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ABSTRACT

This thesis is based on the second volume of *Afżal al-Tavārīkh*, the 17th century Şafavid court chronicle. It consists of a historiographical study of this source and an annotated translation of the section concerning the early years of Shāh Ṭahmāsp's reign (1524-1529). The author Fāżl b. Zayn al-'Abidin b. Ruḥ Allāh al-Khūzānī al-Iṣfahānī was writing his history in 1617-1639 during the reigns of Shāh ʿAbbās I (r. 1587-1629) and Shāh Ṣafī (r. 1629-1642) and devoted the second volume entirely to the reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsp (r. 1524-1576).

Chapter one of the thesis deals with the author, his life and career as a provincial Vazir during the reign of Shāh ʿAbbās, and his emigration to India. It identifies the formative influences which shaped the author's distinctive view of history. One of Fāżl's strengths as a historian is his use of histories that are no longer extant. The sources have therefore been examined in order to assess the influence of these "lost histories" on his presentation of Shāh Ṭahmāsp's early reign. *Afżal al-Tavārīkh* contains transcriptions of more official documents than are found in any other Şafavid court chronicle. The first chapter therefore underlines the importance of this source as a depository of chancery documents.

The historiographical evaluation of *Afżal* proposes that this history is essentially a product of the reign of Shāh Ṣafī and should be viewed as part of Shāh ʿAbbās' propaganda campaign, which aimed at strengthening the Şafavid Shāh's claim to legitimacy.

Chapter two is a critical evaluation of *Afżal al-Tavārīkh*. This chapter examines some of the historiographical issues which were raised in chapter one, in greater depth. Three case studies have been presented in order to draw attention to the author's tendency to suppress inconvenient truths and to determine the ideological basis which underpins the author's historical interpretation. It also outlines how Fāżl's ideological bias determined the structure of his narrative and his literary style.

Chapter three consists of the partial translation of the text followed by a commentary. The translation deals with the narrative of the first six years of Shāh Ṭahmāsp's minority to the year 936/1529. Although the inter-tribal factionalism of the Qizilbāş tribes continued to dominate the court politics, 936/1529 signified the first occasion when the young Shāh Ṭahmāsp succeeded in asserting greater personal political authority at court. This was made possible by the prestige he derived from his victory at the battle of Jām in 935/1528 against the Uzbeks. This allowed him to invite the Ustājlū uymaq back to court from exile in Gilān and thus destabilise the hegemony hitherto exercised by their Qizilbash rivals- the Tekkelūs. This consideration has determined the logical break in the narrative and the translation. The commentary consists of further historiographical notes, prosopography, and notes on geography.
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Transliteration Note

With some minor modification, the transliteration system of *International Journal of Middle East Studies* has been adopted:

**Consonants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Letter</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>١</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٣</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٤</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٥</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٦</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٧</td>
<td>ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٨</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٩</td>
<td>gh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٠</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١١</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٢</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٣</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٤</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٥</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٦</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٧</td>
<td>v or u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٨</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٩</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢٠</td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢١</td>
<td>š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢٢</td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢٣</td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢٤</td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢٥</td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢٦</td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢٧</td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢٨</td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢٩</td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٣٠</td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vowels**

**Long**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Letter</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>١</td>
<td>ä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢</td>
<td>ü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٣</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Letter</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>١</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٣</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Doubled**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Letter</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>١</td>
<td>iyy (final form ï)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢</td>
<td>uww (final form ü)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diphthongs ٍ aw
ٍ َ اٍ ay

The name-ending -iyya has been opted, as in Šūfiyya, Naqshbandiyya.

"a" represents the final "h" as in khāna, muqaddama.
Preface

In recent years, due to the efforts of Iranian scholars, increasing number of Safavid court chronicles have been edited and published. However, none has been subject to a systematic and critical historiographical examination. Although *Afzal al-Tavârikh* has been used to a limited extent, its manuscript form and the absence of multiple copies have ensured that it has remained relatively underutilised by modern scholars of Safavid history.

Martin Dickson regarded volume 2 of *Afzal al-Tavârikh* as an important source for his study of Safavid-Uzbek wars. Jean Aubin made use of the first volume, the history of Shâh Ismâ'îl I, for his study of the contribution of the patrician families to the development of Safavid state under Shâh Ismâ'îl. Faruk Sümer consulted volume 2 for his history of the role of the Turkoman tribes in the establishment and consolidation of the Safavid state. Röhrborn studied the first and the second volumes for his history of the provincial administration under the Safavids. Riazul Islam examines volume 2 of *Afzal* in his history of Indo-Persian relations. Sandy Morton's comparative study of *Ahsan al-Tavârikh* and volume 1 of *Afzal* reveals the extent to which the two sources diverge in their accounts of the early years of Shâh Ismâ'îl. Masashi Haneda's history of the Khûzâ'î family is mainly based on the biographical information derived from the first and second volumes of *Afzal al-

---

Maria Zuppe’s study of Safavid women is partly based on the evidence derived from this chronicle. The present thesis aims to assess the value and the reliability of volume 2 of *Afżal al-Tavārīkh* as a source for the reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsp and also to make the part of the text dealing with the first five years of the reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsp available in English.

The scope of the history, which chronicles the reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsp in some detail, and the period of its conception, the reign of Shāh ʿAbbās, particularly recommended it for a detailed historiographical examination. *Afżal al-Tavārīkh* was written in a period of transition when the Safavid state was undergoing fundamental social and political changes. The emergence of new socio-political alignments, the ghulāms and the Shi’i ‘ulamā, threatened the older established order represented by the Qizilbāsh with their heterodox religious tendencies, and forced a change in the power structure on which the institution of the monarchy rested. It is from this vantage point which Fażlī viewed the history of Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s reign.

*Afżal al-Tavārīkh* is representative of the different oral and written historical traditions which had developed by the first half of the 17th century. *Afżal al-Tavārīkh* is important for it often offers a different version of the events of Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s reign from the majority of the sources contemporary with the Shāh. The historiographical examination has shown that Fażlī’s perception of some events was different from that which is recorded by the contemporary historians of Ṭahmāsp’s reign. Case studies have been presented in order to highlight Fażlī’s methodology and the extent to which he altered his basic sources, dating from Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s reign, in an attempt to rewrite history.

---

Fazli's presentation of the ideological principles on which Shah Tahmasp's kingship rested is also rare among the Safavid court chronicles. In this history, Shah Tahmasp emerges as a monarch whose legitimacy is based on his spiritual authority. He is presented as both the Sufi spiritual guide and the successor to the Lord of the Age. The thesis tries to explore the influences which shaped the chronicler's perception of Tahmasp's kingship and the history of his reign. However, insufficient knowledge about Fazli's own political and religious tendencies limits our understanding of the milieu in which he conceived the history.\(^8\)

Afżal al-Tavārīkh is a significant source for the number and range of official documents that it contains. The official documents have been listed in chapter 1 but the texts of only those relevant to the thesis have been presented in full. For the purpose of this thesis it was decided that the significance of the documents is better understood when studied in the context of the history. The ṣfarān of Mirzā Qāsim's laurercateship is an important example.\(^9\) The principal interest here is in what these documents tell us about Fazli's methodology in writing his history. A preliminary study has shown that different versions of some of the documents exist in different sources. This may have resulted from the individual chronicler's historiographical methods when compiling his history but a thorough discussion of the problem is beyond the scope of this thesis and is assigned to future research. The problem, however, indicates that these documents require a thorough historiographical study and should be used with caution.

One of the most important features of Afżal al-Tavārīkh is the use that Fazli has made of the unknown and lost histories. Fortunately, he usually identifies his sources so it is possible to assess their contribution to Afżal al-Tavārīkh. Tārīkh-i Harat va

\(^8\) The recent discovery of volume 3 of Afżal al-Tavārīkh, which deals with the reign of Shah 'Abbās, and the autobiographical evidence which it offers should enhance our understanding of the social and political milieu in which the historian operated. It is hoped this will be added to the thesis in future. The preface of volume 3 of Afżal al-Tavārīkh is a synthesis of Tārīkh-i 'Ālam Ārā-i 'Abbāsī by Iskandar Beg Munshi and Afżal. The rest of the volume too could be a hybrid and until future research establishes its true provenance, it should be studied with caution.

\(^9\) See chapter 2 "A Critical Evaluation of Afżal al-Tavārīkh".
*Khurāsān* and *Miftāḥ al-qlūb* can be named as the two most important of these lost sources. However, the extent to which Fażlī has altered his basic source *Ahsan al-Tavārīkh* by Ḥasan Rūmūlu calls for caution when assessing the influence of these unknown sources on the chronicle.

The decision to translate rather than edit the chronicle was determined by the absence of multiple copies and the physical difficulties of the Persian text. Existence of only one copy makes the task of a critical edition impossible. The damaged text, the poor and at times illegible handwriting led to the decision to translate rather than attempt to edit the text. It was thought that a translation of the text would make this important text more readily available. This thesis has endeavoured to present as complete a translation of the text as possible. No part of the prose section of the text has been discarded or summarised. The poetry has however been omitted except where it has been considered to be an integral part of the prose. Titles have been deemed to be important indicators of the contemporary political ideology and metaphorical expressions to be representative of the literary style and an insight into the historian's intellectual interests. These have been faithfully translated in order to preserve the idiosyncrasies of this history. The problem of linguistic ambiguities has been overcome to a large extent by a critical and comparative study of the parallel sources.

The second major problem has been the translation of the administrative terminology. Minorsky's translation of *Tadhkirat al-Mulūk*, the manual of Ṣafavid administration, has been adopted as the guide. It is however understood that this 18th century manual, which was written for the benefit of the Afghān occupiers of Iran, may not always be applicable to the Ṣafavid administration under Shāh Ṭahmāsp and Shāh ʿAbbās I.

A related problem has been the translation of the terminology used to define the territorial divisions of the kingdom. The term "vilāyat" in particular poses difficulties since Fażlī uses this term very loosely. *Vilāyat* should normally mean province but
Fazlī uses it to mean sub-province or governorship as in "Sām Mirzā ordered a letter of victory to be sent to the vilāyāt of Khurāsān". Similarly he refers to the governorships of the towns and their dependencies as vilāyat as in the following example "Jagarna Sultan Shamlū..... captured the vilāyat of Sabzivār". In translation an attempt has been made to differentiate between these geographic/administrative divisions even though we cannot be certain what the author intended.

The historiographical evaluation is presented in two separate sections. The three case studies presented in chapter 2 lent themselves to a more comprehensive analysis and together they have been considered to be representative of Fazlī's methodology and his tendency to rewrite history.

The primary purpose of the commentary is to highlight the historiographical problems associated with Afzāl, which could not be dealt with in chapter 2. This section deals with some of the factual inaccuracies and discrepancies found in the chronicle. Furthermore, the history is rich with the names of individuals. This necessitated the inclusion of prosopographical details in the commentary. These biographical studies are intended to throw some light on the development of the careers of a number of Qizilbash chieftains in Safavid administration under Shāh Tāhmāsp and their contribution to the political and military developments of the period.

---

10 Afzāl II, ff. 8b, 24b.
11 Afzāl II, f. 29b.
Chapter 1: Afzal al Tavārikh, Volume II, The Author and the History

THE AUTHOR

Fażl b. Zayn al-Šābīdīn b. Ruḥ Allāh al-Khūzānī al-Iṣfāhānī belonged to the influential Khūzānī family of Iṣfāhān.1 Shāh Ṣāmīrūd, an ancestor of the Khūzānīs, left Baghdad to establish himself and his Jaʿfariyya following (qabīla) in the Khūzān district of Iṣfāhān in the 840s/1440s.2 By 909/1503 the Khūzānīs had emerged as members of the new ruling elite supporting Shāh Ṣāmīrūd and the fledgling ʿṢafavid state. In this year Yār Aḥmad Khūzānī secured Shāh Ṣāmīrūd’s favour who granted him the Khūzān and Kūhpāyya districts of Iṣfāhān and Naṭanz as tiyūl and in 915/1509 he was appointed Vicegerent (vakil).3 The Prefect of Police (dārūgha) of Iṣfāhān too had been chosen from the Khūzānī family for much of this period.4 When Shāh Ṣāmīrūd appointed Yār Aḥmad Khūzānī (Najm-i Thānī) his Vicegerent, he also appointed Yār Aḥmad’s brother to replace him as the Prefect of Police of Iṣfāhān. The tradition continued when Shāh ʿṢafvāsp appointed Mirzā Jān Beg Khūzānī, the son of Yār Aḥmad, the Prefect of Police of Iṣfāhān in 937/1530.5 However, from the 17th century this office became an exclusive prerogative of Georgian princes.6

Other Khūzānīs who achieved high office included Amir Šāy’d al-Dīn ‘Ināyat Allāh Khūzānī who was appointed co-Vazir with Qāzī Jahāb by Shāh ʿṢafvāsp and

---

1 Munzavi identifies him as Mirzā Fażl b. Zayn al-Šābīdīn b. Ruḥ Allāh Ḥusainī Iṣfāhānī, a historian of the court of Shāh Ṣafvā. Ahmad Munzavi, Fihrist-i Nuskahu-i Khattī, 6 vols. (Tehran, 1969/1348), vol. 6, pp. 422-23. Fażl introduces himself as Fażl Allāh but known as Fażl Iṣfāhānī, Afzal al-Tavārikh I, Eaton Collection (172), Cambridge University Library; Edinburgh University Library, Mic. P2829, the last folio which remains unnumbered.
2 Haneda, "La Famille Ḥuzani", p. 79.
3 Ibid, p. 81. See also Aubin, "Revolution Chiite", p. 10. Also p. 30, note 105.
5 Fażl b. Zayn al-Šābīdīn b. Ruḥ Allāh al-Khūzānī al-Iṣfāhānī, Afzal al-Tavārikh II, India Office OR. 4678. f. 65a. See also Haneda "La Famille Ḥuzani", p. 82.
6 TM. p. 149.
Mirza 'Ata Allah Khūzānī Iṣfāhānī who served as the Vazir of Āzarbāyjān, Shīrvān and Shāhī until 967/1559. The author's own grandfather Māshāh Khvāja Rūḥ Allāh Khūzānī Iṣfāhānī also served as Vazir of Mashhad and nāẓīr of the shrine of Imām Rīzā, Vazir of Khurāsān, and Vazir of both Khurāsān and Gilān from 939-75/1532-67. The Khūzānīs continued to hold high office until the early years of the reign of Shāh ʿAbbās. However, it appears that at least one branch of the family, that descending from Mirza 'Ata Allah, were involved in the dynastic quarrels and the civil wars of the reign of Sultan Muḥammad Khudābānda and the early years of the reign of Shāh ʿAbbās.

In 967/1559-60 Mirzā Aḥmad, the son of Mirzā 'Ata Allah (Khūzānī) Iṣfāhānī, was appointed the recorder of the King's assemblies (majlis nīvīs) at the court of Shāh Ṭahmāsp. He later fell from grace and for some time was unemployed though he was occasionally recalled to court to write letters to the Ottomans. Towards the end of Shāh Ṭahmāsp's reign or more precisely during his illness, approximately 982-4/1574-6, Mirzā Aḥmad was appointed the Vazir of Shūshtar and Khūzistān in southern Iran. Later, his opposition to the reigning Sultan Muḥammad Khudābānda (r. 985-995/1578-87) and his Grand Vazir Mirzā Salmān Jābīrī forced Mirzā Aḥmad to join the pro-'Abbās faction in Khurāsān. Mirzā Aḥmad thus became Vazir of Murshid Qūlī Khān, the governor of Mashhad and the guardian of the future Shāh ʿAbbās. He was also appointed the governor of Nishāpur and was given a drum and a banner. This branch of the Khūzānī family seems to have been divided by the same politics of succession which had also ruptured the Šafavīd House. When Sultan

---

7 *Afzal II*, f. 223b. Röhrborn, *Trans. Jahāndārī*, op. cit., pp. 155-6, suggests this evidence may be unreliable as no other source mentions this Vazir.
8 *Afzal II*, f. 236.
10 TAAA, p. 1090.
Muḥammad Khudābanda tried to suppress the rebellion of the supporters of his son Prince ʿAbbās in Khurāsān in 991/1583. Mirzā Ahmad was killed during the siege of Turbat-i Ḵaydariyya by a bullet fired by Bakhtum Beg, his brother’s son, who was an ally of the Grand Vazir Mirzā Salmān and supported the candidacy of Prince Ḥamza. After the death of Mirzā Ṣāḥib, Murshid Qull Khan adopted and raised his young son Mirzā Shāh Vāli and in gratitude for the services of his father appointed him Vazir. In 996/1587-8 after Shāh ʿAbbās ascended the throne he appointed Mirzā Shāh Vāli [Ḵūzānī ʿĪṣāhānī] the Grand Vazir (vazir-i ʿazam). The sources agree that this appointment was in fact made by or at the instigation of the Vicegerent Murshid Qull Khān Ustājīlū, the powerful Qizilbash Amir. Mirzā Shāh Vāli’s tenure as the Grand Vazir was however shortlived. Following the murder of Murshid Qull Khān in 997/1588-9, Shāh ʿAbbās removed all the political allies of his murdered Vicegerent from high office including Mirzā Shāh Vāli. We find that immediately after Shāh ʿAbbās eliminated his Vicegerent the office of Grand Vazir was entrusted to Mirzā Muḥammad Kermānī, who himself was murdered 6 months later. We can not ascertain what became of Mirzā Shāh Vāli as the sources are generally silent about his fate.

The history of the Ḵūzānī family during the 17th century requires further research but we can surmise from the lack of prominence of this family in the chronicles that Mirzā Shāh Vāli was the last of the Ḵūzānīs who held such a high office at the central government as that of a Grand Vazir. The Ḵūzānīs such as Faḍlī

---

12 TAAA, p. 1090; Ṭārīkh-i ʿAbbāsī, pp. 60-62.
13 TAAA, pp. 385, 1090.
15 Ibid.
16 TAAA, p. 399-400; Niqāyat al-ʿĀthār, p. 309.
17 In volume 3 of Afzal al-Tawārīḵ Faḍlī gives a different version of Mirzā Shāh Vāli’s appointment to Vizārat. He claims that Mirzā Shāh Vāli succeeded Mirzā Muḥammad to Vizārat after the latter was murdered by his opponents in 997/1588. Faḍlī also claims that Mirzā Shāh Vāli resigned in the following year 998/1589 and was succeeded by Mirzā Luṭfī, Afzal al-Tawārīḵ III, [This history is at present catalogued wrongly under the title ʿĀlam Āra-i ʿAbbāsī, Dd. 5. 6., Christ’s College Library, Cambridge University], f. 8a.
Khūzānī Iṣfahānī, the author of *Afżal al-Tavārīkh*, appear to have held lower-ranking administrative posts in the provinces. We find that in 995/1586-7 Sulṭān Muhammad Khudābanda appointed Mīrzā Hidāyat-i Najm-i Thānī, the grandson of Najm-i Thānī, *nāzir-i mu‘āmilāt* in Iṣfahān. Mīrzā Hidāyat appears to have survived the tribal factionalism and dynastic quarrels of Khudābanda’s reign as in 1009/1601 he accompanied Shāh ‘Abbās on his famous pilgrimage on foot to Mashhad. Another Khūzānī was Najm al-Dīn Maḥmūd Beg, the grandson of Najm-i Thānī, whom Shāh ‘Abbās appointed the governor of Naṭanz in 1001/1592-3 and to whom he entrusted absolute power (*hukūmat bi istiqlāl*). This appointment is significant. The background to this appointment reveals the way in which Shāh ‘Abbās’ land reforms may have affected the aristocratic families such as the Khūzānīs. In this year the inhabitants of the village of Ābiyāna in the Barzrūd district of Naṭanz complained to Shāh ‘Abbās about the injustices of the local governors and the corruption of the tax collectors (*taḥšīldārān*) who had imposed a rate of tax beyong that which had been set by the Divān. Shāh ‘Abbās ordered the Controller General Āqā Shāh ‘Alī Iṣfahānī to launch an inquiry into this matter. The findings so horrified Shāh ‘Abbās that he ordered the whole of Naṭanz to be converted into crown lands (*khāṣṣa*). Afūṣta-i Naṭanżī claims that this decision was motivated by a desire to protect the subjects of Naṭanz, specially the dervishes and the *fuqarā* [simply the poor or the ascetics?], from that wretched lot [the tax collectors]. This may have indeed been the case but one also suspects that Shāh ‘Abbās may have used this as a pretext to force the pace of conversion of the *mamālik* lands into the *Khāṣṣa* or the royal demesne. As royal demesne Naṭanz would come under the *Khāṣṣa* administration and the revenue accruing from its districts would be payable

---

18 TĀAA, p. 359.
20 *Niqāvat al-Āthār*, p. 462.
21 Ibid, p. 460.
directly to the Shāh to spend as he pleased. As we may recall in 915/1509 Shāh Ismā'īl had granted Naṭanz as a fief (tiyūl) to the most illustrious of the Khūzānīs Najm-i Thānī who was the grandfather of Najm al-Dīn Maḥmūd Beg. We cannot ascertain whether this fief had remained in the Khūzānī family until the reign of Shāh ʿAbbās but in any case the conversion of Naṭanz into crown lands in 1001/1592 ensured that the Khūzānīs ceased to be the beneficiaries of its revenue. However, by appointing Najm al-Dīn Maḥmūd the governor of Naṭanz Shāh ʿAbbās recognised the former connection of this family with the district. It also signalled the Shāh's recognition of the integrity of the family and their ability to restore justice and order in the area.

As the brief history of the Khūzānī family illustrates, by birth Fażlī ʿĪsāhānī belonged to the bureaucratic elite of Ṣafavid Iran and was destined to pursue a career in the state administration. Fażlī was a contemporary of his cousins Mirzā Hidayat Allāh and Najm al-Dīn Maḥmūd and lived through the reigns of Shāh ʿAbbās and Shāh ʿAbbās and Shāh ʿAbbās. Little is known of his early life except that he grew up in Āzarbāyjān, particularly in Ganja, which he clearly regarded as a disadvantage. He apologises for his lack of refinement and learning and professes his ignorance due to an early life and upbringing amongst the Turks. Nevertheless, Fażlī by the instruction of the senior members of the family and as was customary was trained to enter the royal service. It is not clear whether he actually received a formal programme of training and education specifically designed for entry into civil administration at a palace school. If this did occur, his training was based at a provincial level in Āzarbāyjān. He showed an interest in history from an early age and from childhood he would read histories of the rulers of the world and the lives of the contemporary nobility of Iran. In the second volume of Afzāl, Fażlī shows a tendency to use poetry as a historical source where possible. The prose narrative in the second volume of Afzāl

24 Afzāl I, f. 3a.
25 Afzāl I, f. 1b.
26 Afzāl I, f. 1b.
al-Tavārikh is interspersed with verses from Mirzā Qāsim Junaḏālī’s historical mathnāvī “Ṣāhnāma-i Shāh Ṭahmāsp”. Fażlī also mentions Tazkirat al-ṣafā, a biographical dictionary of the Qizilbāsh poets, as another of his works. This together with his use of a historical mathnāvī as a major source, indicates a personal interest in poetry. It may also indicate that he himself was an amateur poet.

Fażlī began his career in Ṣafavid administration as a junior provincial vazir in 1026/1617. In this year while residing at the winter camp at Dānqī Shāh ʿAbbās appointed him Vazir of Paykar Sulṭān Ikramī Dūrt Qājār, the governor of the district (ulkā) of “Barda” of Ṭārān”. Fażlī notes that he became the Vazir of Barda and the falconry (qūshkhāna), which was the tiyūl of Paykar Sulṭān and had an income of 150 tumans. Also at Dānqī and at the same time, Shāh ʿAbbās promoted Sārū Taqī, who at that time was the Vazir of the governor-general (beglarbēgī) of Qarābāḡ, to the post of Vazir (vazir-i kull) of the province of Ṭabaristān comprising Māzandarān and Rustamār. Fażlī and Sārū Taqī were therefore contemporaries and it is more than likely that they were also acquaintances. Whereas Sārū Taqī rapidly rose to the highest office of the state and was appointed the Grand Vazir in 1043/1633, Fażlī remained a provincial Vazir until his departure for India.

Fażlī also gives the year 1023/1614 for this appointment which is likely to be an error. Shāh ʿAbbās was engaged in military campaigns in Georgia in both 1023 and 1026 and we have detailed itineraries of his movements for both campaigns. Dānqī does not appear on his itinerary of 1023 but it does in 1026. This confusion of dates may have arisen from the fact that Fażlī’s professional association with

---

28 Afzal III, f. 380a.
29 Willem Floor, "The Rise and Fall of Mirzā Taqī, the Eunuch Grand Vazir (1043-55/1633-45), Makhḍum al-Omara va Khadem al-foyqara", Studia Iranica 26 (1997), pp. 237-66. 243; TAAA, p. 1093. Floor, quoting TAAA, dates this appointment to 1025 which is inaccurate. The Hijri year 1026 began on 9 January 1617, so the winter, when Shāh ʿAbbās camped at Dānqī, began at the end of the year 1025 and for the most part actually fell in the year 1026.
30 Floor, op. cit., p. 248.
31 Afzal II, f. 180b.
33 TAAA, pp. 912-14.
Paykar Khan predated 1026. In 1025/1616 when on his way to Georgia Shāh ʿAbbās camped along the river Araxes, Paykar Sultan\textsuperscript{34} despatched Fażlī to deliver a petition to the Shāh at the royal camp. Fażlī presented the petition to Shāh ʿAbbās at Aqī Shārī and also reported on the political situation in Georgia. In response to Paykar Sultan’s petition Shāh ʿAbbās ordered him to attack Zakum and also gave Fażlī robes of honour (khażat) and granted him permission to leave. When Fażlī returned to Birda\textsuperscript{35} Paykar Sultan assigned him to muster an army. He spent the whole night enlisting 1500 men from among the regular troops (mulāzim-i muqarrar), the Şūfis and the Shāhsevan. The next day the small detachment embarked on its military mission. At the river Kur Fażlī was responsible for the orderly crossing of the troops.\textsuperscript{35}

The detailed account of the sack of Zakum gives us a good understanding of the tribal and military milieu in which Fażlī operated. In this campaign he accompanied the Turkoman, Ustājlū, Bayāt and Pāzūkī\textsuperscript{36} tribal divisions.\textsuperscript{37} This tribal force sacked Zakum, massacred its inhabitants, and enslaved 700 men. Fażlī is likely to have taken part in battle. He was responsible for the more gruesome task of counting the severed heads, 2000 in total. He notes that as proof of victory, the right ears were cut off to be presented to Shāh ʿAbbās. He was also assigned to prepare the inventory of the spoils of the war. He recorded the booties as follows: 700 Jewish and Georgian captives, 2000 severed heads, and 30000 tumans. This did not include the captives and the money which had been hidden by the troops.\textsuperscript{38} After the sack of Zakum Fażlī again went to Shāh ʿAbbās, who at this time had set up camp in the vicinity of Ganja, to report on the success of the mission.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{34} In the third volume of \textit{A fête}, Fażlī refers to Paykar Ikram Durt as "Sultan" and not "Khan". \textit{A fête III}, f. 356a.
\textsuperscript{35} \textit{A fête III}, ff. 356a, 357a.
\textsuperscript{36} The Pāzūkī were a Kurdish tribe whose original homes were near Kīghi and Alāshkert in the region to the north of Lake Van, \textit{TM}, p. 34.
\textsuperscript{37} \textit{A fête III}, f. 357b.
\textsuperscript{38} \textit{A fête III}, f. 358a.
\textsuperscript{39} \textit{A fête III}, f. 358b.
In 1029-30/1620-1 Paykar Khān was made the governor of Kākheti. He settled in the fortress of Qārlānqūch where he built a town with fine homes and baths and where different groups of his uymaq settled. Fażlī too was promoted and served Paykar Khān as the Vazir of "Georgia, Barda', the falconries (māḥāl-i qūshkhāna), and the administration of the crown lands (khadamāt-i khāliṣṣa). During this period of his tenure as Vazir of Paykar Khān, Fażlī was responsible for the collection of taxes. These included the tax on flocks (chubāṅbegi) as well as royal taxes. Fażlī notes that he was responsible for the collection of the royal tax and revenue (zlāt-i māl-i khāṣṣ-i sharīf) in Tiflis for a number of years during Shāh 'Abbās' campaigns in Georgia. He also had responsibility for the crown lands (khāliṣṣa) of Āzarbāyjān.

In addition to collection of taxes, Fażlī must have played an active part in the economic and social regeneration of Kākheti. Six years of rebellion by Tāhmūrath Khān Gurjī and the Qizilbāsh wars had left Kākheti devastated. Fażlī notes that no sign of cultivation was left in that province. To aid the reconstruction of the province and to reinforce the Šafavīd hold over Georgia, Shāh 'Abbās ordered large numbers of the Turkoman tribes to settle in the area and also offered them financial incentives. Paykar Khān Ikramī Durt resettled 15000 households in Georgia and engaged them in farming and cultivation of the land. This number comprised his own uymaq Ikramī Durt, the Imur, the Zu'l-Qadr, the Sulaymān Ḥājīlu, the other retainers (ahshāmāt) and the Kurds of Āzarbāyjān. Three thousand tumans of the income accruing from the silk produced in Qarābāgh and the cattle tax, which Fażlī

40 Afzal III, ff. 18a, 415 a+b. In this year Shah 'Abbās subjugated the independent areas of Georgia like Kākhetiā more firmly, TAAA, p. 269.
41 TAAA, p. 1020.
42 Morton, op. cit., p. 29.
43 Afzal II, f. 257b.
45 Afzal III, f. 415a.
46 The Imur were a sub-tribal group of the Zu'l-Qadrs. At the time of the death of Shah 'Abbās Khalīl Sulṭān (Imur) held some land in Qarābāgh, Sumer, trans, Ishrāqi and Imami, op. cit., p. 217.
47 This group can not be identified and the reading is uncertain.
administered, were also paid to the farmers to assist them with the purchase of land and materials. This evidence also suggests that Fażli may have held the posts of Vazir of parts of Qarābāgh and Kākhetiā simultaneously.

Fażli’s career in Georgia appears to have depended on the fortunes of Paykar Khān. The latter’s downfall in 1035/1625 ended Fażli’s tenure as Vazir of Kākhetiā. In this year Maurāv Gurji, who was the Vicegerent (vakil) of the governor (vālī) of Georgia Simāyūn Khān, led an uprising against Qirchiqāy Khān, the commander (sipahsālār) of the Šafavid army in Georgia, killing the commander and pillaging the Šafavid army camp. Maurāv Gurji then set out to capture the fortress of Qārlānqūch and to kill Paykar Khān and his Ikrami Durt tribe. Paykar Khān and the majority of the Amirs were at this time on missions to intercept and eliminate the sinqāqāhā, which were pockets of Georgian refugees sheltering in safe locations in forests, when they heard the news of the massacre of the Šafavid troops. Paykar Khān hastily returned to Qārlānqūq and mobilised his tribe and fled. On the night of the attack on Qārlānqūq, Fażli and his elder brother Muḥammad Beg rescued 42 children, possibly their own family children, from the massacre and with only four horses managed to take them out of the citadel. Maurāv and his Georgian troops pursued the Ikrami Durts as they approached the river Kur. Paykar Khān and his family succeeded in crossing the river safely but the Georgians captured many of his fellow tribesmen and took much cattle and booty. Fażli appears to have been with Paykar Khān during that flight. Maurāv too crossed the Kur river, captured all of Qarābāgh and proclaimed himself the autonomous governor of the province before

48 Afsal III, f. 415b.
49 Iskandar Beg Munshi reports that although Maurāv Beg Gurji had converted to Islam ten years earlier, he had never renounced his Christian faith and in this year he rebelled against the Šafavids in Georgia and incited the Georgians of Kārtīl (in Northern Georgia) to rebel too. Apparently he aspired to gain the government of Kārtīl but he faced opposition from the notables of that province who considered themselves to be of a purer pedigree than he. In the event Maurāv Beg was defeated by his principal adversary Tahmūrath Khān, the ruler of Kākhetiā, and finally fled to Istanbul. TAAA, pp. 1024. 1061.
50 TAAA, p. 1025.
51 TAAA, p. 1024.
52 Ibid. p. 1025.
returning to Tiflis.\textsuperscript{53} This marked the end of the Georgian phase of Fāzīl's career. Thereafter, he returned to court "distressed and homeless" and awaited a new appointment.\textsuperscript{54} Fāzīl's biography so far supports the idea that he had experience of fighting in the field and thus combined a bureaucratic and a military career.

Elsewhere he notes in his praise of the bravery of the Kurds that he had on many occasions seen their fighting and had suffered the blows of their swords. He wrote from personal experience when he said one can not feign courage when fighting the Kurds.\textsuperscript{55}

Fāzīl's experience as a provincial Vazir in Georgia must be viewed as a formative influence in shaping his perception of the legitimacy of the Šāfavi Shāhs and ultimately his perception of the Šafavid history which he came to chronicle.

In both campaigns of 1023/1614 and 1025-6/1616-7, Shāh ʿAbbās succeeded in subjugating the rebellious Georgians through a policy of military and religious suppression. The Šafavid army was unleashed to massacre and enslave thousands of Georgians, to enforce religious conversions, to desecrate churches and to appropriate land for the Qizilbāsh Amirs.\textsuperscript{56} By the winter of 1026/1617 when Fāzīl was appointed Vazir, much of the Šafavid sphere of influence in Georgia, that is Qisq, Kārtīl and Kākhetiā, had been brought under military control and new governors and their civil administrators were appointed to implement the Shāh's political and fiscal policies. Fāzīl's responsibilities as a Vazir, which included the collection of taxes, placed him at the administrative frontline and brought him into close contact with a disaffected and alienated people who no doubt viewed him as the agent of an occupying force. The native hostility to the Šafavid rule in Georgia must have brought into sharp focus for Fāzīl the question of the Šafavid legitimacy. This

\textsuperscript{53} Afzal III. f. 509b.
\textsuperscript{54} Afzal III. f. 521b.
\textsuperscript{55} Afzal I, f. 148.
\textsuperscript{56} Fazli has devoted much of the third volume of Afzal al-Tavarikh to the Šafavid campaigns in Georgia for which he provides first hand accounts. A more accessible source is TĀAA. pp. 873-877, 897-916.
together with domestic political and religious dissent in the heartland of the Safavid empire left an imprint on his history of Shāh Ťahmāsp. As the historiographical evaluation of Afżal al-Tavārīkh in chapter two will illustrate, Fażlī responded to this challenge to the Safavid legitimacy in the pages of his history of Shāh Ťahmāsp.

After his departure from Kākhetia in 1035/1625, Fażlī was appointed Vazir of Ťahmāsp Tarkhān Quli Khān Turkomān, the governor of Kermān. Fażlī's service in the administration of Ťahmāsp Tarkhān was short-lived since the latter accompanied Shāh Ť Abbās to Baghdad in the war against the Ottomans but on his return to Kerman he fell ill and died in 1035/1625. Thereafter there is a lacuna in our knowledge of Fażlī's life and career. For a time he may have continued serving under Ťahmāsp Tarkhān's successor Amir Khān Murābī Sūklen, the son of Rustam Sulṭān Sūklen Zuţl-Qadr. Fażlī includes autobiographical notes on his time in Kermān. For instance, he notes that when he served as Vazir of Kermān although he had intended to visit Shāh Fażl Allah, the leader of the Niţmatullāhī Sūfī order at Māhān, he never found the opportunity. The autograph colophon of the second volume of Afżal al-Tavārīkh, dated 1049/1639-40, was signed in a castle in the Deccan. It is not clear when and why Fażlī went to the Deccan. This and his use of the Indian sources such as the Muntakhab al-Tavārīkh suggest that he travelled to India sometime before the completion of this volume. At present it is not possible to date his departure for the Deccan but it is likely to have been after the death of Shāh Ť Abbās

57 See chapter 2, "The Historiography of the Battle of Ťām".
58 Morton op. cit., p. 29, who cites: Afżal II, f. 221b; Afżal I, f. 140b; Also Afżal III, f. 521b.
59 Tārīkh-i Kerman, p. 286.
60 Amir Khān was also "the keeper of the seal" as well as the governor of Kerman and remained in that post until after Shāh Ť Abbās reign. Ibid: IAAA, p. 1058.
61 Afżal I, f. 142.
I. According to volume three of *Afżal*, at the time of the death of Shāh ʿAbbās Fażlī was in Iṣfahān.62

Was Fażlī a political refugee or one of thousands of Iranians who immigrated to India in search of a better life or patronage? India during the 16-18th centuries was a popular destination for the Iranian elite.63 During this period immigration continued uninterrupted.64 Haneda has found that among the 738 Indian notables included in *Maʿāthir al-umarā*, at least 198 (26.8 per cent) were either Iranian immigrants or were descended from such immigrants with another 205 whose origins have not yet been clarified.65 While there were those who fled from political or religious persecution in Ṣafavid Iran, the majority of Iranian immigrants were attracted by the intellectual and political freedom as well as the superior material life which they found in India. This contemporary saying (*mathal*) best encapsulated the lure of India:

"Anyone who has travelled to India once and has benefitted from this bountiful land, when he returns to Iran, that is if he does not die on the way, he will die yearning for that land of desire".66

ʿAbd al-Nabi, the author of *Tazkira-i maykhāna*, recorded his impressions of his adopted homeland on arrival at Lahore. He found India to be "a land of plenitude and low prices and where one can live as one pleases and no one has the power or the authority to censure him".67 Fażlī’s emigration to India is consistent with this social phenomenon. We have no knowledge of his life and career in India but it is likely that Fażlī entered into the service of the Mughal administration. A brief study

---

62 *Afżal* III, f. 565b.
63 The majority of the Mughal ambassadors to the court of Shāh ʿAbbās were Iranian. Shah ʿAbbās is reported to have said "Why is it that every Mughal ambassador is an Iranian and why don't they send an Indian to Iran?". One such ambassador replied "In India there is a shortage of mankind. If there had been enough men they would not have paid us." Naṣrullah Falsafī, *Zindigīnāma-i Shāh Ābbās Avval* (n. p. 1371). vol. 1 & 2, p. 279, note 1.
64 Masashi Haneda, "Emigration of Iranian Elites to India During the 16-18th Centuries", *Cahiers D'Asie Centrale*, 3-4 (1997). p. 131.
65 Ibid.
67 Ibid. p. 22.
of the biographies of similar notables, particularly other members of the Khûzânî family who emigrated to India, points to a consistent pattern of patronage of the Iranian immigrants by the Mughals.

Fâzîlí was not the only member of his family to have left Şafavid Iran for India.68 Bâqir Khân Najm-i Thânî, a descendant of Shâh Ismâ'îl's powerful Vicegerent Mirzâ Yâr Aḥmad ʿIṣfâhâni, emigrated and attained high office under Akbar. Bâqir Khân's father had been a bureaucrat (dīvānî) in Khurasân but had fallen on hard times. Bâqir Khân himself reached India homeless and in distress. This is further evidence which supports the idea that by the end of the 16th century the Khûzânî family was in decline and had lost much of the political power it had enjoyed during the reigns of Shâh Ismâ'îl and Shâh ʿĪsâmâsp within both the provincial and the central state administration. Hence the emigration of its members to India.69

Bâqir Khân's ascent to high office at the Mughal court may serve as a model for the study of the upward social and political mobility that these immigrant Iranians enjoyed in India. Bâqir Khân was first enlisted into the rank of the regular militia (mulâzîmān) of Emperor Akbar (r. 1556-1605). Under Akbar's successor Jahângîr, Bâqir Khân, thanks to his pedigree as a descendant of the illustrious Yâr Aḥmad Khûzânî (Najm-i Thânî), advanced even further. Descent from Najm-i Thânî clearly carried a great deal of prestige at the Mughal court. Khân Jâhân Ludi in a conversation with the Emperor Jahângîr (r. 1605-1627) is reported to have said "such a pedigree and this job!" and had sought to promote Bâqir Khân. He was appointed

68 Mirzâ Muʿmin Khûzânî, one of the notables (nujabâ) of ʿĪsâhâni, emigrated to India where his son Mirzâ ʿInâyat was born. It appears that Mirzâ ʿInâyat returned to Iran since, in his Tazkira, Naṣrâbâdî notes that he was a secretary in the office of the Mustâṣfi of the royal mawqûfāt (also known as the mawqûfāt-i chihârdah maʿṣûm or the fourteen pure souls). Mirzâ ʿInâyat was a poet and had knowledge of arithmetic. Mirzâ Muhammad ʿṬâhir Naṣrâbâdî ʿĪsâhâni, Tazkira-i naṣrâbâdî, (Tehran, 1317), p. 111. See also Haneda "La Famille Ḫuzânî", p. 91. For the royal religious endowments or mawqûfāt-i chihârdah maʿṣûm see Rôhrborn, trans, Jahândârî, op. cit., pp. 174-5.
69 The question of the immigration of the Khûzânîs to India was first raised by Haneda, "La Famille Ḫuzânî", p. 91.
to the post of the commander of three hundred horsemen (sadī ši savār). He later married the daughter of Khadija Begum and the niece of the powerful Empress Nūr Jahān. Marriage into the Mughal ruling dynasty "opened the doors of felicity and ennoblement" to him. He was promoted to the post of the commander of two thousand horsemen (dau hizārī) in the government of Multān. Bāqir Khān grew so powerful in the Multān region that he collected all the tributes payable in the vast region stretching between Multān and Qandihār. Emperor Jahāngīr held Bāqir Khān in such high esteem that he regarded him as his own son.

