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

Firdawsi, Yūsuf u Zulaykhá (ed. Ethé, p. 249, ll. 2421-2 and 2426).

Iraj Mirzá Jalálu'll-Mamálik.
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 Firdawsi," 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 Jâmi', the literature of the last four centuries has been very much neglected, and...
the sources of which I have made use are almost exclusively Persian, and, until the nineteenth century is reached, when printing and lithography were gradually introduced into Persia, chiefly manuscript. In the formation of my Persian library I have always had regard to the requirements of my work rather than to mere beauty of illumination, illustration, or 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 Ḥājjī ʿAbdu'l-Majid 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 A. Davidson, the Head of that Department.

I wish that I could have profited more by the counsel of my Persian friends, especially Mīrzā Muḥammad Khān of Qazwīn and Ḥājjī Mīrzā Yāḥyā of Dawlatābād, during the progress of this work, but to my old acquaintance Ḥūsayn Dānish 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 Taqlī-zāda, fortunately chanced to visit this country after an absence of some fourteen years while the last sheets of this book were passing through the Press, and he most kindly read through the proofs and favoured me with numerous observations and corrections which will be noticed under the Errata and Addenda. From well-read and intelligent Persians the European student of their language can learn many things not to be found in books, at any rate in books to which he has access, while their taste and judgement, even if at times he cannot wholly agree with them, are almost always suggestive and deserving of consideration. Only a few days ago I received a visit from the learned Shaykh Kāżim ad-Dujaylī, an Arabic-speaking Shīʿa of ʿIrāq 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 Shīʿa 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:


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 undiscriminating praise of over-zealous friends, even as Saʿdī says:

"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.

June 12, 1924.
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## ERRATA AND ADDENDA

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

p. 170, l. 14. “Read ‘ways,’ ‘passages’ for مقابر (‘Tombs’), which gives no good sense.” [*T.z.*] The washing of the feet before praying is a Sunní practice; the Shí’á confine themselves to mere stroking of the foot (*mush*) with the damp hand. The giving of

---

1 It is, however, ascribed, as I have ascribed it, to Isma‘íl Khán Sarbáž 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 *Qisáš-al-

---

...
translations set to music and adapted to the piano.” [T.z.] (I find that I possess the former work, which is entitled أفرادهّا ꟾه ﻣﻨﻴـ(211,215),(993,220)

p. 338. “Two half-verses (mi;rd1) have been accidentally omitted after l. 7. The two verses should run thus” [T.z.]:

p. 355, l. 1. There is some difference of opinion as to the proper vocalization of the place-name which I have written “Tanakábun,” Taqfzada thinks it should be “Tunukábun,” while Riđa-qul Khán in his Anjuman-drá-yi-Náširi gives it as “Tanakábun.”

p. 370, last line. “Hájjí Mírzá Hasan-i-Shirází and Hájjí Mírzá Hasan-i-Asháiyání 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. 407, fourth line from the end, and p. 435, l. 5. “The Abwáb-i-Jádn was not by Mullá Muḥsin-i-Fayd, but, so far as I remember, by Mullá Husayn Wa’d-i-Káshíf, the author of the well-known Anwár-i-Suhayl.” [T.z.] The real author appears to have been Muhammad b. Fathulláh Rafi’u’d-Dn, called ‘Wa’d-i-Qazwíní’ (‘the Preacher of Qazwín’). See Edwards, op. cit., cols. 405–6.

p. 430. “Sayyid Muhammad Báqir of Rasht was only a third- or fourth-rate theologian, and Mullá Aḥmad-i-Niráqi (p. 411) only of the second class. Much more important, though omitted here, are:—

(i) Áqá-yi-Bihbihání, the founder of the Uṣūl and Mujtahidí School, who flourished at the end of twelfth century of the hijra.

(ii) Shaykh Ja’far-i-‘Arab (also called al-Kabr, ‘the Great’), who was contemporary with Fath-‘Ali Sháh.

(iii) Shaykh Muḥammad Hasan, author of the Jawáhir-ul-Kalám, a large work in six volumes on Shi’a Jurisprudence (see p. ix supra).

