the celebrated Bábí heroine Qurratu'l-'Ayn, whose hostility to the Shaykhís and Bábís ultimately cost him his life, but earned for him from the orthodox Shí'a the title of the "Third Martyr" (*Shahíd-i-Thálith*)⁷⁵³. Some account of the

[page 422]

Shaykhís and their doctrines, sufficient for the ordinary student of Persian thought, is given in Note E (pp. 234-44) at the end of the second volume of my *Traveller's Narrative*⁷⁵⁴. Shaykh Aĥmad was the author of numerous works, all, I think, in Arabic, of which the titles are given in the *Rawḍātu'l-Jannát* (p. 25), which asserts amongst other things that he held the Šúfis in great detestation, notwithstanding his own unorthodox views on the Resurrection. Naturally the pantheistic and latitudinarian opinions of these mystics are distasteful to dogmatic theologians of every kind, whether orthodox Shí'a or Sunní, Shaykhí, Bábí and Bahá'í, or Christian. Henry Martyn evidently felt that he had far more in common with the ordinary

⁷⁴⁷ His pamphlet on the "Union of Islám" (*Ittihádu'l-Islám*) was lithographed at Bombay in 1312/1894-5.

⁷⁴⁸ Composed in 1211/1796-7. See the full and interesting account of the work in Rieu's *Persian Catalogue*, pp. 33-4.

⁷⁴⁹ For a full account of these events, see Malcolm's *History of Persia*, ed. 1815, vol. ii, pp. 417-22.

⁷⁵⁰ Of this I possess a good MS. dated 22 Jumádá ii, 1222 (27 Aug. 1807).

⁷⁵¹ See my *Cat. of Pers. MSS. in the Camb. Univ. Library* (1896), pp. 7-13.

⁷⁵² Pp. 25-6, of the Tíhrán lithographed edition of 1306/1888.

⁷⁵³ See vol. ii of my *Traveller's Narrative*, pp. 197-8 and 310-12.

⁷⁵⁴ See also A.-L.-M. Nicolas, *Essai sur le Cheikhisme* (Paris, 1910), pp. 72. A list of Shaykh Aĥmad's writings is given.

fanatical *mullá* of Shiráz than with the elusive and eclectic Súfí. The later Shaykhís and Bábís, though both derive from a common source, hold one another in the utmost detestation; and at least one of the doctors of theology who examined and condemned the Báb at Tabriz towards the end of the year A.D. 1847, Mullá Muḥammad Mámaqání, belonged to the Shaykhí school⁷⁵⁵.

The Bábí-Bahá'í movement, of which the effects have now extended far beyond the Persian frontiers even to America, has naturally given rise to a far more extensive literature, which forms a study in itself, and which I have discussed elsewhere⁷⁵⁶. Of the Báb's own writings the Persian *Bayán* and the *Dalá'il-i-sab'a* ("Seven Proofs") are the most important of those composed in Persian⁷⁵⁷. Bahá'u'lláh's *Íqán* ("Assurance")

[page 423]

is the earliest reasoned apology, and was written before he advanced his claim to be "He whom God shall manifest." His later "Tablets" (*Alwáh*), many of which are in Persian, are innumerable; amongst them the "Epistles to the Kings" (*Alwáh-i-Saláṭín*) are the most interesting and important. There is also an abundant Azalí literature, and each dichotomous schism has given rise to a fresh crop of controversial pamphlets. Of systematic refutations of the Bábí and Bahá'í doctrines in Persian the most elaborate are the *Iḥqáqu'l-Haqq* ("Verification of the Truth") of Áqá Muḥammad Taqí of Hamadán⁷⁵⁸, composed about 1326/1908; and the *Minháju't-Ṭálibín*⁷⁵⁹ of Ḥájji Ḥusayn-qulí, an Armenian convert to Islám, lithographed at Bombay in 1320/1902. The Bábís and Bahá'ís have developed a somewhat distinctive style of their own in Persian which possesses considerable merits. Some of Bahá'u'lláh's "Tablets" (*Alwáh*) addressed to Zoroastrian enquirers are even written in pure Persian without admixture of Arabic. Their most important works, like the *Kitáb-i-Aqdas* ("Most Holy Book"), are, however, written in Arabic. From the point of view of style, both in Persian and Arabic, an immense improvement was effected by Bahá'u'lláh, for the style of Mírzá 'Alí Muḥammad the Báb was, as Gobineau says, "terne, raide, et sans éclat," "dull, stiff, and devoid of brilliance."

2. PHILOSOPHY.

Philosophy (*Hikmat, Filsafa*) is defined by the Muslims as "a knowledge of the true essence of things, as they really are, so far as is possible to human capacity." It is divided into two branches, the theoretical (*nazari*), and the practical ('*amali*). The former comprises Mathematics (*Riyáḍiyyát*), Natural Science ('*Ilmu't-Ṭabí'at*), and Metaphysics (*Má wará'ba'd or fawq*

[page 424]

at-Ṭabí'at); the latter Ethics (*Tahdhibu'l-Akhláq*), Economics (*Tadbíru'l-Manzil*), and Politics (*Siyasatu'l-Mudun*). The three best-known Persian treatises on Practical Philosophy, namely the *Akhláq-i-Násirí*, *Akhláq-i-Jalálí*, and *Akhláq-i-Muḥsiní*⁷⁶⁰, all belong to the period preceding that which we are now discussing, and I do not recollect any important Persian work on the subject which has appeared since. We may therefore confine our attention here to the first, or theoretical, branch of Philosophy, and in this section to Metaphysics, which on the one hand borders on Theology, and on the other on Science. It is generally admitted that a very close connection existed between the Shí'a and the Mu'tazila⁷⁶¹ in early 'Abbásid times, and it is well known that the latter were the most enlightened and philosophic of the theological schools of Islám, and that in particular they were the champions of Free Will against the rigid Determinism which subsequently triumphed, to the great detriment of the intellectual development of the Muhammadan world. Those sections of Shí'ite theological works which treat of the Nature and Attributes of God are, therefore, of a more philosophical character than is commonly the case in Sunni books of a similar type.

Muslim Philosophy, like Muslim Science, admittedly and avowedly owes almost everything to the Greeks. Its development from the middle of the eighth century of the Christian era, when under the early 'Abbásid Caliphs the work of translating into Arabic the works of the most eminent and celebrated Greek thinkers began, down to the deadly blow inflicted on Islamic civilization by the Mongol Invasion and the destruction of

[page 425]

Baghdád and the 'Abbásid Caliphate in the middle of the thirteenth century, has been repeatedly traced by European scholars. For a broad general view, characterizing the chief exponents of the different schools of Islamic thought, Dr T J de Boer's

⁷⁵⁵ See *Traveller's Narrative*, vol. ii, p. 278.

⁷⁵⁶ *Travellers Narrative*, vol. ii, pp. 173-211; *Materials for the Study of the Bábí Religion*, pp. 17 5-243.

⁷⁵⁷ French translations of both have been published by the learned and impartial A.-L.-M. Nicolas.

⁷⁵⁸ *Materials*, pp. 189-90.

⁷⁵⁹ *Ibid*, pp. 196-7.

⁷⁶⁰ See my *Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion*, pp. 442-4.

⁷⁶¹ See de Boer's *Hist. of Philosophy in Islam*, translated by E. R. Jones (London, 1903), pp. 33, 43, 72 and 84; and Goldziher's *Vorlesungen über der Islam* (Heidelberg, 1910), pp. 234 *et seqq.*

History of Philosophy in Islam, translated into English by E. R. Jones, may be recommended to the general reader. It will be observed that only one of the thinkers mentioned in that book, Ibn Khaldún (b. A.D. 1332 at Tunis, d. A.D. 1406 at Cairo), flourished after the fall of the ‘Abbásid Caliphate, and he was a unique and isolated phenomenon, “without forerunners and without successors⁷⁶².” The question we have to answer here is, has Persia, which in earlier times produced so large a proportion of the so-called “Arabian Philosophers⁷⁶³,” produced any metaphysician of note since the beginning of the sixteenth century? To answer this question one would need to combine with a competent knowledge of Arabic and Persian a grasp of the history and subject-matter not only of “Arabian” but of Greek Philosophy (and, indeed, of Philosophy in general) to which I cannot lay claim. This, indeed, constitutes the difficulty of judging the value of the scientific literature of Islám. How many of those who admire the Persian quatrains of ‘Umar Khayyám can follow M. Woepcke in the appreciation of his Arabic algebraical treatises? A knowledge of Arabic does not suffice to enable us to decide whether ar-Rází or Ibn Síná (Avicenna) was the greater physician. Much valuable work of this technical character has been done in Germany, by Dr E. Wiedemann of Erlangen (Optics, Physics, etc.), Dr Julius Hirschberg of Berlin (Ophthalmology), Dr Max Simon (Anatomy), and others, but very much remains to

[page 426]

be done, and few scholars are competent to undertake it. As regards Philosophy in Persia during the last three or four centuries, all one can say is that half a dozen thinkers have established a great reputation amongst their countrymen, but how far this reputation is deserved is a question which has not yet received a satisfactory answer. These thinkers are, in chronological order, as follows: (1) Shaykh Bahá’u’d-Dín al-‘Ámilí (d. 1031/1622); (2) Mír Dámád (d. 1041/1631-2); (3) Mullá Şadrá (d. 1050/1640-1); (4) Mullá Muhsin-i-Fayd (d. after 1091/1680); (5) Mullá ‘Abdu’r-Razzáq al-Láhijí; and, in quite modern times, (6) Hájji Mullá Hádí of Sabzawár (d. 1295/1878).

Now Muslim philosophers are of two sorts, those whose philosophy is conditioned by and subordinated to revealed Religion, and those whose speculations are not so limited. The former are the *Mutakallimún* or *Ahl-i-Kalám*, the Schoolmen or Dialecticians⁷⁶⁴; the latter the *Hukamá* (pl. of *Hakím*) or *Falásifa* (pl. of *Faylasúf*), the Philosophers proper. Of the six persons mentioned above, Mullá Şadrá certainly and Hájji Mullá Hádí possibly belong to the second class, but the four others to the first. These four, however, if less important from the point of view of Philosophy, were in other ways notable men of letters. Biographies of all of them except Mullá Hádí, who is too modern, are given in the *Rawđátu’l-Jannát*, or the *Qişaşu’l-Ulamá*, from which, unless otherwise stated, the following particulars are taken.

The first five were more or less contemporary, and are, to a certain extent, interrelated. Shaykh Bahá’u’d-Dín and Mír Dámád both enjoyed considerable influence and stood in high favour at the court of Sháh ‘Abbás the Great, yet there was no jealousy between them, if we may believe the pleasing anecdote about them and the Sháh related by Sir

[page 427]

John Malcolm⁷⁶⁵. Mullá Şadrá was the pupil of both of them⁷⁶⁶, while Mullá Muhsin-i-Fayd and Mullá ‘Abdu’r-Razzáq al-Láhijí were both his pupils and his sons-in-law.

1. *Shaykh Bahá’u’d-Dín al-‘Ámilí.*

Shaykh Bahá’u’d-Dín Muḥammad ibn Ḥusayn ibn ‘Abdu’ş-Şamad al-Ḥārithí al-‘Ámilí al-Hamdání al-Jab‘í was one of the numerous Shí‘a doctors who came to Persia from Jabal ‘Ámil in Syria, whence he derived the *nisba* by which he is commonly known, though by the Persians he is most often spoken of as “Shaykh-i-Bahá’í.” His father Shaykh Ḥusayn, a disciple of Shaykh Zaynu’d-Dín “the Second Martyr” (Shahíd-i-Thání), came to Persia after his master had been put to death by the Turks for his Shí‘ite proclivities, bringing with him the young Bahá’u’d-Dín, who applied himself diligently to the study of Theology in all its branches, Mathematics and Medicine. His teachers included, besides his father, Mullá ‘Abdu’lláh of Yazd, a pupil of Jalálu’d-Dín-i-Dawání, the author of the *Akhláq-i-Jalálí*, who was in turn a pupil of the celebrated Sayyid-i-Sharíf-i-Jurjání. In Mathematics he studied with Mullá ‘Alí *Mudhahhib* (“the Gilder”) and Mullá Afđal of Qá’in, while in Medicine he was the pupil of ‘Alí’u’d-Dín Maḥmúd⁷⁶⁷. In due course he attained great celebrity as a theologian and jurist, and became *Şadr* or Shaykhu’l-Islám of Işfahán. After a while he was possessed with the desire to make the pilgrimage to Mecca, and on his homeward journey visited, in the guise of a *darwish*, Mesopotamia, Egypt, the Híjáz

⁷⁶² De Boer, *op laud.*, p. 208.

⁷⁶³ So-called merely because they wrote in Arabic, at that time exclusively, and even now to a considerable extent, the learned language of Islám, as Latin was of Christendom.

⁷⁶⁴ See de Boer, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-3.

⁷⁶⁵ *Hist. of Persia* (ed. 1815), vol. i, pp. 558-9. The anecdote occurs in the *Qişaşu’l-Ulamá* and in the *Rawđátu’l-Jannát*, p. 115.

⁷⁶⁶ *Rawđátu’l-Jannát*, p. 331.

⁷⁶⁷ Some account of him is given in vol. i of the *Ta’rikh-i-‘Álam-árá-yi-‘Abbási* amongst the notices of eminent men of the reign of Sháh ‘Abbás, whence some of the particulars here given concerning Shaykh-i-Bahá’í and Mír Dámád are also derived.


and Palestine, and made the acquaintance of many learned men and eminent doctors and mystics.

Shaykh-i-Bahá'í was born at Ba‘labakk in Syria on Muḥarram 17, 953 (March 20, 1546), and died on Shawwál 12,1031 (August 20, 1622). His principal works are the *Jámí-i-‘Abbásí*, containing legal decisions (*fatáwá*); the *Zubda*; the *Miftaḥu'l-Faláh*; the *Tashrihu'l-Aflák* (“Anatomy of the Heavens”); the *Khuláṣatu'l-Hisáb* on Arithmetic; the *Kashkúl* (“Beggars’ Bowl”), a large miscellany of stories and verses, the latter partly in Persian⁷⁶⁸; a similar work called the *Mikhlát*; also a Persian *mathnawí* poem entitled *Nán u Ḥalwá* (“Bread and Sweetmeats”) describing his adventures during the pilgrimage to Mecca, and another entitled *Shír u Shakar* (“Milk and Sugar”). Extracts from these poems, as well as from his ghazals, are given in the *Majma‘u'l-Fuṣṣahá* (vol. ii, pp. 8-10).

2. Mír Dámád.

Mír Muḥammad Báqir of Astarábád, with the pen-name of Ishráq, commonly known as Dámád (“son-in-law”), a title properly belonging to his father Sayyid Muḥammad, whose wife was the daughter of the celebrated theologian Shaykh ‘Alí ibn ‘Abdu'l-‘Alí, pursued his earlier studies at Mashhad, but spent the greater part of his life at Iṣfahán, where, as we have seen, he stood in high favour with Sháh ‘Abbás the Great, and where he was still living when the author of the *Ta'rikh-i-‘Álam-árá-yi-‘Abbásí* wrote in 1025/1616. He died in 1041/1631-2. Most of his writings were in Arabic, but he wrote poetry in Persian under the *takhalluṣ* of Ishráq. He seems to have had a taste for Natural History as well as Philosophy, for, according to the *Qiṣaṣu'l-‘Ulamá*, he made an observation hive of glass in

[To face p. 428]



Autograph of Shaykh Bahá'u'd-Dín-i-'Ámilí

Or. 4936 (Brit. Mus.), 15

[page 429]

order to study the habits of bees. It is stated in the same work that after his death his pupil and son-in-law Mullá Ṣadrá saw him in a dream and said, “My views do not differ from yours, yet I am denounced as an infidel and you are not. Why is this?” “Because,” replied Mír Dámád’s spirit, “I have written on Philosophy in such wise that the theologians are unable to understand my meaning, but only the philosophers; while you write about philosophical questions in such a manner that every dominie and hedge-priest who sees your books understands what you mean and dubs you an unbeliever.”

3. Mullá Ṣadrá of Shiráz.

⁷⁶⁸ These Persian verses are omitted in the Cairo ed. of 1305/1887-8, but are contained in the Ṭihrán lithographed ed. of 1321/1903-4.