We may have no knowledge of Faḍlī’s fortunes in the Deccan but Bāqir Khān’s success at the court of Jahāngīr indicates that in India at least some members of the Khūzānī family attained the social and political distinction which they had enjoyed under Shāh Ismā’īl Šāfavī. It is also likely that on arrival to India Faḍlī sought the patronage of his powerful relative Bāqir Khān. The alliance of the two branches of the Khūzānī family was further consolidated when Faḍlī’s son Najm al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Faḍl Allāh Khūzānī married the daughter of Bāqir Khān. Najm al-Dīn Aḥmad was employed "in the service of the kings" in the Deccan. Najm al-Dīn too had an interest in history and wrote a universal history titled Tīrāz al-Akhbār and dedicated it to Aurangzīb.

Much research is required on the Indian phase of Faḍlī’s life but the available evidence indicates that his immigration to India did not necessarily represent a break

---

70 One characteristic of the Mughal administration was military in origin. Every official or civil administrator would be enrolled in the army list and would be given a mansab as the nominal commander of so many horsemen which determined his pay and status. Their promotion took the form of an increase in their nominal command. Jadunath Sarkar, Mughal Administration, (Calcutta, 1935). p. 8.
71 Nūr Jahan was the powerful wife of the Mughal Emperor Jahāngīr. She too was Iranian. Her father was Mirzā Ghiyāth Beg from a noble family of Tehran. Mirzā Ghiyāth had served as the governor of Yazd under Shah Tahmāsp but the family met misfortune after Mirzā Ghiyāth’s father died. He then emigrated to India in search of employment and fortune. R. C. Majumdar, The Mughul Empire, (eds.) R. C. Majumdar, J. N. Chaudhuri and S. Chaudhuri, (Bombay, 1974). pp. 184-5.
with the family's tradition of royal service. On the contrary, patronage and
intermarriage ensured the continuity of the fortunes of this powerful patrician family
in Mughal India.

THE HISTORY, AFŽAL AL-TAVĀRĪKH

In the words of the author himself, Fażl b. Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn b. Rûh Allāh al-
Khūzānī al-Īṣfāḥānī, this chronicle is:

"An annalistic account of the reign of His Majesty Shāh Ṭahmāsp the
warrior of the faith, may he rest in paradise, over the mamālik of Iran
and the account of his victories and wars which occurred between the
year 931/1524-5, which is the first Naurūz of his accession, to the year
984/1576-77 and the account of the death of that progeny of the dynasty
of the peerless prophet. And the accession of Shāh Ismāʿīl II". 74

The second volume of Afžal al-Tavārīkh, the subject of this thesis, is in fact part of a
more extensive history of the Ṣafavīd dynasty written in three volumes. Only one
known copy of volume 2 appears to exist. However, both Munzavī and Tehrānī have
cited an unidentified volume or volumes of Afžal al-Tavārīkh as being in the library
of Raja Muḥammad Fayžī in Fayžābād in India.75

Fażlī claims that he first conceived the idea of writing a history of the reign of
Shāh ʿAbbās I during the winter camp in the village of Dānqī near the city of Ganja
in Qarābāgh in the year 1026/1617 when Shāh ʿAbbās appointed him Vazir to
Paykar Suľṭān Ikramī Dūrt Qājār, the governor of the ulkā 76 of Bardaʿ of Ārān.
Fażlī wrote the history of ʿAbbās' reign in a matter of a few days and then sought the
opinion of the perceptive men (mustaʿidān va arbāb-ī idrāk).77 The general opinion
must have been favourable since Fażlī subsequently decided to embark on writing a
much more extensive history encompassing the history of the Ṣafavīd dynasty from

74 Afžal II, f. 10a+b. Contrary to Fażlī's scheme, the history ends with the death of Shāh Ṭahmāsp.
The account of the reign of Shāh Ismāʿīl II is not included.
75 Munzavī, op. cit., vol. 6, pp. 422-23; Muḥammad Muḥsin Āqā Buzurg al-Tihrānī, al-Zarīʿa ilā
76 The term "ulkā" or ölge as in Turkish, referred to in this text, applies to the territory held by a
clan. TM. p. 27.
77 Afžal I, f. 1b.
its beginning with the arrival of their ancestors from Arabia to Iran to the reign of Shāh 'Abbās. Faḍlī wrote this history in three volumes (jilds).79

The first volume of Afzal al-Tawārikh begins with the emigration of Sayyid Firūz Shāh Zarrīn Kulāh from "Arabia" to Ardabil where he bought the district of Gulkhurān and settled there. It also chronicles the asceticism (faqr) of Firūz Shāh's order, his miraculous deeds, the followers (murīdān) of his order and finally its demise.80 This volume continues with the history of the dynasties which ruled over Iran before the advent of Shāh Ismā'īl Ṣafavī and finally chronicles his reign and ends with Ismā'īl's death in 930/1524.81 Volume one was discovered in 1937 by Minorsky and was shown to be part of the same history as the long known second volume. It is now at the Eaton Collection (172) of Cambridge University. Although no date of composition can be determined for this volume, it appears that Faḍlī wrote it during the reigns of both Shāh 'Abbās and Shāh Ṣafī. In the final section of the chronicle dealing with the death of Shāh Ismā'īl, Faḍlī indicates that the reigning monarch is 'Abbās. He hopes that Shāh 'Abbās will one day read the khotba in his name in Istanbul, Mecca and Medina.82 In the preface, however, he declares his intention to write a history of Shāh Ṣafī. It appears that Faḍlī wrote the history during Shāh 'Abbās' reign and added the preface later during Ṣafī's reign. A recent inspection has shown this manuscript to be of Indian origin. It is written on Indian paper and was bound in India.

Faḍlī intended the second volume of Afzal al-Tawārikh to be a history of the life and reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsp from his birth in 919/1513 to his death in the year

78 The claim that the Ṣafavid dynasty originated from Arabia is erroneous and is likely to be part of the 17th century propaganda intended to forge closer association between the Ṣafavid dynasty and the heartland of Islam. The origins of the Ṣafavid dynasty are shrouded in mystery but it is generally believed that the family originated from Kurdistan. They later moved to Azerbaijan and finally settled in Ardabil in the 5th/11th century. R. M. Savory, Encyclopedia of Islam, (Leiden, 1995), vol. viii, p. 766. See specially, Ahmad Kasravi, Shaykh Ṣafī va Tabārash, (Tehran, 2335). p. 48.
79 Afzal 1, f. 2b.
80 Ibid.
81 Ibid.
82 Ibid, f. 276.
984/1576. This volume was also intended to include the reigns of his successors Shah Isma'il II and Sultan Muhammad Khudabanda.\textsuperscript{83} At a later stage of writing Fażlī decided to subdivide this volume into daftars, each devoted to the reign of one of the above-mentioned monarchs. In the preface of the second volume the author states that he will compile a history of Shah Isma'il II and Shah Sultan Muhammad Khudabanda.\textsuperscript{84} However, of the three daftars only daftar one on the reign of Shah Ṭahmāsp has been discovered and, contrary to the author's initial scheme, it begins with his accession and not his birth. The history begins abruptly in mid sentence. Therefore the section dealing Shah Ṭahmāsp's birth and early life is probably lost. At the same time Fażlī also indicates his intention to write a history of the reigning monarch Shah 'Abbās and states:

"The purpose of writing these preliminary works and these histories is to compile a history of the life and victories of Shah 'Abbās the Great".\textsuperscript{85}

The history of Shah 'Abbās is the third volume Afzal al-Tavārīkh which has recently been discovered at Cambridge. The manuscript is dated 1045/1635. The entire volume is devoted to a very detailed treatment of the reign of Shah 'Abbās. Similar to volume 1, it has been copied on Indian paper and bound in India. As has already been noted in the preface of the first volume, Fażlī again expresses his intention to devote the rest of his life to writing a history of Shah Ṣafī. This history, if it was written, has not been discovered as yet.

The British Library acquired the second volume of Afzal al-Tavārīkh from the British diplomat Sidney Churchill in 1893. Churchill had served as the Secretary to Her Majesty's Legation at Tehran for many years. From 1884 to 1894 he collected a large number of Persain manuscripts of which he presented 240 volumes, including Afzal al-Tavārīkh, to the British Library.\textsuperscript{86} The previous ownership of the

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{83} Afzal I, f. 2b.
\item\textsuperscript{84} Afzal II, f. 2.
\item\textsuperscript{85} Ibid.
\item\textsuperscript{86} Charles Rieu, Supplement to the Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum, (London, 1895), the preface.
\end{itemize}
manuscript remains uncertain despite the two Persian seals which it contains. One seal bears the name "Husain Shāh Quli ..lu". The second seal bears the phrase "By the grace of God" at the top, followed by the only decipherable word "Kāmrān". It is also dated 1074/1663. There are also some dates and notes which are recorded on the last folio. These were remembrance notes made by the owners of the manuscript. They are in different hands and all record the severity of the weather conditions at Naurūz or soon after. The Hijri dates are : 1237/1821-2, 1260/1844, 1279/1862 and 1280/1863. The last date "1280/1863" proves that the manuscript was in Iranian/Indian possession at least until this year.

The Date of Writing of the Second Volume of Afsal al-Tavārikh

Fażlī offers few clues to this. The colophon is clearly dated 1049/1639 when the author finished writing the history in a castle in the Deccan. This is three years before the death of Shāh Ṣafī in 1052/1642. Nevertheless linguistic evidence such as the use of the present tense when writing about events suggests that it was written over a long period of time and mostly during the reign of Shāh ʿAbbās I. For example, in 932/1525 Mir ʿAbd al-Vahhab, the head of the ʿAbd al-Vahhābiyya order, died in Istanbul after a long period of imprisonment. In his obituary Fażlī writes that the suyūrghāl and the regular salaries which Shāh Ṭahmāsp had granted to ʿAbd al-Vahhāb's sons on that occasion still continued during the reign of Shāh ʿAbbās when the author was writing. Elsewhere, under the events of the year 943/1536, he writes the following in praise of Amir ʿInāyat Allāh Khūzānī, Vazir of Āzarbāyjān and a relative of his:

"The just minister administered the taxation of the districts of Āzarbāyjān in a way that from that date to present which is eighty years no other mumayizān (tax inspector?) has had the power to overrule the assessment (jamā') of that

87 Afsal II, f. 190b.
88 Afsal II, f. 236b.
able minister." 90

This dates the composition of at least this section of the chronicle to the year 1023/1614, which predates Fażlī's appointment as Vazir of Paykar Khān Ikrāmī Durat Qājār in 1026/1617. Later the author offers a precise date of composition when recording the events of the year 963/1555. In this year Shāh Ṭahmāsp issued a corpus of regulations (dastūr al-čamal) which outlined the details of royal ceremonies and laid down the principles for the state's military, civil and fiscal policies. Fażlī writes that the regulations "which were registered at the Royal Secretariat (daftar-khāna-i ḥumāyūn) are still in force in this year which is 1026/1617 during the reign of Shāh ʿAbbās". 91 Morton has also identified a similar pattern of composition spanning over a long period of time for the first volume of Afzal al-Tāvārīkh. 92 This together with the completion date of 1045/1635 for the third volume suggests that Fażlī wrote all three volumes of Afzal al-Tāvārīkh simultaneously and for the most part during the reign of Shāh ʿAbbās I. 93

**The Arrangement of Material and The Physical Characteristics of the Manuscript**

Fażlī has narrated the events in an annalistic framework. The events of each year of Shāh Ṭahmāsp's reign have been recounted in chronological order. The year and a summary of the events of that year form the main headings and the summary of individual events form the sub-headings.

The author has adopted a mixed calendar system Turki (solar)/ Hijrī (lunar)/ Accession (julās) as the year frame for his narrative. 94 Each year begins with the Naurūz of the Turki year at the beginning of spring and is also given its

---

90 Afzal II, f. 93a.
91 Afzal II, f. 213a. For the dastūr al-čamal of Shāh Ṭahmāsp see also TM. pp. 144, 176.
92 See Morton, op. cit., p. 29.
93 Charles Melville has raised the possibility that the dates of the surviving manuscripts do not necessarily represent the order of composition. This is discussed in a forthcoming article.

Dickson and McChesney have treated the difficulties of this mixed calendar system in detail. Here I reproduce an excerpt of their findings.
corresponding Hijri and accession year. The Turki years form a twelve year cycle and each year is given an animal name. This calendar which is known as the Chinese-Uighur calendar is the legacy of the Mongol rule of Iran and was in use until 1925.95 The Hijri year could begin any time during the Turki year and vice versa. For instance, the Naurūz of the year of the Horse (yunt īl) coincided with Saturday 16 Jumādā al-Awval 931/24 February 1525.96 Such a method of dating events was also favoured by other historians contemporary with Fażī. Iskandar Beg Munshi the author of Tārikh-i Ālam Ārā-i Ābbāsī explains in his history his reasons for adopting such a calendar system. He notes that "the people of Iran did not understand the Arabic Hijri year; for among the Turks and the Persians the beginning of the year is Naurūz (the beginning of spring)."97 It should be noted that Fażī's correspondence of the Turki and Hijri years differs from the same cycle presented in Khulāṣat al-Tāvārikh. A selection of three dates should illustrate the point:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.H.</th>
<th>A.H.</th>
<th>A.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>931</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yunt īl (Horse)</td>
<td>qūy īl (Sheep)</td>
<td>pīchī īl (Ape)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>takḥāqūy īl (Fowl)</td>
<td>īt īl (Dog)</td>
<td>tangūz īl (Pig)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The manuscript numbers 276 folios and the pagination is done in English. The preface (dībācha) starts abruptly and in mid-sentence on folio 2 which suggests that at least one folio of the preface is missing. Folios 46-63 of the manuscript are misarranged. This has been corrected and the translation represents the correct sequence of the folios. There is also a lacuna between the years 969/1561 and 975/1567 where folios are missing. We cannot determine the precise number of the missing folios since the English pagination is numbered in an unbroken sequence. A summary of these missing folios however appears in the list of contents at the

---

96 According to Qāzī Ahmad b. Sharaf al-Dīn al-Ḥusain al-Ḥusainī al-Qumī, Khulāṣat al-Tāvārikh, (ed.) Ḫasan Ishraqī, (Tehran, 1359)., p. 157, this Turki year was the year of the Fowl (Takḥāqūy īl).
97 Dickson, op. cit., p. 376.
98 Afsal Il, ff. 15a, 20b, 26b.
99 Khulāṣa, pp. 157, 162, 169.
beginning of the chronicle. The colophon proves that it is an autograph copy but there is evidence that it was written in more than one hand. The style of the script is nastʿaliq and on the whole clear. There are twenty lines to each folio.

Many physical characteristics of Afzal al-Tavarih conform to the conventional tradition of manuscript writing dating back to the Ilkhani period. Fazlī has used red ink for the main and sub-headings as it was the convention. Red ink has also been used to overline names of the individuals and verses from the Quran. The author has preferred the use of red overlines to highlight important words and phrases to the more conventional method of writing them in red ink.

Folios 10 to 15 are a detailed list of contents. In the preface of the first volume of Afzal al-Tavarih, Fazlī notes that the list is intended to assist the reader with finding the material without having to read the whole chronicle. The amount of the corrections and additional text on the margins, some of which are in the same hand, suggests that this was a working copy and not intended for formal presentation to a patron.

The text has in places been crossed out. Some of these are certainly editorial corrections but in the majority of the cases historical discrepancies have been treated in this way. For instance, when reporting the appointment of Qāżī Jahān Saiḥī as the Grand Vazir in 930/1523-4, Fazlī uses the formula "vizārat-i qalamrau-i humāyūn" or "Vizarat of the August Dominions" to refer to this office, which has been crossed out. According to Aḥsan al-Tavarih and Khulāṣat al-Tavarih, the standard title for this office is "vizārat-i ḍivān-i ʿalā" or the variant "vizārat-i ʿaẓam-i ḍivān-i ʿalā" as it appears in Tadhkirat al-Mulūk. In another instance, the following sentence has been scored over: "It was ordained that according to the regulations (bi-dastūr)

100 Afzal Il, ff. 13b-15a.
102 Afzal I. f. 3a.
103 Afzal II. f. 10a.
104 Aḥsan, p. 185; Khulāṣa. vol. I, p. 156: TM, p. 44.
the aforementioned Pillar of the State (*rukn al-saltana*) should leave his deputy and seal with [Shah Ţahmāsp] so that the royal decrees could be endorsed by the seal of that Pillar of the State". The dignitary referred to here was the powerful Vicegerent Div Sulṭān Rūmlû and the occasion was his departure for Lār. To defuse the political tension between the Rūmlû and the Ustājî tribes at court, Šah Ţahmāsp appointed Div Sulṭān as the commander of the armies of Fārs, Kirmān, the Persian Iraq, and Khurāsān in 931/1524 and sent him to Khurasān to defend the province against the Uzbekîs. Div Sulṭān set off for Lār under this pretext but once at Lār he summoned the armies of the above-mentioned provinces and set off for Āzarbāyjān to eliminate his rival Köpek Sulṭān Ustājî, abandoning Khurasān to the Uzbeks. However, the most contemporary source *Ahsan* throws a different light on this episode and notes that Div Sulṭān took the Šah's seal with him to Lār which he used to endorse the military summons which he sent to the governors of the provinces. It is perceived historical inaccuracies or discrepancies of this kind which are crossed out in *Afzal*. This leads me to believe that these marks were made by a later critical reader of *Afzal* who was familiar with different historical traditions and disagreed with Faźlī's interpretation of events or his use of terminology. Another significant example of interference with the text concerns the poems used in this chronicle. Consistently throughout the chronicle where a verse has been attributed to Mirzā Qāsim Junābādī, his name has also been scored over.

**The Sources of Afzal al-Tavārikh**

In 1026/1617 Faẓlī set out to write a three volume history of the Şafavid dynasty starting with the emigration of Sayyid Firūz Šah-i Zarin Kulāh from Arabia to Iran and ending with the death of Šah ŤAbbās I. It is the scope of this history which dictated the use of its sources some of which are no longer extant. The use of

---

1° *Afzal II*, f. 16a.
1° *Ahsan*, p. 188.
these now lost histories remains the most distinguishing feature of *Afzal al-Tavarikh*. Although some of these may not be directly relevant to the second volume they are worthy of mention here in order to draw attention to the outstanding quality of this chronicle.

1. *Qarā-majmu‘a*:

In the preface of the first volume of *Afzal al-Tavarikh* Fażlī mentions, as his first source, the *Maqāmāt va-Maqālāt* written by the founder of the Šafavī order Shaikh Ṣafī al-Dīn Ishāqī. These were the accounts of the miraculous and extraordinary events of his own life, his ancestry and the events of his time until his death in the year 735/1334. Fażlī claims that Ṣafī al-Dīn wrote this book in Persian and Turkish in a book known as *Qarā-majmu‘a* and titled it *siyar-i šūfiyya*. Fażlī also claims that Ṣafī al-Dīn wrote this book in Turkish and that it was later translated into Persian by a Chilibī Beg “Farīgh” Shīrāzī during the reign of the Mughal emperor Akbar (r. 1555-1605) and at the command of Mirzā ‘Azīz Koka, who was the governor of Gujurat. As Morton has also argued there seems to be some confusion in the title Fażlī assigns to this source. Elsewhere in the manuscript Fażlī differentiates between *Qarā-majmu‘a* and *Siyar-i šūfiyya*. For instance, in his discussion of the emigration of Sayyid Fīrūz Shāh from Medina to Āzarbāyjān Fażlī lists *maqāmāt va maqālāt* and *siyar-i šūfiyya* as his sources. Morton has also noted the variants *Siyar-i ḥālāt-i šūfiyya* and *siyar-i ḥālāt* for this work. He has also considered the possibility that a separate composition called *Siyar-i šūfiyya* which covered the history of the Šafavī order down to the time of Shāh Ismā‘īl existed. *Qarā majmu‘a* has not been discovered but Minorsky refers to a few citings of this history. He believes this must be the book referred to by Chardin who claimed that

---

108 Morton, op. cit. p. 31. He cites *Afzal I*, f. 7b.
109 *Afzal I*, f. 4. For other examples of the confusion surrounding the title of this book, also see Morton, op. cit., p. 32.
110 Morton, op. cit., p. 32.
111 *TM*, p. 113, note 6.
at times of war the Şafavi Şâh convened his officers and auguries were taken from the book "Karajamea". Tarbîyat the author of Dânîshmandân-i Azarbâyjân also mentions the book "Qarâ majmû'a", authorship of which he attributes to Şâfî al-Dîn and claims that the only copy of this book was kept in the royal library (khazâna-i kutub) of the Şafavi Şâhs. Tarbîyat identifies a Baqâ'î and Gharîbi and their Tazkiras which they wrote in Persian and Turkish as his source and claims some quotations from Qarâ majmû'a are found in Gharîbi's Tazkira. Qarâ majmû'a was clearly a rare book even at the time of writing of Afzâl al-Tavârikh and unlike Şafvat al-şafâ and its revised versions of the time, which the Şafavid kings upheld as the official history of the Şafavid order, Qarâ-majmû'a was not in wide circulation.

2. Şafvat al-şafâ:

In the author's own words this is the history of the life of Shaykh Şâfî which Ibn Bazzâz-i Ardabîlî compiled on the basis of the narrative given to him by Sayyid Şadr al-Dîn Mûsâ, the Shaikh's son. It is likely that the composition of this history began midway through Şadr al-Dîn's life and was completed by 759/1358. Şafvat al-şafâ is believed to have been heavily altered through the ages in order to revise the early history of the Şafavid order and their Sunni origins. The edition which would have been available to Fażlî Işfahâni is likely to have been the official version which Mir Abulfâth edited by the order of Shâh Tâhmâsp.

3. Ḥabib al-Siyâr:

In Fażlî's own words" the master writer and distinguished historian Khvând Amir wrote Ḥabib al-siyâr during the reign of Shâh Ismâ'îl the propagator of

---

114 Afzal I, f. 2a.
115 Kasravi, op. cit., p. 8.
religion of the rightly guided Imāms, in honour of Khvāja Ḥabīb Allāh Sāvaji the Vazir of Khurasan".117

4. Aḥsan al-Tavārīkh:

A history of the Safavids from the accession of Shāh Ismā'īl I to the end of the reign of Sultan Muḥammad Khudabanda written by Ḥasan Beg Rūmlū who himself served this exalted dynasty in the ranks of the sons of the nobility (amir-zāda).118

5. Muntakhab al-Tavārīkh:

This work, which is also known as Aḥsan al-Tavārīkh, is by Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Khākī Shīrāzī the son of Ahmad Beg the paymaster general (lashkar-nivīs) of Shāh Ṭahmāsp. The Khākiyya order (siṣila-i khākiyya) was originally from Shīrāz but according to Iskandar Munshi they had left Shīrāz and some members of the family were scattered in Iraq and Āzarbāyjān. Some of the family also held very high office at the palace and the chancery.119 According to Khākī Shīrāzī this is a universal history from the earliest times on the life of the prophets, the saints, sultāns, the shaykhs, scholars (fuẓulā), the ‘ulama, poets, and vazirs which he wrote in one volume.120 According to the preface, Shīrāzī began writing his history in India during the reign of the Mughal Emperor Akbar and completed it five years after the accession of Jahāngīr (r. 1014/1605-1069/1658) in 1019/1610.121 This disagrees with Afzal which puts the date of completion at 1023/1614 and renders it unreliable.122 It is also thought some additions were made to it in the year 1021/1612.123 Fażlī claims that Shīrāzī dedicated this history to Nūr al-Dīn

117. Afzal I, f. 2a.
118. Ibid.
119. TAAA, p. 164.
120 Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Khākī Shīrāzī, Muntakhab al-Tavārīkh, India Office, MS. Or. 1649. f. 5a.
121 Ibid.
122 Muntakhab, f. 5a; Afzal I, f. 2a.
123 Rieu, Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts, p. 886.
Muḥammad Selim Gurkānī also known as Jahāngīr but no evidence is found in
Muntakhib itself to support this claim.\textsuperscript{124} In the preface of Muntakhab al-Tavārikh
Shirāzī expresses a life-long interest in history which began with reading history
books in childhood. Shirāzī shared this interest with Faḍlī who similarly professes a
keen interest in history from childhood in the preface of the first volume of Afżal al-
Tavārikh.\textsuperscript{125} Like Faḍlī, Shirāzī too went to India for reasons which remain
unknown. Shirāzī notes that when he reached the safety of India, dār al-amān- i
Hind, he aspired to write this history. Shirāzī lists the following histories as his
sources: Raużat al-ṣafā; Ḥabīb al-siyār; Mujmal-i Faṣīḥī; Tārīkh-i Ibn Khulkān;
Jahāngushā-i 'Aṭāmalik Juwaynī; Tārīkh-i Rashīdī by Mirzā Ḥaydar Kashmīrī
Gurkānī; Akbar-nāma by Shaykh Abu'l Faḍlī; Tārīkh-i Niẓām al-Dīn Ḥamād Bakhshī;
Tārīkh-i Firūz Shāhī by Ziyābaratī; Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī; Tārīkh-i Banākūfī; Valḥāt va
Tārīkh-i Jahān Ārā by Aḥmad Ghafarī; and Tārīkh-i Abu'l Faḍl Baihaqī Birūnī.\textsuperscript{126}

Where and when Faḍlī came upon Muntakhab al-Tavārikh is not certain. In
spite of Faḍlī's own Indian connection it is more likely that he had access to the
source while he was still in Iran and in the service of the Safavids. As has been
already noted Faḍlī had written the first ninety three folios, for which in parts he
cites Muntakhab al-Tavārikh as a source, by 1023/1614. At this time he had not yet
begun his career as a Vazir in the Safavid provincial administration in Qarābāgh. If
so, Muntakhab must have been in international circulation within four years of its
completion in India. If Faḍlī came upon this source after his departure for the Deccan
then he may have revised his history in the light of the new evidence.

6. Shāhnāma- i Shāh Tahmāsp :

\textsuperscript{124} Afżal 1. f.2a.
\textsuperscript{125} See also Sholeh A. Quinn, "The Historiography of Safavid Prefaces", in Safavid Persia, op. cit.,
pp. 1-26. Although Quinn has not examined either Muntakhab al-Tavārikh or Afżal al-Tavārikh, she
has shown the historian's profession to childhood interest in history to have been a characteristic of
the structure of the preface (muqaddima) in Safavid historiography.
\textsuperscript{126} Muntakhab, f. 5b.
By Mirzā Qāsim Junābādī Khurāsānī. This is a mathnāvī on the reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsp. Farīdī makes extensive use of this source. In the preface of the first volume the author notes that most of the verses in the first and second volumes are by Mirzā Qāsim. In the notice of death of the poet in 982/1574 at the age of 82 he repeats the same statement. Fażlī clearly regarded Shāhnāma as an important source for his history. Analysis of the text shows that in his account of the troubled and unstable first decade of Ṭahmāsp’s reign he makes greater use of the poems from Shāhnāma than in the latter parts of the chronicle when Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s reign had achieved greater stability. Fażlī also refers to Shāhnāma-i Shāh Ṭahmāsp as his source for the event of the defection of the Ottoman Sultān Bāyazid to Ṭahmāsp’s court in 966/1558-9.


This history does not appear to be extant. Fortunately Fażlī names this source where he quotes from it. For instance, when writing about the justice and benevolence of Dūrūsh Khaṇ the governor-general of Khurāsān Fażlī recounts passages from Tarīkh-i Herat va Khurāsān. He also quotes this history as the source for the section on the celebration of the Naurūz of the year 951/1544 when the exiled Emperor Humāyūn Gūrkānī received some 8000 tumāns in Naurūz gifts from the notables of Khurāsān. Fażlī also attributes his two-day version of the battle of Jām, 935/1528, to Nujūmī Harāvī.

10. Tarīkh-i Khuld-ārā by Iskandar Beg Munshī.

This is likely to be a different title for the well known Tarīkh-i ‘Ālam Ārā-i

---

127. Ibid.
128 Aḥzāl II, ff. 2, 272.
129 Aḥzāl II, f. 228b.
130 Aḥzāl II, f. 18a.
131 Aḥzāl II, f. 123a.
‘Abbāsī. It could also be the scribal error (taṣḥīf) in writing the word "ʿĀlam Ārā".132 Fażlī notes in his preface that this is a history of the "lives and vicissitudes of the Ṣafavid dynasty from the emigration of Sayyid Firūz Shāh Zarīn Kulāh from Arabia to the year 1026/1617."133 This corresponds with the first and second volumes (ṣāḥifa) of Tārīkh-i ʿĀlama Ārā-i ʿAbbāsī. The first volume, which consists of an introduction (muqaddima) and twelve maqāla, is a history of the origin of the Ṣafavids and the reigns of Shāh Ismāʿīl I, Shāh Tāhmāsp, Shāh Ismāʿīl II, Sulṭān Muḥammad Khudābanda. The second volume chronicles the history of Shāh ʿAbbās from his birth and the first thirty years of his reign down to the year 1025/1616.134


Fażlī ascribes the book to Maulānā ʿAḥmad Shirāzī. This was a universal history spanning from "the birth of mankind to the death of His Majesty the Shadow of God".135

12. Other works by Malik Shāh Ḥusain Sīstānī and Naṣīrā-i Hamadānī which they compiled in Iran. Fażlī does not give a title for these works and describes them as "musavadāt", meaning rough draft of anything or memoranda. Malik Shāh Ḥusain Sīstānī was one of the notables of Sīstān and for a time acted as Vazīr of Malik Jalāl al-Dīn Malik Nīmrūz, the hereditary ruler of Sīstān and his kinsman.136 He was also involved in Shāh ʿAbbās' diplomatic efforts to subjugate the province of Makrān to Ṣafavid rule in 1030/1620.137 In addition to his political and administrative involvement in the government of Sīstān, Malik Shāh Ḥusain was a man of letters and a poet. Taqī al-Dīn Auḥadī in his biography of poets praises him for his intelligence and his eloquence. Auḥadī also attributes the books Tuhfat

132 I must thank Professor Afshār for this suggestion.
133 Afzal I, f. 2a.
134 TAAA, pp. 4-5.
135 This may be the missing part of the source "Miftāḥ al-Qulūb" by Shams al-Dīn al-Asil, which dealt with the Ṣafavid history. See Storey, vol. 1, part. 1, p. 155.
136 Taqī al-Dīn Auḥadī, 'Arḍafāt al-ʾAṣḥiqīn or Tazkira-i Auḥadī, The British Library, IO. Islamic 3654, f. 612a. This work is also commonly known as Tazkira-i Auḥadī, which is used as reference in this work hereafter.
137 TAAA, p. 958.
al-`Irāqain and Tazkira-i Shu`arā (a biography of poets) to Malik Shāh Sistānī.138 Naṣīrā-i Hamadānī was a native of Imām-zāda Sahl-i ‘Alī, a district of Hamadān in western Iran. He was well versed in all the arts and sciences particularly in mathematics. He also had a reputation for his talent in composition (inshā’2) and experimented with poetry, though Naṣrābādī Isfahānī claims that he was a "second-rate poet".139 Hamadānī was probably best known for his wit and humour and attended the highest social circles at the capital Isfahān which included the home of ḍAllāma Shaykh Bahā al-Dīn Muḥammad. Shaykh Bahā is reported to have invited Hamadānī to the gatherings at his home "to enliven the meetings". Hamadānī died in 1030/1620.

Fazlī clearly had access to the unpublished works of these men through his association with the high literary and political echelons of ‘Abbās' reign. Another source in the same category which Fazlī claims to have used is the work by Sulṭān Maḥmūd Fil-i Mashhādī, the inspector of the elephant-stable in Ḥaydarābād Deccan. According to Fazlī, "Sulṭān Maḥmūd compiled it while at the service of Muḥammad Quṭb in the province of Gulkanda and dedicated it to Muḥammad Quṭb Shāh, "the Shīʿī Pādishāh, the devoted ghulām and the propagator of religion of the Infallible Imāms".140

13. Trustworthy and reliable individuals: Fazlī includes eye witness accounts of the events in his history. One such eye witness was Mīrzā Fath Allāh Isfahānī, accountant and book keeper (mustaufī) of the standing corps of royal troops (qūrchīyān) who served under Shāh Ṭahmāsp.141 For an obituary of Mīr Ghīyāth al-Dīn Mānsūr, Mīrzā Fath Allāh provided Fazlī with many tales of the miraculous powers of Mīr Ghīyāth al-Dīn.142

14. Official State Documents:

138 Tazkira-i Auḥadī, f. 612a.
140 Afzal I, f. 2a.
141 For a brief biography of Mīrzā Fath Allāh see also TAAA. p. 164-5.
142 Afzal II, f. 115b.
Fazlî notes that to inform the reader he has included in the events of each year, whatever correspondence between Shâh ʿ Tahmâsp and other monarchs which has come to his attention. He has also included many fārmāns and letters of victory (fathnāma) from which interesting socio-economic and political evidence can often be gleaned. As Minorsky has shown in his translation of Tadhkirat Al-Mulûk, such documents were usually recorded by the "The Recorder of the King's Assemblies" (majlis-nīvīs or vāqi'-nīvīs) by the orders of the Shâh for whom he acted as a private secretary, rapporteur, and in effect as a court historian. He answered all the Shâh's foreign correspondence with the other kings and issued the fārmāns concerning appointments, allocation of annual salaries, grants of land and pensions. The majlis-nīvīs was expected to have had considerable archives and Fazlî clearly had access to such archives through his family connections with the royal court administrators.

One such majlis-nīvīs was Mîrzâ Aḥmad the son of ʿAṭâ Allâh Khūzânî, the governor of Shīrvān and Shakkî. When ʿAṭâ Allâh died in 967/1559-60, Shâh ʿ Tahmâsp appointed his son Mîrzâ Aḥmad as majlis-nīvīs in gratitude for his father's long service. The Khūzânîs had been a family of high-ranking bureaucrats since the reign of Shâh Ismāʿīl and the family archives too provided Fazlî with a rich source of material for the system of provincial government and administrative procedures under ʿ Tahmâsp. For instance, Fazlî notes the work which Mîrzâ ʿAṭâ Allâh Khūzânî, Vazir of Āzarbāyjân, carried out in 957/1550 in construction, repair of buildings and purchase of land. Similarly the document of appointment of Fazlî's grandfather Khvāja Masḥūḥ Rūḥ Allâh Khūzânî to the Vizârat of Gîlân, Lâhijān and Khurāsān in 978/1570 outlines the function of a provincial Vazir in some detail. The following is a list of the official documents contained in the second volume of Afzal al-Tavārīkh:

143 Afzal I. f. 3a.
144 TM, pp. 121-2.
145 Afzal II, f. 236.
146 Afzal II, f. 146b.
1. The farman of appointment of Mirzā Qāsim Junābādī as the poet laureate (930-1/1523-4).

2. A letter from Durmīsh Khān, the governor of Khurāsān and the tutor of Prince Sām Mirzā, to ʿUbayd Khān Uzbek, 930-1/1523-4.

3. The letter from Shāh Tāhmāsp to Ibrāhīm Khān Kīyānī, the frontier governor (vāṭī) of Lār.147

4. The letter from Ibrāhīm Khān Kīyānī to Shāh Tāhmāsp.148

5. The letter of victory of Baghdād, 935/1528.

6. The letter from Shāh Tāhmāsp to ʿUbayd Khān Chingizī, 936/1529.149

7. ʿUbayd Khān’s reply to Shāh Tāhmāsp’s letter, 936/1529.150

8. A letter from Shāh Tāhmāsp to ʿUbayd Khān.151

9. The farman addressed to Muḥammad Khān Sharaf al-Dīn Oğlū Tekkelū, instructing him to organise the royal reception of Humāyūn Gūrkanī on his arrival to Khurāsān ,951/1544. 152

10. The farman of appointment of Shāhverdi Sultān Muṣāhib Ziad Oğlū Qājār as the governor-general (beglarbegī) of Qarābāgh, 958/1551.153

11. The letter of victory of Georgia, 958/1551.154

12. Shāh Tāhmāsp’s letter to Humāyūn Gūrkanī including a short personal letter (ruq′a) written in Shāh Tāhmāsp’s own hand, 959/1551.155

13. Shāh Tāhmāsp’s letter to the Ottoman Sultān Sulaymān, delivered by Mir Shams al-Dīn Ilkhānī and composed by Mirzā Kāfī Ṭūsī the Secretary of State (munshī al-mamālik), 960/1552.156

147 Aفزāl II, f. 19b.
148 Aفزāl II, f. 20 (a & b).
149 Aفزāl II, ff. 54b - 56b.
150 Aفزāl II, ff. 56b - 60a.
151 Aفزāl II, ff. 60a - 62a.
152 Aفزāl II, ff. 118a - 122a.
153 The text of this farman is written on the margin of folios 150a-151a.
154 Aفزāl II, ff. 151a-154b.
155 Aفزāl II, ff. 162a-164a.
156 Aفزāl II, ff. 168a-174a.
14. The Ottoman Sultan Sulayman's letter to Shah Tahmasp. 961/1553.157
961/1553.158

16. The royal farman prohibiting the drinking of wine, gambling and prostitution in the empire, 963/1555.159

17. Farman of appointment of Mirza Shukrullah Isfahani as the Financial Controller (mustaufi al-mamalik), 963/1555.160

18. Farman of appointment of Sultan Ibrahim Mirza as the governor of Mashhad and Nazir of the Shrine of Imam Riza 964/1556.161

19. Farman of appointment of Sultan Husain Mirza Safavi, the son of Bahram Mirza, to the governorship of Qandahar in 965/1557.162

20. Shah Tahmasp's letter to Sultan Bayazid on his arrival to Chakhur-i Sad. 966/1558.163

21. Shah Tahmasp's letter to Sultan Sulayman to mediate between the Sultan and his son Bayazid.164

22. Shah Tahmasp's letter to the Ottoman Prince Selim in an attempt to mediate on behalf of Sultan Bayazid and his children, 968/1560.165

23. Farman of appointment of Maulana Malik Muhammad Heravi as the tutor of Prince Sultan Husain Mirza and the chief librarian of the royal library, 974/1566.166

24. Farman of appointment of Masih Khvaja Ruhi Allah Khuzani, the author's paternal grandfather, to the Vizirat of Gilan, Lakhijan and Khurasan, 978/1570.167

157 Afzal II. ff. 177a-179a.
158 Afzal II. ff. 181b-201b.
159 Afzal II. ff. 210b - 212a.
160 Afzal II. ff. 213a-214b.
161 Afzal II. ff. 216b - 219a.
162 Afzal II. ff. 224a-225b.
163 Afzal II. ff. 229b-230a.
164 Afzal II. ff. 232a-235b.
165 Afzal II. ff. 238-241b.
166 Afzal II. ff. 245b - 246b.
167 Afzal II. ff. 254-6.
Where the author does not include the actual text of an official document he cites these sources. The account of incarceration of Khvāja Amir Beg Kajajī Ṭabarzī in the fort of Alamūt illustrates this point. Khvāja Amir Beg Kajajī was a senior official at the time of Shāh Ṭahmāsp, who had held several positions as the Vazir of Ghāzī Khān Tekkelū, later that of Amir Sultān Rūmlū, the custodian of the shrine of Imām Rīzā in Mashhad, and the Vazir of Khurāsān. In 958/ 1551 he was charged with the practice of an occult science and was imprisoned for life. Although the author does not reproduce the actual text, he acknowledges Khvāja Amir Beg’s petition (ʿarz -dāsht) to Shāh Ṭahmāsp as his source.