(iv) Shaykh Murtádá al-Anšárí, the founder of present-day Shi’a Law, and the Master of all the mujtahids of the last seventy years with the exception of—

(v) Shaykh Hádí of Tíhrán, who was also of the first class.”

p. 439. “Shaykh Aḥmad al-ʿAḥsá’í was not an admirer and follower but a great enemy of Mullá Shárd. Of modern Persian philosophers mention should have been made of Mírzá Abúl-Hasan-i-Jiwa, who died only some twenty years ago.” [T.z.] I met him in Tíhrán 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-Maknána (‘Hidden Words’), of which mention should have been made here.” [T.z.]
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to a peculiar murmur (called in French 'empiolement') characteristic of embolism, on which he published a monograph in French. He also wrote several medical treatises on the Diseases of Women and Children in Persian. [T.x.]

p. 454, l. 1. "For P'timadu'd-Dawula read P'timadu's-Saljana." [T.x.]

p. 468. "Newspapers existed in Persia before A.D. 1851, in the reign of Muhammad Shah (A.D. 1835-1848) and even in the later days of his predecessor Fath-‘Alif Shah. See the Kawa newspaper passim, especially No. 6 of the New Series (Dawra-i-jadid)." [T.x.] 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 Dihli in A.D. 1798, and a much more definite report of one published in Tehran in 1253/1837-8.

p. 486, end. "The articles to which reference is here made were not by Mirzâ Muhammad Khan but by myself, writing under the pen-name of Mu’azzil (‘Student’)." [T.x.]

p. 488. "To say ‘Mirzâ Kâ’im-zâda,’ ‘Sayyid Jamâl-zâda,’ ‘Taqi-zâda 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 ‘Mirzâ,’ ‘Sayyid’ and Hájji can only be prefixed, as ‘Khán,’ ‘Beg’ and the like can only be suffixed, to personal names, such as Hasan, ‘Ali and Muhammad, not to patronymics." [T.x.]

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

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

PART I.

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

SOME GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ON THE ŞAFAWİ DYNASTY.

The rise of the Şafawi 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 18581 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 Ghaznawis, Saljus, Khwárazmsháhs, and Houses of Chingiz and Tímúr; or, if Persian like the Buwayhids, exercised control over a portion only of the old Persian Empire. To the

1 London: Smith and Elder, 1866.
CONSIDERATIONS ON THE ŠAFAWÍ DYNASTY

The Safawí 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 Isfahán, whither he transferred the seat of government from Qazwín, became, as the Persian saying runs, “Half the world” (Nišf-i-Jahân), 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 history1 of the Šafawí 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 Šafwatu’s-Šafá, containing the biography of Shaykh Šafíyyu’d-Dín, that celebrated saint of the thirteenth century from whom the dynasty derives its name; the Nasab-náma-i-Silsila-i-Šafawíyya on the genealogy of the family, with valuable biographical details of its earlier representatives not to be found elsewhere; the

1 Of Krusinski’s and Hanway’s admirable accounts of the later Šafawí period I shall speak in chap. iii.
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Ahsanu’l-Tawárikh, completed in A.D. 1577, only about a year after the death of Sháh Táhmasp, 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-‘Alam-adrá-yi-‘Abbás, an immense monograph on the reign of Sháh ‘Abbás the Great. Not one of these has been published1, much less translated, and all except the last are very rare even in manuscript. Of the Nasab-náma and the ‘Alam-adrá 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-qulf Khan in his supplement to Mírkhwánd’s Rawdatu’s-Šafá, 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 and the Seniory of Venice. This mission included Husayn ‘Alb Beg2 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.

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

2 Don Juan calls him (f. 120v) “Uzén Aly Bech,” but Antonio di Govea has “Ussein Alibeg,” which shows clearly that the first part of the name is Usayn, not Usín, as I had at first supposed.
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 companions1 enable us to check Don Juan’s narrative. Don Juan, however, having apostasized from Islam, dared not return to Persia to meet the fate of a renegade, so that for the tragic sequel we must turn to the Persian historians. In the ‘Alam-árd-yi-‘Abbášt under the year 1022/1613-42 we find an account of the arrival at Isfahán of ambassadors from the King of Spain, accompanied by several Christian priests and a Persian envoy returning from Europe3. The latter, who had incurred the Sháh’s displeasure, was incontinent put to death in the most cruel manner, without being permitted any opportunity for explanation or apology; and the Sháh then explained to the Spaniards that he had dealt thus with him because of sundry treasonable and disrespectful acts of which he had been guilty during his mission, such as opening letters sealed with the royal seal and making known their contents; wearing mourning on the occasion of the Queen of Spain’s death; and selling the credentials to the Pope with which he had been provided to a merchant who should impersonate him and derive what profit he could from the transaction. “But,” the Sháh concluded, “the chief of his faults and the chief reason for his punishment was that he behaved so ill towards the attendants who accompanied him, and vexed them so much, that several of them adopted the Christian faith and remained in Europe in order to escape from his tyranny, so that zeal for Islam required his punishment, and thus he received his deserts.”