Şadru'd-Dín Muḥammad ibn Ibráhím of Shíráz, commonly known as Mullá Şadrá, was the only son of an aged and otherwise childless father. On his father's death he left Shíráz and went to Işfahán, where, as we have seen, he studied with Shaykh-i-Bahá'í and Mír Dámád, from both of whom he held *ijázas*, or authorizations to expound their works. He subsequently retired to a village near Qum, where he lived a secluded and austere life, engaged in profound meditations on Philosophy. He is said to have made the Pilgrimage to Mecca on foot seven times, and to have died at Başra on his return from his seventh journey in 1050/1640-1, leaving a son named Ibráhím who did not follow his father's doctrine but denounced and controverted it, boasting that "his belief was that of the common people." To these meagre particulars of Mullá Şadrá's life, derived from the *Rawđátu'l-Jannát* (pp. 331-2) and the *Qişaşu'l-'Ulamá*, I can only add that it is clear from some expressions in the Preface to his *Asfár* that he suffered a good deal at the hands of the orthodox divines, and that Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsá'í, the founder of the Shaykhí school, wrote commentaries on two of his works, the *Hik-*

[page 430]

matu'l-'Arshiyya and the *Mashá'ir*. Shaykh Muḥammad Iqbál is therefore probably right when he says⁷⁶⁹ that "the Philosophy of Şadrá is the source of the metaphysics of early Bábiism," and that⁷⁷⁰ "the origin of the philosophy of this wonderful sect must be sought in the Shí'a sect of the Shaykhís, the founder of which, Shaykh Aḥmad, was an enthusiastic student of Mullá Şadrá's philosophy, on which he had written several commentaries."

The two most celebrated of Mullá Şadrá's works, all of which, so far as I know, are in Arabic, are the *Asfár-i-Arba'a*, or "Four Books"⁷⁷¹, and the *Shawáhidu'r-Rubúbiyya*, or "Evidences of Divinity." Both have been lithographed at Tíhrán, the first in two folio volumes in 1282/1865, the second, accompanied by the commentary of Hájji Mullá Hádí of Sabzawár, without indication of date or place of publication. Amongst his other works which I have not seen the *Rawđátu'l-Jannát* (p. 331) enumerates a Commentary on the *Uşúlu'l-Káfi*, the *Kitábu'l-Hidáya*, notes on the metaphysical portion of Avicenna's *Shifá*, a Commentary on the *Hikmatu'l-Ishráq* (presumably that of the celebrated and unfortunate Shaykh Shihábu'd-Dín-Suhrawardí, known, on account of his execution for heresy, as *al-Maqtúl*), the *Kitábu'l-Wáridáti'l-Qalbiyya*, the *Kasru Aşnámi'l-Jáhiliyya*, or "Breaking of the Idols of Ignorance," several commentaries on various portions of the (*Qur'án*, etc.

Of Mullá Şadrá's philosophical doctrines, in spite of their

[page 431]

high reputation in Persia, I know of only two brief and necessarily superficial accounts in any European language. The Comte de Gobineau devotes several pages⁷⁷² to them, but his information was probably entirely derived orally from his Persian teachers, who were very likely but ill-informed on this matter, since he concludes his notice with the words "la vraie doctrine de Moulla-Sadra, c'est-à-dire d'Avicenne," while the *Rawđátu'l-Jannát*⁷⁷³ explicitly states that he was an *Ishráqí* ("Illuminatus" or Platonist) and strongly condemned the Aristoteleans or Peripatetics (*Mashshá'ún*), of whom Avicenna was the great representative.

The other shorter but more serious account of Mullá Şadrá's doctrine is given by Shaykh Muḥammad Iqbál, formerly a pupil of Dr McTaggart in this University of Cambridge, and now himself a notable and original thinker in India, in his excellent little book entitled *Development of Metaphysics in Persia: a contribution to the History of Muslim Philosophy*⁷⁷⁴, p. 175, but he devotes much more space (pp. 175-95) to the modern Hájji Mullá Hádí of Sabzawár, whom he regards as Mullá Şadrá's spiritual successor, and who, unlike his master, condescended, as we shall presently see, to expound his ideas in Persian instead of in Arabic. It may be added

[page 432]

that Mullá Şadrá speaks with great respect of that eminent Maghribi Shaykh Muḥyi'd-Dín ibnu'l-'Arabí, whose influence, non-Persian though he was, was probably greater than that of any other thinker on the development of the extremer forms of Persian philosophical-mystical speculation.

⁷⁶⁹ *Development of Metaphysics in Persia* (Luzac, London, 1908), p. 175.

⁷⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 187.

⁷⁷¹ Gobineau has misunderstood *Asfár* (which is the plural of *Sifr*, "a book," not of *Safar*, "a journey") when he writes (*Rel. el Philos.*, 1866, p. 81), "Il a écrit de plus quatre livres de voyages." In the same way he mistranslates the title of one of the Báb's earlier works, the *Ziyárat-náma* ("Book of Visitation") as "un journal de son pèlerinage."

⁷⁷² *Les Religions et les Philosophies*, etc. (1866), pp. 80-92.


⁷⁷³ P. 331. The passage runs in the original:

كان... منقحاً اساس الإشراف بما لا مزيد عليه و منقحاً ابواب
الفضيحة على طريقة المشاء و الزواق'

⁷⁷⁴ London, Luzac and Co., 1908. Muḥammad Iqbál has set forth his own doctrines (which, as I understand them, are in the main an Oriental adaptation of Nietzsche's philosophy) in a short Persian *mathnawí* poem entitled *Asrár-i-Khudí*, lithographed at the University Press, Lahore, and translated into English with an introduction and Notes by my friend and colleague Dr R. A. Nicholson (*The Secrets of the Self*, London, Macmillan & Co., 1920).

4. Mullá Muḥsin-i-Fayḍ of Káshán.

Muḥammad ibn Murtaḍá of Káshán, commonly called Muḥsin with the poetical pen-name of Fayḍ, was a native of Káshán, and, as already said, the favourite pupil and son-in-law of Mullá Ṣadrá. In the *Rawḍātu'l-Jannát* (pp. 542-9) and the *Qišāsu'l-'Ulamá* much fuller notices of him are given than of his master, and, since he was not only a theologian and a philosopher but likewise a poet of some note, he is also mentioned in the *Riyādu'l-'Árifín* (pp. 225-6) and the *Majma'u'l-Fuṣahá* (ii, 25-6). His literary activity was enormous: according to the *Qišāsu'l-'Ulamá* he wrote nearly two hundred books and treatises, and was surpassed in productivity by hardly any of his contemporaries or predecessors except Mullá Muḥammad Báqir-i-Majlisí. Sixty-nine of these works, of which the last, entitled *Sharḥu's-Ṣadr*⁷⁷⁵, is autobiographical, are enumerated in the *Qišāṣ*, but fuller details of them are given in the *Rawḍát* (pp. 545-6), where the dates of composition (which range between 1029/1620 and 1090/1680) are in most cases recorded. His age at this latter date, which is also notified as the year of his death, is stated as eighty-four⁷⁷⁶, so that he must have been born about 1006/1597-8. Of one of his works, the *Mafátiḥu'sh-Sharáyi*, I possess



Autograph of Mullá Muḥsin-i-Fayḍ

Or. 4937 (Brit. Mus.), p. 84

[page 433]

what appears to be an autograph copy, made in 1042/1632-3, now bearing the class-mark C. 18.

When Mullá Muḥsin wished to leave his home in Káshán and go to Shíráz to study under the celebrated theologian Sayyid Májid of Baḥrayn, his father opposed this project, and it was finally agreed to take an augury (*tafa'ul*) from the *Qur'án*, and from the poems ascribed to the first Imám 'Alí ibn Abí Ṭálib. The former yielded the verse (ix, 123) "if a part of every band of them go not forth, it is that they may diligently instruct themselves in Religion"; the latter the following lines rendered particularly apposite by the words *shuḥbatu Májidi*, "the society of some noble one," which might in this case be taken as referring particularly to the above-mentioned Sayyid Májid:

⁷⁷⁵ It was written in 1065/1654-5. See *Rawḍātu'l-Jannát*, p. 546. It is wrongly entitled *Sharḥ-i-Ṣuwar* in the Indian lithograph of the *Qišāṣ*.

⁷⁷⁶ *Rawḍātu'l-Jannát*, pp. 542 and 549.

تغرب عن الأوطان في طلب العلى،
و سافر ففى الأسفار خمس فوائد،
تفرج همم و اكتساب معيشة،
و علم و آداب و صحبة ماجد،
فإن قيل فى الأسفار ذل و محنة،
و قطع الغيابة و ارتكاب الشدائد،
فموت الفتى خير له من قيامه،
بدار هوان بين ذل و حاسد،

“Go abroad from the home-lands in search of eminence, and travel,
for in travel are five advantages:
The dissipation of anxiety, the acquisition of a livelihood, knowledge,
culture, and the society of some noble one (*májid*).
And if it be said, ‘In travels are humiliation and trouble, the
traversing of deserts and the encountering of hardships,’
Yet the death of a brave man is better for him than his continuance
in the mansion of abasement, between humiliation and an envious rival.”

[page 434]

After these clear indications, Mullá Muḥsin’s father no longer opposed his desire to go to Shíráz, where he pursued his studies not only with the aforesaid Sayyid Májid, but also with Mullá Ṣadrá. It is difficult to accept the statement of the *Qišaş* that this took place in 1065/1654-5, for this would make him nearly sixty years of age before he began his serious studies with Mullá Ṣadrá or married his daughter.

Mullá Muḥsin is described in the *Qišaş* as a “pure Akhbári” (*Akhabári-yi-Şirf*), a Şúfí, and an admirer of Shaykh Muḥyi’-d-Dín ibnu’l-‘Arabí. Shaykh Aḥmad Aḥsá’í, who, as we have seen⁷⁷⁷, wrote commentaries on two of the books of his master Mullá Ṣadrá, detested him, and used to call him *Musi’* (“the ill-doer”) instead of *Muḥsin* (“the well-doer”), and to speak of the great Shaykh as *Mumítu’-d-Dín* (“the Slayer of Religion”) instead of *Muḥyi’-d-Dín* (“the Quickener of Religion”). According to an absurd story in the *Qišaş*, Mullá Muḥsin was chosen by Sháh ‘Abbás to confute a Christian missionary sent by the “King of the Franks” to convert the Persians. The sign offered by this missionary was that he would specify any article held in the closed hand of his opponent⁷⁷⁸. Mullá Muḥsin chose a rosary (*tasbiḥ*) made of clay taken from the tomb of the Imám Ḥusayn. The Christian hesitated to speak, but, when pressed, said, “It is not that I cannot say, but, according to the rule I observe, I see that in thy hand is a portion of the earth of Paradise, and I am wondering how this can have come into thy possession.” “Thou speakest truly,” replied Mullá Muḥsin, and then informed him what he held, and bade him abandon his own faith and accept Islám, which,

[page 435]

according to the narrator, he was constrained to do. Though extremely pious in most respects, Mullá Muḥsin scandalized the orthodox by his approval and sanction of singing. His best-known Persian compilation is probably the *Abwábu’l-Janán* (“Gates of Paradise”) composed in 1055/1645, on prayer and its necessity⁷⁷⁹, but few of his numerous writings have been published or are now read and at the present day, at any rate, his name is more familiar than his works.

5. Mullá ‘Abdu’r-Razzáq-i-Láhijí.

The subject of this notice resembled Mullá Muḥsin in being a pupil and son-in-law of Mullá Ṣadrá and a poet, who wrote under the pen-name of Fayyád, but his writings, though much fewer in number, are more read at the present day. The best known are, perhaps, the philosophical treatise in Persian entitled *Gawhar-i-Murád* (“the Pearl of Desire”), and the *Sar-máya-i-Ímán* (“Substance of Faith”), also in Persian, both of which have been lithographed. The notices of him in the *Rawdátu’l-Jannát* (pp. 352-3) and the *Qišaşu’l-‘Ulamá* are short and unsatisfactory. The latter grudgingly admits that his writings were fairly orthodox, but evidently doubts how far they express his real convictions and how far they were designed from prudential motives to disguise them, thus bearing out to some extent the opinion expressed by Gobineau⁷⁸⁰.

⁷⁷⁷ Pp. 429-30 *supra*.

⁷⁷⁸ This is called *khaby*, and thought-reading *ḍamir*. See my translation of the *Chahár Maqála*, p. 64 and n. 2 *ad calc.*, and pp. 130-1.

⁷⁷⁹ Not to be confounded with a later homonymous work on Ethics.

⁷⁸⁰ *Op. laud.*, pp. 91-2.

I have been obliged to omit any further notice than that already given⁷⁸¹ of the somewhat elusive figure of Mír Abu'l-Qásim-i-Findariskí, mentioned by Gobineau⁷⁸² as one of the three teachers of Mullá Şadrá, because, apart from the brief notices of him

[page 436]

contained in the *Riyádu'l-‘Árifín*⁷⁸³ and the *Majma‘u'l-Fuṣahá*, in both of which the same poem is cited, and the passing reference in the *Dabistán*⁷⁸⁴ to his association with the disciples of Kaywán and adoption of sun-worship, I have been unable to discover any particulars about his life or doctrines. He appears to have been more of a *qalandar* than a philosopher, and probably felt ill at ease in the atmosphere of Shí‘a orthodoxy which prevailed at Işfahán, and hence felt impelled to undertake the journey to India. He must, however, have subsequently returned to Persia if the statement in the *Riyádu'l-‘Árifín* that his tomb is well known in Işfahán be correct.

Gobineau (*op. laud.*, pp. 91-110) enumerates a number of philosophers who succeeded Mullá Şadrá down to the time of his own sojourn in Persia, but most of them have little importance or originality, and we need only mention one more, who was still living when Gobineau wrote, and whom he describes as “personnage absolutement incomparable.”

6. Hájji Mullá Hádí of Sabzawár.

It is not, however, necessary to say much about this celebrated modern thinker, since his philosophical ideas are somewhat fully discussed by Shaykh Muḥammad Iqbál at the end of his *Development of Metaphysics in Persia*⁷⁸⁵, while I obtained from one of his pupils with whom I studied in Tíhrán during the winter of 1887-8 an authentic account of his life, of which I published an English translation in my *Year amongst the Persians*⁷⁸⁶. According to this account, partly derived from one of his sons, Hájji Mullá Hádí the son of Hájji Mahdí was born in 1212/1797-8, studied first in his native town of Sabzawár, then at Mashhad, then at Işfahán

[page 437]

with Mullá ‘Alí Núrí. Having made the pilgrimage to Mecca, he visited Kirmán, where he married a wife, and then returned to Sabzawár, where the remainder of his life was chiefly spent until his death in 1295/1878. His best-known works, written in Persian, are the *Asráru'l-Hikam* (“Secrets of Philosophy”) and a commentary on difficult words and passages in the *Mathnawí*; in Arabic he has a versified treatise (*Manzúma*) on Logic; another on Philosophy; commentaries on the Morning Prayer and the *Jawshan-i-Kabír*; and numerous notes on the *Shawáhidu'r-Rubúbiyya* and other works of Mullá Şadrá. He also wrote poetry under the pen-name of Asrár, and a notice of him is given in the *Riyádu'l-‘Árifín* (pp. 241-2), where he is spoken of as still living and in the sixty-third year of his age in 1278/1861-2, the date of composition. Most of his works have been published in Persia in lithographed editions.

3. THE SCIENCES — MATHEMATICAL, NATURAL AND OCCULT.

As stated above⁷⁸⁷, Mathematics (*Riyádiyyát*) “the Disciplinary” and *Ṭabí‘iyyát* the Natural Sciences, in conjunction with Metaphysics (*Má wará* or *Má ba‘da‘t-Ṭabí‘at*), constitute the subject-matter of the theoretical or speculative branch of Philosophy, of which, therefore, they form a part. It is probable that to this manner of regarding them is partly due the unfortunate tendency noticeable in most Muslim thinkers to take an *a priori* view of all natural phenomena instead of submitting them to direct critical observation. The so-called “Arabian,” *i.e.* Islamic, Science was in the main inherited from the Greeks; its Golden Age was the first century of the ‘Abbásid Caliphate (A.D. 750-

[page 438]

850), when so much trouble and expense was incurred by the Caliphs, especially al-Manşúr, Hárúnu'r-Rashíd and al-Ma‘mún, to procure good and faithful Arabic translations of the great Greek philosophers, naturalists and physicians; and the great service it rendered to mankind was to carry on the Greek tradition of learning through the Dark Ages of Europe down to the Renaissance.

⁷⁸¹ See pp. 257-8 and 408 *supra*.

⁷⁸² *Op. laud.*, p. 82.

⁷⁸³ Pp. 165-6.

⁷⁸⁴ Shea and Troyer’s translation (London, 1843), vol. i, pp. 140-1.

⁷⁸⁵ Pp. 175-95.

⁷⁸⁶ Pp. 131-4.

⁷⁸⁷ Pp. 423-4 *supra*.