Fazlī often reveals first hand knowledge of geography. He says that he lived in Shakkī for several years and speaks from personal experience when he writes that the climate, the hunt, the fruits, and the plains are much better in Shakkī than in Georgia and Āzarbāyjān. Later he admits to have seen the fortress of Ālsūrām, on the border between Bāsh Ājuq and Kārtīl when he was the Vazir of Paykar Khān Ikramī Durt Qājār in 1023/1614.

The Historiographical Value of ʿAfzal al-Tavārikh:

ʿAfzal al-Tavārikh belongs to the genre of Šafāvī court chronicles. The use of standard sources, choice of historical themes, the conventional structure of the narrative, and the number and the range of the official documents that it contains place ʿAfzal in the mainstream of Šafāvī historiography.

The standard sources include among others Ḥabīb al-siyār, Lubb al-Tavārikh, Tārīkh-i ʿĀlam Ārā-i ʿAbbāsī, Aḥsan al-Tavārikh. It is often easy to identify the influence of specific sources for any section of ʿAfzal since the author names his sources in his narrative. For instance, in his section relating to the murder of Khvāja

---

170 ʿAfzal II, f. 180b. For the problem of confusion of the dates see below.
Habib Allah Sava'i, the Vazir of Khurasan, Fażlī praises Khvaja Ḥabib Allah's philanthropy and cites Aḥsan al-Tavārīkh as his source.\textsuperscript{171}

Often Fażlī considers rival historical traditions before opting for his favoured version of the events. For instance, in his narrative of the battle of Jām Fażlī first considers Ḥasan Beg Rūmlū's Aḥsan al-Tavārīkh but then opts for Maulānā Nujūmi Haravī's lost history Tārīkh-i Harat va Khurāsān, Iskandar Beg Munshī's Tārīkh-i ʿĀlam Ārā-i ʿAbbāsī, Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Khāki Shirāzī's Muntakhab al-Tavārīkh, and Maulānā Ḥamad Shirāzī's lost history Miftāḥ al-Qulūb.\textsuperscript{172} Although Fażlī's version of events cannot always be corroborated, his tendency to identify his sources enables us to reconstruct some of the written and oral historical traditions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries which otherwise would have been lost.

For the period of Shāh Tahmāsp's minority 931-6/1524-9, which concerns the present study, the influence of Rūmlū's Aḥsan al-Tavārīkh on Afzal al-Tavārīkh is most discernible. There are striking similarities between the two sources in terms of the annalistic structure of the narrative, the choice of historical themes and language. The two dominant themes in Afzal, as in Aḥsan, are Qizilbash factionalism and civil war, and the Uzbek wars. However, the affairs of the neighbouring countries were of little interest to Fażlī. Bābūr's victory over the Afghāns in India in 932/1525, the struggle between the Uzbeks and the Timūrids over Balkh in the same year, or the Ottoman invasion of Hungary in 933/1526, which Rūmlū has chronicled, receive no attention in Afzal as they were not relevant to his main themes of the internal politics and the Uzbek wars.\textsuperscript{173}

The chapter in this thesis on the historiographical study of the battle of Jām will examine in some detail the methodology which has been employed in writing Afzal al-Tavārīkh. Fażlī has used Aḥsan, the chronicle most contemporary with Shāh Tahmāsp, as his basic source. He has imitated Aḥsan in some basic facts and details

\textsuperscript{171} Aafżal II. f. 24a.
\textsuperscript{172} Aafżal II. f. 43a.
\textsuperscript{173} For these events see, Aḥsan, pp. 194-5, 197, 203-5.
but has considerably updated his narrative which has given rise to significant
discrepancies between the two chronicles. Quinn has termed this method of historical
writing "imitative writing". By this process the author copies, paraphrases, alters, and
versifies his source material to create his own version of the events. Thereby he
continues some elements of the historical traditions of his predecessors but also
incorporates the contemporary political and cultural influences of his own milieu. As
the historiography of the battle of Jâm will best demonstrate, Faţlī often borrows
word for word from Ahsan its literary embellishments which are devoid of any
historical content and imposes his own historical interpretation.

An episode from the developing hostility between Div Sulţân Rümlū and Köpek
Sulţân Ustājlu serves as another example to illustrate the point. Although Faţlī's
account of this event is more extended and offers more independent evidence, it is
nonetheless informed by Ahsan's narrative. The sequence of events and the choice of
material correspond to Ahsan's narrative. Faţlī has also copied word for word from
Ahsan a literary passage and four couplets.174

As has already been noted Afzal al-Tavārikh is a depository of official
documents. This quality distinguishes Afzal from Ahsan which includes only one
official document- 'Ubayd Khān's letter to Shāh Ṭahmāsp (936/1529)- for the entire
reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsp, and from Khulāśa which also contains only one official
letter, Ṭahmāsp's letter to 'Ubayd Khān.175 These documents which include letters of
victory, royal correspondence and farman's of appointment, offer interesting socio-
conomic and political evidence.

Some of these documents such as the farman of appointment of Mīrzā Qāsim
Junābādī as the poet laureate are unique. However, a comparison of the text of Shāh
Ṭahmāsp's farman to Muḥammad Khān Sharaf al-Dīn Oğlu Tekkelū instructing him
to prepare for the arrival of the Mughal Emperor Humāyūn in Khurāsān, as recorded

in Afzal and that published by Navā'ī, show the two farmāns to differ substantially both in terms of contents and language.\(^\text{176}\) Both farmāns seem to be variants of the same official document and both differ from the text of the same farmān found in the Indian source Akbarnāma.\(^\text{177}\) We cannot be sure which of these three documents was the original farmān, but the variations suggest that the chronicler treated the official chancery documents as source material in exactly the same way that he used his other sources, that is, in the process of transcribing the farmān he paraphrased and altered the text.\(^\text{178}\) This problem will be examined further in chapter 2.

Afzal however is not free from historical inaccuracies. Fażlī at times gets the dates, relationships or names wrong. These inaccuracies are partly due to scribal errors. That is almost certainly true of some of the dates of events or the names of individuals. Another category of errors, however, cannot be so easily explained as the carelessness of composition. Fażlī's consistent identification of the mother of Shāh Ṭahmāsp, in both the first and second volumes, as the daughter of Murād Āq Qūyūnlū is one such example.\(^\text{179}\) This is likely to be a historiographical revision of the Šāfāvid genealogy in order to forge a closer historical and dynastic alliance between the Šāfāvids and the Āq Quyūnlūs.\(^\text{180}\)

One striking characteristic of volume 2 of Afzal al-Tavārīkh is the cult of the divine kingship which the author constructs in the memory of Shāh Ṭahmāsp. Fażlī reconstructs Shāh Ṭahmāsp in the image of an omnipotent monarch. This quality is most discernible in the section of the chronicle which deals with Shāh Ṭahmāsp's minority, the first ten years of his reign from 931-941/1524-35 when his rule was

---

\(^{176}\) Afzal II, ff. 118a - 122a; Shāh Ṭahmāsp Šafavi, majmū'ā'-i āsnād va mukātibā'-i tārikhi hamrāh bā yāddāshtha'-i tārikhi, (ed.) 'Abd al-Ḥusain Navā'ī, (Tehran, 1368). pp. 53-61.

\(^{177}\) The text of this version of the farmān is found in Ālam Ārā-i Shāh Ṭahmāsp, (ed.) Iraj Afshār, (n. p., 1370). pp. 392 - 404. Afshār cites Bayāzid Bayāt, "Tazkira-i Humāyūn va Akbar", (ed.) Muhammad Hīdāyat Ḥusain (Calcutta, 1941), as his source.

\(^{178}\) Afshār has also outlined a similar process of inscribing and engraving the royal farmāns on stone which has given rise to alterations of the text. Iraj Afshār, "Similar Farmāns from the Reign of Shah Šafi" in Šafāvid Pesia, op. cit., pp. 285 - 304.

\(^{179}\) Afzal II, ff. 3a, 65a.

\(^{180}\) Ṭahmāsp's mother, Tajju Begum, was the daughter of Mihmad Beg Maušillu, and the Maušillu were a branch of the Āq Quyūnlū, Khulāsa, p. 290.
at its weakest. In the scheme of *Afżal al-Tavārīkh*, Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s political authority rested on the notion of the divine kingship of the Ṣafavīd Shāhs. This ideological basis of kingship is best embodied in the royal titles which Fażlī employs. *Afżal* contains some of the most elaborate and ideologically charged set of royal titles that can be found in any of the contemporary court chronicles. The titles reiterate the Ṣafavīd claims to spiritual leadership by virtue of descent from Imam ʿAlī and thus sanction the Shāh’s exercise of political authority. Pretensions to such intense personal charisma were in need of constant corroboration by external factors as signs of divine favour. 181 *Afżal al- Tavārīkh* is thus replete with accounts of Ṭahmāsp’s miraculous deeds and his direct communion with the Shi’i divines.

Throughout the chronicle Fażlī constructs this cult of the divine ruler whose external signs of piety and divinity were manifest for all to see. We are told that at times of adversity and trouble or when Shāh Ṭahmāsp needed to take an urgent decision he would await and receive divine revelation (*laṣīfa-i ghaybī*). 182 In one instance, to assert greater royal control over Khurāsān, Shāh Ṭahmāsp was guided by divine inspiration to appoint Sultān Ibrāhīm Mirzā as the governor of Khurāsān and the overseer (*nāzīr*) of the shrine of Imām Rizā. 183 Elsewhere Fażlī notes that he heard from a trustworthy Sayyid in Mashhad that before Shāh Ṭahmāsp was contaminated by alcohol, whenever he prostrated and bowed in humility during prayer all the candles and the lights of the mosque too prostrated and bowed. This was not seen again until he repented in 964/1556-7. 184

Several episodes are also reported to demonstrate the miraculous powers of Shāh Ṭahmāsp. In 940/1533-4 during an attack by the Ottoman army on Āzarbāyjān, extreme bad weather forced Sultān Sulaymān’s army to abandon Tabriz and move to Iraq. We are told that Shāh Ṭahmāsp remained in the citadel of Şāyīn in Abhar near

---

182 *Afżal II*, f. 77b.
183 *Afżal II*, f. 217b.
184 *Afżal II*, f. 65.
Qazvin and awaited divine assistance. Despite the political dissent and defection of some of the Qizilbash chiefs such as Ghazî Khân Tekkelû, Husain Khân Şâmlû and Malik Beg Khuşîy, divine intervention came in the form of very cold weather and heavy snow. Faţlî reports that it was popular belief that red snow had fallen and that Sultan Sulaymân had interpreted this and the severity of the weather as one of the miracles of the "dynasty of Imâmate and miraculous powers" (dûdmân-i imâmât va kârâmât).185 Similarly Tahmâsp's miraculous powers came to his assistance during a conspiracy to poison him. As Bâshudân Qarâ, a relative of Ḥusain Khân Şâmlû, made an attempt on the Shâh's life by poisoning his goblet of wine but Shâh Tahmâsp by virtue of his innate miraculous power sensed the danger and glanced so sharply at the man that the latter fled.186

The history of Shâh Tahmâsp clearly embodies Faţlî's principles of political authority, kingship, and religion. The ideological content also shaped the literary style of the history. This volume is rich with poetry, verses from the Quran, and also astrological expressions. A preliminary study shows that the ideological richness and the literary style of Faţlî's history of Shâh Tahmâsp distinguishes it from both volume 1, which chronicles the reign of Shâh Ismâ'îl I, and volume 3, which is the contemporary history of Shâh ʿAbbâs I. Both volumes 1 and 3 lack the variety and the richness of the royal titles which Faţlî gives to Shâh Tahmâsp. He opted for a standard title of the Shadow of God for Shâh ʿAbbâs. Faţlî's history of Shâh ʿAbbâs is devoid of any ideological overtones. Shâh ʿAbbâs has a remote presence and rarely appears in a central role in the history. This may be partly explained by the fact that Faţlî has devoted a large part of this volume to the events in Georgia. Given that he was present in Georgia and lived through these events, the chronicle appears more as the personal memoirs of the historian than the history of the court at Işfâhân. In

---

185 Afzal II, f. 77b.
186 Afzal II, f. 80b.
depth analysis of the three volumes could reveal interesting results. This however is beyond the scope of this thesis and awaits future research.

The Šafavid court chronicles remain the principal source of information for the political and dynastic history of the period 1501-1722. However, these sources still await critical evaluation in order to establish the biases and the ideological underpinnings of individual chronicles.1 In recent years a few studies have gone some way towards addressing this problem. Quinn's study of the "Historiography of Šafavid Prefaces" has examined the genre of composing a preface (dibācha).2 Quinn's historiographical study of the dreams of Shaikh Šafi, as they appear in the Šafavid court chronicles up to the reign of Šah ʿAbbas, show how the narrative and the interpretation of specific dreams changed over time in conformity with evolving religious and political attitudes.3 Morton has examined different historical traditions concerning the early life of Šah Ismāʿīl and has shown, how the sources diverge in their accounts of Šah Ismāʿīl's succession to the leadership of the Šafāvī order.4

The present study hopes to advance the limited research which has been carried out in this field. This chapter will study in some detail three case studies which best represent the uniqueness of Afzal al-Tavārīkh among the Šafāvid court chroniclers, the author's biases and his historical methodology.

1. Afzal al-Tavārīkh and Mirzā Qāsim Junābādī 5

Mirzā Muḥammad Qāsim Junābādī, also known by his nom de plume Qāsimī, was an eloquent poet contemporary with Šah Ismāʿīl and Šah Tāhmāsp Šafāvī. He was best known for his mastery of the "epic or historiographical mathnawī" poetry

1 Morton, "The Early Years of Šah Ismāʿīl", p. 2.
2 Sholeh A. Quinn, "The Historiography of Šafavid Prefaces" in Charles Melville (ed.) Safavid Persia, (London, 1996). pp. 1-25. This article formed part of Quinn's doctoral thesis "Historical Writing during the reign of Shah ʿAbbās I" (University of Chicago 1993), to which I did not have access. Quinn has not included Afzal al-Tavārīkh in her study.
5 Afzal al-Tavārīkh II. ff. 3b-4b, 272a.
which recommended him to both Safavid monarchs. Although manuscript copies of his works have survived in abundance his life and the course of his career at Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s court still remain obscure. This is largely due to a lack of sufficient documentary evidence. We have to depend mainly on numerous Tazkiras or a scattering of biographical information found in the poet’s own poems to reconstruct his life. Both sources, however, are limited in that they serve to delineate only the broadest outline of his life and career. The Tazkiras are mainly concerned with his social background and a list of his works. We still have only tentative answers to many questions such as: did he enjoy an official position at court or did Ṭahmāsp reward him for his Shāhnāmas? Did he remain in the service of Shāh Ṭahmāsp or did he emigrate in search of a new patron?

Afżal al-Tavārīkh offers new independent evidence which should help us place Qāsimī’s career at the Safavid court and his relationship with Shāh Ṭahmāsp in a clearer perspective. The evidence consists of an official document (farmān) appointing Qāsimī the poet laureate at the court of Shāh Ṭahmāsp and also an obituary notice which reaffirms the official position which he enjoyed at court. The primary aim of this study is to establish the authenticity and reliability of the evidence presented here. It is also hoped that the process will throw some light on the life and Qāsimī’s literary career. Last but least, this preliminary study will question the conventional wisdom based on the notion that unlike the Ottoman Sultāns, the Safavid Shāhs did not appoint poet laureates who would compose a versified history of their reign.

The Poet

Qāsimī, was a native of Gunābād in Khurāsān. He belonged to a family of sayyids and was the son of Amir Sayyid Junābādī who was the religious leader (pīshvā va muqtādā) of his town. Qāsimī’s brother Amir Abūl-Fatḥ continued the family tradition and succeeded his father as the mayor (kalāntar) of Gunābād while Qāsimī himself emulated the poverty of the lives of the Prophet and the Imāms and adopted an ascetic life.

Qāsimī had studied with Mir Ghīyāth al-Dīn Mansūr Shīrāzī and had a reputation as a master mathematician. He was also a pupil of Maulānā ‘Abd-Allāh Hātīfī, a native of Khargird (modern Langar), a dependency of Jām, and the nephew of ‘Abd al-Rahmān Jāmī and also a celebrated poet at the Timurid court in Herat. Like his mentor Hātīfī, Qāsimī belonged to the late Timurid school of poetry and continued this literary poetic tradition into the Šafavīd period. Both Hātīfī and Qāsimī were the guardians of the Mausoleum of Qāsim-i Anvar at Khargird.

A number of poetic forms and genres flourished in this period, the most popular and extensive of which was the mathnāvī. This form was an imitation of the Shāhnāma genre which used rhymed couplets in the mutaqārib meter of

---

7 Qazvīnī, p. 168, notes "another variant of the name of this town is "Junābād" which is at present known as Gunābād".
8 Zābīl Allāh Šafā, Himāsa sarāt dar Īrān, (Tehran, 1369). p. 363. Šafā claims that Mirza Qāsim inherited this office from his father but he withdrew and his brother took the office.
10 Qazvīnī, p. 169, note 1, cites Naftā‘īs al-Ma‘āthīr.
11 Qazvīnī, op. cit., p. 113, notes "‘Abd al-Rahmān Jāmī held his nephew Hātīfī in high esteem and whenever ‘Abd-Allāh Hātīfī went from Jām to Herat, Sultān Husain Mirzā (Bāyqarā) and Mir ‘Ali Shir, his Vāzir and sipahsālār, bestowed on him great honour and affection".
12 Michele Bernardini, "Il Timurnāma Di Hātīfī E Lo Sahnāme-ye Esma‘īl Di Qāsimī (II MS. Frazer 87 Dellà Bodleian Library Di Oxford), Oriente Moderno 2,(1996). p. 116. Shāh Qāsim Anvar was originally from the Sarāb district of Tabriz. He became a disciple of Shaykh Sād al-Dīn Ardabīlī, the leader of the Šafavī order, and according to his instructions moved to Gilan. He later went to Herat where he found many followers. He was a Šūfi and a poet of high standing. He finally settled in Jām where he died in 837/1433. Ātashkada, vol. 1, pp. 109-111. See also Bernardini op. cit. p. 116, note 69.
Firdausi’s original. Qasimi devoted himself to writing in this poetic form and as was the fashion at the time, he imitated the major mathnavis by earlier poets, most notably the Khamsa by Nizami. A large number of manuscript copies of Qasimi’s works have survived in an unrefined form which suggests that his works had a wide readership. In a letter to the Mughal Emperor Akbar, Qasimi listed his works as follows:

1. *Shahnama-i mazi [Shah Isma'il]* 17 940/1533
   [In honour of Shah Isma'il]

2. *Shahnama- i Shah Tahmasp* 950/1543
   [also known as *Shahnama-i Navvab-i 'Ali*] 18

3. *Shahnama i Shahrukh* 950/1543
   [On the reign of Shahrukh Timur but written at the time of Shah Tahmasp].

4. *Khusrau u Shiriin-i Qasimi* 950/1543
   [In honour of Sâm Mirzâ]

5. *Laili va Majnun* 947/1540
   [In honour of Shah Tahmasp]

6. *Zubdat al-ash'ar* 947/1540

We may also add the following works to this list:

7. *Chugannama* 947/1540

---

14 Christine Woodhead, "An Experiment in Official Historiography: The Post of *Sehnâmece* in the Ottoman Empire c. 1555-1605", *WZKM*, 75 (1983). p. 159. Safa has traced the revival of the mathnavi to Majd al-Din Muhammad Pâyizi, the 12-13th century poet, who wrote the *Shâhanshâhnama* and dedicated it to Sultan Muhammad Khvârazmshah. Safa "Himâsa sarâ'î", p. 354. See also Bernardini op. cit. p. 99.

15 Bernardini op. cit. p. 102. Bernardini also examines the revival in popularity of Mirza Qasim’s historical epics in the later Safavid period.


17 This mathnavi is partly attributed to Hâtifi. Sâm Mirzâ notes in his *Tuhfa-i Sâmî* that in 917/1511 during his Khurasan campaign, Shah Isma'il met Hâtifi and commissioned him to write an account of his victories in verse and named it *Futuhat-i Shâhî*. Hâtifi was already ninety four years old and he only wrote one thousand *bayts* of this mathnavi before he died in 927/1520. pp. 96-7. See also Qazvinî, op. cit., pp. 115-8. It is generally believed that Mirza Qasim continued the work of Hâtifi and completed it ten years after Shah Isma'il’s death.

18 Safa has noted this work as "*Shâhnâma-i Navvab Alî*". Safa, "Persian Literature", p. 957.
[commissioned by Shâh Ţahmâsp]19

8. Shâhnâma-i Khâni

[Possibly at some date after 963/1555 in honour of Sultân Mahmûd the governor of Bhakkar in the Sind region of India].

The Position of Qâsimî at the Court of Shâh Ţahmâsp

One major factor in the decline of the language and literature in general and poetry in particular, in the Šafavid period, is thought to have been the court's failure to patronise the poets and authors adequately. To a large extent this was the effect of the Šafavid religious policy which only encouraged composers of elegies and panegyrics of the Shârî Imâms- that is the chief figures of Shârî hagiology- and discouraged any secular artistic activity.20 The absence of active royal patronage of secular arts reached its peak during the reign of Shâh Ţahmâsp who developed a particular disdain for all secular arts and poetry in particular. The course of the artistic career and fortunes of Qâsimî too were affected by the attitude and the culture which prevailed at Ţahmâsp's court.

It is generally believed that although Shâh Ţahmâsp commissioned Qâsimî to write several mathnâvis he did not reward the poet for his labours. Poetic expressions of Qâsimî's indignation at his treatment by Shâh Ţahmâsp are widely reported in both primary and secondary sources.21 However, it seems that the notion that Shâh Ţahmâsp did not compensate Qâsimî for his works is entirely based on the brief obituary of the poet which originally appeared in Ḫasan Rûmlû's Ahsan al-Tavârîkh.22 Rûmlû reports Qâsimî's death in the year 982/1574 and notes "that because [they] had not given him a prize for the Šâhnâma he wrote these bayts in

---

19 Qâzi Ahmad Qumi, Khulâšat al-Tavârîkh, p. 590, claims Mirzâ Qâsim dedicated Gûy u Chugân or Chugânnâma to Sultân Ibrahim Mirza.
22 Ahsan, p. 462.
grievance". In this poem, inspired by the meanness of his patron, presumably Shāh Tāhmāsp, Qāsimī draws a parallel between his own experience and that of his illustrious eleventh century predecessor Firdausī who experienced similar ingratitude at the court of Maḥmūd Ghaznavī for his Shāhnāma. He writes "deprivation is a property of the Shāhnāma". He then laments, and possibly consoles himself, that "the gift of a base and ignoble man is equal to death".23

We find that Rūmlū’s tradition is followed by later chroniclers. Qāzī Ahmad Qumī too reports this obituary verbatim in Khulāṣat al-Tavārīkh and also lists a number of Qāsimī’s works.24 We also find a reference to Rūmlū’s obituary in secondary sources. Şafā relates it to explain the reason for the poet’s emigration to Bhakkar into self-imposed exile, which he has erroneously identified as Diyar Bakr.25 However Tazkira-i Maikhāna which is the main source on the life and works of Qāsimī does not offer any biographical information on the development of the poet’s career as do none of the other Tazkiras. This is partly due to the fact that most of these authors used Tuhfa-i Sāmī by Prince Sām Mirzā, Shāh Tāhmāsp’s brother, as their basic source. Sām Mirzā completed his Tazkira of the poets by 957/1550, only seven years after Qāsimī had completed his Shāhnāma-i Navvāb-i ‘Alā [or ‘Alī] for Shāh Tāhmāsp and before future events in the life of the poet unfolded. Furthermore, because of his close relations with Tāhmāsp and also his close proximity to the court it would have been politically inconceivable for Sām Mirzā to write on the subject of Tāhmāsp’s alleged ingratitude towards Qāsimī. On the other hand, the farmān of investiture and also the obituary of Qāsimī, found in Afzal al-Tavārīkh, offers new independent evidence and represents a break with this historiographical tradition.

23 Ibid.
24 Khulāṣa, p. 590.
The Farmān of Investiture

The text of this valuable farmān appears on folio 4 of Afzal al-Tavārikh and is inserted immediately after the narrative of the accession of Shāh Ẓahmāsp on 19 Rajab 930/ 23 May 1524. This arrangement of material is clearly intended to emphasise the timing of Qāsimī’s appointment which coincided with the Shāh’s accession or soon after. It is significant that Fażli begins Afzal al-Tavārikh with the appointment of Qāsimī and devotes so much attention to the poet. He attaches greater importance to the appointment of the Poet Laureate than to any of the political appointments which were made at the same time. On his accession Shāh Ẓahmāsp appointed Div Sulṭān Rūmlû and Köpek Sulṭān Ustājlû as co-vicegerents (vakīl). Amir Qavām al-Dīn Ẓuṣain was appointed to share the office of the sadārat with Amir Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Āstārābādī and Qāżī Jahān Sayfī was appointed Vazir. We find Fażli makes only a passing reference to these appointments.26 We can not be certain of the motives of the historian but given that Aḥsan al-Tavārikh served as a basic source for Afzal, we can assume that Fażli was aware of the historiographical tradition in regard to the controversy surrounding Qāsimī’s relationship with Shāh Ẓahmāsp and possibly endeavoured to counter it. The significance of Fażli’s inclusion of this farmān at the start of his history may also be sought in the use which the historian has made of Qāsimī’s poems which are liberally interspersed in the narrative. We find that in the section of the chronicle dealing with the first ten years of Shāh Ẓahmāsp’s reign when his sovereignty was at its weakest Fażli makes greater use of Qāsimī’s poetry than in the latter part of the chronicle. The use of these panegyrics, which are carefully woven into the prose, was clearly intended to glorify the weak rule of a young and ineffective monarch. This was no more than a historiographical device which Fażli utilised in order to put a gloss over Shāh Ẓahmāsp’s unstable reign during his minority and produced the official

26 Afzal II, f. 4b. See also Aḥsan, p. 185; Khulāṣa, p. 156.
document of Qāsimī’s laureatship at the beginning of his history in order to validate his use of this poetic source. Fāzlī was not alone in his appreciation of the power of poetry in perpetuating the kingly authority. If authentic, the farmān of investiture of Qāsimī as Poet Laureate, and more importantly its timing, would signify the importance the ruling classes attached to poetry in the exercise of sovereignty. Qāsimī was entrusted with the task of providing a testimony to Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s greatness. This was, however, premature as it would take the young Shāh at least a decade to attain a degree of power. It also ran counter to the wisdom of an earlier age "until a reign attains stability and its connections are firm, poets do not begin to praise it".27

Fāzlī first begins with the report that the Grand Vazir Khvāja Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Tabrizī28 presented Qāsimī, who had composed poems for Shāh Ismā‘īl, at court to the young Shāh Ṭahmāsp. The poet recited a panegyric of the Shāh which he had composed for the occasion of his accession. The poem praised Ṭahmāsp as the world conqueror and the successor to Jamshīd and Alexander (Iskandar). The eulogy also refers to Ṭahmāsp as a "sapling from the garden of the Prophet, a descendant of ‘Ālī, and the guardian of the earth and the time". Qāsimī further reiterated the Ṣafavīd Shāhs’ mahdistic claims by comparing Shāh Ṭahmāsp to the Mahdī who is "in command of the army of the End of Time".29 Shāh Ṭahmāsp listened to the recitation of the poem, appointed Qāsimī as the Poet Laureate of the august dominions, and ordered the secretaries to register the farmān.

These official documents usually have a standard structure. They begin with the opening formula "The august command has been given". This formula appears to be

28 Soon after his accession, Shāh Ṭahmāsp ordered Khvāja Jalāl al-Dīn to be punished by burning in his hometown of Tabriz. Fāzlī claims Khvāja Jalāl al-Dīn’s execution resulted from the long standing enmity which had developed between the Khvāja and Div Sulṭān Rumlū, Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s first Vicegerent. Thus it appears that Khvāja Jalāl al-Dīn was one of the first to fall victim to the power struggle which began with Ṭahmāsp’s accession. Aftal II, f. 9 a+b.
29 Aftal II, f. 3b.
missing from the opening paragraph of this *farmān*. This may be due to clerical error at the time of transcription rather than a proof of its lack of authenticity. Instead it begins with a lengthy praise of Qāsimī’s literary attributes. The document however ends with the standard formula “The document (*parvāncha*) has received the royal30 seal, so let them honour it”.

After the initial praise of Qāsimī comes the confirmation of his appointment as the Poet Laureate (*malik al-shuʿarā*). The appointment entrusted to him the task of versifying the events of Ẓahmāsp’s reign day by day and thus immortalising his reign”. It also stipulates that the Poet Laureate be awarded the annual sum of sixteen tumans and 2,342 Khurāsānī dinars as *suyūrghāl* and subsidies (*madad u maʿāsh*).31

The sum of money was the revenue accruing from the "aforementioned districts as is registered in the book of standing enactments". Unfortunately the *farmān* does not name the districts. This term of reference to the districts, however, suggests that the *farmān* was issued to confirm an existing grant of *suyūrghāl* and subsidies rather than create a new one.32 In such cases it was customary to include the districts or the communities not in the main body of the text but list them on the back of the document.33 The *farmān* then goes on to emphasise that the "men of genius” and "perceptive men" should recognise Qāsimī’s ennoblement (*mīrzāti*) and also declares him the Shāh’s special companion at the royal assemblies. It concludes with a

---

30 Instead of the customary phrase "*muhr-i ashraf*" (the royal seal), Fazlī has inserted "*muhr-i mihrābād*".

31 The text of the *farmān* is damaged at this point and the reading of the figure 2,342 is uncertain.

32 In Safavid administration the salaries of officials were paid in the form of "*suyūrghāls*" or "assignments" in the majority of cases. "Suyūrghāls" were the highest kind of assignments. The beneficiary acquired the right to collect government dues from the lands assigned to him and practically became their hereditary holder. *TM*, p. 152. Evidence suggests that although a *suyūrghāl* remained in the same family after the death of its principal beneficiary, the transfer was not automatic and required a new royal decree to confirm it. This was intended to enable the Shāh to cancel the grant when he wished to do so. This is clearly evident in the *farmān* of Shavval 938/1531 in which Shah Tahmāsp confirms the transfer of the *suyūrghāl* of Amir Niẓām al-Dīn Ahmad, a sayyid family of Āstarābād, to his children after his death. Az Āstārātā Āstārābād, (eds.) Masīh Zabiḥī and Manuchir-i Sutuda, (n. p., n. d.), pp. 8-9.

33 A similar document, dated 1067/1656 which confirms and redistributes the existing grant among the heirs of the original grantee Mīr Niẓāmatullāh ʿAbd al-Vahhab also has the communities and locations listed on the back of the document. Ann K. S. Lambton, "Two Safavid Suyūrghāls", *BSOAS*, 14 (1952). p. 44.
command to the political dignitaries to pay the Poet Laureate utmost respect and to the landlords and the subjects of the "aforementioned districts" to honour their fiscal obligations to Qāsimī and pay him the requisite taxes (*māl u jihāt va vujūḥāt*) without delay.

Unfortunately the text of this *farmān* is badly damaged in parts, particularly in the opening paragraph, which makes a critical assessment of the authenticity of the document rather difficult. Determining the authenticity of this document is further complicated by the errors which may have resulted from the clerical procedures at the chancery where such *farmāns* of investiture would have been transcribed. Although standard formats and formulas were employed in composition of such official documents, the scribes at the chancery were often guilty of transcribing a text incorrectly or leaving out critical introductory sections. This problem could have been further exacerbated by Fażī himself who may have left sections out or even paraphrased the text as he copied it from its original. Furthermore, since we do not have access to the original *farmān* we can not determine the authenticity with the aid of certain features such as the use of different inks or corroborating seals. Afzal offers the only surviving copy of this *farmān* and until and if the original comes to light we cannot ascertain its authenticity. However, it serves to question the current view of modern scholars and also opens up fresh avenues for future research.

The discovery of this *farmān* of investiture casts doubt on the conventional wisdom based on the notion that although poets and poetry were an essential and prized component of Šafavid court culture, unlike the practice at the Ottoman court, no salaried and official Poet Laureates were appointed at the Šafavid court.

---

36 At the Šafavid Round Table at Edinburgh in 1998, Bernardini and Calmard suggested that although the *Shāhnāma* of Firdaūsī was very popular at the courts of Shāh Ismā‘īl and Shāh Tahmasp and also served as a model for composing the contemporary *Shāhnāma-i Ḥaẓrat-i Shāh*
Ottoman court, the office of Şehnâmeçisi was first inaugurated in the 1550s by Sultan Sulaiman and is believed to have functioned until the beginning of the 17th century. The Şehnâmeçisi's chief function was to compose a literary account of the contemporary events of the Sultan's reign, taking Firdausi's Şahnâma as his model.\(^37\) At the Ottoman court the Şehnâmeçis were therefore the early court historiographers before they were superseded by the vâqi'ênivis as the official court historians. The farman of investiture of Qâsimi also outlines a similar function for Qâsimi as a historian of Ţahmâsp's reign. Viewed in this light, Qâsimi's literary output deserves to be studied for its value as a historical source as it does for its literary merits.

In the absence of sufficient documentary evidence, at present it is not possible to obtain a comprehensive picture of the function of a Poet Laureate at the court of Šâh Ţahmâsp or establish any precedent for it at the court of Šâh Isma'il. There is however uncorroborated evidence that Qâsimi may not have been the first poet laureate at the Safavid court during the first half of the sixteenth century. Both Parsâdûst and Aubin identify an obscure poet by the name of Ḥâbibî Bargshâdi [or Baragshâdi] as Šâh Isma'il's poet laureate. Parsâdûst also claims that the brutality of Šâh Isma'il's religious policy forced Bargshâdi to emigrate to the Ottoman empire and seek refuge at the court of Bâyazid II (r. 886-918/1481-1512).\(^38\) It has not been possible to compile a biography of Bargshâdi as his name does not appear in any of the Safavid court chronicles or the biographies of poets. Nor can we establish whether he too was commissioned to write a Şahnâma. However, Firdausi's Şahnâma was very popular both at the court of Šâh Isma'il and also in the

---

\(^{37}\)Woodhead. op. cit., p. 160.

sharbat-khānahā, which later became coffee houses, where reciters would sing the heroic exploits of Rustam to the public. Shāh Ismāʿīl was so fond of Firdausī's Shāhnāma that he named three of his sons after Firdausī's heroes: Šāh Ṭahmāsp, Bahrām, Sām. In 917/1511-12 Shāh Ismāʿīl also commissioned Maulānā 'Abd-Allāh Ḥātifī, who was the tutor and mentor of Qāsimī, to write a history of his achievements in verse and in the style and metre of the Shāhnāma of Firdausī. Ḥātifī entitled this history Shāhnāma-i Ḥāżrat-i Shāh Ismāʿīl or Shāhnāma-i Shāh-i māẓī but could not complete it before he died in 927/1520-1. There is no evidence that Shāh Ismāʿīl appointed Ḥātifī the poet laureate. This would have been unlikely since Ḥātifī was very old by this time and lived the life of a recluse at Khargird near Jām in Khurāsān and occupied himself with farming. The task of finishing Shāhnāma-i Ḥāżrat-i Shāh Ismāʿīl was left to Ḥātifī's pupil and friend Qāsimī who completed it in 940/1533. It is possible that Ḥātifī's attempt to chronicle the victories and achievements of Shāh Ismāʿīl in verse inspired Shāh Ṭahmāsp to commission Qāsimī to compose a similar work of his reign and to reward him with the office of Poet Laureate.

Further research and documentary evidence are required to establish a similar pattern of appointing poet laureates for the later periods of Safavid history. Shāh ʿAbbās was a great lover of poetry and a generous patron of poets. One of his favourite cultural activities was listening to the recitation of the Shāhnāma by his favourite poets. Several prominent poets were, from time to time, present at his court, among whom we can name Sharaf al-Dīn Ḥasan Shafāʾī, ʿAbd al-Razzāq Khushnīvīs Qazvīnī and Mullā Bikhudī Gunābādī. Shāh ʿAbbās rewarded Qazvīnī with an annual salary of three hundred tumans and Gunābādī, who was a famous Shāhnāma-khvān (reciter of Shāhnāma), with an annual salary of forty tumans.

---

39 Parsādūt, op. cit., p. 754.
41 Naṣrullāh Falsafī, Zindigānī-i Shāh ʿAbbās-i Ayyāl (Tehran, 1370), vol. 1 & 2, pp. 342-3.
42 Falsafī op. cit., 343.
However, there is no indication that Shāh ʿAbbās ever awarded either poet with the title of Poet Laureate (malik al-shu'farā). Among the poets associated with Shāh ʿAbbās the position of the physician Sharaf al-Dīn Ḥasan Shafāʾī (d. 1037/1628) remains uncertain. Roemer claims that he was appointed the Poet Laureate. The primary sources do not corroborate this and their evidence is contradictory. He enjoyed much respect and recognition at court and received many payments and gifts from the Shāh but according to Tazkira-i Maikhāna he was never enlisted in the rank of the Shāh’s close companions. It is possible that Shafāʾī’s excessive fondness for satire (hijā or hajū) may have disqualified him as a candidate for the prized position of royal confidant or laureatship. Shāh ʿAbbās is reported to have disapproved of his satirical works and occasionally criticised him for it. Shāh ʿAbbās may not have had a Poet Laureate but he did commission another poet Kamāli (d. 1020/1611) to compose an account of his military exploits in verse in a compendium titled Shāhnāma or ‘Abbāsniṃa. According to Āzar, the author of Ātashkada, Kamāli completed the Shāhnāma but because of some misfortune it was not presented to Shāh ʿAbbās.

Other famous poets associated with ʿAbbās’ court were Maulānā Shānī Tekkelū and Taqī Auḥadī. Maulānā Shānī Tekkelū always accompanied the Shāh who held him in such high esteem that he rewarded him by measuring his weight in gold in Qazvīn in 1001/1592. However, Maulānā Shānī fell from favour and Taqī Auḥadī, the author of Tazkira-i Auḥadī, replaced him at court. Auḥadī travelled extensively with Shāh ʿAbbās and because he was unmarried he even lived in the palace precincts in the care of the chief of the royal attendants (mihtar-i farrāshān)

43 Roemer, Cambridge History of Iran, p. 275.
44 Tazkira-i Maikhāna, p. 524. Ātashkada, vol. 3, p. 951. contradicts this evidence and reports that Shafāʾī was enlisted as the companion of Shah ʿAbbās.
47 Tazkira-i Auḥadī, British Library IO Islamic 3654. ff. 708 a - 709a; f. 15 a+b.
to be on call at all times. There is however no indication that either Maulanā Shānī or Auhadī were appointed Poet Laureate.

As this brief survey illustrates, there is actually no evidence against the view that the Šafavīd Shāhs appointed poet laureates. It is rather the absence of any categoric reference in the sources to this practice which prompts the speculation as to the status of prominent poets at the Šafavī court. This ambiguity in the primary sources adds all the more value to the farman of appointment of Qāsimī as Shāh Šahmāsp’s poet laureate.