Turning now to Ridá-qlí Khán’s supplement to the Rawdatu’s-Safí, a general history of Persia compiled about A.D. 1858, we find an account of the same event obviously copied, with very slight modifications, from the ‘Alam-árd-yi-‘Abbášt, but with one important and most wanton alteration, for Sháh ‘Abbás is there represented as saying that the chief of his ambassador’s faults was that several persons were disposed to embrace Islam and come to Persia, but the Persian envoy treated them so ill that they repented of their intention, returned to the Christian faith, and remained in that country. For this deliberate falsification of history I can only account by supposing that Ridá-qlí 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.

---

1 See especially The Sherley Brothers...by one of the same House (Chiswick, 1828), pp. 22–35.
2 F. 230 of my ms. marked H. 14.
3 Although the envoy is here named Dengiz Beg Shámlú with the title of Yúz-báșlí (Captain), not Husayn ‘Ali Beg, as in Don Juan’s narrative (f. 120b), there can, I think, be little doubt as to their identity.
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...aster to the occupant of the Throne, and advised that the Sháh should abdicate for a few days and substitute for himself some person worthy of death on whom the prediction of the stars might be fulfilled. This was accordingly done, and a man named 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 Malcolm1 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 Nuğtawiyya (“People of the Point”) who believed in metempsychosis and other heretical doctrines, and of whose appearance and destruction a full account is given by the 'Alam-árá-yi-'Abbási and reproduced in the Rawdatzu's-Ṣafá. It is therefore essential, if a true history of the Şafaws 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.

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 Firidún Bey’s great collection of Turkish State Papers entitled Munshádat-i-Salátín, compiled some time before 991/1583 and published at Constantinople in two volumes2 in 1274/1858.

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 Timúr onwards much of it is concerned with contemporary Persian affairs, and of the last half of the first volume a large portion consists of letters interchanged between the Sultáns Bázázit II (A.D. 1482–1512), Salím I (A.D. 1512–1520), and Suláymán I (A.D. 1520–1566) on the one hand, and Sháh 'Isma'il (A.D. 1500–1524) and his son and successor Sháh Táhmasp (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 unexplored1.

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 16603 by le Père Raphaël du Mans, Superior of the Capuchin Mission at Iṣfahán, a man singularly qualified by

1 History of Persia (London, 1815), vol. i, p. 527.
3 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 Husayn Dánish Bey I have since acquired the second volume also.

1 Some other very interesting State Papers from the Dastúř al-Insáh of Śári 'Abdu'lláh Efendi (d. 1079/1668) have also been published and annotated by the late M. Ch. Schefer in his Christomathia Persana (Paris, 1885), vol. ii, pp. 218–259 and ff. -ff.
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.

As has been said above, to the Safawis belongs the credit of making Persia, after the lapse of eight centuries and a half, “a nation once again.” This is true, in what sense the Safawism meant but the nationalism which thus found expression layb described 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 Sultan Salim “the Grim,” and Shah Isma’il, the founder of the Safawi power, were the respective protagonists of the two nations. The despatches of this period, recorded by Firidun Bey, pass from the realm of diplomacy to that of vulgar abuse, and “rascally Red-heads” (Awbash-i-Qizil-bash) is the politest expression wherewith the Turkish Sultan 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 Sultan Salim and Shah Isma’il both possessed considerable poetic talent, the former wrote almost exclusively in Persian, and the latter, under the pen-name of Khatat, almost exclusively in Turkish. Ottoman hatred was directed against the heretical Qizil-bash as mis-believers, not as Persians (Iran), while the Persian language (Farsi) continued to hold its position as the polite idiom of literature and diplomacy. And though the ancient conflict between Iran and Turan was familiar to all educated Turks and Persians in the classical Shih-i-Shah, or “Book of Kings,” of Firdawsi, Salim, in the following curious exordium to a despatch written in April, 1514 (Safar, 1420), compares himself to the legendary Persian kings Firidun, Kay-Khusraw and Dinawar, while likening his Persian opponent Shah Isma’il to the Turkish protagonist Afrasiyab:

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

1 See E. J. W. Gibb’s History of Ottoman Poetry, vol. ii, p. 261, for a brief account of Salim’s Persian Divan, 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 Sultan ‘Abdu’l-Hamid from the ex-Emperor of Germany in 1904. A number of Shah Isma’il’s Turkish poems are given in my MS. of the Silsilatu’n-Nasab-i-Safawiyya. See J.R.A.S. for July, 1921, p. 412, where other references are given.