So much is generally admitted, but there remains the more difficult and still unsolved question whether the Arabs were mere transmitters of Greek learning, or whether they modified or added to it, and, in this case, whether these modifications or additions were or were not improvements on the original. This question I have endeavoured to answer in the case of medical science in my *Arabian Medicine*⁷⁸⁸, but I was greatly hampered by insufficient acquaintance with the original Greek sources. For such investigation, whether in the Medicine, Mathematics, Physics, Astronomy or Chemistry of the Muslims, three qualifications not often combined are required in the investigator, or wit, knowledge of the science or art in question, knowledge of Arabic (and, for later writers, of Persian and even Turkish), and knowledge of Greek. In the case of the "Arabian" (*i.e.* Muslim) physicians the conclusion at which I arrived (already reached by Dr Max Neuburger in his monumental *Geschichte der Medizin*⁷⁸⁹) was that Rhazes (Abú Bakr Muḥammad ibn Zakariyyá ar-Rázi, *i.e.* a native of Ray in Persia) was, as a physician, far superior to the more celebrated and popular Avicenna (Ibn Síná), and was, indeed, probably the greatest clinical observer who ever existed amongst the Muslims. The notes of actual cases which came under his observation, as recorded in parts of his great "Continens"

[page 439]

(*al-Ḥáwi*), have an actual and not merely a historical or literary value; and even from his methods of treatment it is possible that here and there a hint might be obtained. Avicenna was more logical, more systematic, and more philosophical, but he lacked the Hippocratic insight possessed by his great predecessor.

In my *Arabian Medicine* I sketched the history of the art amongst the Muslims from its beginnings in the eighth century of our era down to the twelfth, but made no attempt to follow it down to the period which we are now considering. The Mongol Invasion of the thirteenth century, as I have repeatedly and emphatically stated, dealt a death-blow to Muslim learning from which it has not yet recovered. Medical and other quasi-scientific books continued, of course, to be written, but it is doubtful if they ever approached the level attained under the early 'Abbásid Caliphs and maintained until the eleventh, and, to some extent, until the thirteenth century of our era. That they added anything which was both new and true is in the highest degree improbable, though I cannot claim to have carefully investigated the matter. A long list of these books is given by Dr Adolf Fonahn in his most useful work entitled *Zur Quellenkunde der Persischen Medizin*⁷⁹⁰, which has pointed the way for future investigators. Of these later works the most celebrated is probably the *Tuhfatu'-Mú'minin*, compiled for Sháh Sulaymán the Şafawí by Muḥammad Mú'min-i-Ḥusaynî in A.D. 1669. It deals chiefly with Materia Medica, and there are numerous editions and manuscripts, besides translations into Turkish and Arabic⁷⁹¹.

What has been said about Medicine holds good also of Zoology, Botany, Chemistry, etc., and in a lesser degree of Mathematics, Astronomy and Mineralogy. Fine work

[page 440]

has been done in some of these subjects by experts who also possessed an adequate knowledge of Arabic. I will only instance Woepcke in Algebra, Wiedemann in Mechanics, Hirschberg in Ophthalmology, and, amongst younger men, Holmyard in Chemistry. All these, I think, have come to the conclusion that the standard attained by the best Muslim investigators surpassed rather than fell short of what is generally supposed. Yet it is often difficult to assure oneself that direct observation, which is the foundation of true science, has played its proper part in ascertaining the phenomena recorded. Dr Badhlu'r-Raḥmán, now Professor of Arabic in the Oriental College at Lahore, when he was a Research Student in this University, took as the subject of his studies the works of al-Jáḥiz, who, on the strength of his great book on animals, the *Kitábu'l-Ḥayawán*, is often regarded as one of the leading naturalists of the Arabs⁷⁹². At my request this able and industrious young scholar devoted especial attention to the question whether the writings of this author afforded any proof that he had himself observed the habits of any of the animals about which he wrote. A passage was ultimately found which seemed conclusive. In speaking of instinct al-Jáḥiz says that when the ant stores corn for food it mutilates each grain in such a way as to prevent it from germinating. After numerous fruitless enquiries as to the truth of this statement, I finally ascertained from Mr Horace Donisthorpe, one of the chief British authorities on ants, that it was correct, and I began to hope that here at last was proof that this old Muslim scholar had himself observed

[page 441]

a fact of Natural History apparently unknown to many modern Zoologists. Unhappily I subsequently discovered the same statement in Pliny, and I am afraid it is much more likely that it reached al-Jáḥiz by tradition rather than by direct observation.

⁷⁸⁸ Pp. viii + 138, Cambridge University Press, 1921.

⁷⁸⁹ Vol. ii, Part i, pp. 168 *et seqq.*

⁷⁹⁰ Leipzig, 1910, pp. v + 152.

⁷⁹¹ See Fonahn, *op. laud.*, pp. 89-91. See also *B.M.P.C.*, pp. 476-7.

⁷⁹² *E.g.* by Fr. Wüstenfeld in his *Geschichte der Arabischen Aerzte und Naturforscher* (Göttingen, 1840), pp. 2 5-6 (No. 65). Carl Brockelmann's view is correct (*Gesch. d. Arab. Litt.*, i, p. 152), but his criticism of Dr L. Leclerc's remarks on the subject (*Hist. de la Médecine Arabe*, i, p. 314) hardly appears justified.

In each of the “Arabian” sciences the same question arises and demands an answer which only one thoroughly versed in the scientific literature of the ancients can give. Does Ibnu’l-Baytár’s great Arabic work on medicinal plants, for example, contain any information not to be found in Dioscorides? Be the answer what it may, it is doubtful whether the later Muslim writers on these various sciences ever surpassed, or even equalled, their predecessors. In quite recent times, especially since the foundation of the *Dáru’l-Funún*, or Polytechnic College, at Īhrán early in the reign of Násiru’d-Dín Sháh, numerous Persian translations or adaptations of European scientific works have been made, but these are entirely exotic, and can hardly claim to be noticed in a work on Persian Literature. A number of them are mentioned in my *Press and Poetry of Modern Persia*, pp. 154-66, under the heading “Modernising Influences in the Persian Press other than Magazines and Journals.” But of those Persians who since the middle of the nineteenth century have successfully graduated in the European schools of science, I know of none who has hitherto made a reputation for original research.

In conclusion a few words must be said about the Occult Sciences, excluding Astrology and Alchemy, which are in the East hardly to be separated from Astronomy and Chemistry. Alchemy is called in Arabic and Persian *Kímiyá*, and the names of four other Occult Sciences, dealing with Talismans, Necromancy, and the like, are formed on the same model, *Límiyá*, *Hímiyá*, *Símiyá*, and *Rímiyá*, the initial letters

[page 442]

being derived from the words *Kulluhu Sirr* (كله سر), “All of it is a Mystery.” The book entitled *Asrár-i-Qásimí* (“Secrets of Qásim”) ⁷⁹³ in Persian, and the *Shamsu’l-Ma’árif* (“Sun of Knowledges”) ⁷⁹⁴ of the celebrated Shaykh al-Búní in Arabic, may be regarded as typical of this class of literature, but to the uninitiated they make but arid and unprofitable reading. Ibn Khaldún is the only Muslim writer I know of who has sought to discover a philosophical and rational basis for these so-called sciences, and his ideas have been collated with the theories of modern Psychical Research in a most masterly manner by Professor Duncan Black Macdonald in his interesting and suggestive book entitled *The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam* ⁷⁹⁵. I have always kept an open mind as to the reality of the powers claimed by Occultists, and, when opportunity offered, have always gone out of my way to investigate such manifestations. Disappointment has invariably been my portion, save in two cases: a “magician” whom I met in Kirmán in the summer of 1888, who, amidst much vain boasting, did accomplish one feat which baffled my comprehension ⁷⁹⁶; and the late Shaykh Ḥabíb Aḥmad, author of an astonishing work in English entitled *The Mysteries of Sound and Number* ⁷⁹⁷, who, if nothing more, was an amazingly skilful thought-reader.

4. HISTORY — GENERAL, SPECIAL AND LOCAL.

It must be admitted, with whatever unwillingness and regret, that in the art of historical compilation the Persians

[page 443]

fall far short of the Arabs, who, indeed, excel in this branch of literature. The earlier Muslim annalists like Ṭabarí, with their verbatim narratives by eye-witnesses of the events recorded transmitted orally through carefully scrutinized chains of traditionists, are not only singularly graphic but furnish us, even at this distance of time, with materials for history of which, thanks to these *isnáds*, it is still possible to estimate the authenticity, even if our judgement as to the strength of the respective links in the chain does not always agree with that of Muslim critics. The later Arab historians selected, condensed, and discarded these somewhat wearisome if valuable *isnáds*, but their narrative, as a rule, continues to be crisp, concise, graphic and convincing. The best of the earlier Persian historians, down to the thirteenth century, though lacking the charm of the Arabian chroniclers, are meritorious and trustworthy. The bad taste of their Tartar and Turkish rulers and patrons gradually brought about a deterioration both of style and substance, very noticeable between Juwayní’s *Ta’rikh-i-Jahán-gusháy* (completed about 658/1260) and its continuation, the *Ta’rikh-i-Waṣṣáḥ* (completed in 712/1312), which, as already observed ⁷⁹⁸, exercised an enduring evil influence on subsequent historians in Persia. Of later Persian histories I have met with few equal to a history of the Caliphate by Hindúsháh ibn Sanjar ibn ‘Abdu’lláh aṣ-Šáhibí al-Kirání, composed in 724/1324 for Nuṣratu’d-Dín Aḥmad the Atábak of Luristán, and entitled *Tajáribu’s-Salaf* (“Experiences of Yore”). This, however, is entirely and avowedly based on the delightful Arabic history of Ṣafíyyu’d-Dín Muḥammad ibn ‘Alí al-‘Alawí aṭ-Ṭiṭtaḳá, composed in 701/1302, commonly known

[page 444]

⁷⁹³ Lithographed at Bombay in 1885 and 1894.

⁷⁹⁴ I possess the lithographed edition of 1318/1900, but others have appeared in India and Egypt.

⁷⁹⁵ University of Chicago Press, 1909.

⁷⁹⁶ See my *Year amongst the Persians*, pp. 453-5.

⁷⁹⁷ London, Nichols & Co., 1903; pp. xiv + 211.

⁷⁹⁸ P. 413 *supra*.

as the *Kitábu'l-Fakhrí*⁷⁹⁹, but here entitled *Munyatu'l-Fuḍalá fí Tawárikhi'l-Khulafá wa'l-Wuzará* (“the Desire of Scholars on the History of the Caliphs and their Ministers”). That it never appealed to the debased taste which we are here deploring is sufficiently shown by the fact that not only has it never been published, but, so far as I know, it is represented only by my manuscript, G. 3 (copied in 1286/1870), and one other (dated 1304/1886-7) in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris⁸⁰⁰.

It would be a wearisome and unprofitable task to enumerate the many Persian historical works composed during the last four centuries. Of the histories of special periods the most important have been not only described but freely quoted in the first part of this volume, notably the *Şafwatu's-Şafá* for the life of Shaykh Şafiyu'd-Dín from whom the Şafawí kings were descended; the monograph on Sháh Isma'íl described by Sir E. Denison Ross in the *J. R.A.S.* for 1896, pp. 264-83; the *Aḥsanu't-Tawárikh*, completed in 985/1577-9 by Ḥasan-i-Rúmlú; and the *Ta'rikh-i-'Álam-árá-yi-'Abbási* of Iskandar Munshi, composed in 1025/1616. There are other monographs on the later Şafawí period such as the *Fawá'id-i-Şafawíyya* (1211/1796-7) and the *Tadhkira-i-Ál-i-Dáwúd* (1218/1803-4), which I would fain have consulted had they been accessible to me. For the post-Şafawí period we have several excellent European accounts which render us less dependent on the native historians, some of whose works moreover (e.g. the *Ta'rikh-*

[page 445]

*i-Zandiyya*⁸⁰¹ and the *Mujmalu't-Ta'rikh-i-Ba'd-Nádiríyya*⁸⁰²) have been published in Europe, while others, such as the *Durra-i-Nádirí* of Mírzá Mahdí Khán of Astarábád, are easily accessible in Oriental lithographed editions. These monographs contain valuable material and are indispensable to the student of this period, but they are generally badly arranged and dully written, and further marred by the florid and verbose style of which we have just been complaining.

For the general histories of our present period, from Khwándamír's *Habibu's-Siyar* (929/1523) at the beginning to Ridá-qulí Khán's Supplement to the *Rawḍatu's-Şafá* and Lisánu'l-Mulk's *Násikhu't-Tawárikh* at the end, with the very rare *Khuld-i-Barín* (1071/1660-1) in the middle, there is even less to be said, since, though for events contemporary with their authors they have the same value as the monographs just mentioned, for the earlier periods they are not even good or judicious abstracts of the carelessly selected authorities from whom they derive their information. They are, moreover, histories not of the Persian people but of the kings, princes and nobles who tyrannized over them and contended with one another for the spoils; wearisome records of bloodshed, violence and rapine from which it is hard to derive any general concepts of value⁸⁰³. Only by diligent and patient study can we extract from them facts capable of throwing any real light on the religious, political and social problems which a historian like Ibn Khaldún would have handled in so masterly a manner.

There are, however, hopeful signs of improvement in

[page 446]

recent times. Poor Mírzá Jání of Káshán, though a merchant without much literary training wrote his *Nuqtatu'l-Káf*⁸⁰⁴ on the history of the Bábí sect, of which in 1852 he was one of the proto-martyrs, with violence and passion indeed, but with knowledge, in plain and simple language without that florid rhetoric which we find so intolerable; while the unfinished “History of the Awakening of the Persians” (*Ta'rikh-i-Bidári-yi-Írániyán*) of the Názimu'l-Islám of Kirmán⁸⁰⁵, with its ample documentation and endeavour to estimate personal characteristics and influence on political events, seems to me to stand on an altogether higher level than any preceding Persian historical work composed during the last six or seven centuries.

5. BIOGRAPHY, AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND TRAVEL.

Muslim writers have always evinced a great partiality for biography, which may be general, dealing with the lives of eminent men of all sorts, like Ibn Khallikán's *Wafayátu'l-A'yán* (“Obituaries of Notable Men”) and the *Rawḍātu'l-Jannát*, of which I have made such extensive use in the latter part of this volume, the former composed in the thirteenth, the latter in the late nineteenth century, and both in Arabic; and the ambitious but unfinished modern Persian *Náma-i-Dánish-warán* (“Book of Learned Men”) compiled by a committee

[page 447]

⁷⁹⁹ Originally edited by Ahlwardt from the Paris MS. 895 (now 2441) and published at Gotha in 1860. A revised text was published by H. Derenbourg at Paris in 1895, and there are at least two cheap and good Egyptian editions. A French translation by Emil Amar has been published by the Société des Études Marocaines (Paris, 1910).

⁸⁰⁰ See Blochet's *Cat. des Mscr. Persans* etc. (Paris, 1905), vol. i, p. 251 (Schefer 237 = Suppl. Pers. 1552).

⁸⁰¹ Ed. Ernst Beer, Leyden, 1888.

⁸⁰² Ed. Oskar Mann, Leyden, 1891.

⁸⁰³ Compare Mr Vincent Smith's judicious remarks on this subject in his monograph on *Akbar*, pp. 386-7.

⁸⁰⁴ Published in 1910 as vol. xv of the “E. J. W. Gibb Memorial” Series.

⁸⁰⁵ This work was published in lithographed fasciculi, and, so far as it has reached me, comprises the Introduction (*Muqaddama*) of 273 pp.; vol. i, completed on the 20th of Dhu'l-Qa'da, 1328 (Nov. 23, 1910), which carries the narrative down to what is called the *Hijrat-i-Şuḡhrá* (December, 1905), and comprises 256 pp.; and vol. ii, completed at the end of Şafar, 1330 (Feb. 18, 1912), comprising 240 pp. Whether there is any likelihood of the work being completed I do not know.

of some half a dozen scholars, of which the first volume was lithographed at Tīhrán in 1296/1879 and the second in 1312/1904-5⁸⁰⁶. More often such works treat of the biographies of some particular class of men, such as Ministers, Physicians, Poets or Theologians; or they follow a geographical or a chronological arrangement, merging on the one hand into geography and on the other into history. Khwándamír's *Dastúru'l-Wuzarâ* ("Models for Ministers")⁸⁰⁷, composed, according to the chronogram implicit in the title, in 915/1509-10, affords us a Persian example of the first type falling at the beginning of the period reviewed in this volume. For the Physicians and Philosophers no Persian work approaches the level of al-Qiftî's *Ta'rikhu'l-Hukamâ*⁸⁰⁸ and Ibn Abi Uşaybi'a's *'Uyûnu'l-Anbâ fî Tabaqâti'l-A'ṭibbâ*⁸⁰⁹ both composed in the thirteenth century of our era, a period so rich in Arabic biographical works. Biographies of poets, on the other hand, abound in Persian, especially in the later period, since Shâh Isma'îl's son Sâm Mírzá set the fashion with his *Tuḥfa-i-Sâmi* (a continuation of Dawlatshâh's "Memoirs of the Poets") compiled in 957/1550. Eminent representatives of the Shî'a sect, both Arabs and Persians of every category from kings to poets, form the subject-matter of the very useful *Majâlisu'l-Mû'minin* ("Assemblies of Believers"), the author of which, Sayyid Nûru'llâh of Shûshhtar, was flogged to death in 1019/1610-11 by order of Jahângír at the instigation of the Sunnis, and who is therefore called by his fellow-believers the "Third Martyr" (*Shahid-i-Thâlith*)⁸¹⁰.