The Obituary of Qāsimī

In the obituary of Qāsimī, reported under the events of the year 982/1574, Fažlī again confirms and commemorates the poet’s life-long service to the Šafavī Shāhs. Fažlī reports:49

"Mīrzā Qāsim Junābdī Khurāsānī who has versified the victories of His Majesty the Warrior of the Faith Abu’l-Baqī Shāh Ismā‘īl, whose abode is with ‘Ali, and of His Majesty Shāh Šahmāsp Šafavī, may he rest in paradise, died. This author Fažlī Iṣfāhānī has [included] in the first and second volumes of Afzal al-Tavārīkh his poems in testimony. After eighty two years of panegyrizing the dynasty of prophecy and authority (dīdāmān-i nubuvat va vilāyat) [Mīrzā Qāsim] has met his Maker. He prayed for the benevolence of the rightful Imāms for intercession for his sins. His Majesty bestowed great favours on his son and confirmed his suyūrgḥāl and regular salary in the son’s name”.

As this obituary states, Qāsimī spent his life at the service of the Šafavī dynasty and Shāh Šahmāsp not only rewarded him for his literary services but also confirmed the transfer of his suyūrgḥāl to the poet’s son after his death. Together the farman of appointment and the above obituary support the idea that throughout his life Qāsimī enjoyed a high standing and a secure position at the courts of both Shāh Ismā‘īl and Shāh Šahmāsp. There is however a body of evidence to suggest that he may have in fact emigrated from Iran in the latter part of his life.

48 Tazkīra-i Auhadī, f. 15a. See also TM, p. 137.
The Question of Qāsimī’s Emigration

Qāsimī himself offers the most reliable evidence in one of his poems which appears to be part of his history of Sultan Maḥmūd. The poem begins with a panegyric of Sultan Maḥmūd which praises him as the "Khān of the age". Qāsimī next praises his own talents as a poet and the power of poetry to perpetuate the name of the kings. Next he gives the first clue as to his connection with Bhakkar and says:

"The precious gems of Bhakkar came to the shore of my thought".

The poet proceeds to list his previous works. He begins with the two Shāhnāmas [of Shāh Ismā‘īl and Shāh Ṭahmāsp]. This is followed by the announcement that he at present is writing the Shāhnāma-i Khānī. Presumably this is the title Qāsimī gave to the mathnavī he dedicated to Sultan Maḥmūd of Bhakkar. Qāsimī also includes Lailī va Majnūn, Gūy va Chugān, Shīrīn va Khusrau, and Shāhrukhnāma in this list.

Next comes an interesting revelation. He boasts to be "the master" of Firdausī and asserts that if Firdausī, who complained of his misfortune, had been as treasure loving (ganj sanj) as he [Qāsimī], and wise enough to panegyrise a king who possessed both a crown and a treasure, he too would have been gratified. Qāsimī obviously believed that he was financially more astute than Firdausī. Qāsimī clearly falls in that category of poets who despite persistent profession of poverty and asceticism, sought the patronage of powerful rulers and went where he found the

---

50 Khalīṣa, pp. 443-6. Qażī Ahmad Qumi includes this poem under the events of the year 971/1563 and in connection with the arrival of Abu’l Makārim, the ambassador of Sultan Maḥmūd Khan, to Tahmāsp’s court in this year. He introduces the poem as part of a history of this dynasty which "the late Mīrzā Qāsim Junābādī" wrote in verse. ‘Abdī Beg Shīrāzī, Takmilat al-Akbār, (ed.) ‘Abdul Husain Navāzī, (Tehran, 1369), pp. 122, 126, also corroborates that Mīrzā Qasim went into the service of Sultan Maḥmūd in India.

51 Khulūsa, p. 444.

52 Sultan Maḥmūd of Bhakkar (or Bukkur) was a local ruler and the commander of the army of the last king of the Arghun dynasty Mīrza Shah Ḥusain. After the death of the latter the Sind region was gradually incorporated into the Delhi empire. Sultan Maḥmūd accepted Akbar’s claim to the Sind region and thus retained his power. To strengthen the political alliance with Akbar, Sultan Maḥmūd had his daughter admitted into the imperial harem. In return he obtained from Akbar, a title, a robe of honour befitting the kings, a jewelled sword, a caparisoned horse, and four elephants. Sultan Maḥmūd was renowned for his liberality, courage and wisdom. E. H. Aitken, History of Sind: A Gazetteer of the Province of Sind, (Karachi, 1907). pp. 100, 105.
highest bidder.\textsuperscript{53} This evidence indirectly supports the notion that Qāsimī had not received the reward he had hoped for from Shāh Tahmāsp. Possibly the initial grant of suyūrgāl had been insufficient and he expected greater riches.

He next states that he went to India. The reason the poet states for his travel to India varies according to different copies of the \textit{Khulāṣat al-Tavārikh} in which we find this poem. It could be "in search of a story"\textsuperscript{54} or "in search of friends".\textsuperscript{55} Both would have been crucial for the continued intellectual vitality of a distinguished poet in this period and Qāsimī appears to have found both. Qāsimī clearly found a new patron in Sultan Mahmūd, the influential and powerful governor of Bhakkar who provided him with rich material for his \textit{Shāhnāma-i Khānī}. On the strength of this evidence we can now consider Ṣafā's assertion that Qāsimī went to the court of Sultan Mahmūd, the vālī of Diyar Bakr, as unreliable.\textsuperscript{56}

The precise date of Qāsimī's trip to India is difficult to determine. Sultan Mahmūd became governor of Bhakkar in 963/1555, a year before Humāyūn's death and Akbar's accession, and continued to play an active role in the politics of the Sind region until his death in 982/1574.\textsuperscript{57} It is therefore possible to date the beginning of Qāsimī's association with the governor of Bhakkar to 963/1555. This date is significant since it coincided with Shāh Tahmāsp's edict of 963-4/1555-56 banning all forms of art. Although Shāh Tahmāsp was an avid patron of all arts in the early part of his reign he is reputed to have gradually withdrawn from artistic patronage

\textsuperscript{53} Iskandar Beg Turkman (Munsbīl) clearly distinguishes those poets of Tahmāsp's reign who solely relied on royal and aristocratic patronage from those poets who despite their poverty and deprivation remained independent of rich patrons and relied on their own crafts and trades for their livelihood. In this second category he names Maulānā Furūghī ʿAttār whose shop in Qazvīn was a gathering place for poets or Maulānā Ṭabkī Qazvīnī who made a living from cooking. \textit{TAAA}, vol. 1, pp. 187-8.

\textsuperscript{54} \textit{Khulāṣa}, p. 445, note 7. The copy at the National Library of Malik.

\textsuperscript{55} \textit{Khulāṣa}, p. 445. The copy at Iran-i Bastān Museum.

\textsuperscript{56} Ṣafā, "\textit{Tārīkh-i Adabiyyat dar Irān}", p. 718. It seems that Ṣafā misread "Bakr" and interpreted it as Diyar Bakr. Diyar Bakr was at this time under the Ottoman control and would have been an unlikely destination for Qāsimī.

\textsuperscript{57} Riazuł Islam, \textit{Indo-Persian Relations}, (Lahore 1970).

and his gradual disengagement from the arts and worldly pleasures culminated in the above edict.  

As the dates of the completion of the mathnavīs also show, Shāh Ṭahmāsp did not sponsor any works of poetry by Qāsīmī after 950/1543. Shāh Ṭahmāsp had developed a disdain for poetry by the time he promulgated his edict, as his instructions on the subject of the education of his fourth son Prince Sūltān Sūlaymān Mirzā illustrate. In 964/1556 Ṭahmāsp summoned the four year old Prince from Shīrāz where he had been raised from birth under the supervision of Ibrāhīm Khān Zu‘l-Qadr and sent him to Khurāsān to continue his education under the guidance of Sūltān Ibrāhīm Mirzā [Ṭahmāsp’s nephew]. Shāh Ṭahmāsp specifically ordered that the young prince should abstain from all the reprehensible acts and refrain from wearing silk clothes. He also ordained that the young prince should first learn to read the word of God (kalām-i malik-i ‘ālām), or the Quran, and then read Persian treatises in the requisite subjects and strictly forbade the young Prince to read any books of poetry. Iskandar Beg Munshi reports that Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s aversion to secular poetry and poets arose from his belief that poets were broad and liberal in their religious belief and conduct and were not godly. This change of literary taste on the part of Shāh Ṭahmāsp led many poets to compose poems in praise of the Imāms or elegies commemorating their martyrdom. A most famous example is that of Muḥtasham Kāshānī who in the hope of a suitable reward, wrote two panegyrics, one for Shāh Ṭahmāsp and another for Princess Pari Khān Khānum. Shāh Ṭahmāsp did not reward Muḥtasham and remarked:

"Poetry written in praise of kings and princes was sure to consist largely of lies and exaggerations, according to the well-known Arabic saying, "The best poetry is that which contains most falsehoods," but that, since it was impossible to exaggerate the virtues of the Prophet and the Imāms,  

59 Khulūṣa, pp. 391-2.  
60 Browne, op. cit., p. 172.
the poet could safely exert his talents to the full, and in addition would have the satisfaction of looking for a heavenly reward".¹⁶¹

Muḥtasham promptly composed a *haft-band*, or poem of seven-verse strophes, in praise of the Imāms and was duly rewarded.⁶²

With Shāh Ṭahmāsp's spiritual and psychological conversion the intellectual climate at court would have been unfavourable to Qāsimī and lucrative royal patronage would not be forthcoming.⁶³ There is however sufficient evidence to support the notion that Shāh Ṭahmāsp's aversion to the arts was short lived. We find that only six years after the date of the famous edict, in 968-9/1560-1, Shāh Ṭahmāsp commissioned his favourite poet Qāẓī Āṭā Allāh Rāzī to compose a poem to celebrate the completion of the new royal palace Ālī Qāpū and the gardens of Saʿādatābād in the new Safavid capital Qazvīn.⁶⁴ Rāzī evoked the grandeur of the royal palace in four distiches which the master calligrapher Maulānā Malik Daylamī inscribed on the portal of the palace (*daulat-khana*). The poet and historian ʿAbdī Beg Navīdī too was commissioned to praise the splendour of the garden of Saʿādatābād in a book of verse.⁶⁵ Navīdī accomplished this task in his book *Jannat-i ādān*.⁶⁶

*The Authenticity of Afżal al-Tavārīkh's Evidence*

The *farmān* of investiture appointing Qāsimī as the Poet Laureate at the court of Shāh Ṭahmāsp, found in *Afżal*, is a rare document. It extends our knowledge of

---

¹⁶¹ This translation is taken from Browne's "History of Persian Literature", p. 173. It also appears in "Cambridge History of Iran", p. 954, and in its original source TAAA, vol. 1, p. 179.

⁶² Browne, op. cit., p. 173; TAAA, p. 178.

⁶³ Shāh Ṭahmāsp's aversion to all forms of art also affected the staff of his royal *kitabkhāna*. Many of the artists employed at the *kitabkhāna* left the royal service. In 1556, three court artists -Malik al-Daylamī, Rustam Ālī and Shāh Mahmūd al-Nishapūri- left the royal library and moved to the court of Sultan Ibrāhīm Mirzā in Mashhad where they completed key sections of the prince's illustrated manuscript *Haft aurang*. Simpson, op. cit. p. 18.

⁶⁴ Prince Sam Mirzā notes in his biography of poets that Qāẓī Āṭā Allah was a courageous, outspoken and honest young man and for this reason no one liked him. He also confirms that for a time he was a companion of Shāh qurān [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] but later moved to Varāmīn [to the south east of Qazvīn] where he was living at the time. *Tuhfa-i Sāmī*, p. 32.

⁶⁵ ʿAbdī Beg Navīdī was from a noble family of Shīrāz and had a reputation for honesty and piety. He was also employed in the Royal Secretariat. Ibid. p. 59.

Qāsimī's life and also challenges the theory that the Šafavid Shāhs did not follow a tradition of fostering a poet laureate. The *farmān* of investiture appointing Qāsimī the Poet Laureate may well be a document belonging to the early part of the reign of Shāh Ťahmāsp when he was an enthusiastic patron of arts. In this period he would have keenly granted Qāsimī royal patronage and the *farmān* simply confirms this. Fažlī's obituary of Qāsimī too offers an independent view of the poet's life and achievements. This however goes counter to the historiographical traditions pertaining to the latter part of Qāsimī's life and is more difficult to corroborate. As we have seen, by the time Qāsimī had completed his three *Shāhnāmas* and as Shāh Ťahmāsp grew increasingly averse to secular arts, neither the artistic and intellectual climate nor the financial prospects at the Šafavid court would have been favourable for Qāsimī. Furthermore, the available evidence, i.e. the poet's own verse, supports the notion that Qāsimī left Iran for India. We cannot determine whether he remained in India until his death in 982/1574 or he returned to Iran sometime before that date. According to one tradition, in his old age Qāsimī donated his hereditary wealth to the sum of two thousand tumans as a religious endowment to the shrine of Imām Riżā in Mashhad.67 He may have indeed returned to Iran in later life but until fresh evidence comes to light we can not accept Afzal's evidence that Qāsimī enjoyed a life-long service at Ťahmāsp's court as reliable. The view that Šah Ťahmāsp and Qāsimī enjoyed an uninterrupted and fruitful patron-client relationship to the end is more consistent with the author's tendency to conceal the fractures in the personal and political life of Šah Ťahmāsp than it is with historical reality.

---

67 Qazvīnī, op. cit., p. 170, note 4. Qazvīnī cites Amin Ahmad Rāzī the author of "Haft Iqlīm".
2. *Afżal al-Tavārikh* and *Mir ʿAbd al-Vahhab*

Mir ʿAbd al-Vahhab Tabrizi was the *Shaykh al-Islām* of Tabriz when the Ottoman army defeated the Safavid forces at Chaldiran in 920/1514. The outcome of the battle proved a fateful event for the *Shaykh al-Islām* and changed the course of his life. At Chaldiran Shāh Ismāʿīl lost both the war and his favourite wife Tājlū Begum to the Ottomans. After the defeat of the Safavid army, Sulṭān Selim proceeded to Tabriz and captured and occupied the city on 15 Rajab 920/5 September 1514. Apparently the inhabitants put up no resistance but Selim’s occupation of city was short lived. The revolt of the Janissaries who protested against the hardships of the campaign forced Sulṭān Selim to abandon the city after 8 days and hastily return to Āmāsya in Anatolia.68 That winter Sulṭān Selim remained in Āmāsya.

Whereas the life of Mir ʿAbd al-Vahhab in the years before the battle of Chaldiran is well documented, his life in the years following Chaldiran is shrouded in mystery. The Safavid court chronicles contain sparse and contradictory evidence. These shortcomings can be rectified, to some extent, by the Ottoman sources but a full picture can not be obtained. The present study aims to evaluate the evidence contained in the obituary notice of Mir ʿAbd al-Vahhab found in *Afżal al-Tavārikh*.

According to this brief obituary, which is recorded under the events of the year 932/1525, Mir ʿAbd al-Vahhab Tabrizi was a devout sayyid who was sent on an official mission to the Ottoman empire to represent Shāh Ismāʿīl at the court of Sulṭān Selim in 921/1515.69 It also reports that Mir ʿAbd al-Vahhab had remained in the Ottoman empire until 932/1525 and that during that time “he had sewn twelve thousand tāj and had incited a group to wear that habit which is a sign of devotion to the Infallible Imāms”. The term tāj is likely to be a reference to the distinctive

---

Qizilbash headgear, wearing of which signified allegiance to Safavid rule and adherence to Shi'ism and suggests that Mir 'Abd al-Vahhāb had engaged in covert religious missionary activity in the Ottoman empire. Fażlī claims that when Mir 'Abd al-Vahhāb's secret was revealed, he together with a number of "the friends of the dynasty of 'Alī", no doubt his disciples, were martyred by the Ottoman army. The high functionaries reported the news of his martyrdom to Shāh Ṭahmāsp who was distressed by this news. Fażlī also reports that Shāh Ṭahmāsp, upon receiving this news, appointed Mir 'Abd al-Vahhāb's sons as the chief justice (aqzā al-qużāl) and the army chaplain (qāţī 'askar) of the whole of Āzarbāyjān. Also in addition to their old grant of suyurghāl, Shāh Ṭahmāsp granted them an annual allowance. This allowance was made on the poll-tax levied on the Christian [or Armenian] (ghubr millat?) population of the whole of Āzarbāyjān at the rate of six Tabrizi dinārs per head.72

A historiographical reading of this obituary shows that there is some confusion among the Safavid sources as to the date and nature of Mir 'Abd al-Vahhāb's mission to the Ottomans as well as the date and manner of his death. Furthermore, comparison of the sources shows that the claim that Mir 'Abd al-Vahhāb's missionary activities resulted in his killing by the Ottoman army is unique to Afżal. Of these sources Aḥsan al-Tavārīkh which served as a basic source for Afżal contains no reference to Mir 'Abd al-Vahhāb or his mission and the manner of his death in Istanbul. Qāţī Aḥmad Ḍumī in his Khulāṣat al-Tavārīkh does not report the Mir's death in 932/1525 but makes a brief reference to his mission to Istanbul and the fact of his death at an unspecified date, under the events of the year

70 According to Tadhkīrat al-Mulūk, p. 43, "in the olden days qāţī-'askar sat at the Divān-begī's keshīk-khana and gave decisions according to the Sharī'at in affairs concerning the victorious army".
71 Reading is uncertain. The word "ghubr" is possibly a scribal error for "gabr", a term applied to the Zoroastrians and, during the Safavid period, also to the Christians.
72 It appears that these privileges and grants remained in the 'Abd al-Vahhābiyya family until the late Safavid period. Two documents dated 1067/1656 and 1115/1704 deal with the redistribution of grants among the later generations of the family. See Ann K. S. Lambton, "Two Safavid Soyurghals" BSOAS 14 (1952), pp. 44-54.
926/1519. Qumí notes that Mír ʿAbd al-Vahhāb was sent to the Ottoman court to deliver Sháh Ismáʿīl’s message of condolence for the death of Sulṭān Selim to his successor Sulṭān Suleyman. Having accomplished his mission Qumí reports that he was detained by the Ottomans and was denied permission to return to Iran. Only Ḥabīb al-siyār agrees with Afžal’s date of 921 as the year when Mír ʿAbd al-Vahhāb travelled to the Ottoman Empire but neither source offers any clues as to the purpose of this mission.

The date of Mír ʿAbd al-Vahhāb’s mission has a strong bearing on its nature. The clarification of one would determine the other. The Ottoman sources corroborate Afžal’s date of 921 as the date Mír ʿAbd al-Vahhāb reached the Ottomans. They also shed light on the nature of his mission.

Upon his return from Tabriz, at Āmasya, Sulṭān Selim received the first ambassador from Sháh Ismáʿīl since Chaldiran on 11 Shavvāl 920/29 November 1514. The embassy included the Shaykh al-Islām of Āzarbāyjān Sayyid Nūr al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Vahhāb and at least three other envoys: Qāżī Isḥāq, Mullā Shukr al-Dīn and Ḥamza Khalīfa. The Šāfavid envoys carried a letter from Sháh Ismáʿīl in which the Shāh expressed his desire to conclude peace with Sulṭān Selim, pay a fine and above all to secure the safe release of his favourite wife Tājlū Begum who had been captured by the Ottoman army at Chaldiran.

Sulṭān Selim’s response to this diplomatic initiative was characteristic of the hardline policy he had adopted towards Sháh Ismáʿīl since his accession to the throne in 918/1512. Unlike his father Sulṭān Bāyāzīd who had opted for a conciliatory attitude towards Sháh Ismáʿīl, from the outset Selim adopted an aggressive and offensive policy in his relations to the equally hostile Šāfavi Shāh, which culminated

73 Khulāṣa, vol. 1, p. 142.
75 Bacque Grammont, op. cit., p. 76.
in the battle of Chaldiran.\textsuperscript{76} This mutual antagonism was evident in the mistreatment of the ambassadors and envoys who arrived at the Ottoman and the Şafavid courts. In 910/1504-5 Şah Ismā'īl mistreated an Ottoman envoy by forcing the man to eat pork and made him watch two of his opponents, one of whom was a Sunni, being burnt alive.\textsuperscript{77} Prior to the battle of Chaldiran in 920/1514 Sultan Selim received the Şafavi ambassador Şah Quli Āqā-yi Büyük Nükār but the message he carried from Şah Ismā'īl so angered the Sultan that he ordered the ambassador to be executed.\textsuperscript{78}

On this occasion too Sultan Selim was intransigent and did not accept Şah Ismā'īl's terms for peace; he would accept nothing less than the Şah renouncing his religious doctrine. He hesitated for a few days and finally refused the Şah's offer. On the 18 Shavvāl/6 December the Şafavi envoys were arrested and were sent to prison. Mir 'Abd al-Vahhāb and Qāżī Ishāq were imprisoned in Rūmelî Hisārī (qafa'-i yekī hisār). The rest of the ambassadors were sent to the Dimetoka fortress [in Thrace?].\textsuperscript{79} On the strength of this evidence we can establish that the purpose of Mir 'Abd al-Vahhāb's mission was to negotiate the release of Tājlū Begum and offer peace to the Ottomans. This enables us to date this mission to the end of 920/1514 and confirm Aťal's date of 921/1515.

After Chaldiran Mir 'Abd al-Vahhāb and his companions were the first Şafavid envoys to be imprisoned on arrival to the Ottoman court. The imprisonment of these ambassadors triggered further diplomatic activity to secure their release and later in 921/1515 a second Şafavid ambassador was on its way to the Porte. This time the high ranking Qizilbāş Hūsain Beg and Bayram Beg arrived at the Sultan's winter quarters at Edirne.\textsuperscript{80} They too carried a letter from Şah Ismā'īl which sought to conclude peace with Sultan Selim and petitioned the Sultan to release Mir

\textsuperscript{76} For a discussion of Sultan Selim's attitude towards Şah Ismā'īl see Allouche, pp. 100-29.
\textsuperscript{77} Allouche, op. cit., pp. 86-7.
\textsuperscript{78} Allouche, op. cit. p. 117.
\textsuperscript{79} Bacque Grammont, op. cit., p. 76..
\textsuperscript{80} Ibid. p. 89.
‘Abd al-Vahhāb. Sultān Selim however persisted with his attitude of refusal and imprisoned the second ambassadors too and subsequently executed them.81 Despite Shāh Ismā‘īl’s attempt to negotiate the release of Mir ‘Abd al-Vahhāb, he seems to have lived in imprisonment in Rūmeli Ḥiṣārī at least until the advent of Sultān Sulaymān. Sultān Sulaymān appears to have had greater interest in improving diplomatic relations with the Şafavīds and his decision to release Mir ‘Abd al-Vahhāb was influenced by this consideration. Sultān Sulaymān possibly responded to the letter he received from Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain, Shāh Ismā‘īl’s Vicegerent.

The letter is dated 928/1521 and protests against the Ottoman policy of detaining and imprisoning the Şafavī ambassadors, intermediaries and envoys sent to Istanbul at different intervals. Mirzā Ḥusain expresses hope that after the death of Sultān Selim, in a spirit of reconciliation and in the interest of harmony and peace, the Ottomans would release those detained, especially Mir ‘Abd al-Vahhāb whose elevated lineage and eminence of his titles distinguished him among his peers. Mirzā Ḥusain adds that this was the reason the Şafavīs had delayed an official presentation for the occasion of the death of Sultān Selim and the accession of Sultān Sulaymān (r. 926-74/1520-66). The letter confirms that Mir ‘Abd al-Vahhāb was in prison at least until 928/1521.82

While it is possible to confirm Afzal’s dating of Mir ‘Abd al-Vahhāb’s mission, we can not corroborate its report that he was killed by the Ottoman army because of his Shi‘i missionary activities. In fact all the available evidence suggests that Mir ‘Abd al-Vahhāb was possibly a pseudo-Shi‘ite. He was the son of ‘Abd al-Ghaffār Ṭabātabā‘ī whom Uzūn Ḥasan had appointed as Shaykh al-Islām of Āzarbāyjān. After having lived in Samarqand with Khvaja ‘Ubayd Allāh Āhrārī, the spiritual leader of the Naqshbandi Şūfi order (d. 1490),83 ‘Abd al-Vahhāb returned to

81 Ibid. pp. 101, 106.
82 Ibid, pp. 353-7. The letter is now held at Topkapi archive, E. 4256.
Tabriz to succeed his father as Shaykh al-Islām. He also forged strong political and family ties with the Āq Qūyūnlūs through marriage to the daughter of Ya‘qūb Mirzā, the son of Uzūn Hasan Āq Qūyūnlū. His son Sayyid Hasan Beg was born of this marriage. The custodianship of the mausoleum of Hasan Pādishāh, also known as Naṣīrīya, in the Sāhib Ābād district of Tabriz, too belonged to Mīr ʿAbd al-Vāhhāb and later to his sons. Therefore on the eve of the conquest of Tabriz by Shāh Ismāʿīl in 1501, Mīr ʿAbd al-Vāhhāb was firmly entrenched in the religious tradition and the political ruling elite of the city, which at this time was predominantly Sunnī. He was so alarmed by the rise of Shāh Ismāʿīl that he fled to Harat in fear of his life. After the death of Sultan Husain Bāyqara, however, and possibly at the invitation of Shāh Ismāʿīl he returned to Āzarbāyjān. In Tabriz he was well received by the Shāh who "granted him immense favour and immunity from the accidents of this world". Shāh Ismāʿīl subsequently sent him to the Ottoman court for negotiations with Sultan Selim. Mīr ʿAbd al-Vāhhāb was a member of the class of Iranian aristocracy who thanks to family solidarity, knowledge of jurisprudence (fiqh), and fiscal expertise succeeded in retaining their power base and privileges within the Safavid administration. Mīr ʿAbd al-Vāhhāb's continued ascendancy under Shāh Ismāʿīl possibly owed less to his fervent adherence to the Safavid ideology than to his administrative skills and knowledge of fiqh. This may also explain why he was not executed soon after his arrival in Ardāvīya as were the second ambassadors who made the same journey later that year. It is likely that Sultan Selim regarded Mīr ʿAbd al-Vāhhāb as being a Sunnī or a Sunnī sympathiser and was

---

84 Bacque Grammont, op. cit., p. 82.
85 TAAA, p. 153; Muhammad ʿAli Tarbiyat, Dānishmandān-i Āzarbāyjān, (Tehran, 1314), p. 268, also offers a brief biography of Mīr ʿAbd al-Vāhhāb.
86 Hans R. Romer, "The Qizilbash Turcomans: Founders and Victims of the Safavid Theocracy" in Michele M. Mazzouï and Vera B. Moreen (eds.) Intellectual Studies on Islam, (Salt Lake City, 1990), p. 34.
87 Habib al-siyār, pp. 608-9.
88 Ibid. pp. 609.
reluctant to kill him. The second ambassadors Ḥusain Beg and Bayram Khan were high ranking Qizilbash Amirs and represented the revolutionary core of the Safavid political and religious establishment and Sultan Selim did not hesitate to execute them. Circumstantial evidence too supports, albeit indirectly, the notion that Mir ʿAbd al-Vahhāb did not represent the religious extremism of the Safavid state.

Navāʿī has claimed that after the death of Sultan Selim, his son and successor Sultan Sulaymān released Mir ʿAbd al-Vahhāb from prison but the long years of harsh imprisonment had so weakened him that he died in 930/1423-4 and was buried in the cemetery of Abū Ayyūb-i Anšārī. Navāʿī however does not identify his source. Therefore on the strength of the available evidence, the notion put forward by Fazlī that Mir ʿAbd al-Vahhāb converted thousands of the Ottomans to Shiʿism or to the religious extremism of the Qizilbash and was killed for it, is not tenable and can not be corroborated. It is however consistent with the author’s systematic attempt to obscure the heterogeneous religious and political character of the Safavid polity under Shāh Ẓahmāsp.

90 Bacque-Grammont, op. cit., p. 82.
3. The Historiography of the Battle of Jām

The battle of Jām, 935/1528, was an important political and military event of Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s minority. Following this military victory Shāh Ṭahmāsp was able for the first time since his accession in 930/1523-4 to assert greater political influence at court. Shortly after the victory at Jām he invited the Ustājlū uymaq back from exile in Gilān thus destabilising the Takalū tribe’s hegemony at court. Militarily too this was a turning point in Ṭahmāsp’s relation with the Uzbekks. For the battle of Jām `Ubayd Khān Uzbek had enlisted the armies of the “appanage states”93 of Transoxiana to join him against the Šafavids. According to Afżal "since the time of Chingiz Khān, no army of such magnitude had crossed the river Oxus" and the Uzbek army comprised the armies of Kashghar, Turkistān, Andijān, Qazāq, Dasht-i Qipchāq and Qirqiz.94 As a consequence of the Uzbek defeat in this battle, however, `Ubayd Khān was unable to enlist the military support of the Uzbek confederacy in his future wars against the Šafavids. In the following year, 936/1529, `Ubayd Khān appealed to the Sultāns of Turkistān for assistance to muster an army for another offensive against Khurāsān but he had little success.95 Abū Saʿīd Khān the Pādishāh of the whole of Turkistān refused `Ubayd Khān’s plea for assistance and advised him to be content with his own kingdom.

Different versions of this major battle appear in the surviving Šafavid court chronicles. Of these sources Afżal al-Tavārīkh offers the most detailed and elaborate account of this event and is one of the main sources which Dickson used for his study of the battle of Jām. Dickson tried to reconstruct the battle of Jām in the light

---

93 The “Appanage-state” is the term Dickson uses to describe the member states of the Abūl-Khayr Dynastic House. Dickson, op. cit., pp. 24-37.
94 Afżal II, f. 41b.
95 Afżal II, f. 54a. Khulāsa, p. 209.
of the evidence found in *Afzal* and a number of other Şafavid and Uzbek sources. He was aware of these divergent and irreconcilable versions but in the absence of a systematic historiographical examination of the source material he was unable to arrive at a definitive version of the battle of Jām. He presents the evidence and leaves to the reader the task of formulating a final version.

Therefore to formulate a clearer view of the battle and to assess the value of *Afzal al-Tavārīkh* as an important source for Şafavid history, certain aspects of *Afzal*’s version of this battle require critical evaluation. This section will first focus on the historical methodology which has been employed in the writing of this chronicle. It will then examine the significance of the author’s distinctive historical interpretation of this event in the context of the reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsp, the subject of Fażlī’s history, and also in the context of the political and religious culture of the reigns of Shāh ʿAbbās I and Shāh Şafī when *Afzal al-Tavārīkh* was written. This exercise, it is hoped, will highlight some of the difficulties faced by the scholars of Şafavid historiography and more widely it will shed some light on the issues relating to the political culture of the reign of Shāh ʿAbbās.

**Historical Methodology**

As Quinn has shown, Şafavid historical writing was based on a methodology which may be called "imitative writing". This methodology called for a chronicler narrating a non-contemporary event to adopt one or more models from contemporary chronicles, narratives which he imitated word for word, paraphrased, versified, simplified, and updated to make his version appropriate for the time. Following this historical tradition, for the battle of Jām, as in the rest of the chronicle, the author Fażlī writing in 1023-1049/1614-39, has used the most contemporary source Ḫasan Rūmlū’s *Aḥsan al-Tavārīkh*, 985/1577, as his basic source. Fażlī has taken much of the narrative from *Aḥsan*. In parts he has reproduced

a verbatim account while in other parts he has paraphrased the narrative. The author has also, with a few exceptions, inserted almost identical epic poems as *Ahsan* at the same points in the narrative. We are told in the preface of the first volume of *Afżal al-Tavārīkh* that most of these verses are by the Poet Laureate Mirzā Qāsim Junābādī. Most importantly Fażli has considerably updated his narrative which has given rise to significant discrepancies between the two chronicles.

The author is systematic in the arrangement of the evidence under two distinct sub-headings. First comes "The battle of Jām and the defeat of Shāh Ṭahmāsp". The narrative then continues under the second sub-heading "The Second Battle of His Majesty Shāh Ṭahmāsp with ‘Ubayd Khān and the defeat of ‘Ubayd Khān". This two-day version of the battle, 10-11 Muḥarram 935/24-25 September 1528, distinguishes *Afżal* from *Ahsan* and the other sources examined here for the purpose of this study, all of which relate a one-day version. Additional sources are Shāh Ṭahmāsp's autobiography *Tazkira-i Shāh Ṭahmāsp*, the *Khulāṣat al-Tavārīkh* by Qāzī Aḥmad Qumī, the *Muntakhab al-Tavārīkh* by Ḥasan b. Muhammad Khāki Shīrāzī and *Ṭārīkh-i Ālam Ārā-i ‘Abbāsī* by Iskandar Beg Munshī. *Afżal* is further distinguished from *Ahsan* by the central and prominent role it assigns to Shāh Ṭahmāsp in leading the Qizilbash army towards final victory; *Ahsan* is more ambiguous on this point. The author Fażli also includes a dream while *Ahsan* does not. Finally Fażli has invested spiritual authority in the person of Shāh Ṭahmāsp in order to legitimise not only his military leadership in this particular battle but also his reign. Although *Afżal*'s two-day version represents an independent

97 *Afżal* II, f. 39a.
98 *Afżal* II, f. 43a.
99 There is some disagreement among the sources about the exact date of the battle of Jām: *Khulāṣa*, p. 187. In the letter of victory, Qāzī Aḥmad has recorded the 2nd Muḥarram 935/16 September 1528 as the date of the Ṣafavid victory at Jām. *TAAA*, p. 54, gives the day of ‘Ashūrā, 10 Muḥarram 935/24 September 1528, as the date of the battle. ‘Abdī Beg Shīrāzī, *Takmilat al-Akhbār*, (ed.) ‘Abdul ʿHusain Nava’ī (Tehran, 1369), p. 65, also notes Saturday 10 Muḥarram 935/24 September 1528. Qāzī Ahmad Ghafari Qazvini, *Ṭārīkh-i Jahān Ārā* (ed.) ‘Allāma Qazvini (Tehran, 1343), p. 284, reports Saturday 15 Muḥarram 935/29 September 1528.
historical tradition, the author Fazli has imitated Ahsan in some basic facts and
sequence of events and has significantly embellished them.

Both sources agree that prior to the battle of Jām, Shāh Tāhmāsp went to
Mashhad for pilgrimage before departing for Khargird, in the vicinity of Jām. A
detachment of the Uzbek army was intercepted near Khargird. According to Ahsan:

"[His Highness] despatched fourteen qūrchīs to reconnoitre [the area]".\(^{101}\)
Afżal too reports this reconnaissance but in a much more elaborate version:

"Shāh Tāhmāsp, the Father of Victory and the Warrior of the Faith, may he rest in
paradise, sent fourteen trustworthy and able young scouts (qarāvulān) who by the
love of the Fourteen Pure Souls had come from the fold of inexistence to the
meadow of life, to reconnoitre the area.....".\(^{102}\)

The religious tone in Afżal's version is striking. By giving Shāh Tāhmāsp the
title of the Warrior of the Faith (ghāzī) the author has interpreted this battle as jihad
(holy war).\(^{103}\) Although in his narrative Ḥasan Rūmlū alludes to the bad customs and
orthodox laws which ʿUbayd Khān had imposed on occupied Khurāsān and that this
had motivated the Shāh to liberate the province, his choice of royal titles does not
include "warrior of the faith" (ghāzī). Ḥasan Rūmlū has opted for only one royal title
"The Shāh the Refuge of Religion" (shāh-i dīn-panāh) which he has extended to "the
Shāh the Refuge of Religion the Shadow of God" in one instance. Afżal's notion that
the "Fourteen Pure Souls", including the Prophet Muḥammad, Faṭīma and the twelve
Shīʿī Imāms, protected the young scouts, elevates this reconnaissance from the
routine military exercise that it was to a pre-ordained religious mission.

Both Afżal and Ahsan concur that the scouts encountered four hundred Uzbek
cavalry. A number of them were captured and some fled back to the ʿAṣḥāvīd camp to

\(^{101}\) Ahsan, p. 213.
\(^{102}\) Afżal II, f. 39b.
\(^{103}\) The ʿAṣḥāvīds redefined jihād in order to justify holy war against the people of the book, that is
the Georgians and also the Sunni Uzbeks and the Ottomans. For example Jāmiʿ ʿAbbāsī, the legal
manual compiled by Bahaʾ al-Dīn ʿĀmulī for Shāh ʿAbbās I, considers when the peoples of the book
can be considered infidels (kuffār-i harb) and brings the frequent ʿAṣḥāvīd wars against the Georgians
within the ambit of regulation of the sacred law and jihād. Arjomand, The Shadow of God and The
Hidden Imam, (Chicago, 1984), p. 175, cites Bahaʾ al-Dīn ʿĀmulī, Jāmiʿ ʿAbbāsī, (ed.) Iraj Afsīār
inform the Shāh. The next day Ţahmāsp sent Ulma Sultan Tekkelū and Muḥammad Khān Zuql-Qadr Oğlū to lead a contingent against the Uzbeks. It appears that the Šafavids had little or no military intelligence on the Uzbek army and this was simply a larger reconnaissance than the previous one to assess the strength of their opponents. The two Qizilbāš chiefs deemed it unwise to engage in battle against the large army that they had encountered and retreated to camp. According to Aḥsan and Afiżal that night both the Šafavid and the Uzbek army camped in Zīr Ābād, in the vicinity of Jām.104 At this point there is some disagreement between the two chronicles. Aḥsan is silent about the events of that night but it reports that the Uzbek Sultāns and the Šafavid chiefs skirmished the next morning immediately before the main battle:

"The next day the Uzbek Sultāns descended on the majestic camp in the vicinity of the district of Zīr Ābād. Both sides opened fire and then withdrew."105

From Aḥsan’s narrative it appears that the main battle of Jām followed soon after this skirmish. According to Afiżal, however, the brief skirmish between the Šafavid and Uzbek scouts (qarāvulān), which preceded the main battle, occurred not on the morning of the same day but during the previous night. By this time both sides had formed a good idea of the size and the fighting power of their opponents and retreated to their respective camps to prepare for battle next morning:

"That night they camped at Zīr Ābād of Jām, two farsakhs from Fāriqī, where the Qizilbāš scouts (qarāvulān) and the Uzbek vanguard (harāvulān) clashed.106

---

105 Aḥsan, p. 213.
106 The battle was fought in a district of Jām, the modern "Turbat-i Jām", which is situated to the south east of Mashhad, close to the border with Afghanistan. There is, however, disagreement among the sources as to the exact district where the two armies met. Muntakhab, f. 602b, Khulāsāt, p. 179, and Amir Ḍamūd b. Khwanadmir, Ḥaraqār-i Shāh Ismā‘īl va Shāh Ţahmāsp, (ed.) Ghulam Ṯizā Taḥtabā’ī, (Tehran, 1370), p. 259, report "Saruqamish", a dependency of Jām to have been the battlefield. Aḥsan, p. 213, identifies it as "Khargirād" (TAAA, p. 53, gives the variant "Khusraujīrd"). Takmilat al-‘Akhbār, p. 65, gives "Burdwaya" as the battlefield. Afiżal II, f. 39a, too claims the battle was fought in "Khargirād", in the vicinity of Jām but it also gives "Zīr Ābād", two farsakhs from Fāriqī, as the location. It is possible that all the different locations listed above, "Saruqamish", "Burdwaya", and "Zīr Ābād", are in fact different districts of "Khargirād". I must thank Dr Bernardini for identifying "Khargirād" as the modern "Langar" which is situated a short distance to the north west of Turbat-i Jām.
After the brief skirmish between the scouts of the two armies each side knew of the close proximity of its opponents and camped nearby to prepare for battle. Darkness descended. In that dark night the intrepid warriors lay restless, thinking to prove their bravery and manliness to their equals and to their Spiritual Guide and the qibla of the Šūfis. They contemplated accomplishing an exalted station in life or attaining great renown for courage in the event of martyrdom...."107

Fazli has considerably expanded his account. He has altered some of the terminology, he has replaced Ahsan's "Uzbek Sultans" with the word "haravulân" (vanguard), and has modified his reading of the brief passage in Ahsan in order to elaborate on the night camped on the battle field. This has provided the author with a structure to convey his homage to the Šūf Qizilbāsh and to commemorate Shāh Tāhmāsp as the "Spiritual Guide and the qibla of the Šūfis".