2 See Firidun Bey, vol. i, p. 381.

3 An interesting proof that, contrary to the views of Professor Nallino, the position of Caliph was already claimed by Sultan Salim, as it certainly was by his son and successor Sulayman.
the extirpator of the foes of the Faith, the humbler of the Pharaohs' pride, the tarnisher of the Khāqān's crowns, the King of those who fight and strive for Religion, whose pomp is as that of Firidūn, whose Court is as that of Alexander, whose justice and equity is as that of Kay-Khusraw, that Dārā of noble descent, Sulṭān Salīm Shāh, son of Sulṭān Bāyāzīd, son of Sulṭān Muḥammad Khān, to thee, who art the ruler of the Persians, the most mighty general and puissant leader, the Dāhīkār of the time, the Dārāb of the combat, the Afrāsiyāb of the age, the famous Amīr Isma'īl."

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

"Furūzandeh Tāj o Tuxtū Kīyān, Fazandeh Aḥtar Kowān,
The illuminator of the crown and throne of the Kayānīān, The upholder of the star of the Kāwayān."

For the rest, the seven tribes who formed the back-bone of the Qizil-bāsh army were, as their names Rūmlū, Shāmlū, Mawsillū, etc., sufficiently indicate, almost exclusively Turkish, as were the principal officers of the Šafawī army, whose war-cry, as we learn from the rare history of Šah Isma'īl, was not "Long live Persia!" or the like, but, in the Turkish language, "O my spiritual guide and master whose sacrifice I am!"

More than a century after Isma'il's death, when the capital had been transferred from the north of Persia to Isfahān, Turkish seems still to have been the language generally spoken at Court. These instances, to which might be added many more, will suffice to show how different was the spirit which animated the Šafawī 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 Ṣadā Khān, 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 sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, the like, but, in the Turkish language, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination, Essential nature of the Shi'a doctrine, were, divided into seventy-two or seventy-three different sects, in later times at any rate, when certain controversies, such as those connected with Free Will and Predestination.


CONSIDERATIONS ON THE ŠAFAWÍ DYNASTY

Creation of the Qur'án, have sunk into a subordinate position, it may fairly be said that the capital and cardinal division is into the People of the Sunnat and the People of the Shi'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 Shi'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 Šafawís 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-Milá, or “Book of Sects,” who died in the middle of the twelfth century, and who writes of them as follows:

“The Shi’á.—They are those who took the side of (Shiyyá’í) ‘All in particular, declaring him to be Imám and Khalífa by explicit written deed, public or secret, and believing that the Imámate cannot quit his posterity; and that, should it do so, it is only by reason of wrong wrought by another, or prudential renunciation on his own part. They assert that the Imámate is not a question of expediency but of principle: it does not depend on popular choice, 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

2 E.g. the second Imám, al-Hasan, elder son of ‘All, 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.
al-Ya'qūbī, a daughter of the last Sasanian king of Persia, Yazdigird III, was given to him in marriage and bore him a son named 'Alī and entitled Zaynul-Abidin, who was the Fourth Imām, and who combined in himself direct descent from the Prophet through his daughter Fāṭima 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 Sunni and Shi'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 Imām, or Vice-gerent of the Prophet, chosen by popular suffrage? Hence the Imāmī and Isma'īlī sects of the Shi'a have always had their stronghold in Persia, though under the Sunni Turkish dynasties of the Ghaznavids and Saljūqs they were kept in a state of subordination. They were more favoured under the Buwayhids and some of the Mongols, notably Ghāzān and Khudā-bandā (Uljāyṭū), but they first obtained unquestioned supremacy throughout the whole of Persia under the Safawīs.