[page 448]

Of the older geographico-biographical works the *Átháru'l-Bilád* ("Monuments of the Lands") of Zakariyyá ibn Muḥammad ibn Maḥmúd al-Qazwíní⁸¹¹, and the Persian *Haft Iqlím* ("Seven Climes"), composed in 1028/1619 by Amín Aḥmad-i-Rázi, are typical specimens⁸¹². Monographs on different provinces or cities of Persia are also fairly common, and generally include notices of the more eminent natives of the region discussed. Of modern biographical works produced in Persia I have made extensive use, especially in the chapter on the Theologians, of the Arabic *Rawḍātu'l-Jannát fî Aḥwáli'l-'Ulamá wa's-Sádât* ("Gardens of Paradise, on the circumstances of Men of Learning and Leading"). This comprehensive work, which deserves to be better known, contains some 742 notices of eminent Muslim scholars, saints and poets, ancient and modern, and was compiled by Muḥammad Báqir ibn Ḥájji Amír Zaynu'l-'Ábidín al-Músawí of Khwánsár in the latter half of the nineteenth century. A good lithographed edition (except that, as usual, it has no Index) appeared at Tīhrán in 1306/1888. The notices are arranged in alphabetical order, not very strictly observed, under personal names, such as Aḥmad, 'Alí, Muḥammad, etc., which, of course, are seldom the names by which those who bear them are commonly known. Thus the Muḥammads, who fill the greater part of the fourth and last volume and comprise a hundred and forty-three articles, include the great Shî'a theologians generally referred to as al-Kulaynî, Ibn Bábawayhi and

[page 449]

Shaykh-i-Mufid; the historians Ṭabarí and Shahrístání; the scientists Rázi and Bírúní; the thinkers Fárábí, Ghazálí and Muḥyi'd-Dín ibnu'l-'Arabí; and the Persian poets Saná'í, Farídu'd-Dín 'Aṭṭár and Jalálu'd-Dín Rúmí, nor is any subordinate plan, chronological or other, discernible within these sections, so that the owner of the book who wishes to consult it regularly is compelled to make his own Index or Table of Contents.

The other book which I have constantly consulted as to the lives of the theologians is the Persian *Qišaṣu'l-'Ulamá* ("Stories of the Doctors") of Muḥammad ibn Sulaymán of Tanakábun, who wrote it in 1290/1873⁸¹³. It contains about a hundred and fifty biographies of Shî'a divines, and is more readable, if less accurate, than the work previously mentioned. Another useful Persian book on the same subject is the *Nujúmu's-Samá* ("Stars of Heaven") composed by Mírzá Muḥammad 'Alí in 1286/1869-70⁸¹⁴, dealing with the Shî'a doctors of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries of the *hijra* (seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth of the Christian era). There exist also two special monographs in Arabic on the Shî'a divines of Baḥrayn and Jabal 'Ámil, the *Lú'lu'atu'l-Baḥrayn* ("Pearl of Baḥrayn") of Shaykh Yúsuḥ ibn Aḥmad al-Baḥrání, who flourished in the eighteenth century; and the *Amalu'l-'Ámil fî 'Ulamá'i Jabal 'Ámil* ("the Hoper's Hope, on the Doctors of Mount 'Ámil"), by Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn 'Alí...al-Ḥurr al-'Ámilí, who belongs to the previous century.

Mention must also be made of another modern biographical work of a somewhat special character, which,

[page 450]

⁸⁰⁶ See my *Press and Poetry in Modern Persia*, pp. 165-6.

⁸⁰⁷ Compare Rieu (*B.M.P.C.*), p. 335. I have a good modern MS. professedly collated with the original in 1268/1851-2, now marked J. 11.

⁸⁰⁸ Edited by Professor Julius Lippert (Leipzig, 1903).

⁸⁰⁹ Printed in Cairo in two volumes in 1299/1882.

⁸¹⁰ See Rieu (*B.M.P.C.*), pp. 337-8.

⁸¹¹ Edited in the original Arabic by F. Wüstenfeld (Göttingen, 1848), and followed in the succeeding year by the same author's "Wonders of Creation" (*'Ajá'ibu'l-Makhlúqât*).

⁸¹² In the *Haft Iqlím* the biographical element preponderates. Unfortunately it remains unpublished, though a critical edition was begun by Mawlawí 'Abdu'l-Muqtadir, of which, so far as I know, only the first fasciculus (pp. x + ١١٤) has been printed at Calcutta in 1918.

⁸¹³ I possess two lithographed editions, one, the second Tīhrán edition, published in 1304/1886; the other, apparently at Lucknow, in 1306/1888-9.

⁸¹⁴ Lithographed at Lucknow in 1303/1885-6.

though the work of a Persian, is written in Turkish. This is the *Khatt u Khattátán* ("Writing and Writers")⁸¹⁵, a history of the art of Calligraphy and its votaries by the learned Mírzá Ḥabíb of Işfahán, who spent the latter period of his life in Constantinople, where he was a member of the *Anjuman-i-Ma'árif*, or Turkish Academy.

These are but a selection of the more useful or less known biographical works, of which many more will be found described in Rieu's, Ethé's, and other catalogues of Persian manuscripts. Of autobiographies the most notable is that of Shaykh 'Alí Ḥazín, which contains one of the few first-hand Persian accounts of the Afghán Invasion and fall of Işfahán in A.D. 1722. Travels are a special form of autobiography, in which His late Majesty Násiru'd-Dín Sháh indulged freely. An account of the mission of Farrukh Khán Amínu'l-Mulk to London and Paris at the close of the Anglo-Persian War in 1857-8 was written by one of his staff, Mírzá Ḥusayn ibn 'Abdu'lláh, but has never been published⁸¹⁶. It concludes with a description of the French Departments of State and Public Institutions. More valuable and varied in its contents is the *Bustánu's-Siyáhat* ("Garden of Travel") of Ḥájji Zaynu'l-'Ábidín of Shírván⁸¹⁷, who wrote it in 1247/1831-2. In a brief autobiography under the heading *Shamákhí* he tells us that he was born in mid-

[page 451]

Sha'bán, 1194 (August 15, 1780), and was taken to Karbalá, where he thenceforth made his home, when only five years old. He travelled extensively in 'Iráq, Gílán, the Caucasus, Ádharbáyján, Khurásán, Afghánistán, India, Kashmír, Badakhshán, Turkistán, Transoxiana, the Persian Gulf, Yaman, the Ḥijáz, Egypt, Syria, Turkey in Asia and Armenia, and in Persia also visited Tíhrán, Hamadán, Işfahán, Shíráz and Kirmán. He 'was a Shí'ite and a *darwísh* of the Order of Sháh Ni'matu'lláh, and in this double capacity made the acquaintance and enjoyed the friendship of many eminent doctors ('*ulamá*) and "gnostics" ('*urafá*). The author, a man of intelligence and a keen observer, does not give a continuous narrative of his travels, but arranges his materials under the following heads:

Chapter I. Account of the Prophet, his daughter Fátima, and the Twelve Imáms.

Chapter II. Account of certain doctors, gnostics, philosophers, poets and learned men.

Chapter III. On sundry sects and doctrines.

Chapter IV. Geographical account of towns and villages visited by the author in Persia, Turkistán, Afghánistán, India, parts of Europe and China, Turkey, Syria and Egypt, the names of these places being arranged alphabetically.

Promenade (Sayr). Prolegomena on the arrangement of this Garden, and on certain matters connected therewith.

Rose-bed (Gulshan). Countries and persons to describe which is the ultimate object of the book, arranged alphabetically in twenty-eight sections, corresponding with the letters of the Arabic alphabet.

Spring (Bahár), containing four *Rose-bowers (Gulzár)*:

- (i) On the interpretation of dreams;
- (ii) Names of certain halting-places of the author on his travels;
- (iii) Various anecdotes;
- (iv) Conclusion.

[page 452]

The book contains a great deal of miscellaneous biographical and geographical information, which, owing to the alphabetical arrangement generally observed, and the very full table of contents prefixed, is fairly accessible to the reader. The author was full of curiosity, and, though unable to visit Europe, lost no opportunity of cultivating the society of European travellers and acquainting himself with the peculiarities of their countries by hearsay. Under the article *Firang* (pp. 385-7) he discusses the general characteristics of the chief European nations, amongst whom he puts the French first, the Austrians second, and the English third; and he gives a long account of his conversations with an Englishman whom he calls "Mr Wiklís" (مستور وكليس)⁸¹⁸ and with whom he became acquainted at 'Azímábád. He also cultivated the society of the Austrian ambassador at Constantinople, who invited him to visit his country, "but," he concludes, "since there was no great spiritual advantage to be gained by travelling in that country, I declined." More valuable is his account of the various religions and sects of Asia, in which he treats, amongst other matters, of the Zoroastrians, Mazdakites, Jews, Christians, Hindu's, Şúfis and *Ghulát* (extreme Shí'a).

It would be impossible to notice here the many excellent books of reference, historical, biographical and geographical, which have been produced in Persia since the middle of the nineteenth century. Many of them, it is true, are for the most part compiled and condensed from older works, both Arabic and Persian, but some contain valuable new matter, not to be found

⁸¹⁵ A very nicely printed edition of this book was published at Constantinople in 1305/1887-8.

⁸¹⁶ My MS. K. 7, copied in 1276/1860 for Prince Bahman Mírzá Bahá'u'd-Dawla, came to me amongst the Schindler MSS. Concerning Farrukh Khán's mission, see R. G. Watson's *History of Persia 1800-1858*, pp. 456 *et seqq.*

⁸¹⁷ Lithographed at Tíhrán in 1310/1892-3. See Rieu (*B.M.P.S.*), pp. 99-101, Nos. 139 and 140, and B. Dorn *Mélanges et Extraits*, vol. iii, pp. 50-59.

⁸¹⁸ Perhaps a corruption of Wilkins (ولكنس).

elsewhere. Something must, however, be said as to certain peculiarities connected with this later literature and with the world of books in modern Persia.

European students of Persian are, as a rule, unless they have lived in that country, accustomed to think in terms of

[page 453]

manuscripts, and to turn to Dr Rieu's admirable catalogues of the British Museum MSS. for information as to literary history. But since the introduction into Persia of printing and lithography, especially since about 1880, the importance of the manuscript literature has steadily diminished, the more important books written being either transferred to stone or set up in type from the original copy. This printed and lithographed literature has not hitherto received nearly so much attention as the older manuscript literature, and it is often impossible to obtain ready and trustworthy information as to the authors and contents of these modern books. The recent publication of Mr Edwards's *Catalogue of the Persian printed books in the British Museum*⁸¹⁹ marks a great step in advance of anything previously accomplished, but the notices are necessarily very brief, and contain, as a rule, no particulars about the authors and only the most general indication of the character of their works. What is needed is a *catalogue raisonné* of Persian books composed during the last century and lithographed or printed in Persia, for it is much easier, for reasons which will be stated immediately, to ascertain what has been published in Persian in Turkey, Egypt and India.

The fact is that the Persian book trade is in the most chaotic condition. There are no publishers or booksellers of substance, and no book-catalogues are issued. Most books have no fixed price or place of sale; many have no pagination; hardly any have indexes or tables of contents. Often books comprising several volumes change their size and shape, their plan, and even their nature, as they proceed, while the author not unfrequently changes his title. Let us take as an illustration a few of the numerous works of reference published under the name of Mírzá Muḥammad Ḥasan Khán, who successively bore the titles of Ṣaní'u'd-

[page 454]

Dawla, Mú'tamanu's-Sultán, and I'timádu'd-Dawla, and was the son of Hájji 'Alí Khán of Marágha, originally entitled Hájibu'd-Dawla and later I'timádu's-Saltána. Now first of all it is very doubtful whether these books were really written by Ṣaní'u'd-Dawla at all; at any rate it is commonly asserted that he coerced various poor scholars to write them, and ascribed the authorship to himself⁸²⁰, proceedings of which the latter must be regarded as wholly reprehensible, whatever may be said in extenuation of the former. In 1293/1876 he published the first volume of the *Mirátu'l-Buldán* ("Mirror of the Lands"), a geographical dictionary of Persian towns and villages, largely based on Yáqút's well-known Arabic *Mu'jamu'l-Buldán*, containing the first four letters of the alphabet (ا to د). Of this volume, however, there appear to have been two editions, the first ending with the notice of Tabríz and containing 388 pages, the second, published a year later (1294/1877), extending to Tíhrán, and containing 606 pages. Having reached Tíhrán, however, the author, growing tired, apparently, of geography, decided to continue his work as a history of the reigning king Náṣiru'd-Dín Sháh, and to add at the end of each remaining volume a Calendar and Court Directory for the current year. Vol. ii, therefore, comprises the first fifteen years of the Sháh's reign (298 pp.) and the Calendar (45 pp.) for the year of publication (1295/1878). Vol. iii continues on the same lines, and contains the years xvi-xxxii of the current reign (264 pp.) and the Calendar (50 pp.). At this point, however, the author seems to have remembered his original plan, and in vol. iv he continues the geographical dictionary with the next two letters of the alphabet (ه and و), at which point he reverts to history, and gives an account of the events of the year of publication (1296/1879), followed by the annual Calendar. More-

[page 455]

over, in order to celebrate this reconciliation of geography and history, the size of this fourth volume is suddenly enlarged from 10½ x 6¾ inches to 13½ x 8¾ inches.

By this time the author appears to have grown weary of the "Mirror of the Lands," for after a year's rest he began the publication of a new book entitled *Muntazam-i-Nāṣiri*, of which also three volumes appeared in the years 1298-1300/1881-3. Of these three volumes I possess only the first and the third. The first contains an outline of Islamic history from A.H. 1-656 (A.D. 622-1258), that is, of the history of the Caliphate (pp. 3-239), followed by an account of the chief events of the solar year beginning in March, 1880, both in Persia and Europe (pp. 239-57), and the usual Calendar and Court Directory (42 pp.). The third volume contains a history of the reigning Qájár dynasty from 1194/1779 to 1300/1882 (pp. 32-387), followed again by the Calendar for the last mentioned year.

Next year the author began the publication of a new work in three volumes entitled *Maṭla'u'sh-Shams* ("the Dawning-place of the Sun"). This opens with a perfunctory apology for the incomplete condition in which the "Mirror of the Lands" was left. However, says he, since the next two letters of the alphabet are *há* (ح) and *khá* (خ), and since Khurásán is the most important province beginning with the latter, and since His Majesty Náṣiru'd-Dín Sháh, whose faithful servant he is, and to whom this and his other works are dedicated, had recently made the journey thither in order to visit the holy shrine of the

⁸¹⁹ London, 1922: 968 columns. The works are arranged under their authors, but there is a General Index of Titles and a Subject Index.

⁸²⁰ See my *Press and Poetry of Modern Persia*, pp. 156 and 164-6.

Imám ‘Alí Riḍá at Mashhad, he has decided to devote this book to an account of that province, which, since it lies to the East, is hinted at in the title. In the first volume (published in 1301/1884) he accordingly describes the route to Mashhad by way of Damáwand, Firúzkhúh, Bištám, Bujnúrd and Qúchán, giving a full account of each of these places and the intervening stations.

[page 456]

The second volume (published in 1302/1885) contains a detailed description of Mashhad, its monuments, its history from 428/1036 to 1302/1885, the most notable men to whom it has given birth, a monograph on the eighth Imám ‘Alí Riḍá, and in conclusion (pp. 469-500) a valuable list of the books contained in the Mosque library. In the midst of all this topographical matter is inserted (pp. 165-216) the text of Sháh Tahmásp’s diary, of which such free use was made in a previous chapter⁸²¹. The third volume (published in 1303/1886) contains an account of the Sháh’s return journey by the ordinary Pilgrim route through Níshápúr, Sabzawár, Sháhrúd, Dámghán and Samnán, with full descriptions of these and the intervening stations, and biographical notices of eminent men connected with each. A *Sál-náma*, or Calendar and Court Directory for the current year, completes each volume, and it is only fair to add that the price of each is stated on the last page as twelve *qráns*, at that time about seven shillings.