Notwithstanding the above discrepancy, in their narrative of the events of the morning of the battle Ahsan and Afzal again converge in both prose and verse but Fazli has incorporated only part of Ahsan's narrative word for word and has added considerably to the narrative. Ahsan begins with a mix of stylised prose and poetry celebrating the sunrise and then continues with the report of the Shāh preparing for battle. To emphasise the similarities between the Afzal and Ahsan, the text common to both sources are underlined and emboldened:

**In the morning when the sun destroyed the legions of the stars and the universe was cleansed of darkness,**108 The Shāh the Refuge of Religion the Shadow of God wore the helmet of victory and armed himself.109

Rûmlû has evoked a scene parallel to the epic literary tradition of Shāhnāma. The metaphor of the sun destroying the black night has been presented as analogous to the imminent battle between the Šafavids representing the true religion and justice and the Uzbeks representing Sunny orthodoxy. The use of this metaphor also predicts the inevitability of the Šafavid victory. Fazli has also reproduced this metaphor which is devoid of any actual historical content. In this way the author has continued Ahsan's literary tradition while interjecting his own historical version. Firstly, Fazli

---

107 *Afzal II*, f. 40a.
108 The prose is interrupted at this point by a verse of three lines. *Ahsan*, p. 213.
109 A verse of three lines is inserted at this point. *Ahsan*, p. 213.
has inserted a different verse at exactly the same point in the narrative. Secondly, he has added some independent information to the text before reporting that the Shah dressed for battle:

In the morning the sun destroyed the legions of the stars and the universe was cleansed of darkness. Until near sunrise His Highness the Shadow of God and the Viceregent of God prayed God for the victory of the fathers of the august State (auliyā-i daulat). The Shah awoke and prayed. Chuha Sultan, the Commander-in-Chief of the Qizilbash forces, received the honour of prostration before the Shah and requested the royal command to sound the drum of Anushirvan. [The Safavid army would sound their drum] only after the Uzbek call to battle. The military inspectors (tavāchīyān) were ordered, on hearing the sound of the drum of Anushirvan, to call the Amir, the centurions (yūzbāšīyān), and the standing corps of royal troops (qurchīyān) to arms. His Majesty the Shadow of God, too dressed for battle and adorned his peerless body with the armour of divine protection and the assistance of the pure spirit of His Holiness the refuge of Prophecy and the Infallible Imams, and waited for the sound of the battle drum of the Chingizī army; following the tradition of his munificent ancestors, Shah Isma'il Abūl-Barā, whose abode is with 'Alī, had allowed the enemy to commence the battle.

The resulting discrepancies between the two sources are striking. Beyond Ahsan’s title of "the Shah the Refuge of Religion the Shadow of God" which invests Shah Tahmasp with spiritual authority, when compared with Afzal, Ahsan’s version is remarkable for the relative secularity of its tone. Whereas Ahsan evokes a secular image of Shah Tahmasp as a warrior-king in the epic chivalric tradition, Afzal renders a saintly image of the Shah. The report of his early morning prayer is intended to emphasise the Shah’s piety and the title of "His Highness the Shadow of God the Viceregent of God" arrogates to the Shah the office of God’s representative on earth. Furthermore, consistent with his choice of royal title and designed to emphasise the divinely ordained authority of Shah Tahmasp, Fazl has substituted the metaphor of "the armour of divine protection and the assistance of the pure spirit of His Holiness the refuge of Prophecy and the Infallible Imams" for Ahsan’s "coat of mail".

110 Fazl has inserted a verse of three baits at this point. f. 40b.
111 Shah Tahmasp’s title reads "ḥażrat-i ẓill-i subhānī khalīfa al-raḥmānī".
112 Afzal II. f. 40b
Fazlī’s claim that continuing a Šafavid tradition, Shāh ʻAlībīrī permitted the enemy to initiate the battle is independent evidence which cannot be corroborated by contemporary evidence. For example in the Uzbek war of 916/1510 against Shaybāk Khān Uzbek, one of the earliest Šafavid chronicles Ḥabīb al-sīyar offers no evidence which would indicate that Shāh ʻAlībīrī followed such a tradition. However, Fazlī in the first volume of Afzal al-Tavarīkh, reports that by the reign of Shāh ʻAlībīrī, warfare had been regulated in conformity with the traditions of the Šafavī Sulṭāns. Fazlī claims that Shāh ʻAlībīrī decreed the ethics of warfare to be codified in a compendium with the title of ʻlughat-nāmaʼ. One such regulation dictated that a defeated enemy should not be pursued on battlefield. For example, In 912/1506 in the war against the Zuqul-Qadrs of Diyar Bakr, the Šafavī Khāns obeyed this tradition. No other evidence has been found to support the existence of such a manual but almost certainly Shāh ʻAlībīrī’s ʻlughat-nāma served Fazlī as his source for the ethics of warfare which he attributes to Shāh ʻAlībīrī.

Hasan Rūmlū continues the narrative by praising the swiftness of the Shāh’s horse in prose and verse in a manner which evokes Rustam’s legendary horse Rakhsh:

[Shāh ʻAlībīrī] then mounted a fierce horse which by night roams a man’s dreams and by day gallops like the northern wind.

Rūmlū continues his eulogy of the meteoric speed of the Shāh’s horse in verse followed by the report:

[The Shāh] drew up the conquering troops in battle array.

Fazlī on the other hand persists with his panegyric of Shāh ʻAlībīrī. This passage is devoid of any significant historical fact but is rich with titles:

As his Highness the Shadow of God dressed in the hereditary garb of courage, the sound of the Uzbek drum reached the World Sovereign the Shadow of God and the

---

114 Afzāl l. f. 155.
115 Ibid.
116 Ahsan, p. 214.
Progeny of the Lord of the Age (farzand-i rasūl-i ākhar al-zamān). The Commander-in-Chief of the Qizilbāsh forces Chuha Sultan, too, ordered the drum of Anūshīrvān to be beaten and His Highness's horse to be prepared. After hearing the beat of the drums, the victorious Amirs and troops ('asākir) mounted the horses of hope and fear and entrusted the reins to divine will. His Highness the Refuge of Caliphate and the Hope of the Šūfīs mounted a fierce horse which by night roams a man's dreams and by day gallops like the northern wind, and drew up the Šūfī ranks in battle array.

While Fażī has imitated Aḥsan's literary imagery of Tahmāsp's horse, he has embellished his account with strong spiritual fervour. Tahmāsp is further invested with supreme spiritual authority as "the Progeny of the Lord of the Age [the Hidden Imām]". Furthermore, his use of the title of the "Refuge of the Caliphate and the Hope of the Šūfīs" juxtaposes the role of the Shāh as both the universal leader of the Muslim world and the Šūfī leader. Moreover, Fażī has appropriately substituted the "Šūfī ranks" for Aḥsan's "conquering troops".

Thereafter both Rūmlū and Fażī proceed with the account of the battle formation of first the Šafavid followed by that of the Uzbek army. Rūmlū reports the battle formation of the Šafavid army as follows:

[Shāh Tahmāsp] turned his attention to the formation of the army of the empire. Chuha Sultan Tekkelū and Husain Khān Šāmlū and Tabaruk Khān Šāmlū and Ḩamza Sultan Zul-Qadr and Ḩamza Sultan Tekkelū and Ahmad Sultan Ustājū and Ahmad Sultan Afshār and Muhammad Khān Zu'Qadr Oğlu and Pir Quli Sultan Shāmlū and Ya'qūb Sultan Qājār and Muhammad Sultan Sharaf al-Dīn Oğlu and Ḩasan Sultan Durghūd Oğlu and Malik Beg Tund Khūy, took position, some on the right and some on the left flank. And gun carriages replete with light cannons ('arābahā-i pur az zarban-i farangi) were deployed in front of the line of troops. The Qizilbāsh army resembled countless particles of sun light and numerous molecules of air, all strong and large as a lion (shīr) and an elephant, cruel and iron-fisted as a lion (hīzbar) and a tiger, and swift as a leopard and a wolf.

And this is Afżal’s description of the Šafavid order of battle:

The Commander-in-Chief of the Qizilbāsh forces Chuha Sultan Tekkelū, Ḩamza Sultan Tekkelū, Ahmad Sultan Afshār, Ya'qūb Sultan Qājār, and Muhammad Sultan Sharaf al-Dīn Oğlu Tekkelū took position on the right wing. Ḩusain Khān Šāmlū.

117 "Bi tasvīyya-i sūfī-i sūfiyya pardakht"
118 Afżal II, f. 41a.
119 My reading of the word "sūjāh" (air) is different from Seddon's reading of Aḥsan. He has opted for the reading "stjāb", meaning of which is not clear. Aḥsan, p. 214.
120 Aḥsan, p. 214.
Tabaruk Khalîfa, Muḥammad Khān Zu‘l-Qadr Oğlu, Fīr Qatī Sultan Şâmlû, Ahmâd Sultan Ustajlu, Ḥasan Sultan Durghûd Oğlu, and Malik Beg Kháû took position on the left wing. Ulma Sultan Tekkelû led a division at the vanguard (charkhya). [His Majesty] with Mîr Ja‘far Sâvî the Grand Vazir (i’timâd al-daula), the court officials (muqarrabân), the centurions (yuzbâšîyân), the standing corps of royal troops (qûrîchiyân), and the gentlemen of the workshops (aqqâyân-i kârkhâniyât) took position at the centre (ūb). His Majesty's army, may he rest in paradise, which did not exceed twenty thousand troops in number, stood in readiness for battle.

In terms of language and content there is little similarity between the order of battle as reported by Rûmlû and Fażlî. First we must consider the divergence between the two accounts of the order of battle before we examine the merits of Fażlî’s description. Whereas Aḥsan only lists the names of the tribal chiefs without assigning them to any particular flank, Fażlî enumerates the tribal formation of the left and the right flanks. Absent from Aḥsan’s description are Ulma Sultan Tekkelû, at the vanguard, and the civil functionaries who formed the centre together with Tahanasp. Moreover, Aḥsan does not report the size of the Qizilbâsh army. On the other hand, a significant omission from Afzal’s report is the Ṣafavids’ use of gun carriages. The omission of this important fact therefore raises questions. It may have been due to a clerical error. It is also possible that the author, in order to emphasise the divinely ordained nature of this victory, decided to edit out a direct reference to this important human achievement. This is certainly consistent with his tendency to...

---

121 Aḥsan, p. 214, identifies him as Tabaruk Khan Shanlu.
122 With the exception of Chuha Sultan whose position on the right flank is attested by both Khulâsa and Afzal, the two sources do not concur on the position of some of the remaining commanders. Ya‘qûb Sultan Qajar, who is listed by Afzal on the right flank, is reported to be on the left flank by Khulâsa. Similarly Husain Khan Shanlu, Tabaruk Khan Shanlu and Ahmâd Sultan Ustajlu who are placed on the left flank by Afzal, are positioned on the right according to Khulâsa, pp. 180-1.
123 During the reign of Shah ‘Abbâs when Afzal was written, a number of court officials were styled muqarrabs (close attendants/companions) by virtue of their special proximity to the Shah. The muqarrabs were divided into two groups "muqarrab-i khâqân" and "muqarrab-i hażrat". The former included the Shah’s physician, the astronomer and the chief of the eunuchs while the latter included the usher of the harem, Aides-de-camp. For a full list of these officials see TM, pp. 55-69; Falsafi, vols. 1 & 2, pp. 816-26. It is assumed here that this category of officials also existed at the court of Shah Tahmâsp.
124 Afzal II, f. 41a-b. Dickson, p. 133, claims "The number of Qizilbâsh engaged at Jam varies in the sources from 24000, to 40000 to 80000 to "countless". He does not identify his sources but among the Ṣafavid sources TAAA, p. 54, puts the Qizilbâsh army, in addition to the irregular troops (khurjîl), at 24000 cavalry who received regular salary (mavâjih). This supports Afzal’s estimate of 20000.
elevate the spiritual authority of Shāh Ṭahmāsp. Fażlī has also edited out Rūmī’s literary description of the physical attributes and the fighting power of the Qizilbāš.

However, Afzal’s detailed description of the order of battle is very useful. It enables us to identify the broad outline of the tribal and political alliances on the battle field. The right flank broadly consisted of the Tekkelū, the Afshār, and the Qājār uymaq and the left flank comprised the Shāmlū, the Zu’l-Qadr, and the Ustājkū uymaq. It is likely that the tribal configuration on the field of battle also represented the political alliances at court. This might explain why the Tekkelū and their adversaries the Ustājkū uymaq took position in opposite flanks. An account of the military review in the following year 936/1529 which took place at Başṭām also supports the notion of the political alignment of the constituent tribes of the Qizilbāš army. The military review was a prelude to the second campaign to liberate Khurāsān from another Uzbek offensive. After his victory at the battle of Jām Shāh Ṭahmāsp had summoned the Ustājkū Amirūn back to court from exile in Gilān and during this military review assigned the Tekkelū army to the right wing under the command of Alqās Mirzā and the Ustājkūs, who numbered sixteen thousand cavalry, to the left wing under the command of Bahrām Mirzā.125

Afzal’s description of the formation of the centre is also valuable for it is further evidence that the army was deployed along ethnic and political lines. In contrast to the predominantly Qizilbāš composition of the left and the right flanks, the centre mainly consisted of the tājik civil and religious functionaries,126 the regular royal militia and Shāh Ṭahmāsp himself. Fażlī’s attention to the detailed formation of the centre is possibly intended to emphasise the identity of those who achieved the final victory, that is Shāh Ṭahmāsp and the Iranian dominated political

125 Khudāsā, pp. 199-200.
126 In the battle of Chaldirān (920/1514) too the Safavid religious classes were deployed in the centre and the Sadr Sayyid Sharīf Shīrāzī and the Sadr Amir ṬʿAbd al-Baqī were killed in battle. R. M. Savory, “The Principal Offices of the Safavid State during the Reign of Ismāʿīl I (907-30/1501-24)”, BSOAS xxiii (1960), p. 103.
and religious hierarchy. During the first phase of the battle the Qizilbash who had been concentrated in the flanks had all been defeated and the majority had deserted.

In both Ahsan and Afżal the report of the battle order of the Qizilbash army is immediately followed by a detailed and similar account of the Uzbek military formation. While both sources agree on most points of detail, Fazlı has paraphrased Ahsan’s prose and has copied the verse. Rümlü reports:

"'Ubayd Khan and Kuchum Khan too deployed their army. 'Ubayd Khan had brought an innumerable army from the countries of Transoxiana, Kashghar, Turkistān, Andijān, Afrār, Sirān, Qābil, Tūrfān, Ghalmān, Qāqaq, Dasht-i Qipchāk and Qirqīz. Such a large army had not crossed the Oxus river since the time of Chingiz Khan. Verse:

More innumerable than ants and locusts, they had seized the mountains and the seas.

'Ubayd Khan and Kuchum Khan took position at the centre. Būraq Khan, Fūlād Sulṭān, 'Abd al-'Azīz Sulṭān, and 'Abd al-Laṭīf Sulṭān were assigned to the left wing and Jānī Beg Sulṭān, Gildy Muḥammad Sulṭān, and Abū Saʿīd Sulṭān to the right wing. Sevīnjūk Muḥammad Sulṭān together with Qanbar 'Affī Beg, Shaykh Dervīsh Beg, and Rustam Quli Beg127 were appointed to the reserve. Ṭābī Khvāja and Qarāja Bahādur were appointed to the vanguard (qarāvulū). The other Sulṭāns and Chiefs (mīrān) such as Kaskan Qarā Sulṭān, Qumish Ughlān, Tanish Beg, Sayyidum Mīrzā, Juẓhtāy Bahādur, Biyaqū Bahādur, Ḥāfīz Qanqarat and Shaykh Abū Saʿīd Afrāsīyāb, each one of whom was a Rustam, took their positions. Then the sound of the drum and fife of both sides and the Allāh Allāh battle cry of the gallant soldiers (bahādurūn) in the battlefield reached the universe."128

Afżal’s paraphrased version is as follows:

"On the opposite side 'Ubayd Khan and Kuchum Khan too deployed the vengeful Uzbek army.129 They themselves took position at the centre. Būraq Khan, Fūlād Sulṭān, and 'Abd al-'Azīz Sulṭān were assigned to the left wing and Jānī Beg Sulṭān, Gildy Muḥammad Sulṭān, and Abū Saʿīd Sulṭān to the right wing.130 Sevīnjūk

127 The title "Beg" is written "'Bi" in Ahsan.
129 Kuchum Khan or Khuchkunji Khan was the grand Khan of the Uzbek confederacy at Samarqand.
130 Būraq Khan was the leader of the Suyunjid appanage-state which was based in Tashkand and Turkistan. Dickson refers to him as "sultan" and not "khan". Dickson, op. cit., p. 132. Fūlād Sultan belonged to the Shah-Budaqīd appanage-state whose dominant leader was 'Ubayd Khan himself. The Shah-Budaqīds were based in Bukhāra. Ibid. ʿAbd al-'Azīz Sulṭān was 'Ubayd's son. Jānī Beg Sulṭān was the ruler of the Janibegid appanage-state and ruled in Kārmīnī and Miyānkān, the area between Samarqand and Bukhāra. Dickson, op. cit., p. 35. The appanage or the tribal affiliation of Gildy Muḥammad Sultan is not clear. Abū Saʿīd Sulṭān was the son of Kuchkunji Khan who succeeded to the throne as the Grand Khan of the Uzbek confederacy after his father's death in the following year, 936/1529.
Muḥammad Sulṭān, Qanbar ʿAlī Beg, Shaykh Dervīsh Beg, and Rustam Qulī Beg were appointed to the reserve so that they could provide reinforcement wherever the need arose. Ṭabl Khvāja and Qarājā Bahādūr were appointed to the vanguard (charkhchī shuda). Kaskan Qarā Sulṭān, Qumish Uglān, Tanish Beg, Sayyidum Mīrzā, Jughāy Bahādūr, Biyaqū Bahādūr, Ḩāfīz Qanqarāt and Shaykh Abu Saʿīd Afrāṣīyāb took position at the centre with ʿUbayd Khān and Kuchūm Khān. The entire armies of Transoxiana, Kāshghar, Turkistān, Andijān, Qāzāq, and Dasht-i Qipchāq and Qirqīz prepared for battle and drew up opposite the victorious army. Such a large army had not crossed the Oxus river since the time of Chingiz Khān.131 Verse: More innumerable than ants and locusts, they had seized the mountains and the seas.132

The victorious warriors of the faith (ghāziyān) too drew up in battle array and each man took up his position. The sound of fīfe and drum and the Allah Allah battle cry of the enemy capturing warriors of the faith could be heard by the inhabitants of the universe.133

The above comparison shows the extent to which Fażlī has imitated Aḥsan in both prose and verse. There are however some minor differences which have resulted from omission of some facts by the author Fażlī. He has omitted Andijān, Aṭrār, Sīrān, Qābīl, Ṭurfān and Ghalmān from the list of kingdoms which comprised the Uzbek army. Similarly in his version Fażlī has not included ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Sulṭān on the left wing of the Uzbek army. There are also some linguistic differences. The author has replaced Aḥsan’s "qarāvulān" with "charkhchī" (vanguard). Unlike Ḥasan Rūmlū, Fażlī has described the Uzbek army as "vengeful" and the Šafavīd army as "victorious". Both Rūmlū and Fażlī have used the same poem to denigrate the Uzbeks for their repugnant physical attributes and their dishonourable character but

---

131 Afsāl, later in the narrative, reports the Uzbek army numbered 80000. However, the text of a letter, dated 961/1553-4, which Shah Tāhmāsp sent to the Ottoman Sulṭān puts the Uzbek army at 200000, Dickson, op. cit., p. 127, note 1; Afsāl II, ff. 198b-199a. As Dickson has also pointed out the number was exaggerated in order to impress the Ottoman Sulṭān. Khulāṣa, pp. 180 & 184, puts the Uzbek army at 250000 cavalry. This however contradicts the text of the letter of victory (fath-nāma), in the same source, p.187, sent by the order of Shah Tāhmāsp to the provinces of the Šafavī empire, which records the size of the Uzbek army at 100000. TAAA, p. 54, cites Mīr Yaḥyā Sayfī the author of Lubb al-Tavārīkh as the most reliable source who reported the size of the Uzbek army at 120000. Iskandar Beg reckons that it was universally believed that the Uzbek cavalry alone without the parṇuvol? and almāncī? stood at 80000. Iskandar Beg’s estimate is closer to that given by the letter of victory cited above. On the strength of the evidence we may consider the figure 100000 as closer to the mark.
132 The verse continues.
133 Afsāl II, ff. 41b-42a.
whereas Rumlu has interspersed the prose with one or more couplets Fažlì has inserted the poem in its entirety at the end of the narrative.

In the following passage Fažlì reproduces only part of Aḥsan's flowery description of the actual battle in both prose and verse. This part of the text creates a literary image of an epic battle without actually conveying any historical facts.

Rumlu writes:

"The two armies undulated like two green seas and came to grips with each other. The lion-hearted men and the destructive battalions advanced to the attack. Such battle ensued that the noise of the horses’ feet thundered through the air, and the cloud of dust concealed the sun. The mighty Qizilbash army kindled the flames of war with the boisterous wind of courage. The deadly poplar arrows of the lightening Uzbek troops fastened the stars of the Pleiad to the belt of Orion."

Fažlì has copied only sections of the above passage:

The two armies undulated like two green seas and came to grips with each other. The lion-hearted men and the destructive battalions advanced to the attack. Such battle ensued that the noise of the horses’ feet thundered the air, and the cloud of dust concealed the sun. The mighty Qizilbash army kindled the flames of war with the boisterous wind of courage. The deadly poplar arrows of the lightening Uzbek troops fastened the stars of the Pleiad to the belt of Orion.

The subsequent section of the narrative in both Aḥsan and Afzal describes the battle. Although Fažlì continues with selective imitation of prose and verse from Aḥsan, the two historical traditions begin to diverge significantly. The principal disagreement between Rumlu and Fažlì arises from their respective interpretation of the extent of Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s active participation in the battle and his personal contribution to the Safavid victory.

Rumlu reports:

134 Aḥsan, p. 216.
135 Afzal II, f. 42a.
In the meantime, Jānī Beg Khān and a division of the Uzbek army attacked the Tekkelū Amirs. In the midst of fighting the Qizilbash Amirs were defeated. The courageous Muḥammad Sulṭān Sharaf al-Dīn Oğlū fell from his horse but one of the militia (mulāzīmān) mounted him [on his horse] and Ḥasan Sulṭān Durghūd Oğlū came to his assistance and engaged in the fighting. Finally the Tekkelū Amirs fled and Jānī Beg Sulṭān overwhelmed them and forced them to retreat [The Uzbeks] opened fire on the camels of the army store (urdūbāzār). The men of the army store drove the Uzbeks away by their fire but the Uzbeks overcame [them] killing and injuring the majority of the men.

The Amirs of the left wing also fled. Yaʿqūb Sulṭān Qājār and Malik Beg Khū'iy, without pausing to stop, went to Dāmghān and Semnān. After the flight of the left and the right flanks, the Shāh the Refuge of Religion remained in his pivotal position and was not at all perturbed.

The gunners and musketeers were deployed in front of the line of troops but were unable to use their guns because the Uzbeks did not attack from the front. The air was full of dust and in the darkness one could not distinguish friend from foe. After the sky had cleared, the Shāh the Refuge of Religion saw a white banner under which a crowd had assembled. It appeared to that Majesty that ʿUbayd Khān was standing under the banner. His Majesty the Refuge of Religion sent the army to defeat that wretched [man]. The loyal ghāziyān and the war-like standing corps of royal troops drew their swords and attacked ʿUbayd and Kuchūm Khān. The army of ʿUbayd Khān and Kuchūm Khān too came to the defence. Both sides witnessed the cruel sword remove the mask of darkness from the luminous faces and make an attempt on the lives of the brave [men]. The bow turned its arched back to the enemy and despatched with swift arrow the inevitable news [of victory] to the hearts of the young and the old. As the battlefield warmed to the flaming sword of the standing corps of royal troops and the breeze of desire blew over the ghāzīs’s meadow of fortune and the worthy heroes sensed the scent of victory, ʿUbayd Khān and Kuchūm Khān retreated from the battlefield and fled.136

And Afzal’s version:

In the meantime, Jānī Beg Khān and a division of the Uzbek army attacked the Tekkelū Amirs. Chuha Sulṭān Tekkelū with the right wing of the Qizilbāsh army were unable to repulse the assault and were forced to flee the battle ground. Muḥammad Sulṭān Sharaf al-Dīn Oğlū fell from his horse and the Uzbeks rushed upon him but Ḥasan Sulṭān Durghūd Oğlū came to his assistance and mounted him on his horse. Next came the militia (mulāzīmān) of Muḥammad Sulṭān who took him to safety. The defeat of the Tekkelū contingent and the heavy loss of men that they sustained prompted the Uzbeks to attack the Qizilbāsh army with greater boldness and courage.

The reserve, the right, the left wings and the vanguard broke ranks. Without pausing to stop, Ahmad Sulṭān Afshār returned to his district (ulkā) of Kermān, and Yaʿqūb Sulṭān Qājār and Malik Beg Khū'iy to Semnān. The fearless Uzbeks pursued the retreating army attacking the Qizilbāsh and the army stores which were

136 Aḥsan, pp. 216-8.
positioned at the rear of the army. The courageous men of the army stores fought the Uzbeks killing large numbers. Finally they too were overpowered and abandoned all belongings and equipment and fled for their lives. The Shah the Refuge of Religion remained in his pivotal position and was not at all perturbed by the turn of events. The gunners and musketeers who were at the service of His Majesty opened fire on the Uzbeks. The air was full of dust and in the darkness one could not distinguish friend from foe.

When the dust settled, it appeared to the Shah that except for the centre, not one of the troops who had earlier been engaged in battle remained on the field. The author of Ahsan al-Tawarih who himself was at the service of His Highness Shah Tahmasp the warrior of the faith, may he rest in paradise, as an arm-bearer in the rank of the standing corps of royal troops (qurchiyan-i yarag bardar), has noted in his history that after the sky had cleared, the Shah led the centre, attacked and defeated 'Ubayd Khan and Kuchum Khan. The authors of Khulil Arâ, Muntakhab al-Tavârikh, Mi'tâh al-qulub,137 and Maulana Nujumi the author of Tarikh-i Harat va Khurâsan, have written that after all hope of any assistance from the Amirs of the right and left wings had diminished, the Shah firmly held his ground and struck many Uzbeks from their horses with his lethal lance. [The Shah] then determined to ride to the foot of the banner when the Grand Vazir Mir Jafar, the Sadr Mir Qavam al-Din Husain, and the Qizilbash Centurions (yuzbâshiyân) beseeched him to retreat, counselling him that such defeats were prevalent in warfare. [They advised him] that with divine favour, he should muster a new army to take revenge on the Uzbeks on whom the world has turned its back. They then took His Highness away from the battlefield leaving the entire camp (urdû) and the equipment of the army stores (urdû bazârî) in possession of the covetous Uzbeks. 138

A comparison of the two accounts of the battle as illustrated above shows that both Rûmlû and Fażlî agree in their view of the course of events during the first phase of the battle. Both sources concur in the view that in this phase of the battle the cavalry of both armies advanced to the attack. The vanguard, the right and the left flanks of the Safavid army were unable to repulse the Uzbek offensive and broke ranks; the troops dispersed and their commanders fled. Fażlî also adds the name of Ahmad Sulṭân Afshâr, the governor of Kermân, to Ahsan's list of the Safavid Amirs who fled back to their provinces. Although neither source names him, Chuha Sulṭân Tekkellû, the commander-in-chief of the Qizilbash forces who had led the Tekkelûs in the right flank, was also among those who fled from the battle field but later that

138 Afsal II, ff. 42b-43a.
day reappeared next to the Shāh. Both sources also agree that the Uzbeks captured and plundered the Ṣafavid army stores.

The comparison of the two versions also yields some interesting divergence. Ṣafzal and Aḥsan disagree on three important issues. Firstly, the two sources report opposing views concerning the success with which field artillery was used in this battle. Savory has interpreted Aḥsan's evidence as the proof that the immobility of the artillery rendered it ineffective at the battle of Jām. On the other hand, Ṣafzal's evidence cannot be dismissed as unreliable. In a battle which the Ṣafavids were outnumbered by the Uzbeks by about 4 to 1, it is more than likely that superior firepower contributed to the clear victory which the Qizilbāš achieved. An account in Bābūrnāma supports this. According to this account, the centre of the Ṣafavid army had formed itself in the Ottoman fashion of chaining together the light cannons in a laagar protected by infantry-fusiliers. This formation could withstand a cavalry attack from any direction. One must also remember that the Ottoman victory against the Ṣafavids at Chaldiran was largely achieved by the use of artillery against a light and tribal cavalry force.

The second issue concerns the question of whether Shāh Ṭahmāsp personally engaged in battle. Aḥsan reports "[Shāh Ṭahmāsp] sent the army to beat off that wretched [ʿUbayd Khān]". The wording clearly denies that Ṭahmāsp took any active part in the final offensive leading up to the victory. Fażlī on the other hand, quotes Aḥsaḥn as reporting that "after the sky had cleared, the Shāh led the centre, attacked and defeated ʿUbayd Khān and Kuchūm Khān". As has been illustrated above, Seddon's edition of Aḥsan al-Tavārīkh does not corroborate this evidence. It is not possible to account for this discrepancy. Fażlī may have had access to a different

---

140 Dickson, p. 136.
141 Lockhart, op. cit., p. 90
copy of Alṣan from that which Seddon edited. Alternatively, he may have misread his source but this is unlikely. Another possibility is that he distorted Alṣan’s evidence in order to elicit a picture consistent with the accounts given by the other four sources, Khuld Ārā, which is in fact Tārīkh-i ‘Ālam Ārā-i ‘Abbāsī by Iskandar Beg Munshi and two lesser known sources, Muntakhab al-Tavārikh,142 Miftāh al-qulūb, and the lost source Tārīkh-i Harat va Khurāsān by Maulānā Nujūmī Haravī, all of which claimed that Šahmāsp fought and killed many Uzbek s. At any rate the revāyat attributed to Rūmlū and that found in Seddon’s edition of Alṣan al-Tavārikh differ significantly.

Thirdly, the two sources differ as to when the battle was concluded, whether on the afternoon of the same day or it was fought over two days. Rūmlū clearly distinguishes between the initial defeat of the left and the right flanks of the Šāfavid army and the final Qizilbash victory but he does conclude the battle in one day. Fazlī on the other hand, opts for the two day version of the battle. He ends the narrative of the first day of the battle with the Šāfavid army defeated and the young Šāh Šahmāsp distraught.143 He then continues the narrative under the sub-heading “The Second Battle of His Majesty Šah Šahmāsp Šafavī, may he rest in paradise, with ‘Ubayd Khan the Deaf and the Defeat of ‘Ubayd Khan”.144

The Second Day of the Battle

Fazlī reports that that night the Uzbek s, confident of their victory, occupied and plundered the Šafavid camp. Šāh Šahmāsp and the remaining Šafavid contingent, having been defeated by an Uzbek army of 80,000 strong, retreated to a nearby river some three leagues away for the night.145 During the night Shaykh ʻAli b. ʻAbd al-ʻĀl (Karakī), the Mujtahid of the Age, the Amirs and the Khāns tried to

---

142 Dickson, p. 127, note 1, has erroneously identified this source as Bahjat al-Tavārikh.
143 Afzal Ⅱ, f. 43a.
144 Afzal Ⅱ, ff. 43b-45a.
145 The author may have had the “Tedjen River” in mind.
comfort the young Shāh but he was inconsolable. Interestingly only Afzal reports the
presence of Shaykh Karakī at the battle of Jām and hence the extent of the Shiʿī
cleric's military and political involvement at court. Faḍlī uses his narrative of the
night interval between the two battles to establish and strengthen the Shāh's spiritual
and political authority and thus his claim to military leadership. This is partly
achieved by his use of royal titles and partly through a detailed account of the divine
revelation which Shāh Tahmāsp is alleged to have received in his dream that night.

The author continues to emphasise the spiritual authority of Shāh Tahmāsp
by the use of the following titles: "The Refuge of the Caliphate", "The Spiritual
Guide and the Shadow of God", "The Spiritual Guide and the Qibla", "the Pādishāh
the son of the House of ʿAlī", "the Kaʿba and Qibla of the Sūfīs", and "the World
Sovereign the Shadow of God and the Progeny of the Lord (rasūl) of the Age".
These titles reiterate the official ʿṢafavid propaganda based on the Shāh's claims to
spiritual leadership by virtue of descent from Imām ʿAlī. He is presented as both the
heir to the ʿAlid Shiʿī heritage and also the spiritual guide (pīr) and the object of Sūfī
termination (qibla va kaʿba). Furthermore the title of "The Refuge of the Caliphate"
bestows on Tahmāsp universal leadership of the Muslim world. This was no doubt
intended to counter the Ottoman Sultan's usurpation of the same title.146 Acceptance
of the Shāh's religious authority and hence of his political and military leadership
would therefore be considered as incumbent on his Qizilbāsh following.

The author further attempts to strengthen the Shāh's claim to political and
religious legitimacy by giving the most elaborate surviving account of a dream
which the Shāh is alleged to have had that night. It is the inclusion of the dream in
the narrative which dictated the author's preference for the two-day version of the
battle as opposed to the one day-version reported by all the other chroniclers. Faḍlī
reports that in the middle of that calamitous night Shāh Tahmāsp woke up and

146 Sūleyman the Magnificent and His Age. The Ottoman Empire in the Early Modern Age, (eds.)
Architecture", in The Cambridge History of Iran, vol. 6, p. 762.
demanded that Mir Niżām al-Mulk Rażāvī, the custodian of the shrine in Mashhad, who was in attendance, be summoned. The Shāh wanted to tell Mir Niżām al-Mulk his dream but before he could relate it the pious sayyid advised the Shāh to act upon the instruction of Their Holinesses, as prescribed in the dream. The religious and the political dignitaries present, including Shaykh ʿAlī b. ʿĀl (Karakī), the Sādir Mir Qavām al-Dīn Ḥusain, the Grand Vazir Mir Jaʿfar and the pillars of the state, rejoiced at hearing this auspicious news and asked "His Highness the Refuge of the Caliphate" to relate the whole dream. The Shāh asked Mir Niżām al-Mulk who had featured in the dream at the gathering of his "peerless ancestors" to recount it. Mir Niżām first enumerated those present in the dream. They were first His Holiness the Refuge of Mūḥammadan Prophecy [the Prophet Mūḥammad]. Then came Shāh-i vilāyat panāh, it is not clear whether this refers to Shāh Ṭahmāsp or Shāh Ismāʿīl. Finally, there were the guiding Imāms and the grand shaykhs the ancestors of Ṭahmāsp. The above saintly gathering made it known that unless Ṭahmāsp personally took part in battle victory would not be achieved.147 Afzal then reports that when Mir Niżām told the dream to those present in the royal camp "the Sūfis and the sincere devotees" (ṣāfiyān u yekjahān u mukhlīṣān) rejoiced, cried Allāh Allāh and pledged to serve their spiritual guide (pīr va pīr-zāda)".

The dream bears all the characteristics of an "oracular dream". The dreamer, Shāh Ṭahmāsp, received the dream in sleep. The revelation- that victory depends on his personal command of the army- is made directly to him without any symbolism, therefore it requires no interpretation.148 The earliest chronicled version of this divine revelation appears in Shāh Ṭahmāsp's autobiography Tazkira-i Shāh Ṭahmāsp. In this much simplified version the Shāh states that after the day's battle the Safavid army spent the night in the desert, not knowing what the outcome of the battle had been. That night the revelation came to Ṭahmāsp in a vision (dar vāqī'a). Shāh

---

147 Afzal II, ff. 43b - 44a.
Tahmasp reports that he saw his master and lord (āqā va maulā-i khud) Imām ‘Ali who smiled at him and said "praise be to God, he [Tahmasp] has attained a blessed victory". This was confirmed the next morning when the Shāh realized that the Uzbeks had indeed been defeated and their leaders had fled. Unlike Afzal’s dream which prophesies Tahmasp’s conditional victory, the Shāh’s vision confirms an act already accomplished. This may account for the absence of the Prophet, the other Imāms and Tahmasp’s ancestors from the vision. Imām ‘Ali was the sole divine representative in the vision through whom Shāh Tahmasp asserted the divine origin of his authority. Writing approximately forty years before Fazī, Qāzī Ahmad Qumī also offers another version of the same dream in his chronicle Khulāṣat al-Tavārīkh, completed in 998/1591 during the reign of Shāh ‘Abbās. According to Khulāṣa a pious man in Mashhad dreamed that Imām Rizā was on his way to Jām. In a conversation with the man the Imām is reported to have said that he was going to help Tahmasp. Qāzī Ahmad reports:

"The verifier of the spirituality of His Majesty [is] that the depth of the spirituality of that Majesty has stirred the Lord of Glory. "Truth has come and falsehood is bound to perish." And the breeze of victory blew over his [Tahmasp’s] triumphant face. "Allāh may help thee with a mighty help". And the spirits of the other Infallible Imāms revealed to the merciful Pādishāh "Upon them be the most excellent of prayers and the most perfect greetings". Divine inspiration and the infallible guide whispered in his ear and revealed to his heart that "In whatever way you want you are victorious". Through his all-embracing sanctity [of the eighth Imām], demanding obedience and infallibility, the flower of desire blossomed beautifully in his heart. In this way that son of valiant kings and the heir of the dynasty of the gallant Ḥaydar stood his ground and despite his youth, the small number of the warriors of the faith and the multitudes of the enemies of the faith, he placed his trust in "Many a small party has triumphed over a large party by Allāh’s command." and implored the guiding Imāms. He did not fear that multitude which resembled the day of Judgement.


150 The Quran, chapter 17, verse 81. The Quran, Arabic text with a new translation, translated by Muhammad Zafrullah Khan.

151 Ibid. p. 512.


Khulāsā's version of this dream shares common features with Afzal's. It too is a prophetic dream and invokes the spirits of the Shī'ī Imāms to intercede on Ṭāhmasp's behalf. To authenticate the dream, in both versions, it is told not by Ṭāhmasp himself but by an intermediary, a faithful and righteous believer who himself was present in the dream. Qāzī Aḥmad does not name the believer but the Custodian of the holy shrine at Mashhad Mīr Nīżām al-Mulk Rażāvi, as named by Faẓlī, certainly fulfils the necessary requirements of piety and devotion. However unlike Tazkira which names Imām ʿAlī as the divine who was revealed to Ṭāhmasp and Afzal which invokes the collective sanctity of the prophet, the Imāms and the Šafavid shaykhs, Khulāsā identifies Imām Rīzā as the divine whose revelation inspired the Shāh.

The two accounts of the dream also significantly differ. Khulāsā reports the dream to have been revealed to the believer in Mashhad and not on the battlefield as is stated by Afzal. Afzal's version communicates a greater sense of immediacy and reality about the dream and gives Ṭahmasp a more active role, a quality which Khulāsā's version lacks. Qāzī Aḥmad relates the story which he has heard from a trustworthy source but after the event. Faẓlī gives the illusion of being a court chronicler witnessing the events unfolding before him on the battlefield.

Shāh ʿAbbās' official court historian Iskandar Beg Munshī, a contemporary of Faẓlī, also makes a passing reference to the dream. Amid the defeat of the right and left flanks of the Qizilbash army, Iskandar Munshī relates:

"His Highness, may he rest in paradise, had dreamed that His Holinesses the Infallible Imāms had given His Majesty the good tidings of victory. That Majesty due to his firmness, valiance and sincerity of belief did not move and his august disposition displayed no signs of trepidation." ¹⁵⁴

Although Iskandar Munshī's version of the dream also contains the essential element, the Infallible Imāms prognosticating victory, it is a much simplified version.