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

Safawī is the adjective formed from Ṣafi, a notable Ṣūfī saint, named in full Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn, who died in Glān 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 Mūsā Kāẓīm the seventh Imām. 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 Rashidu'd-Dīn Faḍlullāh, speaks of him in his letters, and also by the fact that an immense biography of him, the Ṣafwatu9;-Ṣafiā, was composed shortly after his death, largely from data supplied by his son Ṣadru'd-Dīn, which has been used directly or indirectly by all the historians of the great dynasty whereof he was the ancestor. Shāh Isma'il, the actual founder of the dynasty, was sixth in descent from him, but I have found no evidence to prove that he himself adopted the violent Shi'a views characteristic of his descendants. The little evidence available points rather the other way, for in a letter written to Isma'il's son Shāh Ṭahmāsp in A.D. 1529-30 by the Uzbek leaders, they say that, according to what they have heard, Shaykh Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn was a good Sunni, and express their astonishment that Ṭahmāsp "neither follows the example of His Holiness Murtaddā'All, nor that of his forefather." Khwāja 'Alī, grandson of Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn and great-great-grandfather of Shāh Isma'il, is the first member of the House who shows a strong Shi'a bias and holds converse in his dreams with the Imāms, 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 Ṣafawīs were simply the hereditary pirs, murshids, or spiritual leaders, and their unity was not yet complete. They were, in fact, a loose confederation of spiritual groups, each with its own centre and with its own adherents. The first member of the House who shows a strong Shi'a bias was Shāh Isma'il, who succeeded his father Shāh Ṭahmāsp in 1501 and ruled until 1524. He was a man of strong will and determination, and he quickly established his supremacy over the whole of Persia.

---

1 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.

2 Abundant illustrations of this are furnished by such works of the Saljūq period as the Ṣiyāṣat-nāma and the Rūḥatu's-Ṣūdi'r.
CONSIDERATIONS ON THE ŞAFawi DYNASTY [pt 1]

directors of an increasingly large and important order of 
darwishes or Şûfis which drew its adherents not only from 
Persia but from the Turkish provinces of Asia 
Minor, where they appear to have carried on 
an active propaganda¹. How successful this 
promised to become in later days is shown by the dreadful 
massacre of some forty thousand of the Shi'a perpetrated 
in his dominions by Sultan Salim “the Grim” as a pre-
liminary to his great campaign against Shah Isma'il in 
A.D. 1514¹. To these devoted darwishes or murids, as their 
war-cry cited above (p. 15) sufficiently shows, the head of 
the Şafawi House, even after he had ceased to be a Shaykh 
and had become a Shah, continued to be regarded as the 
pîr or murshid. Chardin, Raphaël du Mans³, and other 
reputable authorities have scoffed at the title 
“Great Sophi,” by which the Şafawi Shâhs are commonly desig-
nated by contemporary European diplomatists 
and writers, on the ground that the Şûfis 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 Şafawis, even in the Sîsilatu'n-Nasab com-
piled about the time when Raphaël du Mans wrote, and still 
more in the Aksanû't-Tawârîkh and other earlier chronicles, 
the Şûfis, especially the Şûfis of Rûm (i.e. Turkey in Asia), 
are represented as the cream of the Şafawi army; we read 
of “self-sacrifice, courage, and whatever else is inseparable 
from Şûfihood”⁴ and of unworthy and disloyal acts described 
as “un-Şûfi-like” (nd-Şûfî). What, then, more natural than 
that he who was regarded not only as the Shah of Persia

² Ibid., p. 259, and pp. 71–3 infra.
³ L’État de la Perse en 1660, ed. Schefer, pp. 16–17.
⁴ See J.R.A.S. for July, 1921, the Persian words on the illustration 
facing p. 415.
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but as the Shaykh of these devoted darwishes or Şûfis, whose courage amazed contemporary Venetian travellers, 
should be called in Europe “the Great Şûfî” or “Sophî”⁸? 
At any rate no more probable origin has been suggested 
for this term, which can scarcely be regarded as a corrupt 
pronunciation of Şafawi.

It would appear that an idea prevailed in Europe (based, 
perhaps, on vague recollections of the Magi or Wise Men 
from the East) that Sophi was derived from σοφός, an 
opinion which Don Juan of Persia¹ is at pains to refute; for, 
having described how Shâh Isma'il immediately after he 
had conquered Tabrîz adopted the title of “gran Sophi de 
Persia,” he adds: “no Sophi por sabio, como algunos mal en-
tendieron, pensando que venia de Sòpos vocablo Griego, sino 
de Sophi, que es vocablo Persiano, y quiere desir, lana, ó al-
godon” (“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 cotton⁹”).