Henceforward most of Muḥammad Ḥasan Khán’s numerous works included a *Sál-náma*, or “Year Book” for the current year, placed at the end of each volume and having a separate pagination. His biographies of eminent Muslim women, entitled *Khayrátm^m Ḥisán^m*, published in three volumes in the years 1304-7/1887-90, lacks this addition, which is, however, found in the *Kitábu ‘l-Ma‘áthir wa ‘l-Áthár* (published in 1306/1888-9), on the Memorabilia of forty years of the reign of Náṣiru’d-Dín Sháh, an invaluable book of reference for students of the history, biography and evolution of modern Persia down to the date of publication. The plan of a geographical dictionary was taken up by another writer, Muḥammad Taqí Khán called Ḥakím, who in 1305/1887-8 published, under the title of *Ganj-i-Dánish* (“the Treasure of Learning”), a com-

[page 457]

plete Encyclopaedia of Persian place-names comprising 574 large pages. One welcome feature of this book is that the author prefixes a long list of the authorities and books of which he made use in his compilation. This includes a number of European (including ancient Greek) works.

These Persian lithographed books, notwithstanding their shortcomings, are, as a rule, pleasant to handle, well written, well bound, and printed on good paper. Some of them, like the *Khatt u Khattátán* (“Calligraphy and Calligraphists”) of Mírzá-yi-Sanglákh, and the excellent edition of the *Mathnawí* with Concordance of Verses (*Kashfu ‘l-Abyát*) associated with the name of ‘Alá’u’d-Dawla, are really beautiful books, while almost all are far superior to the Indian lithographs. They are, however, hard to obtain in Europe, and indeed anywhere outside Tíhrán, Tabríz and perhaps Iṣfahán. Even the British Museum collection is very far from complete, while my own collection, originally formed by purchase in Persia⁸²², owes much to the fact that I was able to add to it a number of volumes from two very notable Persian libraries, those of the late M. Charles Schefer and of the late Sir A. Houtum-Schindler. As has been already said, few greater services could be rendered to Persian scholarship than the proper cataloguing and describing of these lithographs, and the devising of means to place them on the European book-market. Since lithography can be carried on with simple apparatus and without any great technical skill or outlay of money, it is often practised by comparatively poor scholars and bibliophiles, who print very small editions which are soon exhausted, so that many books of this class rank rather with manuscripts than with printed books in rarity and desirability⁸²³.

CHAPTER X.

THE MOST MODERN DEVELOPMENTS (A.D. 1850 ONWARDS).

I have endeavoured to show that under the Qájár Dynasty, especially since the middle of the nineteenth century, the old forms of literature, both prose and verse, took on a fresh lease of life, and, so far from deteriorating, rose to a higher level than they had hitherto reached during the four centuries (roughly speaking A.D. 1500-1900) with which we are dealing in this volume. We must now consider three or four quite recent developments due in the first instance to what Mírzá Muḥammad ‘Alí Khán “Tarbiyat,” the real author of my *Press and Poetry in Modern Persia* (pp. 154-66), calls “Modernizing Influences in the Persian Press other than Magazines and journals.” Amongst these he assigns an important place to the various scientific text-books compiled by, or under the supervision of, the numerous Europeans appointed as teachers in the *Dáru ‘l-Funún* and the Military and Political Colleges in Tíhrán from A.D. 1851 onwards, and the Persian translations of European (especially

⁸²¹ See pp. 84 *et seqq. supra*.

⁸²² For a list of the books I bought in Persia in the autumn of 1888, see my *Year amongst the Persians*, pp. 554-7.

⁸²³ Compare p. 551 of the book mentioned in the preceding footnote.

French) books of a more general character, such as some of Molière's plays and Jules Verne's novels, which resulted from an increased interest in Europe and knowledge of European languages. Of such books, and of others originally written in Persian in this atmosphere, he gives a list containing one hundred and sixty-two entries, which should be consulted by those who are interested in this matter. The Revolution of A.D. 1906, with the remarkable development of journalism which it brought about, and the increase of facilities for printing resulting from this, gave a fresh

[page 459]

impulse to this movement, which, checked by the difficulties and miseries imposed on Persia by the Great War, seems now again to be gathering fresh impetus. What we have to say falls under three heads, the Drama, Fiction and the Press, of which the first two need not detain us long.

The Drama.

The only indigenous form of drama is that connected with the Muḥarram mournings, the so-called "Passion Plays" discussed in a previous chapter⁸²⁴, and even in their case it is not certain that they owe nothing to European influence. Three at least of Molière's plays (*Le Médecin malgré lui*, *Le Misanthrope*, and another entitled *The Ass*, which I think must be intended for *L'Étourdi*) have appeared in Persian translations, but are seldom met with, and seem never to have attained any great popularity. I possess only *Le Misanthrope*, printed at Constantinople in the *Taşwîru'l-Afkâr* Press in 1286/1860-70. The title is rendered as *Guzârish-i-Mardum-gurîz* ("the Adventure of him who fled from mankind"), the characters are Persianized, and the text is in verse and follows the original very closely, though occasionally Persian idioms or proverbs are substituted for French. Here, for instance, is the rendering — in this case a paraphrase — of the "Vieille chanson" in Act I, Scene 2:

“Si le roi m'avait donné
Paris, sa grand' ville,
Et qu'il me fallût quitter
L'amour de ma mie,
Je dirais au roi Henri
'Reprenez votre Paris,
J'aime mieux ma mie, o gail
J'aime mieux ma mie!”

[page 460]

گر بیک موی تَرکِ شیرازی،
بدهد پادشه بمن شیراز،
گویر ای پادشاه گرچه بُود،
شهرِ شیراز شهرِ بی انباز،
تَرکِ شیراز کافی است مرا،
شهرِ شیراز خویش بستان باز،

The following Persian version of Act II, Scene 7, if compared with the original, will give a fair idea of the translator's method. The characters are *Mú'nis* (Alceste), *Fatîna* (Célimène), *Laylá* (Éliante), *Nâsiḥ* (Acaste), *Na'im Beg* (Philinte) and *Farrâsh* (un garde de la Maréchaussée):

⁸²⁴ Pp. 172-94 *supra*.

مؤنس (به پیش فرّاش می‌رود)... چه هست فرمایش؟
 بیما به بینم!

فرّاش دارم دو حرف با سرکار،
 مؤنس توان دو حرف خودت را کنی بلند اظهار،
 فرّاش رئیس دیوان آن را که بنده‌ام فرّاش،
 مرا بدست بدادست حکم حاضر باش،
 بتو...

مؤنس بکه؟ بمن؟
 فرّاش آری بتو،

مؤنس برای چه کار،
 فرّاش بحرف مفت (امیدی) و حضرت سرکار،
 فتینه بناصح: چسان؟

ناصح امیدی و اوگشته اند دست و بغل،
 بچند شعر که نگذاشته است وقع و محل،
 کنون ز پیش بخواهند بست واره کار،

[page 461]

مؤنس من و مداهنه هرگز نمیکنم اقرار،
 ناصح ولیک حکم چنین رفته هین بجنب از جا،
 مؤنس میان ما چه بخواهند داد صلح و صفا،
 بحکمهای بزرگان مگر بود تسبیق،
 که شعرهای بد مردمان کنی تصدیق،
 از آنچه گفته‌ام انکار نیست زان مرجو،
 بد است هرچه بخواهی

ناصح ولیک مضمون نو،
 مؤنس نمیتوان گذرم شعرها پر و پوچ است،
 ناصح قبول رای تو خواهند و جای خواهش هست،
 برو!

مؤنس میروم اما نمیتوان اهدا
 ز رای خویش بگردم

ناصح برو تو خود بنما،
 مؤنس مگر بحکم شهبی خاص گردد و منسوب،
 که شعرهای ستیزیده یافت باید خوب،
 و گرنه فاش بگویم که شعرهاش بدند،
 ببايد اینکه چنین شاعران بدار کشند،
 (به نعمان بگ و نعیم بگ همین که دید میخندند)
 حقیقه که چنین سخره هم نبود گمان،
 که بوده باشم و هستم بکان!

ناصح روان شو هان،
 فتینه کجا شمارا باید.....

مؤنس روم ولی در دم
 بیایم اینجا تا کش مکش برم از هم،

[page 462]

No indication of the translator's identity appears on the title-page of my edition, nor is there any prefatory matter. Curiously enough, in the very same year in which this Persian version of *Le Misanthrope* was published (1286/1869-70) Ahmed Vefiq (Ahmad Wafiq) Pasha printed his Turkish translations of *George Dandin*, *Le Médecin malgré lui*, and *Le Mariage Forcé*⁸²⁵, while *Tartufe* appeared in Turkish somewhat later⁸²⁶.

In 1291/1874 there was lithographed in Tihrán a volume containing seven Persian plays with an Introduction on the educational value of the stage by Mirzá Ja'far Qarája-dághí. These plays were originally written in Adharbáyjání Turkish by Mirzá Fath-'Alí Darbandí, and were published in Tiflis about A.D. 1861. Five of them have been republished in Europe, with glossaries, notes and in some cases translations. These are (1) the *Wazír of Lankurán*, text, translation, vocabulary and notes, by W. H. D. Haggard and G. le Strange (London, 1882); (2) *Trois Comédies traduites du dialecte Turc Azeri en Persan et publiées... avec un glossaire et des notes par C. Barbier de Meynard et S. Guyard* (Paris, 1886); (3) Monsieur Jourdan, with translation, notes, etc. Edited by A. Wahrmund (Vienna and Leipzig, 1889). The three comedies contained in No. 2 are the "Thief-catching Bear" (*Khirs-i-qúldúr-básán*), "the Advocates" (*Wukalá-yi-Muráfa'a*), and "the Alchemist" (*Mullá Ibráhím Khalíl-i-Kímíyá-gar*). The two remaining plays, hitherto unpublished in Europe, are "the Miser" (*Mard-i-Khasís*) and "Yúsuf Sháh the Saddler"⁸²⁷.

[page 463]

Three more plays, written at a date unknown to me, by the late Prince Malkom Khán, formerly Persian Minister in London, were partly published as a *feuilleton* (*pá-waraq*) in the Tabriz newspaper *Ittihád* ("Union") in 1326/1908. A complete edition, from a copy in the library of Dr F. Rosen, the well-known scholarly German diplomatist, was published in 1340/1921-2 by the "Kaviani" Press in Berlin. These plays are (1) the "Adventures of Ashraf Khán, Governor of 'Arabistán, during his sojourn in Tihrán in 1232/1817"; (2) the "Methods of Government of Zamán Khán of Burújird," placed in the year 1236/1820-1; and (3) "Sháh-qulí Mirzá goes to Karbalá and spends some days at Kirmánsháh with the Governor Sháh Murád Mirzá."

Finally in 1326/1908 there appeared at Tihrán a bi-weekly newspaper called "the Theatre" (*Tiyátr*) which published plays satirizing the autocratic régime. I possess only a few numbers, containing part of a play entitled "Shaykh 'Alí Mirzá, Governor of Maláyir and Túlýsirkán, and his marriage with the daughter of the King of the Fairies."

These are all the Persian plays I have met with⁸²⁸. All are comedies, and all are satires on the administrative or social conditions of Persia. In the "Wazír of Lankurán" a rather weak and common-place love-story is combined with the satire, but generally speaking this element is lacking, and the object of the writer is simply to arouse dislike and contempt for the old-fashioned methods of government. In other words, these productions, like the "Travels of Ibráhím Beg," of which we shall shortly have

[page 464]

to speak, are primarily political pamphlets rather than plays. Hardly one of them has ever been acted on the stage, and none has produced an effect comparable to Kemál Bey's Turkish play *Waṭan, yakhod Silistra*⁸²⁹. In short the drama has not succeeded in establishing itself in Persia even to the extent which it has done in Turkey.

The Novel.

Of stories after the style of the "Arabian Nights" or the more popular and indigenous "Husayn the Kurd" there is in Persia no end, but of the novel properly so called there is even less to be said than of the drama. Two rather ambitious attempts in this direction have recently come under my notice, and it is characteristic of recent tendencies to glorify Zoroastrian Persia that both of them deal with pre-Islamic times, the one with Cyrus, the other with Qubád and his son and successor Anúsharwán (Núshírwán) and the heresiarch Mazdak.

The former (or rather the first volume of it, which, to judge by the colophon, was intended to be followed by two more volumes) was completed in 1334/1916, and printed at Hamadán in 1337/1919. It is entitled "Love and Lordship" (*Ishq u Salṭanat*), and was written by a certain Shaykh Músá, Director of the "Nuṣrat" Government College at Hamadán, who was

⁸²⁵ E. J. W. Gibb's *History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. v, p. 14.

⁸²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 59 and n. 1 *ad calc.*

⁸²⁷ "The Alchemist" was translated by G. le Strange in the *J.R.A.S.* for 1886 (pp. 103-26); "Yúsuf Sháh" in the same journal for 1895 (pp. 537-69) by Colonel Sir E. Ross; and the text of the same was published in 1889 at Madras by E. Sell. See E. Edwards's *Catalogue of the Persian Printed books in the British Museum*, 1922, col. 207-8.

⁸²⁸ Since this was written I have come across a little comedy entitled "Ja'far Khán comes from Europe" (معمد كانه عا نلد ينعبد) by Hasan Muqaddam, printed at Tihrán and actually performed there about two years ago.

⁸²⁹ Gibb (*op. laud.*, vol. v, p. 15) alludes very briefly to the outburst of patriotic enthusiasm aroused by this play "Fatherland" when it was first acted in the theatre of Gedik Pasha. Sultán 'Abdu'l-'Aziz was highly displeased and alarmed, and banished Kemál Bey to Famagusta in Cyprus.

good enough to send me a copy in January, 1920. It is described in the colophon as “the first novel (*roman*) composed in Persia in the Western fashion”:

و می توان گفت اولین رمانی است که در ایران با اسلوب مغرب
زمین تألیف شده

[page 465]

It aims at being a historical novel, but the proper names generally have their French, not their Old Persian, forms, e.g. “Mítrádát” (correctly explained as *Mihr-dád*), “Akbatán” (Ecbatana, instead of *Hagmatána*, for Hamadán), “Agrádát,” “Ispákú (Spako)” and “Siyákzar” (Cyaxares, for Huvakhshatara), though Cambyses (Kambújiya) takes the intermediate form “Kámúbúziyá.” The lengthy descriptions of the scenes and persons introduced into the story, and the numerous dialogues are evidently copied from European models. The story itself, into which an element of love as well as of war is introduced, is readable if not very thrilling, but is overloaded with dates, archaeological and mythological notes, and prolix historical dissertations ultimately based for the most part on the statements of Herodotus mixed with information derived from the Avesta. There is no attempt to make use of archaic language or to eschew the use of Arabic words, but the author has at any rate avoided glaring anachronisms. The following short extract (p. 247) from the description of the preparations for the marriage of Cyrus will suffice to show how far removed is the style of this book from that of the type of story hitherto current in Persia:

بلی این تہیہ تہیہ عروسی است، و گمان ندارم کہ عروسی جز
برای کورس پادشاہ با اقتدارِ پارس و مدی باشد، چه کہ امروز
کسی جز او این قدر در نزد اهالی اکباتان محبوبیت ندارد کہ
مردم عروسی او را چون عیدی بزرگ دانستہ و بازارها را زینت
کرده و از صمیم قلب اظهار سرور و شادمانی نمایند،

“Yes! These preparations are the preparations for a wedding, and I do not think that it can be the wedding of anyone else than Cyrus, the mighty King of Persia and Media, for today none but he commands in so great a measure the affection of the people of Ecbatana, so that they regard his wedding as a great festival, and have decorated the bazaars, and from the bottom of their hearts make manifest their joy and gladness.”

[page 466]

I do not know what measure of success this “historical novel” has achieved in Persia, nor did I ever meet with more than the one copy sent me by the author, accompanied by a letter dated 4 Šafar, 1338 (Oct. 30, 1919), in which he requested me to review it in the *Times*. I hope he will accept this brief notice as the best I can do to make his book known in Europe as a praiseworthy attempt to instruct while entertaining his countrymen, and to introduce a literary form hitherto unknown in Persia.

The second of the two historical novels mentioned above was printed at Bombay in 1339/1920-1, was written by Šan‘atí-záda of Kirmán, and is entitled “the Ensnarers: or the Avengers of Mazdak⁸³⁰.” Like the last it is incomplete, for it ends (on p. 110) with the words “here ends the first volume,” though how many more the author intended to add does not appear, nor do I know whether any further instalment was actually published. In general style it much resembles “Love and Lordship,” but presents more archaeological errors, as, for instance, where (p. 10) a portrait of the Sásánian king Bahrám Gúr is described as bearing a label written in the cuneiform character (*khaṭṭ-i-mikhî*)!