As has already been noted, Aḥsan, which was not only the chronicle closest to the events but also served as a basic source for Afzal, does not report this dream. Although Tahmāsp has produced a much simplified version in his autobiography Tazkira-i Shāh Tahmāsp, its omission from Aḥsan suggests that the dream as a political and religious legitimising tool had not been utilised by the chronicles contemporary with Shāh Tahmāsp. This device was the product of the historiography of the reign of Shāh ‘Abbās and as we have seen, by ‘Abbās’ reign different versions of it began to appear, first in Khulāṣat al-Tavārīkh, and then in Tārīkh-i Ālam Ārā-i ‘Abbāsī and Afzal al-Tavārīkh. It is also likely that the authors of these histories used Shāh Tahmāsp’s vision, as it appears in his autobiography, as a prototype for their account of the dream.155 Shāh Tahmāsp was aware of the importance of dreams as means of legitimising his actions. Towards the end of his life he rarely took a decision or acted without recourse to his dreams. For example in 972/1564, he granted exemption from taxation to the people of Azarbāyjān, Iraq, Fārs, Khurāsān, Shīrvān and Gilān after he had received instructions from the Hidden Imām in a dream.156 However, as the above historiographical review has shown, on this occasion Shāh Tahmāsp’s alleged dream served as a historiographical device which successive generations of historians of the reign of Shāh ‘Abbās further elaborated and developed. Nevertheless, as Jonathan Katz has also noted, it would not be appropriate to view the dream only as a literary device. "Its functional role, contents and patterns were culturally determined".157 The dream therefore is valuable as it offers an insight into the ideological basis of political legitimacy as perceived by the chronicler Faẓlī.

Faẓlī elaborated the dream in order to promote the divine authority of Shāh Tahmāsp and his right to rule and to exercise military command. In the context of

155 Katz, op. cit., p. 158.
157 Katz, op. cit., p. 177.
the battle of Jām which was fought when Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s political authority and prestige were at their weakest, the alleged direct communion with the Prophet and the Imāms clearly was intended to elevate the position of the young Shāh above that of the military and political dignitaries. Against a background of the civil war politics, inter-uymaq rivalries and Ṭahmāsp’s lack of sufficient political authority, the divine affirmation of his rule was perceived [by Fazlī] as the means to focus the disparate political and tribal loyalties on the person of the Shāh.

Appropriately the dream emphasises the Šafavid commitment to Twelver Shi‘ism. On the one hand, the choice of the custodian of the shrine of Imām Rīzā, Mir Nizām al-Mulk Ražavī, as the person who authenticated and related the dream consolidated the Shāh’s association with the Shi‘i heritage. On the other hand, the inclusion of the grand Shaikhs of the Šafavid order, the ancestors of Ṭahmāsp, in the gathering of the Shi‘i Imāms reiterated the official claim to the Shi‘i origin of the Šafavid dynasty. Fazlī wrote Afoat in the period when the Šafavid state was emerging from the turbulent years of the reigns of Shāh Ismā‘īl II (r. 1576-77) and Sulṭān Muḥammad Khudābanda (r. 1577-87) when a number of political circumstances had conspired against the establishment of Twelver Shi‘ism. Shāh Ismā‘īl II’s flirtations with Sunnism had threatened to destroy the tenuous foundations of the newly established Twelver Shi‘ism. The loss of the holy Shi‘i shrine in Mashhad to the Uzbeks (1589-98) and the ātabāt in Najaf, Karbalā, and Kāẓimain to the Ottomans (1530s-1598) too questioned the ability of the Šafavid Shāhs to protect the Shi‘i heritage. Once Shāh ‘Abbās suppressed the tribal factionalism which had prevailed during the first decade of his reign, he pursued a systematic policy “to strengthen Twelver Shi‘ism as the pillar of Šafavid legitimacy”. The Shi‘i propaganda evident in this dream may therefore be viewed
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as having been influenced by Shah Ābbās’ commitment to Twelver Shi‘ism and his desire to reinforce the ruling dynasty’s commitment to Twelver Shi‘ism.

The Final Assault

Having related the dream, Fażlī continues the account of the second day of the battle of Jām. During that night a number of the troops of the left and the right flanks who had dispersed earlier that day regrouped and rejoined the royal camp by the river. By the next morning Tāhmāsp is alleged to have had a total of no more than seven thousand cavalry and infantry under his command. Three hours to sunrise on Saturday 11 Muḥarram 935 /25 September 1528 Tāhmāsp led his small army into the occupied Šafavīd camp against an army of eighty thousand Uzbeks. The Uzbeks who had believed they had attained victory, unaware of the Šafavīd resurgence, were ambushed as they lay asleep in the tents. They could not withstand the Šafavīd assault and were defeated and their commanders Ībāy’d Khān and Kuchūm Khān fled back to Transoxiana.

Afzal’s version of the events is by far the most interesting and detailed of the surviving accounts of the battle of Jām but it cannot be corroborated. Although Fażlī’s main source was Aḥsan, he nevertheless attributes his version of the battle of Jām to the following sources: Khuld Ārā which is in fact Tārīkh-i Ālam Ārā-i Ābbāsī by Iskandar Beg Munshī, Muntakhab al-Tavārīkh by Ḥasan b. Muḥammad Khākī Shīrāzī, Tārīkh-i Harat va Khurāsān by Maulānā Nujūmī Haravī and Miftāḥ al-qulūb. Of these sources only Muntakhab al-Tavārīkh and Tārīkh-i Ālam Ārā-i Ābbāsī (Khuld Ārā) have survived. Muntakhab does not corroborate Afzal’s version and there are discrepancies with Tārīkh-i Ālam Ārā.

---

160 Different copies of Khulāsa diverge on the size of the army Tāhmāsp led to victory during the second phase of the battle. The Museum of Iran Bāstān copy of Khulāṣat al-Tavārīkh, Ishrāqī’s edition, p. 184, puts the Šafavī army at more than 3000 and the copy belonging to Sa‘īd Naftī reports the troops to have numbered at no more than 3000. TAAA also agrees with Khulāṣa’s estimate of almost 3000. This comprised the troops of the centre who had remained loyal to Shah Tāhmāsp after the left and the right flanks had deserted. Afzal’s figure of 7000 clearly allows for those troops who had reassembled at the royal camp during the night by the river.

161 Afzal II. ff. 44a-45a.
Muntakhab only gives a sketchy account of the battle of Jām. It reverts to the one-day version of the battle. We are told that, on Saturday 11 Muharram 935/ 25 September 1528, the Uzbek and the Qizilbāş armies engaged in battle. At first the Qizilbāş army appeared to have been defeated but later advanced to the attack and overcame the Uzbeks. Muntakhab does not report the dream nor does it clarify the extent of the Shāh's participation in battle. According to this account, in the afternoon of the same day, the Commander-in-Chief of the Qizilbāş forces Chuha Sultān returned to camp after he had heard the news of victory and the entire royal army moved to Nishapūr where it remained for a few days before moving to Qum.162

Ṭārīkh-i 'Ālam Āra (Khuld Ārā) offers a more intricate picture than Muntakhab. Although it clearly differentiates between the early Qizilbāş defeat and their later victory, it too limits the battle to one day. The left and the right flanks were crushed and the Qizilbāş troops dispersed but the battle was far from concluded since in a dream the Infallible Imāms had told Ṭahmāsp of his imminent victory. The Shāh stood his ground with three thousand men.163 This, we are told, was due to the Shāh's firmness, courage and his sincerity of belief, and no doubt the saintly assurances he had received earlier. Ṭahmāsp then ordered his troops to attack the Uzbeks. The Shāh's tactic was to follow a chivalrous code summed up in the motto: "He who dies valiantly and routs dishonour merits a good name". The troops were ordered to fight with only swords and to strike each man but not kill him before turning to the next soldier. With divine assistance (bi hamrāhī-i junūd-i ghaybī) and as "the Perfect Spiritual Guide" had instructed, the Ṣafavid army struck the enemy. The majority of the Uzbek troops were incapacitated by their injuries and were unable to repulse the attack so they fled.164 The discrepancies between this version of

162 Muntakhab al-Tawārikh, ff. 602b - 603a.
163 Iskandar Beg Munshi here quotes Shah Ṭahmāsp who claimed that of the three thousand troops of the centre who attacked and defeated the Uzbeks, 1700 were the standing corps of royal troops (qūrchīs) and the remainder were Amirs. TAAA, p. 56.
164 TAAA. pp. 54-6.
the battle of Jām and that in Afzal are clearly evident and it is impossible to attribute Afzal’s version to Ṭārīkh-i ‘Ālam Ārā, as the author has claimed.

As has been shown, there is general consensus among the contemporary and non-contemporary sources that the battle was fought and concluded in one day. This makes it impossible to authenticate Afzal’s two-day version of the battle of Jām. This historiographical examination suggests that Fazli has used his sources selectively and has considerably embellished the evidence.

The Appraisal

Afzal al-Tavārīkh’s version of the battle of Jām appears fictitious and of little use in reconstructing the battle of Jām. But does it, nevertheless provide any insight into the nature of Ṭahmāsp’s rule? The ideological basis of Fazli’s model of kingship bestows on Shāh Ṭahmāsp a degree of power and authority which cannot be supported by the political realities of the period of the Qizilbāsh interregnum. Since Ṭahmāsp’s accession in 930/1524 at the age of ten and a half, internecine tribal factionalism and civil war had prevailed in Iran. The young Shāh exercised little or no effective political authority as the Rūmlū, Uṣṭājlū, Shāmlū and Tekkelū tribal chieftains battled over the control of the office of vicegerency (vīkālat). 165 Such was the degree of the power of the chiefs at court and the Shāh’s lack any effective personal authority that during a fight between Ḫūsain Khān Shāmlū and Chuha Sultān Tekkelū, in 937/1530 inside the royal tent, two arrows lodged themselves in Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s crown. 166 The behaviour of the Qizilbāsh during the battle of Jām is also a testimony to the weakening of the Shāh-Qizilbāsh relationship. During the early hours of the battle of Jām when the Uzbek army appeared to have overpowered the right and the left flanks of the Ṣafavid army, the same Qizilbāsh chieftains and

165 For a survey of the politics of Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s minority and the tribal factionalism and civil wars see Dickson, op. cit., esp. pp. 51-3, 64-77, 93-7, 197-201, 205-296; Roemer, The Cambridge History of Iran, vol. 6, pp. 233-50.
their tribal levies displayed little loyalty to the Shah or to the Safavid cause and fled from the battlefield. Therefore Afžal’s image of Shah Tahmāsp as the omnipotent monarch whose spiritual and political authority had cemented the Shah-Qizilbash partnership and ultimately resulted in victory at Jam cannot match up to the historical realities of his minority.

Furthermore, Fazlī’s theory of kingship, fusing the spiritual and political authority of Shah Tahmāsp, articulates the religio-political extremism which was more a characteristic of Shah Ismā’īl’s kingship than that which prevailed in the official politics of the reigns of the Shāhs Tahmāsp and ‘Abbās I. Fazlī’s view of the Shāh as the Caliph and the deputy of Hidden Imām was not only incompatible with the systematised Imāmi doctrines but was also against the principles and the official policies of Shah Tahmāsp.

To harness the centrifugal and politically destabilising extremist tendencies of the Turkoman tribes, Shah Tahmāsp pursued a policy which on the one hand suppressed the extremist Turkman tribes and, on the other, aimed at instituting an orthodox "Shi‘i hierocracy" in Iran. In 939/1532-3 in a landmark decision Shah Tahmāsp issued a farman which designated Karakī the deputy (nā‘īb) of the Hidden Imām and thus devolved on him the supreme spiritual authority during the occultation of the Imām. With this appointment Shah Tahmāsp began "the

---

168 Arjomand, "The Shadow of God", p. 133. Throughout his reign, Shah Tahmāsp suppressed religious extremism (ghuluww). In 938/1531-2 he ordered the bloody suppression of the extremist Turkman tribe of Sārūlū on account of their "irreligion" (ilḥād). In 962/1554-5, he put down another group of Sufis who proclaimed him Mahdī. In 973/1565-6, the members of an irreligious (murtad) Turkman clan were put to death or imprisoned in Alamūt. In 982/1574-5, Shah Tahmāsp massacred the Ismā‘īli community near Anjudan and imprisoned their 36th Imām, Murād, who was subsequently executed by Shah ‘Abbās. Arjomand, "Religious Extremism (GHULUWW), Sufism and Sunnism in Safavid Iran : 1501-1722" Journal of Asian History 15 (1981). pp. 5, 13. See also Falsafi, vol. 3, p. 44. Newman, on the other hand, argues that the public proclamation of Tahmāsp’s superior, implicitly divine, status never entirely ceased. He cites a coin minted in Yazd in 955/1548 which refers to Tahmāsp as al-sulṭān al-‘ādil (the just Sultān), and an inscription, in Arabic at a shrine in Īṣfahan, which describes Tahmāsp as sāḥib-i zamān (lord of the age) dated 962/1554, as examples. Newman "The Myth of Clerical Migration", pp. 94-5.
169 Arjomand, "The Shadow of God", pp. 133-4. For the translation of the text of this farman see
process of rationalisation of the structure of domination”¹⁷⁰ in accordance with the principles of Shīʿī orthodoxy. However, this process came to an abrupt end when Karaki died shortly after his appointment in 940/1533-4. The unstable reigns of Ƭaḥmāsp’ successors Shāh Ismāʿīl II (r. 984-85/1576-77) and Muḥammad Khudābanda (r. 985-95/1578-1587) too interrupted this process.

Faẓlī’s version of the battle of Jām and his underlying ideological principles of kingship may not be an accurate presentation of history but it does communicate a sense of the mythology which had been created about Shāh Ƭaḥmāsp by ‘Abbās’ reign and thus encapsulates the historical memory of its own time. As with any historical myth it served an immediate political function; it was a propaganda tool in the legitimising efforts of Shāh ʿAbbās. It is therefore appropriate to view Faẓlī’s history of the reign of Shāh Ƭaḥmāsp in this framework of royal sponsored programme of public relations of Shāh ʿAbbās’s reign. As McChesney has noted, this programme of public relations rested, partly, on the constant veneration of the Ƭaḥfīd tradition, in particular its greatest monarchs Shāh Ismāʿīl and Shāh Ƭaḥmāsp, and partly to the ineffable authority of the Imamī tradition in the lives of the people and the Shāh. Re-affirmation of these commitments took a number of forms- the use of court chronicles and poetry”.¹⁷¹ Furthermore, pious acts such as pilgrimages to the shrine of Imam Rīzā in Mashhad and the royal sponsored institution of religious endowments (vaqf) may also be seen as symbolic acts intended to reinforce the Ƭaḥfīd commitment to Shīʿī orthodoxy.¹⁷² Although Shāh Ismāʿīl was revered as the founder of the Ƭaḥfīd state, it was the reign of Shāh Ƭaḥmāsp which became the focus of mythologising the first century of Ƭaḥfīd history. His reign was

---

¹⁷¹ McChesney, op. cit., p. 182.
particularly suited to this process. Shāh Ṭahmāsp's long reign of fifty three years presented a model of stability and longevity. His piety and devotion to Shiʿi orthodoxy served to bolster Shāh ‘Abbās’ attempts at religious and political reform: that is to strengthen religious orthodoxy and ultimately to centralise the system of government.

Fazlī’s presentation of the battle of Jām certainly contains the propaganda elements outlined above, however, his notion of the Šafavid Shāh as the supreme spiritual and political authority raises several problems. Firstly, the conundrum for the scholar of Šafavid history is whether to view the royal titles such as "the Refuge of the Caliphate", "the Spiritual Guide and the Shadow of God", "The Spiritual Guide and the Qibla", "The Ka‘ba and the Qibla of the Šūfīs", and "the Progeny of the Lord of the Age", attributed here to Shāh Ṭahmāsp, as only ceremonial usages of such titles and interpret them as a nostalgic view of the past, as Babayan has asserted,¹⁷³ or to view them as the evidence of continued vitality and persistence of religious extremism as a popular legitimising principle during ‘Abbās’ reign. A second and related problem is why Fazlī, a provincial vazir in ‘Abbās’ reign and a member of an Iranian notable family with a long tradition of service in Šafavid administration, should superimpose such extremist views of kingship on the reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsp when Ḵaṣṣan Rūmlū the author of his basic source Aḥsan al-Tavārīkh and a member of the Rūmlū Qizilbāsh tribe with whom we normally associate religious extremism and who was a contemporary of Shāh Ṭahmāsp, does not articulate such views in his account of the battle of Jām.

Fazlī’s view of history was no doubt shaped by the cultural and political climate of his own time. A brief outline of the religious and political policies of Shāh ‘Abbās will suffice to highlight the prevailing official political culture. The extremist tendency to fuse the spiritual and political authority in the person of the Shāh was as

incompatible with Shâh ‘Abbâs’ official policy as it had been against Shâh Ţahmâsp’s principles. Shâh ‘Abbâs pursued Ţahmâsp’s religious policy with even greater rigour and effectiveness. His fundamental institutional reforms— that is the introduction of the ghulâm system into the central and provincial government as well as the army— was accompanied by an anti-extremist religious policy. The cornerstones of this policy were: eradication of millenarian extremism, persecution of Šûfîsîm, suppression of Sunnîsîm, and propagation of Twelver Šîîsîm. Despite this official policy, both millenarian movements and Šûfîsîm survived into the 17th century.

Although Shâh ‘Abbâs pursued an official policy to consolidate Twelver Šîîsîm, popular culture remained prone to influences from all shades of spirituality and religious tendencies.

By 1002/1593 Dervîsh Khusraw, the leader of the messianic Nuqtâvî movement founded in 800/1397 by Maḥmûd Pasîkhânî, commanded nationwide support in all Iranian cities. The Nuqtâvîs were a millenarian movement whose Mahdîstic claims alarmed the political establishment. In 1002 Dervîsh Khusraw predicted the downfall of Shâh ‘Abbâs and his replacement by a Nuqtâvî disciple who had attained unity with God. From the time of Shâh Ţahmâsp the movement had been particularly strong in Kâshân and Qazvin and many of the poets and the writers of that region supported it. Members of the provincial uymaq who had formed the traditional bastion of extremism, central and provincial government officials, a large section of the Iranian literati, and even for a period of time possibly Shâh ‘Abbâs himself supported the Nuqtâvîs. The movement particularly attracted the Iranian intellectuals. We may name Muḥammad Vuqū’î Nishâpûrî, Mîr ‘Alî Akbar Tashbihî Kâshî, Muḥammad Šûfî Āmûlî, Ḥakîm ‘Abî Ṭâbî Allah Kâshânî, ‘Abd al-Ghânî Yazdî, and the physician Maulânâ Sulaymân Sâvajî, among the literati who

174 Arjomand “Religious Extremism”. p. 3.
were Nuqtavis.\textsuperscript{177} Shāh ʿAbbās too visited the tekkiya of Dervīş Khusraw, the Nuqtavi spiritual leader, and was sworn a trustee of the order. Following the Shāh's example the majority of the Amirs and the high functionaries too visited Dervīş Khusraw and were converted to the cause by his eloquence.\textsuperscript{178} However, the heresy and political ambitions of Dervīş Khusraw were soon revealed and in 1002/1593 Shāh ʿAbbās suppressed the movement killing its leaders and a large number of disciples and supporters.

Although the Mahdistic rebellion of the Nuqtavi Dervīş Khusraw was suppressed, the millenarian/extremist spirit did not die. In 1029/1619 Sayyid Muḥammad, a member of the Shaykhavand family, claimed to be the deputy of the Hidden Imam according to one tradition, and the Mahdi himself by another tradition. Sayyid Muḥammad accused Shāh ʿAbbās of being irreligious, a tyrant and a deceiver of the people. He incited a rebellion in Gilān to overthrow heresy and injustice in Iran and to spread Shiʿism in the world by the force of his sword. Sayyid Muḥammad attracted the support of a large section the Gilānī people and his power grew so that it threatened to bring about a civil war and the secession of Gilān from the Šafavid empire. Shāh ʿAbbās, who feared for the stability of the Šafavid state, lured Sayyid Muḥammadd to Māzandarān where he was recuperating from a severe illness at the time and had him and his supports executed.\textsuperscript{179}

We also find 11 years later in 1040/1631, early in the reign of Shāh Šafi, another claimant Mahdi Dervīş Rizā threatened the political sovereignty of the Shāh. Dervīş Rizā who was a member of the Afshār uymaq "claimed to be the awaited Mahdi and made his khurūj against the Šafavī order [Zu'l Hijja 1040/July 1631]". However his rebellion was suppressed on the day of the Bloody Mab'as Massacre on 29 Rajab 1041/20 February 1632.\textsuperscript{180}

\textsuperscript{177} Ibid, p. 910.
\textsuperscript{178} Falsafi, op. cit., vols. 1 & 2, p. 736.
\textsuperscript{179} Falsafi, op. cit., vol. 3, pp. 917-18.
\textsuperscript{180} Babayan, op. cit., p. 148. For a discussion of this movement see also pp. 148-189.
Even at an official level during the reign of Shāh ʿAbbās, political dissent among the members of the Qizilbāsh was interpreted as betrayal of the Şūfī principle of loyalty to one’s perfect spiritual guide. For instance, Shāhverdi Khān, the governor of Qarājadāgh and a descendant of the old Şūfīs of Lāhījān, declared his allegiance to the Ottomans in 1001/1592-3, but later repented and claimed that he had practised taqiyya. Twenty three years later, in 1024/1615 Shāh ʿAbbās ordered an inquiry to identify those Şūfīs of Qarājadāgh who had supported Shāhverdi Khān in his defection to the Ottomans. Some had already died but the survivors, a number of Şūfīs and Khalīfahā, were sentenced and punished by death because they had betrayed their Perfect Spiritual Guide twenty three years earlier. Iskandar Beg Munshi explains that the purpose was to exclude that crowd from the circle of şūfigarī and distinguish the Şūfī from the non-Şūfī.181

The emergence of three Mahdistic rebellions within 38 years (1593-1631) and for the most part in the reign of Shah ʿAbbās points to the continued vitality of religious extremism (ghuluww) and Şūfīsm as a socio-religious force at this time. It indicates that despite the official policy of strengthening Shiʿī orthodoxy, heterodoxy continued to permeate the religious sensibilities of the population at all levels of society and remain the focus of political opposition to the Safavi rule. The ethnic composition of the disciples of these claimant Mahdis shows that messianic movements such as that of DerVīsh Khusraw and DerVīsh Rīzā drew support not only from the disaffected Turkman tribesmen but also from the Iranian (tājīk) social group.182 Rudi Matthee has discussed how coffeehouses functioned as the public arena where the Dervīshes, the Qalandars and the Mullās, engaged in public recitations.183 This public cultural arena was the meeting place of different religious influences where converts would be recruited.

182 Babayan, op. cit., p. 15.
Fażlī wrote *Afżal al-Tavārīkh* in this cultural and political milieu. He was a member of the patrician Khūzānī family and served as a provincial Vazir first in Qarabāgh and later in Kermān until he departed for India at an unknown date. As a government official in the provinces, Fażlī would have been familiar with the varied religio-political topography of Ṣafavī Iran and would have been sensitive even susceptible to influence from extremist religious and political views which were current at the time. It is likely that Fażlī's historical perspective was shaped and informed by this climate of Messianic expectation. His characterisation of Shāh Ṭahmāsp's kingship was a defence of the divine right of the Ṣafavī Shāhs and was possibly intended to be a counter offensive against the religious and political dissonance of rival Mahdis who sought to usurp the traditional role of the Ṣafavī Shāh as the spiritual guide. It could be argue that Fażlī's repeated references to Shāh Ṭahmāsp and his relationship with the Qizilbāš in "Ṣūfiesque ghulāt" terms represents a Ṣūfī perspective of kingship and that despite Shāh 'Abbās' ruthless suppression of heterodoxy, the tension existing between extremism and Ṣūfism on the one hand and Shiʿī orthodoxy on the other was far from resolved. The struggle between heterodoxy and orthodoxy was an evolutionary process which did not conclude until the end of the 17th century. Viewed in this light, *Afżal al-Tavārīkh* may shed some light over the evolution of the Ṣafavid kingship during the reign of Shāh 'Abbās.

To sum up, as has been demonstrated here, for his narrative of the battle of Jam, Fażlī has used *Aḥsan al-Tavārīkh*, the chronicle most contemporary with the reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsp, as his basic source. He has copied *Aḥsan*’s narrative structure and literary embellishments but has altered his religious and political interpretation of this important military and political event of the minority of Shāh Ṭahmāsp. *Afżal al-Tavarikh*’s version of the battle of Jam can not be corroborated, even when the author attributes his version to specific sources. It does not help us
reconstruct the battle of Jām but it helps shed light on the persistence of religious extremism during the reigns of Shāh ʿAbbās I.

The Conclusion: An appraisal of the three case studies

The three case studies examined above explored the author Fażlī ʿĪsfāhānī's distinctive historical interpretation and his methodology. The case study concerning the Poet Laureate Mirzā Qāsim Junābādi highlighted the uniqueness of Afzal al-Tavarikh as a depository of rare official ʿṢafavid documents. It also pointed out that Fażlī's idealised interpretation of the relationship existing between Shāh Tāhmāsp and the Poet Laureate could not be corroborated. The case study concerning Mīr ʿAbd al-Vahhāb Tabrīzī examined all the available evidence and cast serious doubt on Fażlī's assertion that Mīr ʿAbd al-Vahhāb adhered to the ʿṢafavid religious ideology and engaged in covert missionary activities in the Ottoman empire. The historiographical examination of the battle of Jām illustrated Fażlī's historical methodology, especially his use of the sources. Moreover, it explored the ideological basis which underpinned Fażlī's historical interpretation of the events. This study showed the extent to which Fażlī's ideological bias determined the structure of his narrative and dictated his use of literary and historiographical devices such as dream episodes.

Although the three case studies are independent of each other when viewed collectively and critically they yield a similar pattern, that is the author's tendency to suppress inconvenient truths and to gloss over fractures in the reign of Shāh Tāhmāsp. It is therefore possible to assert that Afzal al-Tavarikh represents an attempt by Fażlī to re-write the history of the reign of Shāh Tāhmāsp in conformity with the contemporary political and cultural climate of his own time. In the process historical realities were distorted in order to create a myth.
Chapter 3. The Translation of Aفزل al-Tavārīkh

[Folio 2]......1 Shāh Ismā‘īl II and the death of that courageous Pādishāh and the reign of Shāh Sulṭān Muḥammad Khudābanda, and the [events] of twelve years of the government will be written2. The eloquent [writer] endeavours to commemorate the prosperous life of the peerless sovereign, the undisputed king of the universe who is worthy of the auspicious throne, the devoted follower of amir al-mu’minin Ḥaydar, the propagator of Twelver Shi’ism, the Sulṭān of the land and the seas, the heir of the apostle of God fearing people, a pure and chaste son, the servant of the Infallible Imāms, Shāh ‘Abbās Pādishāh al-Ṣafavī al-Mūsavi al-Ḥusainī. The purpose of these preliminary works and the writing of these histories is to celebrate the unique life of that victorious [king] of all kings of the age which, should life permit, will include the life and the account of victories of that all powerful [monarch].

The commemoration of the accession of His Majesty Shāh Ṭahmāsp to the felicitous throne of Iran and the appointment of the pillars of the state, and of Mirzā Qāsim to the position of Poet Laureate.

According to the extended history whose authors and titles have been recorded in the preface of the first volume (jild) of Afżal al-Tavārīkh and what the author of these confused lines (rāqim-i suṭūr-i birāšt-i parishān) has ascertained from reliable witnesses who lived through that time, after the death of the late Shāh Ismā‘īl the warrior of the faith, whose abode is with ‘Alī, which happened in Manqūţāy district of Sarāb in Āzarbāyjān, his chaste spirit flew with ‘Alī. On the morning of Monday 19th Rajab 930 A.H.3 which coincides with the Turkish year of the snake (yīlān 71) 4

1 According to the British Library pagination folio 1 is missing and the manuscript begins with folio 2.
2 Due to the missing folio 1 this sentence is incomplete.
3 A conservation tape covers the margin of this folio and partially conceals the starting word of each sentence; it is therefore uncertain whether the author gives the year 930 A.H. or 931 A.H. for the accession of Shah Ṭahmāsp. Also see the commentary "The Date of Ismā‘īl’s death and the accession of Shah Ṭahmāsp".
4 See the commentary "Date of Shāh Ismā‘īl’s death.....".
when the hour was most propitious, the pillars of the state, the nobles and the sincere Şūfis gathered. [On that morning] the progeny of the dynasty and the eldest of Shāh Ismā'īl's children His Majesty Shāh Ṭahmāsp the Padishāh the warrior of the faith, who on that date was ten years and six months and seven days old, ascended the throne of the kingdom of Iran. [3a] [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] was born on the morning of Wednesday 3rd Zul-hijja al-ḥarām 919 A.H. to the daughter of Sulṭān Murād the grandson of the pious Ḥasan Padishāh Turkoman (pādis̄hāh-i sharʿ-šuṭār) in Shāh Ābād district of Iṣfahān. In readiness to serve the fortunate Prince, all the court's servants and well-meaning and sincere devotees stood in their place as was customary from the time of Shāh Ismā'īl and performed their appointed duties.

The military princes stood before the Throne like the kings of chess.

The wise Şadrs sat in the assembly like flowers crowning a meadow.

To mark the date of accession of that fortunate Padishāh, eloquent poets and preachers composed this verse:

Date, By divine favour, you Ṭahmāsp the king of the world
succeeded the Shāh, the warrior of the faith, to the golden
throne.

You replaced your father and captured the world.

"You replaced your father" became the date.6

"The King of Religion" "Khusraw- i din", its date is "khusraw- i din".7 To mark Shāh Ṭahmāsp's accession to the auspicious throne, it was decided 8 to produce an inscribed royal signet-ring. The year 930/1523-49 was calculated as the year of

5 Reading is uncertain.
6 "jāy i pedar girify" is the chronogram. Above this and inserted between two lines is the number "93". It is not clear this is intended to be 930 or 931. See the commentary: The date of Shāh Ismā'īl's death....".
7 "Khusraw- i din" is another chronogram which yields the date 930 A.H.
8 Reading is uncertain.
9 The text gives the date 931 A.H. which is an error. See the commentary "The date of Shah
accession. This aroused great excitement and it was ordained that in the presence of the most sacred [Shāh], calligraphers should inscribe the (ṣaʿf) of the royal signet-ring on a precious carnelian and arrange this couplet on its border:

"If your benevolence guides us, fortune will obey".

The powerful khāns, the gallant vazirs, the exalted amirs, the high ranking āqāyān, the centurions (yuzbāshīyān), the standing corps of royal troops (qūrchāyān), the Ṣūfis, the civil functionaries (arbāb-i qalam), the grand mayors (kalāntarān), the landlords (arbāb) and the subjects of the God-protected dominions who were present strewed gold and silver over the victorious throne and received royal favours. [3b] The governor-generals (beglarbāqān), the Amirs, and the servants who were not present received honorific gifts (tashrīfāt) together with the joyous news of the accession. They sent alms (taṣaduq) and gifts to court.

The Grand Vazir (Ftimād al-daula) Khvāja Jalāl al-Dīn Muhammad Tabrīzī who by the order of His Highness Shāh Ismāʿīl, whose abode is with ʿAlī, had been appointed the Vazir of the august dominions presented the most eloquent Qāsim Junābādī Khurāsānī at court. [Qāsim Junābādī] who had versified the victories and battles of Shāh Ismāʿīl received the honour of kissing the Shāh's feet. He had brought a poem which he recited. ........ he was rewarded with a suyurghāl. These few couplets are from the poems of that virtuous sayyid.14

---

10 The text reads: "the jewellers who have a good pen".

11 It is not possible to define the term āqāyān too precisely as their function within the palace or the system of administration remains obscure. Minorsky suggests āqā usually means a eunuch but it may also have a broader use meaning a "class of gentlemen", TM, pp. 47, 118, also considers ushers to be the sons of āqāyān. According to Minorsky they formed a class of gentlemen having a rank inferior to the amirs, muqarrabs, yasiīvuls and eshik-āqāsīs (ushers). Due to such ambiguities, the term āqāyān will not be translated.

12 A tape covers the margin of this folio too. Although some of the text is not in view it is possible to guess the meaning.

13 The text is damaged and this sentence is not fully legible.

14 The text is damaged and illegible in parts. For a summary translation of this poem see chapter 2, Afsal al-Tavārīkh and Mirza Qāsim Junābādī". 
After hearing his recitation, [Sháh Táhmasp] appointed Mírzá Qásim the Poet Laureate. [4a] The secretaries (munsháin) were ordered to write the farman of appointment of the Poet Laureate in his name and enter it in the register.

The Farman of Appointment of Mírzá Qásim as the Poet Laureate. 15

...... we have appointed him as the Poet Laureate so that just as he versified the account of the battles and victories of my father, whose abode is with CAli, with divine favour [Mírzá Qásim] should turn into verse the events of our eternal reign from day to day, and thus leave a token of remembrance on the face of the world. And every year from the aforementioned districts 16 (maḥáli mazkúra-i iimn) the sum of sixteen tumáns and 2342 Khuráshí dinárs17 which is registered in the book of standing enactment (daftar-i khulúd) should be granted to him as suyurgháil and subsidies (madad-i maʿásh) so that he may pray for the continuity of [our] eternal reign. The men of genius and perceptive men should obey the said Mírzá and should consider their obedience of him a requisite of orderly affairs and the good of the country. They should not neglect to pay respect to that exalted and enchanting orator who is universally praised for his eloquence and whose rules of poetry adorn every diwan, ranging from the scholarly to the novice. The exalted vazirs, the grandees, the men of learning, the mayors (kalántarán), the landlords, the subjects, and the natives of the God-protected dominions should esteem him as the companion of the special assembly.18 They should show him utmost respect and kindness. 19

The document (parvânça) has received the royal seal so let them honour it.

---

15 Unfortunately the text of this rare farman is damaged and in some parts it is barely legible.
16 It appears that the districts are not listed in the main text of the farman. See also chapter 2. "Afzal al-Táviríkh and Mírzá Qásim Junábadí".
17 The reading of "thousand" is uncertain.
18 This sentence is not fully legible. The translation is therefore an abridged version.
19 The next sentence is not fully legible but it is clearly a reference to the duties and obligations of the landlords and the subjects residing in the districts revenues of which had been granted to Mírzá Qásim as suyurgháil. It affirms the taxes (mál va jihád) payable to Mírzá Qásim.
Five months before the death of Shah Isma'īl, Chāyān Sultan Ustâjūlû, the Vicegerent (vakīl) and Commander-in-Chief of the Qizilbash forces died and by royal decree (ḥasab al-amr- i ʿalā) Div Sultan Rūmlu was appointed to share the office of Vicegerent and the administration of the affairs of the august empire with Muṣṭafā Sultan, known as Köpek Sultan. They both sealed the royal decrees (farāmin- i muṭāʾa). Mir Qavām al-Dīn Naqīb Iṣfahānī joined Mir Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Āstārabādī in the illustrious office of ṣadārat and together they administered the affairs pertaining to the religious law (sharīʿa). On Tuesday the 20th Rajab/24 May which was the second day of the accession, [Shah Ṭahmāsp] left the Manqūṭa district of Sarāb for the capital Tabriz which was the seat of throne of the Emperors (khavāqīn) of Iran. The exalted sayyids and the most honoured notables of Tabriz with the entire residents decorated the city and the market (bāzār) and competed with each other in welcoming the Pādīshāh, the refuge of mankind. They lined the road to the mosque of Īṣān Pādīshāh, which is more than one farsakh, with ? of Rūm, Damascus satin, Frankish velvet, and Iraqī cloth. They congratulated the felicitous accession and recited this verse. 

[5a] On his way His Highness the Shadow of God went to the mosque of Īṣān Pādīshāh to circumambulate the tomb of that Shiʿī Pādīshāh and to pray. [Shah Ṭahmāsp] read the sermon (khutba) of the Pādīshāh of Islam. His Highness the

---

20 For a biography of Div Sultan Rūmlu see the commentary.
21 For a discussion of these appointments see the commentary.
22 For a brief discussion of Shah Ṭahmāsp's coronation see the commentary.
23 Reading uncertain.
24 This part of the text is damaged and the verse is not fully legible but it seems to be a panegyric celebrating the reign of Shah Ṭahmāsp as the chief of all sovereigns under whose shadow the sun rested.
25 This important part of the text is damaged and reading is uncertain but it appears to be a reference to the religious proclivities of Ḥasan Pādīshāh. It is likely that Fazlī alludes to the Shiʿism of the Aq-Quyunlū. A note in the margin written in a different hand, possibly by a later owner and critical reader of the chronicle, confirms this: "Praise be to God, the author of this book reproaches the Sunnis everywhere but here because Ḥasan Pādīshāh is the maternal forefather of the Safavīs, he calls him a Shiʿī. Otherwise it is known to historians that at the time of Ḥasan Pādīshāh and his children, the Shiʿī religion was not .... and they were Sunnī."
26 This sentence is an abridged translation.
Seat of Caliphate the Shadow of God was blessed with divine favour and left the mosque. [He] embarked upon territorial expansion and destruction of the enemies with divine assistance, he distributed much alms among the poor and the needy and set off for the royal palace (daulat khāna- i khāṣṣ). [Shāh Ţahmāsp] excelled in command of the army and administration of the government. The sagacity of that heir to the throne of the Messenger of God (vārith- i masnad- i rasūl- i raba al-‘ālamin) astonished the experienced officials. [Shāh Ţahmāsp] camped in Tabriz for winter. [He] attended to the affairs of the government and waited to see from which direction the opponents and the pretenders to the hereditary land would attempt to attack and usurp the kingdom in the aftermath of the death of Shāh Ismā‘īl Abū’l-Bāqī the divine spirit (rūḥ Allāh- i ruḥa).

The account of ʿUbayd Khān's first attack on the citadel of Harat and his defeat at the hand of Sām Mirzā.

When His Highness Shāh Ismā‘īl, whose abode is with ʿAlī, was alive, [5b] ʿUbayd Khān b. Mahmūd Khān Uzbek repeatedly desired to conquer Khurāsān and attacked the citadel of Harat but returned unsuccessful. At this time before the news of Šāh Ismā‘īl’s death and the accession of Shāh Ťahmāsp had yet reached him, he crossed the Oxus river with the intention of capturing Khurāsān.

Anxious about the [Uzbek] crossing, the people of Khurāsān took refuge in the citadel of Harat and at the foot of the mountains and fortified places. ʿUbayd Khān with the hostile Chingizīd and Uzbek Khāns were determined to capture the citadel of Harat and Khurāsān. Upon receiving the news of the Uzbek approach, Timūr Oğlu, Ḫusain Beg, Khvāja Ḥabīb Allāh, and the courageous warriors of the faith (ghāziyān) gathered in the house of Durmīsh Khān, the Commander-in-Chief of the army for consultation. Durmīsh Khān had as yet received neither the robe of honour from His Highness Shāh Ťahmāsp warrior of the faith, may he rest in paradise, nor the decree of his appointment as the governor-general of Khurāsān and tutor (lala-gī) of the judicious Prince Sām Mirzā. [They] blockaded all the exits of the citadel to its
inhabitants and set about strengthening the fortifications and organising the army. Khvāja Ḥabīb Allāh Sāvājī, the Vazir of Durmīsh Khān, in whose name Khvānd Amir the master author has written Ḥabīb al-siyār, took control of the Fīrūzābād gate. Timūr Oğlu trusted in the unequalled good fortune of the Pādīshāh, the refuge of the people, and guarded the Iraq gate. It was decided that Ḥusain Beg, the Khān’s brother, should fortify the Malik gate and call for a show of courage. Khvānd Durmīsh Khān with an entourage remained in the service of the Prince of the world Sām Mirzā and organised aid to the different parts of the citadel and the gates. Each of the notables of Harat, the landlords, the notables and the subjects of Khurāsān who had taken refuge in the citadel, were assigned a task and every tribe (qaum) was appointed to assist a group. They were preparing to defend the citadel as the Uzbeks camped at the foot of the fortress.