The rapid rise to power of Isma'il is one of the most re-
markable events in Persian history, especially in view of his 
forlorn and threatened childhood. His father, Shaykh Hay-
dar, was killed in A.D. 1490 when he was only about three 
years of age⁶, and he and his two brothers, of whom the 
elder, Sultan 'Ali, also fell in battle about A.D. 1495, were in 
constant danger from the Turkmen rulers of the “White 
Sheep” dynasty, and had many hair-breadth escapes in 
which they owed their lives to the devoted loyalty of their 
faithful Şûfis. Only seven of these accompanied Isma'il when, 
at the age of thirteen, he set out from Lâhijân for Ardabil 
to win a kingdom or perish in the attempt, but at every

¹ Ed. Valladolid, 1604, f. 59v.
² Krusinski agrees with this view. See p. 68 of the English version 
(London, 1728).
³ He was born on Rajab 5, 892 (June 27, 1487).
stage he received reinforcements, so that at Tārum his army numbered fifteen hundred men, and by the time he reached Arzinjān on his way to attack Fārrukh-Yasār, king of Shīr-wān, it had increased to seven thousand. Within a year he had taken Tābrīz, been crowned king of Persia, and, despite the attempts of his counsellors to dissuade him, imposed the Shi'a doctrine on his subjects. He was warned that two-thirds of the people of Tābrīz were Sunnis, and that the introduction into the prayers and professions of Faith of the distinctively Shi'a clauses, and more especially the cursing of the first three Caliphs, 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 alive.” He was as good as his word, and when the above-mentioned anathema was uttered all men were commanded, on pain of death, to exclaim, “May it (i.e. the curse) be more, not less!” (*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 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 Tābrīz, adds “from the time of Nero to the present, I doubt whether so bloodthirsty a tyrant has ever existed,” yet adds a little further on that at Caesarea “he caused proclamation to be made that everyone who brought provisions for sale should be liberally paid, and forbade his men, under pain of death, to take even as much as a handful of straw without paying for it, as it was a friendly city.” He further describes him as “amiable as a girl, left-handed by nature, as lively as a fawn, and stronger than any of his lords,” and says that “this Sophi is loved and reverenced by his people as a god, and especially by his soldiers, many of whom enter into battle without armour, expecting their master Ismael to watch over them in the fight.”

The closest historical parallel to the Ṣafawī movement is, I think, afforded by the propaganda in favour of the Ṭabāṣšids 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 Sallām a far more energetic and formidable antagonist than the earlier in the Umayyad Caliph Marwān, and hence its more limited success; for while the ‘Ṭabbāṣids 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 Sallām to massacre in cold blood some forty thousand of his Shi'a subjects. Fear, however, was not the only motive of this ferocity; with it were mingled anger...
and disappointment. For Sultan Salim was what is now called a Pan-Islamist, and his ambition was to be not merely the Sovereign of the greatest and most powerful Muhammadan State, but the supreme head of the whole Muslim world. His conquest of Egypt and the Holy Cities of Mecca and Madina in A.D. 1517, and his assumption of the title of Caliph, which, whether by threats or promises, or a combination of the two, he induced the last titular 'Abbásid Caliph to surrender to him, might well have given him this position but for Sháh Isma'il and the barrier of heterodoxy which he had erected between the Turks, Egyptians and other Sunnís to the West and their fellow-believers to the East in Transoxiana, Afghanistán, Balúchistán and India. The Persians not only refused to recognise Sultan Salim as Caliph, but repudiated the whole theory of the Caliphate. The Turkish victory over the Persians at Cháldirán in August, 1514, failed of its results owing to the refusal of the Ottoman troops to push home their advantage, and thus robbed the succeeding Egyptian campaign of its full measure of success, and left a lasting soreness which served greatly to weaken the political power of Islám and to impose a check on Turkish ambitions whereby, as we have seen, Europe greatly profited. Between A.D. 1508, when it was taken by the Persians, and A.D. 1638, when it was finally recovered by the Turks, Baghdád, once the metropolis of Islám, changed hands many times as the tide of these bitter and interminable wars ebbed and flowed, until the increasing weakness and effeminacy of the later Safawi kings left Turkey in undisputed possession of Mesopotamia.