Before leaving this subject I must at least mention a Persian translation of three episodes in the career of the immortal Sherlock Holmes, translated from a Russian version by Mír Isma‘íl ‘Abdu’lláh-záda, and printed at the Khurshíd Press in Tíhrán in 1323/1905-6. They are entitled respectively the “Episode of the Gold Spectacles,” the “Account of Charles Augustus Milverton⁸³¹,” and “the Village Lords.” Holmes in passing through a Russian medium has been transmuted into “Khums” (خمیس) or “Khúmís” (خومیس): Dr Watson

[page 467]

has been more fortunate. The adventures are narrated in the simplest possible style, and would form an admirable reading-book for beginners in Persian, if the book were obtainable in any quantity, which is unlikely. In Turkey Sherlock Holmes had an enormous success, and I remember a news-vendor on one of the Bosphorus steamers offering me a Turkish version of the

⁸³⁰ دامر گستران یا انتقام خواهان مزدک،

⁸³¹ The original is entitled “the Adventure of Appledore Towers.”

“Engineer’s Thumb,” while the late Sulṭán ‘Abdu’l-Ḥamíd was said to entertain the greatest admiration for Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, and to desire above all things to put him in charge of his Secret Police.

It is hard to say whether Hájji Zaynu’l-‘Ábidín of Marágha’s fictitious “Travels (*Siyáhat-náma*) of Ibráhím Beg,” which, according to Mírzá Muḥammad ‘Alí Khán “Tarbiyat”⁸³², had an appreciable effect in precipitating the Persian Revolution of A.D. 1905-6, should be reckoned as a novel or not. The hero and his adventures are, of course, fictitious, but there is little exaggeration, and they might well be actual. The book is a bitter satire on Persian methods of government and social conditions, which are depicted in the most sombre colours, with the definite object of arousing discontent in order to bring about reform. The Persians are very sensitive to ridicule, but on the whole bear it much better than most European nations, and most Persian reformers have made extensive use of satire as a means of promoting their objects. This *Siyáhat-náma* is well and powerfully written in a simple yet forcible style, and I know of no better

[page 468]

reading-book for the student who wishes to obtain a good knowledge of the current speech and a general, if somewhat lurid, idea of the country.

In this connection mention should also be made of the Persian translation made by the talented and unfortunate Hájji Shaykh Aḥmad “Rúḥí” of Kirmán of Morier’s *Hájji Bába*, published by Colonel D. C. Phillott at Calcutta in 1905⁸³³. This book, like the last, is a clever satire on the Persians, the more remarkable as being the work of a foreigner; but it belongs rather to the domain of English than Persian literature. All that I had to say about it is contained in the Introduction (pp. ix-xxiii) which I contributed to the edition published by Messrs Methuen in 1895, and all that need be said about the Persian translator and his work has been well said by Colonel Phillott in his Introduction to the Persian text.

The Press.

Of Persian journalism, which has been the most powerful modernizing influence in Persia, I have treated so fully in a previous monograph on the subject⁸³⁴ that little need be said here, save by way of summary. Printing was introduced into Persia about a century ago by ‘Abbás Mírzá, and the first Persian newspaper appeared about A.D. 1851, in the third year of Nāṣiru’d-Dín Sháh’s reign. It was soon followed by others, but these early news-sheets, issued by the Government, were entirely colourless, and even when I was in Persia in 1887-8 the only Persian newspaper worth reading was the *Akhtar* (“Star”), published weekly at Constantinople. It was founded in 1875, and lasted about twenty years. Prince Malkom Khán’s *Qánún* (“Law”)

[page 469]

appeared in 1890 and was printed and published in London, but in consequence of its violent attacks on the Persian Government, the Sháh, and his Ministers, its circulation in Persia was prohibited. The Calcutta *Ḥablu’l-Matín* first appeared in 1893, the *Thurayyá* (“Pleiades”) in Cairo in 1898, and the *Parwarish*, which replaced it, in 1900. These were the most important Persian papers published outside Persia, and it was not until 1907, when the Revolution was an accomplished fact, and the conflict between King and Parliament was at its height, that independent and influential newspapers began to appear in Persia itself. Amongst the most interesting of these from a literary point of view I should place the *Šúr-i-Isráfil* (“Trumpet of Isráfil” — the Angel of the Resurrection), the *Nasím-i-Shimál* (“Breeze of the North”), the *Mušáwát* (“Equality”), and the *Naw Bahár* (“Early Spring”). The first, second, and fourth of these supplied me with many fine poems from the pens of Dakhaw, Sayyid Ashraf of Gílán, and Bahár of Mashhad, for my *Press and Poetry in Modern Persia*, but the *Charand-parand* (“Charivari”) column of the *Šúr-i-Isráfil* also contained some excellent and original prose writing of which I shall now give two specimens, since they are unlike anything else which I have met with in Persian. Both are by Dakhaw: the first appeared in No. 1 of the *Šúr-i-Isráfil* (May 30, 1907); the second in No. 2 (June 6, 1907).

چونند پرند

بعد از چندین سال مسافرت هندوستان و دیدن ابدال و اوتاد و
مهارت در کیمیا و لیمیا و سیمیا الحمد لله بتجربه بزرگی نائل
شدم، و آن دواى ترك تريك است، اگر اين دوا را در هر يك از
ممالك خارجه كسى كشف ميكرد ناچار صاحب امتياز ميشد

⁸³² See my *Press and Poetry of Modern Persia*, pp. 22 and 164. The Persian text was printed in three volumes, the first at Cairo without date; the second at Calcutta in 1323/1905, though publication was apparently delayed until 1907; the third at Constantinople in 1327/1909. The name of the author appears only on the title-page of vol. iii. A German version of the first volume by Dr Walter Schulz was published at Leipzig in 1903 with the title *Zustände im heutigen Persien wie sie das Reisebuch Ibrahim Begs enthüllt*.

⁸³³ See pp. vii-viii of the English Introduction to this work, and also my *Persian Revolution*, pp. 93-6.

⁸³⁴ *The Press and Poetry in Modern Persia*, Cambridge, 1914.

انعامات می گرفت، در همه روزنامه‌ها نامش بزرگی درج میشد،
اما چکنم که در ایران قدردان نیست!

عادت طبیعت ثانوی است همینکه کسی بکاری عادت کرد دیگر
باین آسانیا نمیتواند ترك کند؛ علاج منحصر باین است که
بترتیب مخصوصی بمرور زمان کم کند تا وقتیکه بگلی از سرش
بیفتد.

حالا من بتهام برادران مسلمان غیور تریاکی خود اعلان میکنم
که ترك تریاك ممکن است باینکه اولاً در امر ترك جازم و مصمم
باشند؛ ثانیاً مثلاً يك نفر که روزی دو مثقال تریاك میخورد روزی
يك گندم از تریاك کم کرده دو گندم مُرفین بجای آن زیاد کند؛
و کسیکه ده مثقال تریاك می کشد روزی يك نخود کم کرده
دو نخود حشیش اضافه نماید و همین طور مداومت کند تا وقتیکه
دو مثقال تریاك خوردنی به چهار مثقال مُرفین و ده مثقال تریاك
کشیدنی به بیست مثقال حشیش برسد؛ بعد از آن تبدیل خوردن
مُرفین به آب دزدك مُرفین و تبدیل حشیش بخوردن دوغ وحدت
بسیار آسان است؛ برادران غیور تریاکی من در صورتیکه خدا
کارها را این طور آسان کرده چرا خودتان را از زحمت حرفهای
مفت مردم و تلف کردن این همه مال و وقت نمی رها کنید؛
ترك عادت در صورتیکه باین قسم بشود موجب مرض نیست و کار
خیلی آسانی است!

و همیشه بزرگان و متشخصین هم که میخواهند عادت زشتی
از سر مردم بپندازند همین طور میکنند مثلاً ببینید واقعاً شاعر
خوب گفته است که عقل و دولت قرین یکدیگرست؛ مثلاً وقتیکه
بزرگان ما فکر میکنند که مردم فقیرند و استطاعت نان گندم
خوردن ندارند و رعیت همه عمرش را باید بزراعت گندم صرف
کند و خودش همیشه گرسنه باشد به ببینید چه میکنند!

روز اول سال نان را با گندم خالص می پزند، روز دوم در هر خروار يك من تلخه، جو، سیاه دانه، خاک آزه، یونجه، شن. . . مثلاً مختصر عرض میکنم. . . کلوخ، چارکه، گلوله، هشت مثقالی میزنند، معلوم است در يك خروار گندم که صد من است يك من ازین چیزها هیچ معلوم نمیشود، روز دوم دو من میزنند، روز سوم سه من، و بعد از صد روز که سه ماه و ده روز بشود صد من گندم صد من تلخه، جو، سیاه دانه، خاک آزه، کاه، یونجه، شن، شده است در صورتیکه هیچ کس ملتفت نشده و عادت نان گندم خوردن هم از سر مردم افتاده است،
واقعاً که عقل و دولت قرین یکدیگر است،

برادران غیور تریاکی من البته میدانید که انسان عالم صغیر است و شابهت تمام بعالم کبیر دارد یعنی مثلاً هرچیز که برای انسان دست میدهد ممکن است برای حیوان، درخت، سنگ، کلوخ، در، دیوار، کوه، دریا هم اتفاق بیفتد و هرچیز هم برای اینها دست میدهد برای انسان هم دست میدهد چرا که انسان عالم صغیر است و آنها جزو عالم کبیر، مثلاً این را میخواستیم بگوییم همان طور که ممکن است عادت را از سر مردم انداخت همان طور هم ممکن است عادت را از سر سنگ و کلوخ و آجر انداخت چرا که میان عالم صغیر و عالم کبیر مشابهت تمام است، پس چه انسانی باشد که از سنگ و کلوخ هم کمر باشد،

مثلاً يك مریضخانه، حاجی شیخ هادی مجتهد مرحوم ساخت موقوفاتی هم برای آن معین کرد که همیشه یازده نفر مریض در آنجا باشند، تا حاجی شیخ هادی حیات داشت مریضخانه بیازده نفر مریض عادت کرد، همینکه حاجی شیخ هادی مرحوم شد طلاب مدرسه به پسر ارشدش گفتند ما وقتی تو را آقا میدانیم که

[page 472]

موقوفات مریضخانه را خرج ما بکنی، حالا به بینید این پسر خلف ارشد با قوت علم چه کرد، ماه اول يك نفر از مریضها را کمر کرد، ماه دوم دو تا، ماه سوم سه تا، ماه چهارم چهار تا، و همین طور تا حالا که عده مریضها به پنج نفر رسیده، و کمر کمر بحسن تدبیر آن چند نفر هم تا پنج ماه دیگر از میان خواهد رفت، پس به بینید که با تدبیر چطور میشود عادت را از سر همه کس و همه چیز انداخت حالا مریضخانه، که بیازده مریض عادت داشت بدون اینکه ناخوش بشود عادت از سرش افتاد چرا؟ برای آنکه آن هم جزو عالم کبیر است و مثل انسان که عالم صغیر است میشود عادت را از سرش انداخت، (دخو)

Translation.

“After several years travelling in India, seeing the invisible saints⁸³⁵, and acquiring skill in Alchemy, Talismans and Necromancy⁸³⁶, thank God, I have succeeded in a great experiment; no less than a method for curing the opium-habit! If any one in any foreign country had made such a discovery, he would certainly have received decorations and rich rewards, and his name would have been mentioned with honour in all the newspapers. But what can one do, since in Persia no one recognizes merit?

“Custom is a second nature, and as soon as one becomes habituated to any act, one cannot easily abandon it. The only curative method is to reduce it gradually by some special procedure, until it is entirely forgotten.

“To all my zealous, opium-eating, Muslim brethren I now proclaim the possibility of breaking the opium-habit, thus. First, they must be firmly determined and resolved on abandoning it. Secondly, one who,

⁸³⁵ The *Abdāl* (“Substitutes”) and *Awtād* (“Pegs”) are two classes of the *Rijālu’l-Ghayb*, or “Men of the Unseen World,” who play an important part in the cosmogony of the Mystics.

⁸³⁶ Concerning these Occult Sciences, see pp. 441-2 *supra*.

for example, eats two *mithqáls*⁸³⁷ of opium daily should every day diminish this dose by a grain (*nukhúd*) and add two grains of morphine

[page 473]

in its stead. One who smokes ten *mithqáls* of opium should daily reduce the amount by one grain, adding instead two grains of *hashish* (Indian hemp). Thus he should persevere until such time as the two *mithqáls* of opium which he eats are replaced by four *mithqáls* of morphine, or the ten *mithqáls* of opium which he smokes by twenty *mithqáls* of *hashish*. After this it is very easy to substitute for morphine pills hypodermic injections of the same, and for *hashish* ‘curds of Unity⁸³⁸.’ O my zealous, opium-eating brethren, seeing that God has made matters so easy, why do you not save yourselves from the annoyance of men’s foolish chatter, and the waste of all this time and money? Change of habit, if it be effected in this way, does not cause illness and is a very easy matter.

“Moreover great and eminent men who wish to make people forget some evil habit act in precisely this way. See, for example, how well indeed the poet says that intelligence and fortune are closely connected with one another. For example, when our great men consider that the people are poor and cannot eat wheaten bread, and that the peasant must spend all his life in cultivating wheat, yet must himself remain hungry, see what they do.

“On the first day of the year they bake the bread with pure wheat-flour. On the second day in every hundredweight (*kharwár*) they put a maund of bitter apricot stones, barley, fennel-flower, sawdust, lucerne, sand — I put it shortly as an illustration — clods, brick-bats and bullets of eight *mithqáls*. It is evident that in a hundredweight of corn, which is a hundred maunds, one maund of these things will not be noticed. On the second day they put in two maunds, on the third three, and after a hundred days, which is three months and ten days, a hundred maunds of wheat-flour have become a hundred maunds of bitter apricot stones, barley, fennel-flower, sawdust, chaff, lucerne and sand, and that in such fashion that no one has noticed it, while the wheaten bread habit has entirely passed out of men’s minds.

“In truth intelligence and fortune are closely connected with one another!

“O my zealous, opium-eating brethren! Assuredly you know that man is a little world, and has the closest resemblance to the great world; that is to say, for example, that whatever is possible for man may happen also in the case of animals, trees, stones, clods, doors,

[page 474]

walls, mountains and seas; and that whatever is possible for these is possible also for men, because man is the microcosm, while these form part of the macrocosm. For example, I wanted to say this, that just as it is possible to put a habit out of men’s minds, even so is it possible to put a habit out of the minds of stones, clods, and bricks, because the closest resemblance exists between the microcosm and the macrocosm. What sort of a man, then, is he who is less than even a stone or a clod?

“For example, the late *mujtahid* Hájji Shaykh Hádí⁸³⁹ built a hospital and settled on it certain endowments so that eleven sick persons might always be there. So long as Hájji Shaykh Hádí was alive the hospital was accustomed to receive eleven patients. But as soon as Hájji Shaykh Hádí departed this life, the students of the college said to his eldest son, ‘We will recognize you as the Master only when you spend the hospital endowments on us!’ See now what this worthy eldest son did by dint of knowledge. In the first month he reduced the number of patients by one, in the second by two, in the third by three, in the fourth by four ; and so in like fashion until the present time, when the number of patients has been reduced to five, and gradually, by this excellent device, these few also will disappear in the course of the next five months. See then how by wise management it is possible to expel habit from the minds of every one and every thing, so that a hospital which was accustomed to eleven patients has entirely forgotten this habit without falling ill. Why? Because it also forms part of the macrocosm, so that it is possible to drive a habit out of its mind, just as in the case of man, who is the microcosm.”

“Dakhaw.”

⁸³⁷ The *mithqál* = 4·60 grammes, and is divided into 24 *nukhúd* (“peas”), each of which consists of 4 grains or barley-corns (*gandum*).

⁸³⁸ *Dúgh-i-Wahdat*, or *Banjáb*, is a mixture of *hashish* and curdled milk similar to *asrár*, *habb-i-nashát*, etc. *Búq-i-Wahdat* (“the trumpet of unity”) is the name given by *hashish*-smokers to a paper funnel through which the smoke of the drug is inhaled.

⁸³⁹ See my *Persian Revolution*, pp. 406-7.