At this time ʿAlī... the royal Qūrchī (qūrchī-i khāss-i sharīfa), arrived with the robe of honour for Durmīsh Khān, the refuge of government (viyālat-panāḥ), and the Amirs of Harat. He also delivered the letter which His Highness, may he rest in paradise, had written to the fortunate brother Sām Mirzā containing the decree of appointment of Durmīsh Khān as the governor-general of Khurāsān and tutor of the young Prince. The Sūfīs were saddened by the death of Shāh Ismāʿīl the Shīʿī Pādīshāh and believed this terrible event to have emboldened the Uzbek army. However, they were comforted by the divine favour which had adorned the world-conquering throne with His Highness, may he rest in paradise. They praised God, read the sermon of the accession of His Highness, the refuge of the Caliphate, and

---

27 The citadel of Harat had five gates: Fīrūzābād gate (south), Iraq gate (west), Malik and Qipchāq gates (north), Khūsh or Khūshk gate (east), Robert D. McChesney, "The conquest of Herat 995-61/1587-8: Sources for the study of Safavid/Qizilbash-Shibamid/Uzbek relations" in Jean Calmard (ed.) Etudes Safavides, (Paris, 1993), pp. 84-5.

28 Reading is uncertain.

29 The term "qaum" usually means "an ethnic group" or tribe. This leads me to translate it into "tribe". However, it should be noted that the author rarely uses this term especially in reference to the Qizilbash tribes who are usually described as "people".

30 The text is damaged and the full name of the Qurchi is not legible.

31 "had written" is crossed out in the MS.
sounded the drum announcing the joyful tidings. An envoy was sent to Majān\textsuperscript{32} to bring back to the citadel a group of agitators (āshūb-talabān) who were in every district, with enough provisions before the Uzbek army reached the foot of the citadel. The provisions were sufficient to supply the citadel in the event that reinforcements did not arrive. In one week they fortified the fortress, and relying on the felicity of the young Sayyid Pādishāh they mustered the courage and manliness they needed for war. The qūrchī did not stay at the citadel for more than a day and was swiftly despatched to court [6b] with petitions to seek reinforcement...\textsuperscript{33}

As soon as ʿUbayd Khān received the news of the death of Shāh Ismāʿīl and the accession of His Highness, may he rest in paradise, he assumed the possession of the province of Khurāsān and divided it among the Chingīzī and Uzbek Sulṭāns and encircled the citadel of Harat. Kuchum Khān with the army of Turkistān camped in the suburb (qariyya) of Shāymānā\textsuperscript{34} and ʿUbayd Khān and the Uzbeks took position in the garden of Āhū. Sevinjūk Sulṭān, the son of Shaybak Khān, camped in the Murād garden and Abū Saʿīd Sulṭān in the suburb of Marān.\textsuperscript{35}

That army encircled Harāt [Harat] like the halo surrounding the moon.

After the Uzbek army set up camp, as has been related, and resolved to capture the citadel, ʿUbayd Khān's officers attacked the gate of Firūzābād with full force and war ensued. Khvāja Ḥabīb Allāh with the commanders (sardārān) who controlled the Firūzābād gate took position in the tower and encénte (burj va bāra) and opened musket fire on [the Uzbeks] and thus inflamed the fire of the battle. With cannon and musket fire (tūp va tufang) they defeated the Uzbeks who returned to their camp.

The next day ʿUbayd Khān himself mounted his horse and attacked the barricades

\textsuperscript{32} Reading is uncertain. It may be Majvan, probably a clerical error for Majān. Majān was a western suburb of Merv in early medieval times. Le Strange p. 403.

\textsuperscript{33} The text is damaged and illegible at this point.

\textsuperscript{34} In Aḥsan, p. 185, it is "šāmīyānā".

\textsuperscript{35} The reading is uncertain. In his thesis, Dickson, p. 59, writes "the village of Farzān", but he does not cite his source.
(kūcha band). A courageous battle ensued and arrows, cannon and muskets were fired from the direction of the citadel. The Uzbeks fought with arrows, mace and swords. In the twinkle of an eye, the lightening of destiny consumed the life of many brave warriors (abtāl) and grandees.

The army of Tūrān had repeatedly attempted to capture the citadel of Harat and had [7a] fought the brave Qizībāsh but with no success. So Kuchum Khān who was the Pādishāh of Turkistān wrote a decree to Durmīsh Khān stating that the death of Shāh Ismā’īl had occurred by divine will and that His Highness Shāh Ṭahmāsp at the age of ten would be unable to overcome the exalted Pādishāh of Rūm and the Sultāns of ......... and other opponents. If that Grand Vazir surrendered to the officers of ʿUbayd Khān who were a formidable enemy, resolved their differences and surrendered the keys of the castle, his life would be valued and he would become a humble servant of the exalted dynasty. He would be granted any of the kingdoms of Tūrān and Turkistān that he desired and would be enlisted in the ranks of the noble Amirs. Otherwise, after the capture of the citadel of Harat, he would be held responsible for the murder, plunder and captivity which would befall the army and the subjects of Khurāsān. When Kuchum Khān Chingīzī’s worthless letter reached Durmīsh Khān Shāmlū it was brought to the attention of the judicious and honourable Prince Sām Mirzā. The fortunate Prince ordered the eloquent secretaries to write a letter (nishān) to Kuchum Khān.

It wrote:

The most noble of the Khāns the exalted Kuchum Khān Chingīzī who, by divine will, should know that what you had written to that most eminent of Amirs and the fortunate tutor Durmīsh Khān, he delivered to us. It is indeed not worthy of the intellect of that refuge of kingship [Kuchum Khān] who despite having witnessed my

36 The text is damaged and parts of this sentence are not legible, so the translation is a summarised version.
37 The text is illegible but it may be a reference to the Sultāns of “Tūrān”.
38 See the commentary.
father's many battles and victories and remembers the defeat and the utter ruin of that absurd and conceited Shaybak Khān, imagines His Highness Shāh Ṭahmāsp, who is the greatest distributor of justice and is a progeny of the dynasty of Zahra and Ḥaydar, to be a child. And he [Kuchum Khān] is impervious to the unequalled felicity of [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] who before God is entrusted with the propagation of the true religion of the Infallible Imāms. And he [Kuchum Khān] has perceived my tutor Durmish Khān, the refuge of satānat, to be as ungrateful as the quarrelsome and the worldly-minded Amirs of Tūrān. He [Kuchum Khān] does not know that by virtue of the loyalty (ikhlāṣ) and the Sūfī probity (ṣūfi qarī) of his ancestors he [Durmish Khān] is blessed by the love of the exalted Ṣafavī dynasty. He is the envy of the Sulṭāns of Turkistān and has complete authority over the province of Khurāsān and prefers servitude to this dynasty to sovereignty of Tūrān. Should our advice be heeded then it is in your best interest to return to your own kingdoms before the victorious Qizilbash army arrives and thus not be deceived by the false words of this ‘Ubayd Khān and not cause the killing of many Muslims on both sides who have uttered the sacred words "There is no God but Allah and Muhammad is his messenger". The besieged of this citadel who number twelve thousand warriors keenly await war and glory and have sufficient supplies for the defence of the citadel for one year whereas the [Uzbek] army can not maintain the siege for more than a month. You should take whatever action would be advantageous to your army and be in no doubt as to the superiority of the Qizilbash army.

vasalām

For several days they [Uzbeks] endeavoured to capture the citadel but had no success, and there appeared no hope of a breakthrough so when the Khāns of that

---

39 This is a reference to Shāh Ismā‘īl to whom Fazlī gives these titles "navvāb-i ghurfān-panāh-i rizvān dastgāh, ‘Ali āshīyānī Shāh bābā-am" (My father who has taken refuge in divine compassion and whose abode is in Paradise with ‘Ali).
40 The text is not legible and not all the royal titles can be deciphered.
41 At this point the text is damaged and illegible and the translation is an abridged version.
42 Reading is uncertain.
kingdom read the guiding (murshidāna) letter of the eminent Prince Sām Mīrzā, they felt more dispirited. They stormed the city wall (hiṣār) and once they had reached the turret (kangara) with much labour, they saw not a single settlement within twenty farsakh\(^43\) of the citadel. The people of Khurāsān would not bring even a man\(^44\) of supplies to their camp and their provisions would be even more scarce in a few days. So they resolved to fight. The Uzbek army consented, besought God for assistance and fearlessly stormed the citadel of Harat. The courageous young [fighters] in the citadel bravely fought the Uzbeks and averted their victory. Like the spring cloud their ferocious sword rained on the flames of rage of the Uzbek army and extinguished their fire. Their determination and ferocity disheartened [the Uzbeks]. Large numbers from both sides fell to the arrows, cannon and musket fire. The sound of victory echoed in the ears of the rancorous Uzbeks and they returned to their camp to consider their tactics.

The next day Durmish Khān with a group of esteemed companions and gallant [soldiers] ascended the tower of Mīrzā Sultān Ahmad which was adjacent to the Murād garden.\(^45\) He sent a company under the command of Iṣās \(^46\) Beg known as Qarā Ishīk, an officer on his staff, to the Murād garden for a display of valour. The united troops came upon the Uzbek guards (pāsbanān) in the White garden (Bāgh-i Safid) and a great battle ensued.

[8b] The bloodthirsty and quarrelsome Uzbeks were defeated and fled. Qarā Ishīk and the company passed through the White garden and reached the Murād garden. A

---

\(^43\) The length of farsakh is a equal to 6.24 kilometres. Lambton suggests that it tends to be used to express the distance which can be covered on foot or by a mule in an hour. Ann K.S. Lambton, Persian Grammar, (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1989). p. 259, note 1.

\(^44\) A "man" is a weight which varied according to local customs. For example a Tabriz man (man-i Tabriz) weighs 6.5464 lb.

\(^45\) The Murād garden was situated a short distance from the city walls of Harat and was separated from it by the smaller White garden. It is not clear what Fāzī means by locating the tower of Mīrzā Sultān Ahmad as adjacent to the Murād garden. This description links the city walls to the garden. See McChesney, "The conquest of Herat", op. cit., pp. 84-5; Maria Zuppe, "Les Residences Princières de Herat" in Jean Calmard (ed.), Etudes Safavides, (Paris, 1993), pp. 271, 272-76.

\(^46\) The reading of the name is uncertain. Iran dar ruzigār-i ..., p. 231, identifies him as Muḥammad Beg known as Qarā Ishīk, the chief of the Qurchis (qurchi-bāshī) of Durmish Khān.
brave Shāmlū broke the gate with the force of a mace and entered the garden. As it happened ‘Ubayd Khān was talking to Sevinjūk Muḥammad Sulṭān when a number of anxious Uzbeks hurriedly ran towards them and delivered the news of the Qizlibāsh entry. Fearing for his life, Sevinjūk Sulṭān fell in a stream of water and ‘Ubayd Khān fled through an opening in the wall and rode to his troops. The warriors (ghāziyān) overcame the [Uzbeks], returned to the citadel and sounded the kettledrums. The Uzbeks were unable to stay so they retreated, lifting the siege of the citadel, and returned to Tūrān. The illustrious guardians of the citadel requested His Highness the valiant Prince for permission to pursue the Uzbek army but the progeny of the dynasty of humanity and benevolence did not permit the pursuit of the defeated army as this was against the custom of the victorious dynasty. [Sām Mirzā] ordered the gates of the citadel to be opened and the letters of victory to be despatched to the districts (vilāyāt) of Khurāsān, and attempted to capture the minds and hearts of the poor and the farmers (mazārīn). [Sām Mirzā] wrote a loyal and sincere petition (‘arīza- i ikhlās āīn) to his reigning elder brother His Majesty Shāh Tāhmāsp Ghāzī. Qarā Ishīk Shāmlū delivered the petition which besought [the Shāh] to bestow favours upon the felicitous tutor (lala) Dūrmīsh Khān, the wise counsellor Khvāja Ḥabīb Allāh Sāvaji, the devoted Amirs and the courageous Sūfis. The Prince's petition reached the Pādishāh, the refuge of mankind, at the end of winter in the capital city of Tabriz. [Shāh Tāhmāsp] was delighted by the news of this victory and considered it as a harbinger of growing power and felicity (daulat) [of the state].47 [Shāh Tāhmāsp] sent an excellent horse with a [9a] precious jewel studded saddle, some cloth from Rum and Irāq, a bejewelled scabbard, which had belonged to the enemy-destroying Shāh Ismā'īl, whose abode is with ‘Alī, and one of his own worn garments, to his fortunate brother Sām Mirzā. Dūrmīsh Khān the Commander-in-Chief, Khvāja Ḥabīb Allāh, the Amirs, and the devoted followers (mukhlīṣān) who had distinguished themselves in service, received honorific gifts

47 At this point the text is damaged and the reading is uncertain.
and favours. Again the decree confirming the appointment of Durmish Khan as the
governor-general of Khurāsān was issued and he was also rewarded with the grant
(*inšām*) of the taxes (*māl va jihāt*) of the district (*ulkā*) of Qāzin which formed part
of the royal demesne (*khāṣṣ-i sharīf*).48

[Shāh Ṭahmāsp] engaged in pleasure with peace of mind and wrote letters of victory
to the august dominions informing the devoted followers (*mukhlīsān*) of the victory
which had been achieved by divine assistance and the good fortune of His Majesty at
the beginning of the august reign. [His Majesty] enlisted Qarā Ishīk in the rank of
the personal royal attendants (*dar silk-i bandīqān-i khāṣṣ-i sharīf*), granted him the
title of Sulṭān and assigned to him the fief (*tiyūl*) of the district of (*ulkā*) of Tabas.

The account of the burning of the Grand Vazir Khvāja Jalāl al-Dīn
Muḥammad, the appointment of Qāzī Jahān to the august office of
Vizārat, and the appointment of Dervīsh Muḥammad Khān to the
government of Shakki.

At the time of Shāh Ismāʿīl, enmity had developed between His Excellency the Pillar
of the State Dīv Sulṭān Rūmīlū and the Grand Vazir Khvāja Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad
Tabrizī. Such enmity and hostility is one characteristic of the relationships between
the office holders (*mutiṣādiyān*) in the state administration (*dīvān*). Now Dīv Sulṭān,
who had gained absolute authority, sought to unveil the deeds of that wise counsellor
of Iran. He disclosed many of his treacheries and wrongdoings to the Just Pādīshāh
and thus instigated the murder of that able minister. Many people were vexed by the
wrongdoing and the crimes that the Khvāja had committed during the reign of Shāh
Ismāʿīl, and consequently spoke against him. [9b] The just and righteous Pādīshāh
was troubled by his behaviour and ordered that able minister whose life had been
safe until that day, to be burnt alive. [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] entrusted him to ...... 49 It was
ordained that the inhabitants of Tabriz should burn Khvāja's body, who himself was

48 For Qāzin see the commentary.
49 The text is damaged and illegible at this point.
a native of Tabriz, in the fire of his own perfidy in the Şāḥibābād square. This was to be a lesson to the impious impostors. After they heard the charge of treachery brought against Khvāja the notables of the capital city of Tabriz, who are all devoted Sūfis, gathered and burnt the body of that slanderer in the flames of royal anger and scattered his ashes to the wind of selfishness. The pure earth then turned to the sky and supplicated the blessing of divine compassion for infinite clouds of rain to wash the earth where the Khvāja's bones had been burnt and to cleanse the air which had scattered his ashes. After the death of the impious Khvāja it began to rain. This cleansed the world from his existence to the astonishment of the people. There had existed an intimate friendship between Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain Iṣfahānī the Vicegerent (vakīl) of Shāh Ismā'īl and Khvāja Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad. When Khvāja Jalāl al-Dīn heard that Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain had been murdered at the hands of Mihtar Shāh Ḥuli, as has been recorded in the first volume of Afzal al-Tavārikh, Khvāja by divine inspiration uttered this quatrain in lamentation. Elegy (marthiyya):

O the world-enlightening light of my two eyes
You left and darkened my days as night.
As if you and I were two candles
The times killed you and I burn.

And in the midst of the fire which had enveloped him, he uttered this verse:

I made home in the abode of calamity and I caught fire
As he who nestles in the land of evil does, like me.

[10a] After Khvāja's body was burnt Qāzī Jahān Sayfī Qazvīnī who is one of the exalted sayyids of.... was considered worthy of the robe of Vizārat, and was appointed the Vazir of the august dominions and received worthy favours.

---

50 This sentence has been recorded in the margin of the folio as a note. Although it is partially covered by a tape, it is possible to convey the meaning of the sentence.
51 The text is damaged and this word is illegible. However, as his name implies, Qāzī Jahān was one of the sayyids of Qazvin.
The news of the death of Qāsim Khān the frontier Amir (vālī) of Dasht- i Qipchāq who was a descendant of Jūjī Khān and was a brave Pādishāh, reached His Majesty the Emperor of the World (khāqān- i jahān) in this winter camp. Shaykh Shāh b. Farrukh Yasār, the frontier amir (vālī) of Shīrvān, succumbed to the call of God and two months after the death of Shāh Ismā‘īl, he too died. His son Sulṭān Khālid ascended the throne of Anūshīrvān and declared his allegiance [to Shāh Ţahmāsp] and sent worthy gifts (pīshkīsh) to the Seat of the Caliphate. His Majesty, may he rest in paradise, assigned Mīrzā ‘Atā Allāh Khūzānī ʻIsfahānī, who at the time of Shāh Ismā‘īl oversaw and administered the affairs of the private establishment of His Majesty (nāzīr va ṣāḥīb- i nasaq- i muhimāt- i sarkār- i ḥaẓrat- i ʻafliā),52 to take the robe of honour to the kingdom of Shīrvān with many precious fabrics for his chaste sister who was married to Sulṭān Khālid and thus honoured them.

His Majesty received the news that after the death of Shāh Ismā‘īl, Lavand Khān the governor (vālī) of Kākht, due to the enmity that existed between him and Ḫūsain Beg the governor of Shakkī, had invaded Shakkī and had killed Ḫūsain Beg. But he did not have the power to capture Shakkī and returned to Georgia. Ḫūsain Khān’s officers appointed his son Dervīsh Muḥammad Beg the governor of the province of Shakkī and reported it to the seat of the throne of the Caliphate. By royal command the robe of honour of governorship with the decree (fārmān- i qaẓā jaryān) in the name of Dervīsh Muḥammad Khān were despatched [to Shakkī].

[Shāh Ţahmāsp] spent the winter in Shahibābād53 district of Tabrīz, engaged in leisure and rest and endeavoured to conciliate the hearts of the friends, devotees, the subjects, the infirm and the weak.

The List of Contents (fihrist). The years of the reign of His Majesty Shāh Ţahmāsp Ghāzī, may he rest in paradise, [10b] and an account of his wars and victories from the year of the Horse (yunt īl), 931/1524-5 which was the first Naurūz of his

52 It is not possible to arrive at a precise definition of this office. Minorsky does not identify such a department in TM.
53 Reading is uncertain.
accession to the year of the Pig (tangūz īl), 984/1576-7 and the narrative of the death of that progeny of the dynasty of the peerless Prophet. The account of the accession of Shāh Ismā'īl II, may he rest in paradise.

The year of the Horse (yūnt īl), 931/1524-5. The appointment of Mirzā ʿAṭā Allāh ʿIsfahānī as Vazir of Āzarbāyjān, Shirvān and Shākki. The burning of Maulānā Ibrāhīm Munshī and appointment of Mirzā Kāfi Ṭūsī as Secretary (munshī). The development of enmity between Dīv Sultān Rūmlū and Köpek Sultān Ustājlū over the office of Vicegerency (vikālat). Köpek Sultān was sent to Georgia. The dismissal of the Grand Vazir (vizārat-i dīvān āʿlā) Qāẕī Jahān and the transfer of that exalted office to Mīr Jaʿfar Sāvaji. Chūha Sultān shared the office of Vicegerency with Dīv Sultān. The arrival of Mīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn ʿAlāʾ al-Mansūr Shīrāzī at the exalted threshold. Ibrāhīm Khān, the frontier governor (vālī) of Lār, paid homage. The death of Durmīsh Khān, the governor-general of Khurāsān and transfer of that office to his brother ʿHusain Khān. Winter camp at Qarābāgh. The deaths of the Sadr Mīr Jamāl al-Dīn, Mīr Muḥsin Ražāvī Qumī and Maulānā Hilālī.

The year of the Sheep (qūy īl), 932/1525-6. The war between Dīv Sultān and Köpek Sultān and the defeat of Köpek Sultān. The murder of Khvāja Ḥabīb Allāh Sāvaji at the hand of the Shāmlūs of Harat. ʿUbayd Khān attacked Khurāsān and captured the sacred Mashhad. Jāghatāy Bahādur went to Isfīrāyīn. He fought Zain al-Dīn Sultān and was defeated. Köpek Sultān petitioned the exalted threshold. Kār Kīā Sultān Khān, the vālī of Gīlān, arrived in the exalted threshold. Mīr ʿAbd al-Vahhāb Tabrīzī was martyred in the province of Rūm. Winter camp in Qazvīn.

The year of the Ape (pichī īl), 933/1526-7. Köpek Sultān fought with Dīv Sultān and was killed. Dīv Sultān was murdered by the orders of His Majesty. The office of Vicegerency was transferred to Chūha Sultān. ʿUbayd Khān attacked and captured Āstārābād. Demrī Sultān, Ukhlī Sultān and Jagarna Sultān were murdered by the officers of ʿUbayd Khān. Winter camp in Qazvīn.

The year of the Dog (*İl il*), 935/1528-9. His Majesty turned his attention to Khurāsān. Zaynāsh Bahādur was murdered. The citadel of Dāmghān was captured. Āstārābād, Sābziwār and Nīshāpūr were conquered. His Majesty entered the sacred Mashhad. His Majesty fought ʿUbayd Khān in Jām and ʿUbayd Khān was defeated during the second battle. The government of Kermān was entrusted to Āqā Kamālī and Aḥmad Sultan Afshār was dismissed. His Majesty turned his attention to Baghdād, Zulfiqār was killed and Arab Iraq was conquered. Winter camp in Qazvin.

The year of the Pig (*tangūz il*), 936/1529-30. ʿUbayd Khān attacked the citadel of Harat and captured the whole of Khurāsān. Mowlānā Hīlālī was murdered. His Majesty turned his attention to Khurāsān and ʿUbayd Khān fled. The ambassador of the above-mentioned ʿUbayd Khān arrived at court with a letter of friendship. The enemy-destroying Pādishāh replied to the above letter. The throne (*takht-nишān*) of Harat was entrusted to Bahram Mīrzā and Ghāzī Khān Tekkelū was appointed the governor-general of Khurāsān. The tomb of Mowlānā Jāmī was desecrated. [His Majesty] went to ʿIsfāhān and appointed Khvāja Nīmatullāh Nayīlārī54 Vāzir of ʿIsfāhān.55

The year of the Mouse (*sīchqān il*), 937/1530-1. His Majesty married. Sām Mīrzā and Ḥusain Khān Shāmlū arrived in the exalted threshold. The fight between Chuha Sultān [Tekkelū] and Ḥusain Khān [Shāmlū] and the massacre of the Tekkelūs. Ulma Tekkelū fled to the province of Rūm [the Ottomans]. Qumish Ughlān Uzbek was defeated in Khurāsān. The office of Vicegerency was transferred to

---

54 Reading of the last name is uncertain.

55 The text immediately following this sentence continues as a note in the margin. It is in parts crossed out but seems to refer to the appointment of Ḍaqā Kamālī as the governor of Kermān. Although it is not listed here, according to the main account of the events of this year Shah Ṭahmāsp spent the winter in ʿIsfāhān.
'Abd Allah Khan Ustâjlu and Husain Khan Shâmlü. Bâbûr Padishâh Gûrkâni died. Mûsâ Sulţân was appointed the governor-general of Tabriz. Winter camp in Tabriz. **The year of the Cow (âdîl), 938/1531-2.** 'Ubayd Khan besieged Harat. Fil Pâshâ and Ulma [Tekkelêu] attacked the citadel of Bitlis and were defeated. Mir Ja'far was murdered and the office of Vizârat was entrusted to Aḥmad Beg Iṣfâhânî. Mir Ghiyâth al-Dîn Maṇşûr was removed from the office of Ṣadr and Mir Mu'izz al-Dîn Muḥammad Iṣfâhânî was appointed Ṣadr. The Uzbeks were defeated in Baştâm. Winter camp in Tabriz.56 [Shâh Ţahmâsp] turned his attention to Astarâbâd and entrusted its government to Badr Khân Ustâjlu. Sulţân Sulaimân attacked Iraq. He returned to Baghdâd and conquered Arab Iraq. His Majesty launched a campaign against the citadel of Vân. The Uzbeks were defeated in Khabûshân. Sulţân Muḥammad Mîrzâ was born. Ḥusain Khân and Malik Beg Kuṟiy were killed. Aḥmad Beg was removed from the office of Vizârat and the office was entrusted to Amir 'Inâyat Iṣfâhânî. Shaykh 'Ali b. ʿĀlî, Shaykh Niṟmatullâh Ḥîlî and Maulânâ Lisânî died. Winter camp at the foot of the citadel of Vân. **The year of the Leopard (bârs îl), 939/1532-3.** Alqâs Mîrzâ was appointed the governor of Astarâbâd. Mashhad was conquered. Departure towards Harat. 'Ubayd Khân fled. The throne of Harat was entrusted to Sâm Mîrzâ and Aghzîvâr Khân Shâmlü was appointed the governor-general of Khurasân. Shâh Quli Sulţân Ustâjlu was appointed governor of Mashhad. Khvâja Ruḥ Allâh Iṣfâhânî was appointed Vazir of the sacred Mashhad. Shâh Quli Khulafâ was appointed the Keeper of the Seal. Qârâvûlî ʿArâbgîrlû was appointed the senior officer of all the aides-de-camps, cuñuchs, door-keepers and ushers (Eshîk āqâsî bâshi garî).57 Ghâzî Khân Zu'l-Qadr was appointed the governor of Fârs. Winter camp in Tabriz. **The year of the Rabbit (tûshqân îl), 940/1533-4.**58

56 The events of the year of 938 to this point have been noted on the right margin. The remainder of the events of this year are recorded in the main text.
57 TM, p. 47.
58 This heading is recorded on the margin but no text follows. The author or the copyist omitted or simply forgot to record the summary of the events of 940/1533 under this heading.
The year of the Whale (lūy īl), 941/1534-5. The Ottoman Sultan (Qāyṣar-i Rūm) moved from Baghdad to Iraq. His Majesty left Vān and clashed with the Ottoman army and the Ottomans are defeated. [11b] His Majesty returned to Vān. Vān and Arjish were captured. Aghzīvār Sultan incited Sām Mīrzā to invade Qandahār but he was defeated. Farāh was granted to Khalīfa Sultan and Mashhad to Šuyfān Khalīfa Rūmlū. After the death of Āqā Kamālī, Amir Beg Mihr (or Muhr ?) Tabrīzi was appointed Vāzir of Khurāsān. Alvand Khān Afshār was murdered by royal command. Birām Ughlan attacked Harat and Khalīfa Sultan was defeated and killed. Šuyfān Khalīfa departed from Mashhad to capture Harat and Birām Ughlan left. Winter camp in Tabrīz.

The year of the Snake (yīlān īl), 942/1535-6. ʿUbayd Khān attacked the sacred Mashhad and Šuyfān Khalīfa was killed. [Šuyfān] Khalīfa's wife (mankūha) took possession of the citadel of Mashhad. The mob (ajlāf) took control of the citadel of Harat and Khīzr Chelebi, the deputy of Šuyfān Khalīfa, was murdered in the citadel of Harat. ʿUbayd Khān came to the aid of the [rebellious] mob of Harat and occupied the citadel of Harat. Sultan Khalīl, the Vālī of Shīrvān, died and the hereditary land was transferred to Shāhrukh. The Vālī of Gilān Amīr Muṣṭafā and Amir ʿInāyat Iṣfahānī were burnt alive. Qāẕī Jahān was once again appointed Vāzir. Maulānā Ahli [Shirāzī] died. Winter camp in Tabrīz.

The year of the Horse (yūnt īl), 943/1536-7. His Majesty turned his attention to Ardabil and departed for the plain of Bastām. Sām Mīrzā was pardoned and was summoned from the citadel of Tabas. ʿUbayd Khān fled from Harat. Sultan Muḥammad Mīrzā was appointed to the throne (takht-nishīn) of Harat and Muḥammad Khān Sharaf al-Dīn Oğlu Tekkelu was appointed the governor-general of Khurāsān. Nisā and Abīvard were captured. Ismāʿīl Mīrzā was born. Qandahār was captured and Būdağ Khān Qājār was appointed [governor]. Kaskan Qarā Sultan Chingīzī was appointed to Balkh. Din Muḥammad Sultan and
ʿAlī Sūltān Khvārazmī arrived in the exalted threshold and Nisā and Abīvard were granted to them. Kār Kīā Sūltān Ḫusain died and Bahrām Mīrzā was appointed to Gilān Lāhijān and the dependencies of Gilān. Khān Ahmad's rebellion (khurūj) in Gilān. Khvāja Kalān Ghūryānī was burnt alive and Mīr Qavām al-Dīn Ḫusain Nūrbakhsh was imprisoned in the fortress of Alanjaq (in Āzarbāyjān). Winter camp in Qazvin.

**The year of the Sheep (qūy īl), 944/1537-8.** The Zu'l-Qadr ghāzīs attacked and captured the citadel of Ustā in Māzandarān.ʿAlī Beg Bayāt was appointed governor [of the citadel]. Khvāja Kalān was murdered. Rukn al-Dīn Mas'ūd Ṭabīb Kāshī was burnt alive. Mīrzā Kāmrān Gūrkhānī attacked and captured Qandahār.

[12a] Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ Butakchī's rebellion and his capture. Sūltān Murād Mīrzā was born. Winter camp in Tabriz.

**The year of the Ape (pīchī īl), 945/1538-9.** Alqāṣ Mīrzā fought and captured Shāhrukh, the Wāli of Shīrvaṇ. Alqāṣ Mīrzā was appointed to Shīrvaṇ and Dervīsh Muḥammad Khān, the Wāli of Shakkī, declared his allegiance. In Hizār Asb-i Qipchāq 60, His Majesty assisted the Sultāns of Khvārazm to capture it and appointed Dīn Muḥammad Khān [as its ruler]. Winter camp in Tabriz.

**The year of the Fowl (ṭakhāqūy īl), 946/1539-40.** The dominion of Āstārā in Tālīsh was granted to Bāyandur Khān. Bahrām Mīrzā attacked Kurdistān. Ḫaydar Quli Sūltān Afsār was appointed the governor of Shūshṭar. ʿUbayd Khān Uzbek died. Winter camp in Tabriz.

**The year of the Dog (lī īl), 947/1540-1.** Ghāzī Khān Tekkelū arrived from Rūm and was appointed the governor of Maḥmūdābād in Shīrvaṇ. Shāh Quli Khalīfa, the Keeper of the Seal, attacked Kurdistān. The citadel of Tiflis was captured; Luʿārṣāb Khān fled and Gurgiştān Kārtīl was invaded. His Majesty returned to Tabriz. Pir Sūltān Khalīfa Rūmlū attacked Malik Jahāngīr b. Malik Ṭāvūs but returned

---

59 Reading of "Mazandaran" is uncertain.
60 The reading of "Qipchāq" is uncertain. It may be an scribal error for "Urgang" the capital of Hizār Asb.
unsuccessful. Rayyshahr was captured. The fortress of Bādkūya in Shīrvān was captured. Ghāzī Khān Zu'l-Qadr died and Ibrāhīm Khān was appointed governor of the province of Fārs. Sultān Ḥaydar Mīrzā was born. Winter camp in Tabrīz.

**The year of the Pig (tangūz il), 948/1541-2.** The campaign to Ahvāz and Khūzistān. The Arabs and the Alvār surrendered. The assault on the people (alūs) of Bayāt. The sayyids of Uskūya fell from favour. The ambassadors from Tūrān arrived. Sultān Muṣṭafā Mīrzā was born. Winter camp in Qum.

**The year of the Mouse (sīchqān il), 949/1542-3.** Mir Qiyath al-Dīn Maṃṣūr Shīrāzī died. Winter camp in Qum.

**The year of the Cow (ād il), 950/1543-4.** His Majesty recovered from illness. The invasion of Rustamdār. The war between Dīn Muḥammad Khvārazmī and Ṣadr al-Dīn Khān Ustājlū in Āstārbād and the defeat of the Khvārazmīyān. Ghāzī Khān Tekkelū was murdered by royal command. Winter camp in Qazvīn.

**The year of the Leopard (bārs il), 951/1544-5.** Muḥammad Humāyūn Pādishāh Gūrkānī arrived in the exalted threshold and then returned to India with the aid of the Sūfis of ?. The conjunction of the planets (qirān-i 'ulvīn). Winter camp in Qazvīn.

**The year of the Rabbit (tūshqān il), 952/1545-6.** Dīn Muḥammad Khān Ürganji invaded Mashhad but returned without capturing it. Mir Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥammad Īṣfāhānī and Maulāna Šadaft Āstārbādī died. Sultān Sulaymān Mīrzā was born. Winter camp in Qazvīn.

**The year of the Whale (lūy il), 953/1546-7.** Alqās Mīrzā's rebellion and reconciliation. The war between the Afshār and the Zu'l-Qadr in Tabrīz. Georgia was conquered. Alqās Mīrzā rebelled again. Sultān Jaghatāy Turkoman and Maulāna Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusain Ṭālib Kāshī died. Winter camp in Shīrvān.

**The year of the Snake (yīlān il), 954/1547-8.** The Amirs fought Alqās Mīrzā and he escaped to Rūm. Mihtar Daulatyar, the ghulām of Alqās Mīrzā fought and was killed in Shīrvān. The throne of Anūshīrvān was entrusted to the young Ismāʿīl

---

61 Reading uncertain.
Mirzā and Kūkja Sultān Qājār was appointed his tutor and governor-general. The Rūmīs (the Ottomans) were defeated in Alashkard and Sultān Burhān in Shīrvān. Idham Beg Rūmlū went on a mission to the Deccan. Winter camp in Qazvin.

The year of the Horse (yunt il), 955/1548-9. Sultān Sulaymān and Alqās Mirzā invaded Iran but they returned unsuccessful. The Ottomans captured the citadel of Vān. Ismāʿīl Mirzā attacked ʿĀdiljūz and [the citadel of] Qāris. Bahram Mirzā attacked Ulma Tekkelū. [Ulma] fled and captured the citadel of Tarjān and Arzanjān and returned to Erivan. Ismāʿīl Mirzā departed for Shīrvān and the Chief of the Qūrčīs (qūrčī-bāshī) attacked Shakkī. Alqās Mirzā came to Iraq and fled towards Baghdad. ʿAli Sultān Uzbek was defeated in Āstārābād. Winter camp in Tabriz.

The year of the Sheep (qūy īl), 956/1549. Muḥammad Khān Tekkilu attacked the state (vilaʿyat) of Ghurjistān. Alqās Mirzā came from Baghdād and arrived in the exalted threshold. Sām Mirzā was appointed the governor of Ardabil and the custodian (mutivalī) of the tomb of the guiding ancestor [Shaykh Ṣāfī al-Dīn]. ʿAbd Allāh Khān [Ustājlū] was appointed the governor-general of Shīrvān. Iskandar Pāshā was defeated in Erivan. Bahram Mirzā died. Winter camp in Tabriz.

The year of the Ape (pichī īl), 957/1550. [13a] The Sultāns of Tūrān invaded Khurāsān but returned unsuccessful. The Chief of the Qūrčīs went to the aid of Surkhāb Khān Ardalān and the servants of the seat of the Caliphate defeated the Kurds and the Ottomans. Shāh Quli Sultān Ustājlū, the governor of Āstārābād died. Shāhverdi Sultān Zuʿl-Qadr was killed by the Abā Yaqa Turkoman in Āstārābād. Abā Yaqa Turkoman rebelled. Sultān Amir Ghayb Beg Ustājlū was appointed the governor of Āstārābād. The governor-general of Khurāsān captured the state of Ghurjistān and Qaraq Beg, the son of Muḥammad Khān was appointed governor of Ghurjistān. Construction of buildings in Bardā. Khānūlū Sultān Bahārlū was appointed the governor of Bardā. The district of Jālart in Ārān was granted to ʿAli Sultān Ikramī Durt. Sultān Mahmūd Mirzā was born. Winter camp in Qarābāgh.
The year of the Fowl (takhāqūy īl), 958/1551. His Majesty turned his attention to Shakkī and captured that dominion. Ţuyqūn Beg Qājār was appointed governor of Shakkī. Lavand Khān, the Vālī of Kākht in Georgia paid homage by kissing the feet of [Shāh Ṭahmāsp]. [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] departed on a campaign to capture Kārtīl in Georgia. Shāhverdī Sulṭān Qājār was appointed the governor-general of Qarābāgh. The Frankish Pādishāh sent an ambassador (īlchī). Tabt Āqā was sent on a mission to the Ottoman Sulṭān. Dīn Muḥammad Khān Uzbek sought refuge at the exalted threshold. Khvāja Amir Beg Mihr was imprisoned. Khvāja Rūḥ Allāh Ḥṣafāhānī was appointed the Vazir of Khurāsān. Alqāṣ Mirzā died in the fortress of Alamūt. Winter camp in Qarābāgh.

The year of the Dog (īl īl), 959/1551-2. The Amirs attacked Ādiljūz and Arjīsh in Rūm. The citadel of Akhlāt was captured. Vān (in Kurdistan) was invaded. Ismāʿīl Mirzā departed on the campaign to attack and capture the citadel of Pāsīn. Iskandar Pāshā was besieged in the citadel of Arz al-Rūm. Ismāʿīl Mirzā was appointed the governor of ‘Alīshīkar. The ambassador (īlchī) of Humāyūn Pādishāh was granted permission to leave with a letter of friendship. Ādiljūz was captured and Arjīsh was encircled and that province was destroyed. Winter camp in Kurdistan.

The year of the Pig (tangūz īl), 960/1552-3. The citadels of Arjīsh and Bārgīrī were captured. Ismāʿīl Mirzā attacked and sacked Kurdistan. [13b] Qāẓ ‘ī Jahān died. Sayyid Shams al-Dīn Ḥīkhānī went on a mission to the Ottomans carrying a letter of friendship. Winter camp in Nakhjīvān.

The year of the Mouse (sīchqān īl), 961/1553-4. Sulṭān Ḳbāḥīm Mirzā went to the Aid of Surkhāb Ardalan. Mir Shams al-Dīn returned from the Ottomans. The Ottoman Sulṭān invaded the provinces of Iran for the fourth time but returned unsuccessful. The Amirs invaded the Ottoman provinces. The Ottoman Sulṭān wrote a letter to His Majesty seeking peace. His Majesty turned his attention to Georgia Kārtīl and captured it. His Majesty sent Shāh Quli Beg Ustājlū once again with a

62 In the manuscript the word Kurdistan has come before Vān.
letter to the Ottoman Sultan. 'Abd Allah Khan the governor-general of Shīrvān fought with Qāsim Shīrvānī and the Shīrvānis were defeated by Tajlū Begum, the sister of His Majesty. Farrukhzād Beg departed on a mission to the Ottomans.

Selim Shāh the governor of Delhi, the Vāli of Gujarāt Sultan Maḥmūd, and Niẓām al-Mulk, the ruler of Daulatabād in India, died. Maulānā Ḥairatī died. Winter camp in Barda in Qarābāgh.

The year of the Cow (ūd īl), 962/1554-5. Kūkija Sulṭān Qājār went to punish Aḥ ā Yaqū Turkomān. Amir Ghaib Sulṭān Ustājlū was appointed the governor of Āstārabād. Jarandāb Sulṭān Shāmlū was appointed the dārūgha (governor or prefect of police) of Qazvin. Ismā’īl Mirzā married. Winter camp in Birda.