ART AND LITERATURE.

One of the most curious and, at first sight, inexplicable phenomena of the Safawi period is the extraordinary dearth of notable poets in Persia during the two centuries of its duration. Architecture, miniature-painting and other arts flourished exceedingly; the public buildings with which Sháh 'Abbás adorned his realms, and especially his capital Isfahán, 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 Riḍá-ji-'Abbási and his colleagues. Yet, though poets innumerable are mentioned in the *Tuhfu-i-Sámí* and other contemporary biographies and histories, there is hardly one (if we exclude Jámí, Hátífi, Hiláli and other poets of Khurásán, who were really the survivors of the school of Herát) worthy to be placed in the first class. During the seventy stormy years of Timúr's life there were at least eight or ten poets besides the great Háfíz, who outshone them all, whose names no writer on Persian literature could ignore; while during the two hundred and twenty years of Safawi 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 'Urff of Shíráz (d. A.D. 1590) and Sá'íb of Isfahán (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 Safawi poets so meagre. The phenomenon is noticed by Riḍá-qi Khán in the preface to his great anthology of Persian poets entitled *Majma'-i-Fuṣaḥá*, composed in the middle of the last century, as well

---

1 This biography of contemporary poets by Prince Sám Mirzá, the son of Sháh Isma'il, is another work which urgently needs publication.

2 Lithographed at Tihrán in two large volumes in 1295/1878.
as by European scholars like the late Dr Ethé, who have written on Persian poe

ty; with this difference, that the European writers commonly speak of Jāmī 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 Riđā-qlī Khān, rightly as I think, places certain modern poets of the Qājār period, notably such men as Qā'ānl, Furūghī and Yaghmāḥ, 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 Šafawīs seemed to me so remarkable that I wrote to my

learned and scholarly friend Mrzā Muḥammad Khān of Qazwīn, 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 Šafawī 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 Shi'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, Šūfism and mysticism, and, to use their own expression, everything connected with the 'Accomplishments' (as opposed to the 'Legalities'), 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 Šūfīs 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 Šūfism 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 darwīshes] 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 Batūta, 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 Šafawī period might well wonder whether this Persia and that are the same country, and the creed of its inhabitants the same Islām; 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, Kurdistān and Sulaymānīyya, which did not remain under the Šafawī dominion, there are many such buildings just as there were in Ibn Batūta's days.

"At all events during the Šafawī period in place of great
poets and philosophers there arose theologians, great indeed, but harsh, dry, fanatical and formal, like the Majlisís, the Muháqqiq-i-thádhí, 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 Šafawí kings, especially Táhmasp 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 Moghuls¹ 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 Muktáshám of Kashfán (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 Muharram mourning, dates from this period, when every means was employed to stimulate and develop these sentiments of devotion to the House of ‘Álí and detestation of its oppressors. On the other hand the dramatisation of these moving scenes, which now form so remarkable a feature of the Muharram mourning (Ta’áziyya), 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 Muharram, A.H. 1047 (May–June, 1637) at Ardabil, the sanctuary of the Šafawí family, and gives a very full description of all that he saw, the mournings, wailings, lamentations and cuttings culminating on the ‘Áshúrd, the tenth day of the month or Rúz-i-Qátí, 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 Taqlí-záda and Mírzá Húsayn Dánish. The former expressed the opinion that while the solemn recitations known as Rawdatu’l-Shuhudá, or “Garden of the Martyrs,” and other similar books) dates from Šafawí times, the Ta’áziyya-gardánt, 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-yí-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 Šasání dynasty than to his usurpation of the rights of ‘Álí and Fátíma:

¹ The liberality of Humáyún towards poets and men of letters is especially noticed under the year of his death (962/1555) in the Akbarní-Tawdífík. This and the succeeding topics will be more fully discussed in a subsequent chapter.
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 ‘Álí were long included before they finally fell under Turkish dominion1.

POSTSCRIPT.