کبلائی دخوا! تو قدیمها گاهی بدرد مردم میخوردی مشکلی بدوستان روی میداد حل میکردی، این آخرها که سرو صدائی از تو نبود میگفتم بلکه تو هم تریاکی شده، در گوشه اطاق پای منقل لمر داده، اما نگو که تو ناقلای حقه همان طور که توی صور اسرافیل نوشته بودی یواشکی بی خبر نپیدانم برای تحصیل علم کیمیا و لیپیا و سیمیا گذاشتی در رفتی بهند، حکماً کنج نامه هم

[page 475]

پیدا کرده، در هر حال اگر سؤ ظنی در حق تو برده‌ام باید خیلی خیلی به بخشی عذر میخوام، باز الحمد لله سلامت آمدی جای شکرش باقی است چرا که خوب سر وقتش رسیدی، برای اینکه کارها خیلی شلوق پلوق است

خدا رفتگان همه را بیامرزد خاک برایش خبر نبرد. در قاقازان ما يك ملا اینکعلی داشتیم روضه خوان خیلی شوخ بود. حالا نداشته باشد با من هر خیلی میانه داشت وقتی که میرفت روضه بخواند اول يك مقدمه دور و درازی می‌چید، هرچند بی ادبی است میگفت مطلب این طور حرفه‌تر میشود (در مثل مناقشه نیست) بنظرم می‌آید برای شما هم محض اینکه درست بمطلب پی ببرید يك مقدمه بچینم بد نیست

در قدیم الایام در دنیا يك دولت ایران بود در همسایگی ایران هم دولت یونان بود، دولت ایران آن وقت دماغش پرباد بود، از خودش خیلی راضی بود، یعنی بی ادبی می‌شود لولپنگش خیلی آب میگرفت، کتابه ملك الملوكی دنیا را می‌کشید، بلی آن وقت در ایران معشوق السلطنه، محبوب الدوله، عزیز الایاله، خوشگل خلوت، قشنگ حضور، ملوس الملك نبود، در قصرها هم سرسره نساخته بودند، ملأهای آن وقت هم چماق الشریعه، حاجب الشریعه، پارك الشریعه نداشتند، خلاصه آن وقت کالسکه الاسلام، میز و صندلی المذهب، اسب روسی الدین وجود نداشت، خوش آن روزها واقعاً که درست عهد پادشاه و زوزک بود، مخلص کلام، يك روز دولت ایران لشکرهای خودش را جمع کرد، یواش یواش رفت تا پشت دیوار یونان، برای داخل شدن یونان يك راه بیشتر نبود که لشکر ایران حکماً باید از آن راه عبور کنند، بلی پشت این راه هم يك كوچه آشتی گنان مسجد آقا سید عزیز الله

[page 476]

یعنی يك راه باریك دیگر بود ولی لشکر ایران آن راه را بلد نبود
همینکه لشکر ایران پشت دیوار یونان رسید دید این یونانیهای
بد ذات هفت خط با قشون جلو راه را گرفته اند، خوب حالا
ایران چه خاک بسرش کند؟ برود چطور برود، بر گردد چطور بر
گردد، مانده سفیل و سرگردان، خدا رحمت کند شاعرا خوب
گفته است (ع) نه در غربت دلبر شاد و نه روئی در وطن دارم آلتخ
از آنجا که باید کارها راست بیاید يك دفعه لشکر ایران دیدند
یواشکی يك نفر از آن جعفر قلی آقاها پسر بیگلر آقاهاى قزاق
یعنی يك نفر غریب نواز يك نفر نوع پرست يك نفر مهمان
دوست از لشکر یونان جدا شد، و همه جا پا ورچین پا ورچین
آمد تا اردوی ایرانها و گفت سلام علیکم خیر مقدم! خوش
آمدید صفا آوردید، سفر بی خطر، ضمناً آهسته با انگشت شهادت
آن کوچک آشتی کنان را بایرانها نشان داد، گفت ما یونانیها
آنجا لشکر نداریم اگر شما از آن راه بروید می توانید میلکت ما را
بگیرید، ایرانها هم قبول کرده و از آن راه رفته داخل خاک یونان
شدند

حالا مطلب اینجا نیست، راستی تا یادم نرفته اسر آن غریب
نوازا هر عرض کنم، هر چند قدری بزبان ما سنگین است اما چه
میشود کرد، اسمش (افیالتس) بود، خدا لعنت کند شیطان را
نهی دانه چرا هر وقت من این اسر را می شنوم بعضی سفرای
ایران یادم می افتد، باری برویبر سر مطلب، در آن وقت که
جناب چکیده، غیرت نتیجه علم و سیاست معلم مدرسه قزاقخانه
جناب میرزا عبد الرزاق خان مهندس بعد از سه ماه پیاده روی
نقشه جنگی راه مازندران را برای روسها کشیدند ما دوستان
گفتم چینی آدم با وجود حیف است که لقب نداشته باشد

بهست نفر سه شبانه روز هر نشستیم فکر کردیم که چه لقبی برای ایشان بگیریم چیزی بعقلیمان نرسید، حالا از همه بدتر خوش سلیقه هر هستند، میگویند لقبی که برای من میگیرید باید بکر باشد یعنی پیش از من کس دیگر نگرفته باشد، از مستوفیها پرسیدم گفتند دیگر لقب بکر نیست، کتابهای لغت را باز کردیم، در زبان فارسی عربی ترکی، فرنگی از الف تا یك كلمه نیست که اقلًا ده دفعه لقب نشده باشد، خوب حالا چه کنیم؟ یعنی خدا را خوش میآید این آدم همین طور بی لقب بماند، از آنجا که کارها باید راست بیآید يك روز من در کمال اوقات تلخی کتاب تاریخی که جلو دستم بود بر داشتم که خودم را مشغول کنم همینکه کتاب را باز کردم در صفحه دست راست سطر اول دیدم نوشته است (از آن روز بعد یونانیها بافیالتس خائن گفتند و خونش را هدر کردند) ای لعنت بشما یونانیها مگر افیالتس بشما چه کرده بود که شما او را خائن بگوئید، مگر مهمان نوازی در مذهب شما کفر بود؟ مگر بغریب پرستی شما اعتقاد نداشتید؟ خلاصه همینکه این اسر را دیدم گفتم هیچ بهتر از این نیست که این اسر را برای جناب میرزا عبد الرزاق خان لقب بگیریم، چرا که هر بکر بود هر این دو نفر شباهت کامل بهم داشتند، این غریب نواز او هر بود، این مهمان پرست بود او هر بود، این میگفت اگر من این کار را نمی کردم دیگری می کرد، او هر میگفت، تنها يك فرق در میانه بود که تکمه‌های سرداری افیالتس از چوب جنگل وطن نبود، خوب نباشد این جزئیات قابل ملاحظه نیست، مخلص کلام، ما دوستان جمع شدیم يك مهمانی دادیم شادیهما کردیم فوراً يك تلگراف هم بکاشان زدیم که پنج شیشه گلاب قَمَصَر و دو جعبه جَوُزَقند زود بفرستند که بدهیم لقب را بگیریم، در همین حیص و بیص جناب

[page 478]

حاجی ملك التجار راه آستارا را بروسها واگذار کردند، نمی دانم کدام نامرد حکایت این لقب را هر باو گفت دو پاش را توی يك کفش کرد که از آسمان افتاده امر این لقب حق و مال من است، حالا چند ماه است نمی دانی چه امر سراتی راه افتاده، از يك طرف میرزا عبد الرزاق خان بقوه علم هندسه، از يك طرف حاجی ملك التجار بزور فصاحت و بلاغت و شعرهای امرؤ القیس و ناصر خسرو علوی، کبلائی دخونی دانی در چه انشرو منشوری گیر کرده ایمر... اگر بتوانی ما را از این بلایه خلاص کنی مثل این است که يك بنده در راه خدا آزاد کرده، خدا ان شاء الله پسرهای را ببخشد، خدا يك روز عمرت را صد سال کند، امروز روز غیرت است دیگر خود میدانی، زیاده عرضی ندارم، خادم با وفای شما (مهر مگس)

Translation.

Charand-parand. City letter.

“Kablá’í⁸⁴⁰ Dakhaw!

“In old days you used sometimes to be a help to people: if any difficulty befel your friends, you used to solve it. Latterly, there being no sign or sound of you, I kept telling myself that perhaps you too had taken to opium and were lolling⁸⁴¹ at the foot of the brazier in the corner of the room. Now don’t tell me that⁸⁴² you, you queer mug⁸⁴³, quietly, without any one’s knowledge (I do not know whether in order to study

⁸⁴⁰ For the half slang use of “Kablá’í” (= *Karbalá’i*), see my *Press and Poetry of Modern Persia*, pp. 179-82.

⁸⁴¹ *Lam dádan* (slang), “to loll, lounge.”

⁸⁴² Equivalent to *balki*, “perhaps.”

⁸⁴³ *Náquláy huqqa*, explained as equivalent to the French “drôle de type.”

Alchemy, Talismans and Necromancy, as you have written in the *Šūr-i-Isrāfil*) have cut and run to India. Surely then you have found the key to a treasure also! At any rate, if I have entertained an unworthy suspicion of you, you must

[page 479]

forgive me: I ask your pardon! Anyhow, praise be to God, you have got safely back, a lasting cause of thankfulness, for you have come at just the right moment, seeing that affairs are all topsy-turvy.

“May God forgive everybody’s departed friends⁸⁴⁴! May the earth not whisper it to him! In Qāqázán we had a certain Mullá Ínak-‘Alí⁸⁴⁵, a *rawḍa-khwán*⁸⁴⁶ and a very impudent fellow. Whatever may be the case now, he was at that time very thick with me. When he went to recite a *rawḍa*, he used first of all to put forward a long-winded prologue. He used to say (saving your presence)⁸⁴⁷, ‘In this way the matter will be more ass-plain’ (no need to quarrel over a mere illustration). It occurs to me that it would not be a bad thing if I too were to begin with a prologue for you, simply in order that you may get the hang of the matter.

“In olden days there was in the world one great Persian Empire with the State of Greece as its neighbour. At that time the Persian Empire was puffed up with pride⁸⁴⁸. It was very well pleased with itself, and, if you will pardon the expression, its pipe took a lot of filling⁸⁴⁹. Its ambition was the King-of-Kingship of the world. Yes, there was then in Persia no ‘King’s Darling,’ ‘State’s Sweetheart,’ ‘Pet of the Province,’ ‘Beauty of the Privy Chamber,’ ‘Charmer of the Presence,’ or ‘Minion of the Kingdom’⁸⁵⁰. Nor had they yet made ‘slides’ in their palaces⁸⁵¹. Nor did the Mullás of that time include a ‘Club of the Canon Law,’ ‘Chamberlain of the Canon Law,’ or ‘Park of the Canon Law.’ At that time, in short, there did not exist a ‘Carriage of Islám,’ ‘Table

[page 480]

and Chair of the Faith,’ or ‘Russian Horse of Religion.’ Fine days were those indeed, which were in truth the time of King Wizwizak⁸⁵²!

“But to be brief. One day the Persian Government collected its armies and quietly advanced to the back of the wall of Greece. Now to enter Greece there was only one way, by which way the Persian army must needs pass. Yes, but behind that way there was a lane like the *Áshtí-kunán*⁸⁵³ of the Mosque of Áqá Sayyid ‘Azizu’lláh, that is to say, there was another narrow lane, but the Persian army did not know about it. As soon as the Persian army arrived behind the wall of Greece, they saw that these seven-fold rascals of Greeks had blocked the road with troops. Well, what dust must Persia now scatter on her head? How, if she would advance, should she advance, or bow, if she would retreat, could she retreat? She was left abased and confounded. God have mercy on the poet who so well says, ‘Neither does my heart rejoice in exile, nor have I any honour in my native land,’ etc. But, since things must somehow come right, suddenly the Persian army saw one of those Ja‘far-qulí Áqás⁸⁵⁴, a son of the Begler-Áqá of Cossacks, in other words a certain friend of the foreigner and hospitable humanitarian, gently detach himself from the Greek army, and, stepping softly⁸⁵⁵, approach the Persian host. ‘Peace be upon you,’ said he; ‘Your arrival is fortunate! You are welcome! Your visit is a pleasure! May your journey be without danger!’ All the while he was quietly pointing out to the Persians with his forefinger that *Áshtí-kunán* lane. ‘We Greeks,’ said he, ‘have no troops there. If you go that way, you can take our country.’ The Persians agreed, and by that road entered the Greek land.

“This, however, is not the point.... By the bye, while I remember, let me mention the name of this foreigner’s friend, though it comes a trifle heavy on our tongues; but what is to be done? His name was Ephialtes... God curse the Devil⁸⁵⁶! I don’t know why it is that whenever I hear this name I think of some of our Persian Ministers.... But let us return to the point.

⁸⁴⁴ This formula is common amongst the Zoroastrians. See my *Year amongst the Persians*, p. 375, Here it implies that the Mullá was dead.

⁸⁴⁵ *Ínak* is the Turkish for a cow. The name is, of course, meant to be ridiculous. *Qāqázán* may be a misprint for *Qázán*.

⁸⁴⁶ See pp. 181-2 *supra*.

⁸⁴⁷ *Har chand bí-adabist*, “Although it be an incivility” to use such an expression. *Khar-fahm* (“ass-plain”) means comprehensible to the greatest fool.

⁸⁴⁸ “To have wind in the brain,” a common expression for conceit.

⁸⁴⁹ *Luláhingash khaylí áb mí-gírifit*, “Its jug held a lot of water,” said of one who has a great capacity for self-esteem.

⁸⁵⁰ The innumerable titles conferred by the Persian Government form a constant subject of mockery. The fictitious titles here mentioned are, of course, intended to be both barbarous in form and degrading in meaning.

⁸⁵¹ The reference is to the *sursurak* in the Nigáristán Palace at Tíhrán. See my *Year amongst the Persians*, p. 96.

⁸⁵² An imaginary “good time” in the remote past, as we might say “in the days of good King Cole.”

⁸⁵³ I understand that this is the name of a narrow lane, or passage, in Tíhrán. It means “Reconciliation Street.”

⁸⁵⁴ The name of a Persian officer in the Cossack Brigade.

⁸⁵⁵ *Pá-war-chín*, “picking up the feet.”

⁸⁵⁶ An expression used when some ill-natured or inappropriate idea occurs to the mind, as though it had been suggested by Satan.

“When His Excellency, that double-distilled essence of zeal and

[page 481]

sum of science and political acumen, Mírzá ‘Abdu’r-Razzáq Khán, engineer, and lecturer in the School of the Cossack barracks, after a three months’ pedestrian tour drew for the Russians a military map of the road through Mázandarán, we his friends said, ‘It is a pity that such a man of spirit should not have a title.’ So some twenty of us sat for three days and nights considering what title we should obtain for him, but nothing occurred to our minds. Worst of all, he was a man of taste. ‘Any title obtained for me,’ says he, ‘must be virgin; that is to say, no one else must have borne it before me.’ We enquired of the State Accountants, who said there was no ‘virgin title’ left. We opened our dictionaries, and found that neither in the languages of the Persians, Arabs, Turks, or Franks from A to Z was there one single word left which had not been employed as a title at least ten times over. Well, what were we to do? Would it be pleasing to God that this man should thus remain untitled?

“However, since such things must come right, one day, being in a state of extreme dejection, I picked up a history book which was at hand in order to distract my mind. No sooner had I opened the book than I read in the first line of the right-hand page: ‘Ever afterwards the Greeks stigmatized Ephialtes as a traitor whose blood might lawfully be shed.’ O you cursed Greeks, what had poor Ephialtes done to you that you should call him a traitor? Is hospitality to strangers blasphemy in your creed? Do you not believe in kindness to foreigners?

“In short as soon as I saw this name I said, ‘Nothing could be better than that we should adopt this name as a title for Mírzá ‘Abdu’r-Razzáq Khán, both because it is “virgin,” and because these two persons have the closest resemblance to one another. This one was kind to strangers and so was that one. This one was hospitable to guests and so was that one. This one said, “Had I not acted thus, another would have done so,” and so did that one. There was only one difference between them, namely, that the buttons of Ephialtes’s coat were not made of native forest-wood. Well, supposing they were not, such trifles are unworthy of consideration.’

“In short, we friends assembled and gave an entertainment and made great rejoicings. We also instantly despatched a telegram to Káshán bidding them send quickly five bottles of Qamšar rose-water and two boxes of sugared walnuts, so that we might present them [to the Sháh] and secure the title. In the midst of these proceedings Hájji Maliku’t-Tujjár⁸⁵⁷ conceded the Astará road to the Russians.

[page 482]

I don’t know what scoundrel told him the history of this title, but he put his two feet in one shoe⁸⁵⁸ and declared that he was a heaven-sent genius, and that this title was his rightful property. Now for some months you don’t know what a hullabaloo is going on, with Mírzá ‘Abdu’r-Razzáq Khán on the one hand, supported by his science of Geometry, and Hájji Maliku’t-Tujjár on the other with his persuasive eloquence and his quotations from the poems of Imru’u’l-Qays and Nášir-i-Khusraw-i-‘Alawí. O Kablá’í Dakhaw, you don’t know in what toil and moil we are caught! If you can deliver us from this calamity it would be as though you had freed a slave for God’s sake, and may God, if He will, forgive your sons!

“May God make one day of your life a hundred years! Today is a day for zealous endeavour. For the rest, you are the best judge. I have nothing more to submit.

“Your faithful servant, GADFLY.”

It is difficult in a translation to do justice to these articles, which mark an absolutely new departure in Persian satire, and are written in a style at once idiomatic and forcible. Though they appeared under various pseudonyms, I fancy they were all written by Dakhaw, who, little as he wrote, on the strength of them and a few of his poems⁸⁵⁹ deserves, in my opinion, to occupy the first rank amongst contemporary Persian men of letters. It is to be regretted that, though a comparatively young man, he has apparently produced nothing during the last ten or twelve years.

Of the last twelve years I have little to say. The beginning of 1912 saw the culmination of Russian violence and oppression in Persia, and, for the time being, the end alike of liberty and literary effort. Then came the War, when Persia became the passive victim of three contending foreign armies,

[page 483]

⁸⁵⁷ This title, “King of the Merchants,” was at this time borne by Hájji Muḥammad Kázim, whose accomplishments were reputed greater than his honesty.

⁸⁵⁸ This means to stand firm, be obstinate.

⁸⁵⁹ Especially “Kabláy,” and his elegy on Mírzá Jahángir Khán, the latter a poem of rare beauty and feeling. See my *Press and Poetry of Modern Persia*, pp. 179-82 and 200-4.

with little profit to expect from the success of any one of them, while there was scarcity everywhere and famine and devastation in the western provinces. To Persia at least the Russian Revolution came as a godsend, while the subsequent withdrawal of Great Britain after the failure of the Anglo-Persian Agreement left her at last more or less mistress in her own house. How far she will be able to make use of the breathing-space thus accorded her remains to be seen.

Surprise has sometimes been expressed that during the War there should have existed in Persia a considerable pro-German party, largely composed of prominent Democrats and Reformers. The explanation is simple enough. Imperial Russia was hated and feared, and with good reason, and any Power which diverted her attention from her victim and threatened her supremacy was sure of a large measure of popularity, while Persia had no reason to fear or dislike Germany, which lay remote from her borders and had at no time threatened her independence. Germany, of course, took advantage of this sentiment, and carried on an active propaganda, of which the curious history remains to be written. One of the chief organs of the propaganda was the *Káwa* (*Kaveh*) newspaper published at Berlin, nominally once a fortnight, from January 24, 1916, to August 15, 1919. There was a long gap between the combined Nos. 29 and 30, July 15, 1918, and Nos. 31 and 32, October 15, 1918; between No. 33, Nov. 15, 1918, and No. 34, March 1, 1919; and between this last and the final number of the old series mentioned above, which appeared five months and a half later. On January 22, 1920, appeared the first number of the New Series (*Dawra-i-Jadíd*), which definitely renounced politics in favour of literature and science, while keeping the same external form and high

[page 484]

standard of style and typography. In this form the paper, now appearing only once a month, endured for two years more, the last number (No. 12, Jahrg. 2, Neue Folge) being dated December 1, 1921, and containing no less than 33 large pages, closely printed in double columns.

During its propagandist days the contents of the *Káwa* were, of course, chiefly political, and, though valuable for the light they throw on events in Persia, and especially on the doings of the Nationalist "Committee of Defence," have little bearing on literary matters until after the armistice, though here and there exceptions to this rule occur. Thus No. 4 (March 14, 1916) contains a Kurdish poem⁸⁶⁰; No. 20 an obituary notice of that eminent man of letters Sayyid Muḥammad Šádiq "Qá'im-maqámi"⁸⁶¹, better known by his title of *Adibu'l-Mamálík*, who died on the 28th of Rabi' ii, 1335 (Feb. 21, 1917); No. 21 an account of some of the scientific results obtained by Captain Niedermayer's mission to Afghánistán⁸⁶²; No. 23 an article by Professor Mittwoch on the artist Riḍá-yi-'Abbási⁸⁶³; No. 26 an account of Persian students in Germany; No. 33 (Nov. 15, 1918), *à propos* of a new publication, which, though bearing the Persian title *Ráh-i-Naw* (the "New Road"), was written in German, a brief sketch of various attempts to reform or replace the Persian alphabet; No. 34 (March 1, 1919) an account of the foundation in Berlin of a Persian Literary Society, and a letter from Mirzá Muḥammad of Qazwín on a point of Persian orthography; and No. 35 (August 15, 1919) a long and very interesting article by the writer last named on the

[page 485]

oldest recorded Persian verses subsequent to the Arab conquest in the seventh century after Christ⁸⁶⁴.

The *Káwa* of the New Series, which began on Jan. 22, 1920, is, on the other hand, almost entirely literary, and contains numerous articles of the greatest value and interest. The Persian colony in Berlin, though comparatively small, included several men of great intellectual distinction, and, though ardent patriots, keenly alive to the national faults, and eager to absorb what was best of European learning. The special characteristic of the best German scholarship is its sobriety, thoroughness, painstaking accuracy, and exhaustive examination of relevant material from all available sources. This steady influence is exactly what the Persians, with their tendency to ingenious but rash conjectures and premature theories, most need. In the leading article which opened the New Series the editor, Sayyid Ḥasan Taqí-záda, thus defined his aims:

"The *Kawá* [sic] newspaper was born of the War, and therefore its conduct was correlated with the situations arising from the War. Now that the War is ended and International Peace has supervened, the *Káwa* considers its War period as concluded, and now enters on a Peace period. It therefore adopts, as from the beginning of the Christian year 1920, corresponding with the 9th of Rabi' ii, A.H. 1338, a new basis and line of conduct. It has nothing to do with the former *Káwa*, and is, indeed, a new paper, the contents of which will for the most part consist of scientific, literary, and historical articles. Above all else, its object will be to promote European civilization in Persia, to combat fanaticism, to help to preserve the national feeling and unity of Persia, to endeavour to purify and safeguard the Persian language and literature from the disorders and dangers

⁸⁶⁰ Reprinted from the Persian newspaper *Rastakhíz* ("the Resurrection").

⁸⁶¹ So called on account of his descent from the celebrated Mirzá Abu'l-Qásim *Qá'im-maqám*. See pp. 311-16 *supra*.

⁸⁶² Translated from the *Neue Orient*, Nos. 4 and 5, May, 1917.

⁸⁶³ Translated from No. 7 of *Die Islamische Welt*.

⁸⁶⁴ Two such early attempts are discussed, both taken from Arabic books of authority, such as Ibn Qutayba's *Kitábu'sh-Shi'r wa'sh-Shu'ará*, the *Kitábu'l-Aghání*, and Ṭabari's great history. The earliest goes back to the reign of Yazíd ibn Mu'áwiya (A.H. 60-4 = A.D. 680-4).

which threaten them, and, so far as possible, to support internal and external freedom ... In the opinion of the writer of

[page 486]

these lines, that which is today in the highest degree necessary for Persia, which all patriotic Persians should exert themselves to promote, literally, with all their strength, and should place before everything else, is threefold.

“First, the adoption and promotion, without condition or reservation, of European civilization, absolute submission to Europe, and the assimilation of the culture, customs, practices, organization, sciences, arts, life, and the whole attitude of Europe, without any exception save language; and the putting aside of every kind of self-satisfaction, and such senseless objections as arise from a mistaken, or, as we prefer to call it, a false patriotism.

“Secondly, a sedulous attention to the preservation of the Persian language and literature, and the development, extension, and popularization thereof.

“Thirdly, the diffusion of European sciences, and a general advance in founding colleges, promoting public instruction, and utilizing all the sources of material and spiritual power ... in this way

“Such is the belief of the writer of these lines as to the way to serve Persia, and likewise the opinion of those who, by virtue of much cultural and political experience, share his belief.

“Outwardly and inwardly, in body and in spirit, Persia must become Europeanized.

“In concluding this explanation of fundamental beliefs, I must add that in the writer’s opinion perhaps the greatest and most effective service of this sort which one could render would be the publication in Persia of translations of a whole series of the most important European books in plain and simple language.”

In pursuance of this programme, there are a certain number of articles on the German system of education, the proceedings of the Perso-German Society⁸⁶⁵, and the arrangements for facilitating the studies of Persian students in Germany; but matters connected with the language and literature of Persia supply the subject-matter of most of the articles. Thus we find in the year 1920 a series of admirable articles by Taqízáda [sic] (signed *Muḥaṣṣil*) on the most notable Persian poets of early times⁸⁶⁶; an original article written in Persian by

[page 487]

Dr Arthur Christensen of Copenhagen on the existence of verse in Pahlawi⁸⁶⁷; a discussion on the evolution of the Persian language during the last century⁸⁶⁸; articles entitled “Bolshevism in ancient Persia” on Mazdak⁸⁶⁹; comparisons between Eastern and Western research and its results (greatly in favour of the latter), entitled *Munázara-i-Shab u Rúz* (“Dispute between Night and Day”)⁸⁷⁰; the four periods of the Persian language since the Arab conquest⁸⁷¹; “a Touchstone of Taste,” on good modern Persian verse and what the writer calls “Karbalá’í verse”⁸⁷²; Pahlawí, Arabic and Persian sources of the *Sháh-náma*⁸⁷³; ancient and modern translations from Arabic into Persian⁸⁷⁴; and a very interesting article on the “Sources of eloquent Persian and ‘Khán-i-Wálida Persian”⁸⁷⁵, in which the writer ridicules and condemns the slavish imitation of Turkish idiom and style practised by certain young Persians resident in Constantinople. These articles, in most cases, display a wealth of knowledge, critical ability, and originality which I have nowhere else encountered in Persian, and deserve a fuller analysis than can be accorded to them in this volume.

During the last year of its existence (1921) the *Káwa* maintained the same high standard, publishing many articles, both historical and literary, which were fully up to the level of the best European scholarship. A series of important historical articles on “the Relations of Russia and Persia during the period of the Áq-Qoyúnú and Şafawí dynasties, down to the beginning of the reign of Áqá Muḥammad Khán

[page 488]

⁸⁶⁵ *Deutsch-Persische Gesellsehaft*.

⁸⁶⁶ *Káwa*, Nos. 1, pp. 2-6; 4, pp. 15-24; 8, pp. 10-4; and 10, pp. 9-14.

⁸⁶⁷ Nos. 4-5, pp. 24-6.

⁸⁶⁸ Nos. 3, pp. 3-5; and 4-5, pp. 3-4.

⁸⁶⁹ Nos. 3, pp. 5-11, and 4-5, pp. 8-15.

⁸⁷⁰ Nos. 4-5, pp. 7-8; 6, pp. 3-6; 8, pp. 5-10.

⁸⁷¹ No. 7, pp. 5-8.

⁸⁷² No. 7, p. 4.

⁸⁷³ Nos. 11, pp. 7-12; 12 pp. 7- 12.

⁸⁷⁴ No. 9, pp. 4-5.

⁸⁷⁵ No. 12, pp. 3-5. The *Khán-i-Wálida* is where most of the Persian merchants in Constantinople live or have their offices.

Qájár,” written by Sayyid Muḥammad ‘Alí Jamál-záda, also appeared as a monthly supplement, and showed very wide and judicious use of all available sources, both Eastern and Western. The sudden cessation of the paper after December, 1921, was a great loss to Persian learning and scholarship.

In June, 1922, there appeared at Berlin a new Persian literary and scientific review entitled *Írán-shahr*, edited by Ḥusayn Kázim-záda, which, though described as a “Revue ... bimensuelle,” actually appeared only once a month. It is of a lighter and more popular character than was the *Káwa*, and shows a more marked preference for matters connected either with pre-Islamic Persia, or with the problems with which the progressive Persians of today are confronted. No. 7 (December, 1922) contains a long article on the sending of Persian students to Europe, in the third section of which, “on the place and manner of study” (pp. 162-4), the writer argues that such students should go to England or Germany rather than to France, for the following reasons:

“We Persians (with the exception of the people of Ádharbáyján, whose nature and character agree better with those of the Anglo-Saxons), in respect to character, nature, capacity and mental tendencies, more closely resemble and approach the French, that is to say the Latin races, since quick and piercing intelligence, self-confidence, versatility of thought, wit and acuteness of perception, sociability and amiability in intercourse on the one hand, and inconstancy, fickleness of character, quickly-developed weariness and want of perseverance, recklessness, and lack of moderation in action on the other, are characteristic of the nature and disposition both of ourselves and of the French.”

This view seems to have commended itself to the Persians generally, for while in August, 1922, there were seventy

[page 489]

Persian students in Germany, in the following December the number had increased to over 120⁸⁷⁶.

In Persia itself the Press, paralysed for a time after the Russian aggressions of 1912, has resumed its activities, especially since the conclusion of the War; but owing to the badness of the communications and the irregularity of the posts one has to be content with somewhat fragmentary information about it. No. 4 of the *Káwa* for 1921 (pp. 15-16) contained a brief list of Persian papers and magazines which had come into being since the beginning of A.H. 1334 (November, 1915). These, forty-seven in number, were arranged alphabetically, the place of publication, name of the editor, and date of inauguration, being recorded in each case. Tíhrán heads the list with eighteen papers, next comes Shíráz with seven, Tabríz and Rasht with four each, and Işfahán, Mashhad, Kirmán, Kirmánsháh, Khúy, Bushire, Bákú, Herát, Kábul and Jalálábád (the last three in Afghánistán) with one or two each. More than half of these-papers (twenty-five) first appeared in A.H. 1338 (began on Sept. 26, 1919). That the list is far from exhaustive is shown by the fact that of nine Persian magazines of which copies were sent me by their editors or by friends, only two, the *‘Álam-i-Niswán* (“Women’s World”) and the *Armaghán* (“Gift”), appear in the above list. The latter is one of the best, containing many poems, including some by the late *Adibu’l-Mamálik*, and accounts of the proceedings of the “Literary Society” (*Anjuman-i-Adabi*) of Tíhrán. The others are the *Bahár* (“Spring”), very modern and European in tone, but including some interesting poems; the *Furúgh-i-Tarbiyat* (“Lustre of Education”); the *Dánish* (“Knowledge”), published at Mashhad; the *Mimát u Hayát* (“Death and Life”), entirely devoted to European inventions and material progress; the *Firdawsí*, edited and written by *diplomés* of the American College at Tíhrán; the *Párs*, written half in

[page 490]

Persian and half in French, which first appeared at Constantinople on April 15, 1921; and the *Ganjina-i-Ma’arif* (“Treasury of Sciences”), of which the first number appeared at Tabríz on October 24, 1922. None of these approach the *Írán-shahr*, still less the *Káwa*, in excellence of matter or form. An exception should perhaps be made in favour of the *Gul-i-Zard* (“Yellow Rose”), which appeared in Tíhrán about the end of August, 1920, and in which the editor, Mírzá Yahyá Khán, used to publish the poems he composed under the nom de guerre of Rayḥání.

The establishment in Berlin of the “Kaviani” Printing-press (*Cháp-khána-i-Káwayáni*) owned and managed by Mírzá ‘Abdu’sh-Shukúr and other Persians anxious to meet the growing demand for cheap, correct, and well-printed Persian books, marks another very important stage in the Persian literary revival; and at the present time there exists no other Press which can rival it in these respects. Besides modern plays and treatises on Music, Agriculture and the like, and tasteful editions of such well-known classics as the *Gulistán* of Sa’dí and the “Cat and Mouse” (*Músh u Gurba*) of ‘Ubayd-i-Zákání, the managers have had the spirit and enterprise to print such rare works of the great writers of old as the *Zádu’l-Musáfirín* (“Travellers’ Provision”) of Náşir-i-Khusraw, a book of which only-two manuscripts (those of Paris and King’s College, Cambridge) are known to exist; and are now (November, 1923) printing the *Wajh-i-Dín* (“Way of Religion”) of which the unique manuscript has recently been discovered at Petrograd, though books of this sort, recondite in character, costly to print, and unlikely to command a large sale, must almost inevitably be published at a loss. In Mírzá Maḥmúd Ghání-Záda the Press possesses a most competent scholar, who carries on the high traditions of criticism and accuracy established by Mírzá Muḥammad Khán of Qazwín.

⁸⁷⁶ *Írán-shahr*, No. 3, p. 55, and No. 7, p. 153.

INDEX

In the following Index where many reference-numbers occur under one heading the more important are printed in Clarendon type, which is also used for the first entry under each letter of the alphabet. To save needless repetition, all references to any name common to several persons mentioned in the text are brought together under one heading, the individuals bearing this name being arranged either in chronological order, or in order of importance, or in classes (rulers, men of letters, poets, etc.). The letter b. between two names stands for Ibn ("Son of..."), and n. after the number of a page indicates a footnote. The addition in brackets of a Roman number after a name or book indicates the century of the Christian era in which the man lived or the book was written. Prefixes like Abú ("Father of...") and Ibn ("Son of...") in Muhammadan, and de, le, von in European names are disregarded in the alphabetical arrangement, so that names like Abú Sa'íd, Ibn Síná, le Strange, de Slane, *etc.*, must be sought under S, not under A, I, L or D. Titles of books and foreign words are printed in *italics*. A hyphen preceding a word indicates that the Arabic definite article al- should be prefixed to it.