I am indebted to my friend Mr H. L. Rabino, of H.B.M.’s Consular Service, for the following valuable notes on the celebration of the Muharram mourning at Baghdád as early as the fourth Muhammadan (tenth Christian) century. I have only the text of the two passages (one in German and the other in Persian): the reference was probably given in the accompanying letter (December 23, 1922), which has unfortunately been mislaid. I have an impression that they are taken from one of Dorn’s articles, probably published in the Mélanges Asiatiques. The whole quotation runs as follows:


بنای تقیهٔ سید الشیام در بغداد در سال ۹۶۳ هجری، در تاریخ ابن علی شامی آرزوی بر فراز الموت احمر بین بویه در بغداد در دهه اول محرم امر کرد تیامین بازارهای بغداد را بسته سپر به علی پوشیدند و تقیه‌ی سید الشیام پراختند، چون ابن قاعده در بغداد رسید و ادعا علمای اهل سنت آنها بدعنی برک دانتند و چون بر فراز الموت احمر نیز ندانستند چهاره

1 See Krusinski, op. cit., pp. 159-161.
CHAPTER II.

THE CREATION OF THE SAFAWI POWER TO 930/1524
SHAH ISMA'IL AND HIS ANCESTORS.

That Shaykh Šafiyyu'd-Dīn, the saintly recluse of Ardabīl from whom the Šafawi kings of Persia derived their descent and their name, was really an important and influential person in his own day, is a fact susceptible of historical proof. He who wins a throne and founds a great dynasty destined to endure for more than two centuries is apt, if he be of lowly origin, to create, or allow to be created, some legend connecting his ancestors with famous kings, statesmen or warriors of old, or otherwise reflecting glory on a House which, till he made it powerful and illustrious, held but a humble place in men's esteem. But Šah Isma'il, sixth in descent from Shaykh Šafī (as we shall henceforth call him for brevity), who founded the Šafawi dynasty about the beginning of the sixteenth century of the Christian era, and raised Persia to a position of splendour which she had scarcely held since the overthrow of the ancient and noble House of Šāsān by the Arabs in the seventh century, had no occasion to resort to these devices; for whether or no Shaykh Šafī was directly descended from the seventh Imām of the Shi'a, Mūsā Kāẓīm, and through him from 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib¹ and Fāṭima the Prophet's daughter (and his

¹ The full pedigree is given (with only slight variants) in the Šafawī's-Šofā, Akmawut-Tawāriḵh, Sišilatu-n-Nasab-i-Šafawīyya and most other histories of this dynasty, and runs as follows: (1) Šaфиyyu'd-Dīn Abu'l-Fatḥ Isḥāq b. (2) Aminu'd-Dīn Jibrīl b. (3) Šāliḥ b. (4) Qaḏi-u'd-Dīn Ahmad b. (5) Šālahu'd-Dīn Rasḥid b. (6) Muḥammad Ḥāfiz b. (7) Awaḏ al-Khawāṣṣ b. (8) Firūzshāh-i-Zarrīn-kulāh b. (9) Muḥammad b. (10) Sharafshāh b. (11) Muḥammad b.

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 Rashīd-ud-Dīn Faḍl-ulu'llāh for his welfare, and the desire to win his favour and intercession. In the very rare collection of the Minister's letters known as the Munsha'd-i-Rashidi² there occur two documents affording proof of this. The first is a letter (No. 45 of the collection, ff. 145b-149a of the MS.) addressed to Shaykh Šafiyyu'd-Dīn himself, offering to his monastery (Khānqāh) a yearly gift of corn, wine, oil, cattle, sugar, honey and other food-stuffs for the proper entertainment of the notables of Ardabīl on the anniversary of the Prophet's birthday, on condition that prayers should be offered up at the conclusion of the feast for the writer and benefactor. The second (No. 49, ff. 161a-169b) is addressed by Rashīd to his son Mīr Aḥmad, governor of Ardabīl, 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 Islām 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 Šafiyyu'd-Millat wa'd-Dīn (may
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God Most High perpetuate the blessings of His Holy Exhalations! may be well pleased with and grateful to thee. These letters, and especially the second, which is filled with the most exaggerated praises of Shaykh Šafii, sufficiently prove the high repute which he enjoyed amongst his contemporaries.

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 dar wish Tawakkul ibn Isma'īl, commonly called Ibnul-Bazzāz, apparently under the inspiration and direction of Shaykh Sadru'd-Dīn, who succeeded his father Shaykh Šafii 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 printed, 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 Šah Šāhīn (A.D. 1524-1576) by a certain Abū'-

1 See Rieu's Pers. Cat., pp. 345-6.
2 See my Suppl. Hand-list, p. 137, No. 837.
3 Ch. viii comprises no less than 27 sections.
6 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.