The year of the Leopard (bārs īl), 963/1555-6. Shāhverdi Sulṭān Qājār attacked Georgia Kārtil. He fought and killed Lūarsāb Khān. Humāyūn Pādishāh Gurbānī died. Sulṭān Ḥusain Mirzā Ṣafavī attacked the citadel of Qandahār and captured the citadel of Zamīndāvar. His Majesty prohibited all the reprehensible acts and Imām Qūlī Mirzā was born. The governor of Tāshkand Burāq Khān and the Ṣadr Mīr Asad Allāh died. Sayyid ʿAlī Shūshṭārī was appointed Ṣadr. Mirzā Shukr Allāh ʿĪsfāhānī was appointed the Financial Controller (mustaufi al-mamālik) of the protected

63 This Tajlū Begum should not be confused with Tajlū Begum, Shāh Ismā’īl’s favourite wife and Ẓahmāsp’s mother. According to Fazlī, this lady was Mahd Auliya Fatima Sultan Begum whom he claims was Shāh Ismā’īl’s eldest daughter, Shāh Ẓahmāsp’s sister, the wife of Qara Khān Ustājlū and the mother of ‘Abd Allāh Khan Ustājlū, Shāh Ẓahmāsp conferred the title "Tajlū Begum" on her in appreciation of her bravery and military success in battle against Sultan Qāsim Shīrvānī and his Ottoman allies, Afzal Il, ff. 203a-204a. However, Khulāṣa, p. 372, identifies this lady as Pari Khān Khānum, the wife of ‘Abd Allāh Khān and not his mother. It is not possible to account for the different identification of this Princess by Fazlī and Qāzī Ahmad. Zuppe has shown that Shāh Ẓahmāsp did not have a sister with the name of Mahd Auliya, as Fazlī claims. Mahd Auliya was in fact the sister of Shāh Ismā’īl. However, she argues that although the two narratives present two different women, it concerns the same military episode which is undoubtedly authentic. She further argues that it is likely that both Mahd Auliya, the mother of ‘Abd Allāh Khan, and Pari Khān Khānum, his wife, fought in this battle. Therefore Fazlī and Qāzī Ahmad complement each other. Maria Zuppe, "La Participation des Femmes de La Famille Royale A L’Exercice du Pouvoir en Iran Safavides au XVIe Siècle, L’Importance Politique et Sociale de La Parenté Matrilinéaire" (Première Partie), Studia Iranica 23, (1994), pp. 215 note 19, 221, 224. and "La Participation des Femmes de La Famille Royale A L’Exercice du Pouvoir en Iran Safavide au XVIe Siècle, L’Entourage des Princesses et Leurs Activités Politiques" (Seconde Partie), Studia Iranica 24 (1995), pp. 64-5.

64 The reading of "Shāmlū" is uncertain.
dominions. Sultan Muhammad Mirza returned from Khurasan and married the
daughter of Qazi Jahang. Ali Sultan Tekelulu was murdered. Winter camp in Qazvin.

**The year of the Rabbit (tushqan il), 964/1556-7.** Qazi Muhammad and Haydar
Beg Tabrizi were imprisoned in the fortress of Alamut. Mir Miran (?Abd al-Vahhabi)
was appointed the army chaplain (qaizay-i askar). Sultan Ibrahim Mirza was
appointed the governor of the sacred Mashhad. [14a] Shahverdi Sultan Qajar
invaded Georgia (vilayat-i Gurgistan) and punished Simayin Khan. Tabt Aqa
returned from the Ottomans. Muhammad Khan, the governor-general of Khurasan
died and his son Qazaq Khan was appointed to that office. Khvaja Ruh Allah, the
Vazir of Khurasan, arrived [at court] and royal favours were conferred on his son
Mirza Beg. Sultan Muhammad Mirza was once again appointed to the throne (takht-
nishini) of Khurasan. Isma'il Mirza was imprisoned in the fortress of Qahqaha.

Winter camp in Tabriz.

**The year of the Whale (luy il), 965/1557-8.** Khvaja 'Abd al-Qadir Kirmani died.
Shah Quli Khalifa the Keeper of the Seal went to war against Aba'yaq Turkoman.
Khalifa died; the Qizilbash army was defeated; Rustam Khan Qaramanlu, Badr Khan
Ustajlu, Ibrahim Khan Zu'l-Qadr and Yadigir Beg Ustajlu were martyred, and Aba'
returned to Khvarazm. Qandahar was captured and Sultan Husain Mirza was
appointed its governor. Qazvin was flooded. Aba' Turkoman was killed. Shaykh
Zayn al-Din Jabal 'Amuli died. Winter camp in Qazvin.

**The year of the Snake (yilin il), 966/1558-9.** Sultan Bayazid came to Iran
(mamalik-i Iran). Sinan Pasha arrived on a mission from the Ottoman Sultan.
Maulana Abu'l Hasan Abivardi65 died. Winter camp in Qazvin.

**The year of the Horse (yunt il), 967/1559-60.** Sultan Bayazid and his sons met His
Majesty. Sinan Pasha received the honour of kissing [Shah Tahmasp]'s feet. Ali Aqa
Qajar and Arshid66 Aqa Zu'l-Qadr were sent on a mission to the Ottoman Sultan with

65 This is "Bawardi" in the manuscript which must be an error.
66 Reading is uncertain.
a letter of friendship. ʿAli Sultan Uzbek attacked Nishāpūr and his army was defeated. His Majesty became ill. ʿIsā Khān Gurjī converted to Islam. Ḥusain Beg Chāvushlū and Mīrzā ʿAṭā Allāh Vazir of Āzarbāyjān died. Khvāja Qāsim was appointed Vazir of Āzarbāyjān and Khvāja Ziaʾ al-Dīn ʿIsfāhānī was appointed Vazir of Shīrvān and Shakkī. Winter camp in Qazvīn.

The year of the Sheep (qūy īl), 968/1560-61. Sultan Bāyazīd's treachery towards His Majesty. He and his sons were imprisoned. An ambassador was despatched to the Ottoman Sultan delivering a letter of friendship. Simāyūn Khān and Gurgīn Khān attacked the citadel of Tiflis. [14b] Gurgīn Khān was killed and Simāyūn Khān fled. The title of muṣāḥibat 67 of the exalted dynasty was conferred on Shāhverdī Sultan Qājār. Winter camp in Qazvīn.

The year of the Ape (pichi īl), 969/1561-2. Farrukhzād Beg Qarāja Dāghī arrived on a mission from the Ottomans and concluded a royal agreement to return Sultan Bāyazīd back to the Ottoman kingdom. Sūndūk 68 Beg Qūrṣhī-bāshī Afshār, the Chief of the qūrchīs, and Mīrzā Kāfī Munshī al-mamlūk, the Secretary of State, died. Dāvūd Khān Gurgī was appointed the governor of Kārtīl. Sultānum, the sister of His Majesty, died. Mīrzā Beg ʿIsfāhānī was appointed the Vazir of Chakhūr-i Saʿīd. Winter camp in Qazvīn.

The year of the Fowl (takhāqūy īl), 970 A.H. ʿIsā Khān Gurjī, the support of Islam (madīd al-Islam), was imprisoned in the fortress of Alamūt. Ilyās Beg arrived on a mission from the Ottomans. His Majesty sent ambassadors [to the Ottomans]. Mīrzā Muhammad Yūṣūf ʿAstārābādī was appointed the Ṣadr of the royal demesne (sidārat-i miḥāl-i khālīṣa). Maulā Ḥuṭb al-Dīn ʿAllāma Baghdādī and the physician Ḥakīm

---

67 The term "muṣāḥibat" generally means companionship. However, Fazlī claims that muṣāḥibat denotes a formal position in the hierarchy of a Sufi order: in a Sufi order (dar tariq-i ʿSūfīgārī) a muṣāḥib is a "brother" whilst the spiritual guide (murābī) is considered to be a "father". Afzal II, f. 242b. Membre also notes that "muṣāḥib" was a friend and beloved of the Shah. The muṣāḥibān, who numbered 6 or 7, were the Yasāvūls (aides-de-camp) closest to Shah Tāhmāsp. Michele Membre, Mission to the Lord Sophy of Persia (1539-1542), Trans. A. H. Morton, (London, 1993), p. 19. See also TM, p. 133.

68 Reading is uncertain.
Nūr al-Dīn Shīrāzī died. Winter camp in Qazvīn. Ḥakim ʿAbd Allāh was appointed the physician of the hospital of Fārs (dār al-shafāʿī-i Fārs).

**The year of the Dog (ittīl), 971/1563-4.** His Majesty concluded peace with the Sultāns of Tūrān. ʿAlī Sulṭān, the Vālī of Khvārazm, invaded Khurāsān but returned unsuccessful. Mīr Murād Khān, the Vālī of Māzandarān, was granted a drum (tabl) and a banner (ʿalam). Sultān Muḥammad Mīrzā married the daughter of Mīr ʿAbd Allāh Khān. The envoy of Abu ʿl Khān, the governor of Abīvard, and also the envoy of Sultān Maḥmūd Khān, the Vālī of Bhakkar in Sind, arrived. Khānish Khānum, the sister of His Majesty, died.69 Winter camp in Qazvīn.

**The year of the Pig (tangūẓ īl), 972/1564-5.** Sultān Ibrāhīm Mīrzā fought and captured Qazāq Khān Tekkelū. Shāh Quli Sulṭān Yikān Ustājlū was appointed the governor of Harat. The citadel of Khabūshān was captured. Sultān Ibrāhīm Mīrzā married. The stamp-tax (tamghāvāḥ)70 of the protected dominions was reduced. Sultān ʿAlī Mīrzā was born and Sām Mīrzā died. The government and custodianship (tulīyat) of sacred Ardabil was entrusted to Ḥaydar al-Dīn Khān. Winter camp in Qazvīn.

**The year of the Mouse (sichqān īl), 973/1565-6.** Abu ʿl Khān, the Vālī of Abīvard, declared his allegiance. ʿAlī Sulṭān Khvārazmī attacked Āstārābad and died. Winter camp in Qazvīn.

**The year of the Cow (ūd īl), 974/1566-7.** [15a] Sultān Ḥusain Mīrzā, the son of Sultān Muḥammad Mīrzā, came from Harat to the exalted threshold. ʿAbd Allāh Khān Uzbek attacked the citadel of Turbat in Khurāsān but returned unsuccessful.

69 The next sentence in connection with the death of Khānish Khānum is not legible.
70 It is not possible to arrive at a precise translation of "tamghā" but it is clear that it was some form of tax. Tamghā was also the brand of a horse or a camel which was impressed on the back of the animal with a hot iron. In monetary terms "tamghā" may have been the equivalent of modern day road tax: the tax imposed on each branded horse or camel. Rumī also reports that in this year Shah Tahmasp waived the tamghāvāḥ of the protected dominions to the value of 30000 tumans. He also notes in a poem that thereafter "nothing was left of tamghā but its burn", Ahsan, p. 428. See also TM, p. 68.
71 Part of the text following this heading has been cut away, no doubt during the conservation of the manuscript.
The government of Tūn and Ṭabas was entrusted to Shujāʾ Beg Vīrsāq. The Ottoman Sultān Sulaymān and ʿAbd Allāh Khān, the governor-general of Shīrvān died. And Shīrvān was entrusted to his son Shāh ʿAlī Beg.

**The year of the Leopard (bāṛs īl), 975/1567-8.** Shāhverdi Sultān Qājar died. Ibrāhīm Sultān was appointed the governor-general of Qarābāgh. He fought Simāyūn Khān and the Georgians were defeated. The ambassador from the Ottoman Sultān arrived and Tib Āqā went on a mission to the Ottomans. The Valī of Kirmān Khān Aḥmad rebelled and was imprisoned in the fortress of Iṣṭakhr. The throne (takht-nishīnī) of Gilān was entrusted to Sultān Maḥmūd Mirzā and Allāh Quli Sultān Ustājlū was appointed the governor-general. Khvāja Rūḥ Allāh Iṣfāhānī was appointed the Vazir of the royal demesnes (vizārat-i khāliṣṣa). Jamshid Khān was appointed the governor of Rasht and Amīra Sāsān the governor of Kaskar.

**The year of the Rabbit (tūshqān īl), 976/1568-9.** Simāyūn Khān Gurjī was captured and imprisoned in the fortress of Alamūt. Davūd Khān was appointed the governor of Kārtīl. Maṣūm Beg Ṣafāvī was martyred on pilgrimage (ḥaj).

**The year of the Whale (lāy īl), 977/1569-70.** Jarūnāt and Garmsīrāt in Kermān were captured. Uzbek Sultān fought the Qizilbāš at Jām and Mir Ḥusain Tavakūlī and Zainal Beg Zuʿl-Qadr were killed. The son of Ḥusain Khān was appointed governor of Jām.

**The year of the Snake (yīlān īl), 978/1570-1.** Sultān Aḥmad Mirzā was born. Sultān Maḥmūd Mirzā was appointed governor of Shīrvān. Sultān ʿAlī Mirzā was appointed to Ganja, and Sultān Sulaymān Mirzā was appointed the custodian (taulīyat) of the [shrine] in the sacred Mashhad. Sultān Ibrāhīm Mirzā was appointed the Pillar of the State (rukn al-sanṭāna). The royal seal was entrusted to Parī Khān Khānum. Imām Quli Mirzā was appointed governor of Gilān. Khvāja Rūḥ Allāh, 72

---

72 Reading of "Jamshid" is uncertain. Jamshid Khān was Shāh Tahmāsp's nephew, whom, according to Rūmlū, had been sent to govern Gilān in this year. Aḥsan, p. 436.
73 Reading uncertain.
Vazir of Khurāsān and Gīlān, died. Tabt Āqā returned from his mission to the Ottomans.

**The year of the Horse (yūnt īl), 979/1571-2.** The people of Gīlān rebelled and were punished.

**The year of the Sheep (qūy īl), 980/1572-3.** Maulānā Āqājānī was appointed teacher at the Shāhrukhiyya madrasa.

**The year of the Ape (pīchī īl), 981/1573-4.** The rabble (ajlāf) of Tabriz were massacred and Yusūf Beg Ustājlū was appointed governor of the city. Plague struck Ardabil. Sayyid Ḥasan Farāmānī was appointed Vazir (vazir-i qalamrau). Khvāja Jamāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī was appointed the Vazir of the royal demesne (miḥāl-i Khāṣṣ).

Maulānā ʿAbd Allāh Yazdī died. The water of Khumar-i Ṭāshī in Qazvīn was constructed. Sulṭān Muḥammad Mīrzā became blind. ʿAbbās Mīrzā was appointed the governor of Khurāsān.

**The year of the Fowl (takhāqūy īl), 982/1574-5.** The Portuguese ambassador arrived. The Ottoman Sulṭān Selim died. Muḥammad Khān Ustājlū departed for the Ottoman land.74 Mirzā Qāsim Junābādī died.

**The year of the Dog (īt īl), 983/1575-6.** Muḥammad Sulṭān, the Vāli of Khvārazm, came to the exalted threshold. By royal command, Sūfī cloisters (ribāṭ) were constructed in Sulṭānīyya and Zanjān.

**The year of the Pig (tangūz īl), 984/1576-7.** The account of the death of Shāh Tāhmāsp ghāzī. And the conclusion of daftar (part) one of volume 2 of Afzal al-Tavārīkh.

**The Naurūz of the year of the Horse (yūnt īl), 931/1524-5. which is the first year of the reign of His Highness Shāh Tāhmāsp.**

[The world] came forth from behind the veil of inexistence into the plain of life and clothed the world in green attire. [It] removed the carpet of snow from the surface

---

74 This sentence is barely legible but according to the main account of the events of this year, Muhammad Khan was sent to the Ottoman court to convey a message of condolence for the death of Sultan Selim and to congratulate the accession of Sultan Murad, Afzal II. f. 271 a+b.
of the earth and loudly sang this couplet to rouse from winter sleep those who had been waiting for the call of the advancing dawn.\textsuperscript{75} [15b] The sincere devotees (mukhlišān) and the aids (naṣrīyān) were granted a week's leave and thus were honoured from the beginning of the reign. At the end of the festivities and discourse which was customary among both the nobility and the common people,\textsuperscript{76} [His Highness] engaged in pursuit of pleasure and bestowed honorific gifts and rewards upon the fortunate brothers Sām Mīrzn, Āqās Mīrzā, and Bahrām Mīrzā, all the Chiefs, the commanders of the enemy-destroying army, the scholars (fuẓalā), the Ṣadrs and the mayors (kalāntrān) of the provinces and the notables of the august empire. The Chiefs and the mayors of the provinces who were not present at the court, sent their gifts (pīškīsh) to the exalted threshold. [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] sent honorific gifts [to them] and delighted the poor and the deprived with abundant bounty and innumerable favours. [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] then attended to the affairs of the land (mulk).

Mīrzā ‘Aṭā Allāh returned from Shīrvān and received the honour of appointment to the office of Vīzārat of Āzarbāyjān. Maulānā Idham Munshī was burnt alive and the office of the State Scribe\textsuperscript{77} (inshā) was entrusted to Mīrzā Kāfi. Dīv Sūltān arrived with the Chiefs to the exalted threshold, and his enmity with Kōpek Sūltān over the vicegerency (vīkālat). His Highness sent Kōpek Sūltān on a holy war in Georgia. Removal from office and captivity of Qāzī Jahān and the transfer of the august Vīzārat to Mīr Ja'far Sāvājī.

\textsuperscript{75} The narrative of the events of the year 931/1524 begins on the margin of folio 15a, as an extension of the main body of the text, and immediately follows the list of contents. Part of this text is concealed by a conservation tape, The translation is therefore an abridged version.

\textsuperscript{76} This part of the text is written on the top margin of folio 15b. The amount of the text written in tight script on the margins may suggest these were late additions to replace lost folios.

\textsuperscript{77} This was the office of Munshī al-Mamālik which Minrosky has translated as the "State Scribe". This office seems to be distinct from the office of Maļis-nīvīs or Vāqī'-nīvīs (the Recorder of the King's audiences). \textit{TM}, pp. 52-3, 132
After the Sultanī Naurūz, Mirzā ‘Ātā Allāh Khūzānī, who by royal command had taken the decree of governorship and the robe of honour to the young prince Sultan Khalīl, the Vāli of Shirvān, returned. He presented the petition (‘arīza) and the gift of the above-mentioned to the exalted threshold and declared the devotion and allegiance of the heir of the throne of Anūshīrvān [to the Shāh]. Mirzā ‘Ātā Allāh, who had been a long serving official, was honoured by royal favour. [Shāh Ṭāhmāsp] entrusted the Vizārat and tax inspectorate (mumayāzī) of the whole of Āzarbāyjān, which is a quarter of the provinces of Iran, with absolute authority to him.

Under the instructions of the burnt Vazir, Maulānā Idham Munshī had committed acts of treachery in writing the royal decrees (ahkām-i mutḥa). Hence he was burnt in his own fire of deceit in the summer quarters of Sahand in Tabriz. The office of the State Scribe of the whole of the God-protected dominions was entrusted to Mirzā Kāfī, the son of Khvāja ‘Ātiq Urdūbādī, who received the title of the "State Scribe". Khvāja ‘Ātiq Urdūbādī was a son of the disciple (murīd) of Shaykh Rabbānī Qāzī ‘Īmād al-Dīn Ṭūsī whose life has been extensively recorded at the time of the spiritual guide Shaykh Šafī al-Dīn Ishāq.78

The hostility which existed between Div Sulṭān Rumlū and Köpek Sulṭān Ustājlū concerning the sharing of Vicegerency, had intensified [16a] as they prepared to murder and pillage each other’s army and camp (urdū). Köpek Sulṭān enjoyed the support of a large number of the Ustājlūs and Div Sulṭān, despite his courage and daring, was powerless before his enmity. The Grand Vazir Qāzī Jahān proposed to His Majesty that Div Sulṭān be made the commander of the army of Khurāsān. In this way both the security of Khurāsān would be ensured and the hostility between Köpek Sulṭān and him [Div Sulṭān] would be defused. Furthermore, it would save many devoted followers (mukhlīṣān) and Şūfis from perishing in the midst of their

78 This sentence is crossed out and in parts the reading is uncertain. The translation however conveys the meaning.
hostility. His Majesty, may he rest in paradise, found this agreeable and bestowed honours on Div Sultān and granted him permission to leave for Khurāsān. It was ordained that the army of Fārs, Kirmān, Persian ʿIrāq, and Khurāsān submit to the command of the Pillar of the State of Iran and the confidant [of the Shāh], Div Sultān, and deem his prudence in every matter worthy of their loyalty and Ṣūfī probity (ṣāfi-garī). It was also ordered that as was customary he should act as the regent (nāʿīb), and leave his seal at court so that the incumbent decrees (ahkām-i muṭāʿa) are endorsed by the seal of the Pillar of the State. Div Sultān was comforted by the Shāh’s favours and with complete authority set off for the summer-quarters at Lār in Māzandarān. He sent an envoy to summon the governors of Fārs, Kerman and ʿIrāq, especially Chuha Sultān Tekkelū the governor of Gulhar, ṢAli Sultān Zu‘l-Qadr, the governor-general of Fārs, and Qarāja Sultān Tekkelū, the governor of Hamadān, to the summer quarters in Lār. The governors of Māzandarān, Gīlān (Gīlānāt), Rustamdār and Āstārābād sent their militia with gifts (pīshkīsh) to the Pillar of the State of the Pādishāh of Iran and declared their allegiance. [Div Sultān] sent an agent to Qazvīn, Kāshān, Yazd and ʿIsfahān to purchase weapons from the arsenal (qūr-khāna) and karkirāq-khāna. He obtained every kind of weapon and armaments and filled the chests with precious cloths, and rare weapons. The Sultāns, the Amirs and military men from all quarters gathered in the summer camp at Lār[16b] for leisure and discourse. As the weather turned cold they planned a grand celebration and organised what was necessary for the festivities and granted permission to the whole of the army and the notables of the noble camp to drink wine. Red goblets appeared in the hands of rosy-cheeked wine-bearers and

79 This last clause has been written in the margin.
80 This sentence has been scored over possibly by a later critical reader of the chronicle. See the commentary.
81 According to Takmilat al-Akhbār, Chuha Sultān was the governor of ʿIsfahān at this time. Abdī Beg Shīrāzī, Takmilat al-Akhbār, (ed.) ʿAbdī Ḥusayn Navaʾī. (Tehran, 1369). p. 61.
82 This is a reference to the Gīlān-i pīsh and Gīlān-i pas.
83 Reading of this word is uncertain, though my reading may be accurate. The same term appears in TAAA as karkirāqān in the sentence "... they captured all the karkirāqān of all the Amirs and the Pillars of the State who were in Kāshān", p. 354. Its meaning however is unclear.
the song of the singers and the melody of the minstrels passed the pleasure house of Venus (nāḥīd). For three days they feasted and on the third day [Div Sulṭān] offered the honorific gifts of horses, coats of mail (jība) and arms which he had collected, to all the Amirs, the civil functionaries, the enemy-destroying troops, the grandees of the supreme provinces, and the officers and the notables in his own entourage. He demonstrated much favour towards those who merited it and obliged them all with his kindness.

[Div Sulṭān] deliberated with them: it was decided that Durmīsh Khān did not need any assistance and that Khurāsān was secure. Since there had been no news of the Uzbek invasion of Khurāsān from Transoxiana, [the Amirs] could pay their respect to the threshold of the seat of the Caliphate. [He] urged them to move towards the capital city of Tabriz and assist him at once in divesting Köpek Sulṭān of the Vicegerency by force. [He argued] that this would not be contrary to the principles of decency and gratitude and that, His Majesty, the refuge of the Caliphate, would also seek to appease his long-serving officials and would withhold assistance from Köpek Sulṭān. All the Amirs and the army agreed and all united and set off for Tabriz.

[17a] As the news of the advance of Div Sulṭān and his army reached Tabriz, the Ustājlū Amirs assembled in the house of Köpek Sulṭān to deliberate. Qāranja Sulṭān, Qārūq Ḥamza Ustājlū and Nārīn Beg Qājār deemed it wise to wage war on Div Sulṭān who had disobeyed the royal command, had disregarded the royal prerogatives, and without the orders of the Vicegerent (navvāb-i aṭlā) had led an army to the sacred capital and had opposed him. They concluded that, God willing, Div Sulṭān might be troubled by his own presumption. His Highness too was of the

---

84 Reading is uncertain. The text reads something like jiqa which is almost certainly an error. It could read jigha meaning "a jewel worn in the turban" but in view of the context, jība or coat of mail is a more likely reading.

85 It is not clear who the author means by the title "navvāb-i aṭlā", Shah Tahmāsp or Köpek Sultan. This is not a title he usually uses to refer to Shah Tahmāsp. In view of the assertion, in the same sentence, that he [Div Sulṭān] had led an army against the navvāb-i aṭlā, we may interpret the title to refer to the co-Vicegerent Köpek Sulṭān, hence I have opted for the translation "Vicegerent".
same mind but Köpek Sultan and Qāzī Jahān did not consent to war and said that they were both servants of the same royal threshold and there was no glory in shedding the blood of the Qizilbash tribes in pursuit of the office of Vicegerency (vikālat) and authority. Then together with the court nobility they moved to greet Div Sultan. They met and presented the Amirs and the centurions (yūzbāshiyyān) of Irāq, Fārs and Kermān, and as was customary they jointly carried out the affairs of state. Gradually Div Sultan's power and authority at court increased and he instigated the murders of Qārānja Sultan Ustāljū and Nārin Beg Qājār, the supporters of Köpek Sultan, and instigated the imprisonment of Qāzī Jahān in a fortress. In Zu'lı-hijja of the year 931/September 1525, His Highness removed Qāzī Jahān from the office of Vizārat of the empire and sent him to the fort of Lūr in Qarābāgh. He then appointed Mir Ja'far Savağī who was of the Iraqi sayyids of pure descent, to the office of Vizārat, bestowing the title of Grand Vazir (ītīmād al-daula) on him. His Highness also sent Köpek Sultan in command of the army of Āzarbāyjān on a mission of holy war (ghazā) against the infidel Sultāns of Georgia to subjugate them to the Pādishāh of Islam. [17b] In the event of any resistance, Köpek Sultan was instructed to attack and plunder their territories. As had been commanded, Köpek Sultan, who was concerned about the growing power and influence of Div Sultan, agreed to leave for Georgia. He accepted the nominal title of Vicegerent (vakil) and together with the Ustāljū Amirs and the lower ranking Sultāns (salāfīn-i tābīn) was granted leave to wage holy war in Georgia. They set up winter camp in Qarābāgh.

86 The text reads ".....power and authority at the service of His Highness grew.").
87 Ahsan and Ajzāl disagree on the location where Qāzī Jahān was imprisoned. Ahsan, p. 189, cites the fort of Nūrī, and Savory identifies it as "the fortress of Nūrī in Mazandaran", R. M. Savory, "The Principal Offices of the Safavi State During the Reign of Tahmāsp I (930-84/1524-76)", BSOAS XXIV (1961), p. 66. However, Khudāsa, vol. 1, p. 160, agrees with Ajzāl and records "Div Sultan detained Qāzī Jahān and sent him to the fortress of Lūr". Either of these locations were likely to have been chosen to incarcerate Qāzī Jahān, since both Qarābāgh and Mazandaran were by this time under Safavid control. Shah Ismā'īl's commanders conquered both Mazandaran and the citadel of Lūr, in Qarābāgh, in the year 924/1518, Khudāsa, vol. 1, p. 140.
Div Sulṭān cancelled the fiefs (tiyūlāt) of Köpek Sulṭān and the Ustājīlūs. Chuha Sulṭān shared the Vicegerency (vikālat) [with Div Sulṭān]. Mir Ghīyāth al-Dīn Manṣūr arrived at court. The letter to Ibrāhīm Khān at the frontier of Lār and the reply from the above-mentioned. The news of the death of Durmīsh Khān arrived and the appointment of Ḥusain Khān as the governor-general of Khurāsān and tutor (lala) of Sām Mirzā.

After Köpek Sulṭān departed for Qarābāgh Div Sulṭān, in an act of hostility towards him, appointed Chuha Sulṭān Tekkelū as his co-Vicegerent at the chancery (dirān-i ʿāfālā). He removed the seal and the name of Köpek Sulṭān from all the decrees and cancelled the fief (tiyūl) of the Ustājīlū Amirs. Thus he fanned the flames of enmity. Mir Jaʿfar and other men of authority, who had the power of veto, told Div Sulṭān that the tribe of Ustājīlū would not be excluded from the threshold of the Caliphate and that the feud between the two noble men would cause many deaths. However, Div Sulṭān was unrepentant and resolved to sever the lifeline of the Ustājīlū Amirs. So when the news of the confiscation of their land (tiyūl) reached the Ustājīlū Amirs in Qarābāgh, they abandoned the Georgian campaign and waited for spring to take revenge from Div Sulṭān. His Highness also planned to set up winter camp in the capital Tabriz. He was much disturbed by the power of Div Sulṭān and the latter's conflict with Köpek Sulṭān.

[18a] At this time the news of the death of the loyal servant Durmīsh Khān Shāmlū, the governor-general of Khurāsān, reached the young Shāh. The Shāh regretted the death of this man of great felicity and issued the farman of the governorship of Harat and the office of governor-general of Khurāsān to Durmīsh Khān's brother Ḥusain Beg. Shāh ʿAlamīsp bestowed the title of Khān on Ḥusain Beg and named him the tutor (lala) of Sām Mirzā and sent [the decree] with a robe of honour, a horse adorned with gold and precious stones, a small sash (dastār), and the crown (tāj) [to him]. Maulānā Nujūmī Haravī, the historian of Khurāsān, has written much about the
justice and magnanimity of Durmish Khan in his history. This author will briefly point to two entries. One that the forty years sovereignty of Sultan Husain Mirza ⁸⁸ was the time of the world’s nuptials and the four years of the governorship of Durmish Khan were the gifts (sājūţ qa nīthār) of that wedding. The other that one day during the month of Ramadān Durmish Khan was sitting in his own trabeated hospice (‘imārat- i chihil sutūn)⁸⁹ when he noticed an old man (pīr- i zāl) who brought a jug of water onto the roof and placed it facing the north to chill. The Khan thought the old man was unable to buy ice, so he ordered his water-man (ābdār) to secretly go to the rooftop and place one thousand silver mithqāl in the man’s jug.⁹⁰ When the old man saw his jug full of silver he realised that it was a gift from Durmish Khan. He took possession of the [money] and was relieved of deprivation and his children prospered.

[18b] May almighty God have mercy upon him, ‘Alī Sultan Zu’l-Qadr the governor-general of Fārs died and His Majesty granted the governorship of Fārs to Murād Sultan Zu’l-Qadr. Towards the end of this year Amir Jamāl al-Dīn Ṣadr Āstārabādī together with Mir Muḥsīn Rażavī Qumī died. Perceptive advisors (arbāb- i idrāk) found the chronogram adkhalū hā bilsalām āminīn, 931/1524-5, yielded the date of death of the two learned sayyids. On the orders of His Highness their pure bodies were taken to the tomb of the sayyid of martyrs and were buried in the burial place of Ḥusain (ḥārīr) in Karbalā. In this year the poet Maulānā Hilālī was martyred at the hands of ‘Ubayd Khan in Khurāsān.

Mir Ghīyāth al-Dīn came to take the office of Ṣadr of the God-protected dominions and received the honour of audience with the Padishāh, the refuge of mankind. On

⁸⁸ This refers to Sultan Husain Bāyqara, the Timurid ruler of Herat, 1469-1506 A.D.
⁸⁹ In modern Persian, “imārat” refers to a grand building but the definition of the function of the building as “hospice” or a public kitchen where food was provided for the needy, as given by Robert Hillebrand, is more historically accurate. Chihil sutūn or a trabeated building consisted of either an open-ended entrance hall supported by forty columns or like the chihil sutūn palace in Isfahān, the reflection of the many columns in the pond outside, made up the number forty. Robert Hillenbrand, Islamic Architecture, (Edinburgh, 1994), p. 598.
⁹⁰ The copyist uses both “pīr- i zāl” (old man) and “ṣaʿīfa” (a weak female) to refer to this person. One is clearly a clerical error and I have opted for the translation “old man”.

his day of arrival into the city the Mujtahid of the Age Shaykh ‘Alî b. ʿĀl and all the men of learning and sayyids went to welcome him and to present him to the Shâh. His Majesty bowed before Mîr Ghiyâth al-Dîn Manşûr. [Mîr Ghiyâth al-Dîn] behaved in a manner not befitting a scholar and a sayyid who aspired to a noble life of learning. Thus, he repeatedly sought to have learned discussions with Shaykh ‘Alî b. ʿĀl at the King’s audiences (Bihisht Āîn). After Khvâja Naṣîr al-Dîn Muḥammad Ṭūsî, muḥḥaqiq- i bârgâh-i quds, no one had endeavoured more in proclamation of the Jaʿfarî religion as had [Shaykh ‘Alî b. ʿĀl] and he was also His Majesty’s teacher. [This] angered Mîr Ghiyâth al-Dîn. Finally wise arbiters mediated between the religious doctors. They determined that every week each man in the other’s presence, would present a science in which he surpassed [his rival]. [19a] It was arranged that one week Mîr should study grammar (qavâʿid) with Shaykh ‘Alî and the next week Shaykh ‘Alî should study the commentary of tajrid of Maulânâ ‘Alî Qûshchî with Mîr. Mîr however sought excuses and said study of scholastic theology (kalâm) this week and study of jurisprudence (fiqh) next week would be propitious. Shaykh ‘Alî believed excellence, dignity and forbearance to be his virtue. He therefore accepted Mîr’s excuse and attended his teaching. Within one week he acquired that science from Mîr Ghiyâth al-Dîn so that he was able to instruct his own students without a book. The following week the group who sought instruction in jurisprudence gathered but Mîr Ghiyâth al-Dîn abandoning all manner of propriety and good manners did not attend the class and considered his action to be the ultimate perfection and integrity. His Majesty took offence at Mîr’s inappropriate behaviour. He was inclined to show Mîr his displeasure and regretted the kindness he had shown him in the past. Mîr was disgraced and returned to Fârs. He took his leave from His Majesty. By the order of [Shâh Ṭahmâsp] the fief (suyurghâlāt), pension (vaẓîfâ), and the regular salary (muqarrarâ) which in the past had been assigned to him were endorsed and [Mîr] departed for Shîrâz with a robe of honour.
His Majesty, the sublime threshold, engaged in pleasure and rested in Tabriz and waited for spring to resume travelling. The reply to the affectionate letter which His Majesty had written to Ibrāhīm Khān K̲hānī, the Vāli of Lār [19b] arrived with a gift (pishkīsh) and curiosities (tuḥaf) from that province. Ibrāhīm Khān had been an official at the exalted threshold, and as has been related in the first volume of Afzal al-Tavārīkh, he had been the dīvān-bāshi gārī-i sarkār-i ālā. This caused His Majesty great happiness, he bestowed favours on him and as was customary granted the envoy permission to leave.

The letter to Ibrāhīm Khān, the Vāli of Lār.

The repository of royal authority, the illustrious and the most noble Sūltān of the dynasty of the great kings and khans, the protector of kingship Ibrāhīm Khān, the governor of the territory of Lār and the Amir of the just dīvān (dīvān-i ʿadālat-madār) has been honoured with innumerable royal favours. He should consider our endeavours and our honourable royal aspirations to be a prerequisite for his attainment of felicity and prosperity. Our absolute compassion and our undivided affection continue to safeguard his interests and to benefit him and the resentments of the envious and the malice of the opponents do not and will not affect that. Our penetrating mind and affectionate heart are directed towards promoting and enhancing the dignity of that supreme Sūltān of the time in such a way that it will soon be the object of the envy of the rivals, the peers, the governors and the governed of the world, God willing. Your duty is to be confident and untroubled, and to endeavour to protect the subjects and the subordinates, and to eliminate the

---

91 It is not possible to arrive at a precise definition of this title. The title "dīvān-bāshi gārī-i sarkār-i ālā" does not appear in TM. It may however be a variant of "dīvān begī" or the Chief Judge who sat at the trials and with the approval of the Ṣadr dispensed justice, TM, p. 42. Röhrborn cites this evidence in both volumes of 1 & 2 of Afzal al-Tavārīkh as the oldest evidence to support the notion that senior officials in the Safavid government often held more than one post/function: the family of Ibrāhīm Khan were the hereditary rulers of Lār (Southern Iran) and also they, as vassals of Shah Ismāʿīl and Shah Tahmāsp, were appointed as "dīvān bāshi" and in that capacity they sealed the royal documents. Klaus-Michael Röhrborn, Provinzen und Zentralgewalt Persiens im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert, (Berlin, 1966). Trans. Kaikavūs Jahandārī as: Niẓām-i īyālāt dar daurā-i Ṣafavīyā, (Tehran, 2537). p. 135.
wicked, the oppressors and those in power, and to prevent the powerful from oppressing the weak. A couplet:

You should resolve that your wishes are to the advantage of the subjects. This will ensure eternal felicity and guarantee enduring prosperity. [You] may offer your prayers and [express] your desires daily as all that you require is obtainable. May your reign and prosperity endure.92

Ibrāhim Khān's reply.93

The royal patent arrived at an auspicious hour. As it embraced [the subject of] administration of the august kingship and the equity of the pillars of the eternal Caliphate, [we] express our gratitude for the benevolence bestowed on the subordinates and offer our services and the gift of servitude to that heavenly threshold. O God, may the chain of servitude rest on [our] neck. [We] have been and are steadfast on the path of submission, sacrifice, service and prayer. We consider this to be the means of attaining honour and dignity. This servant has the honour to report to the heavenly court, [20b] the light of the threshold of the Sultāns, that praise be God the exalted royal servants have been endowed with the task of administration of the affairs of the kingdom by divine will. The dishonourable opponents have become the target of the arrows of the benefactors and the sincere devotees sense no opposition from any quarter. [We] welcome the sublime commands which were issued in regards to different affairs and in all matters we obey. From day to day its effects will become apparent to His Majesty and it is hoped that [His Majesty] will aid the servants by favours and compassion and will honour them with his commands and prohibitions. [I] will no longer overstep the bounds of propriety.

92 The next and last sentence appears to be incomplete and only a summary is given here.
93 Much of the stylised Persian and the panegyrics at the beginning of this letter have been omitted and the translation forms only the second part of the letter.
The year of the Sheep (qūy īl), 932/1525-6 which was the second year of the accession of His Majesty, whose abode is in paradise.

The account of the battle between Div Sultān and Köpek Sultān and the defeat of Köpek Sultān and his flight to Gilān.

The old world was rejuvenated and the iris, the flower, the tulip, the hyacinth, the jasmine, the sweet basil, the pansy, and the arghavān made the earth the envy of paradise. The nightingale sang the praise of the gardener of the rose-garden of the world in a thousand tongues. His Majesty engaged in pleasure and bestowed favours upon the servants and loyal friends. [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] sent robes of honour to the frontier Amirs and began to attend to the affairs of the state and the organisation of the army.94

After the Naurūz celebrations news arrived that Köpek Sultān and the group who had been sent to subjugate the Sultāns of Georgia were on their way to Sultāniyya in Iraq via Tavālish and Khalkhāl, in order to avenge Div Sultān. Muntashā Sultān and Qilij Khān Kurd (?) Beg, Badr Beg and the Ustājlū commanders of Āzarbāyjān and Iraq had united and were preparing to rebel. His Majesty, the throne of the Caliphate the Sublime threshold, ordained that the Div Sultān and the Amirs of the victorious camp together with the loyal devotees of Āzarbāyjān should mobilise and depart for Iraq. Within a week the militia, the loyal devotees and the Sūfis had prepared for the campaign. It was ordained that the tent of felicity should be pitched towards the abode of Guidance Ardabīl (dār al-irshād-i Ardalib) so that [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] would receive the honour of pilgrimage to the pure tomb of the great grandfather and the father, whose abode is with ‘Alī, to seek intercession in the battle against the ungrateful rebels.

[21a] His Highness appointed the fortunate Prince and the noble brother Alqāṣ Mirzā the vicegerent in Tabriz to safeguard the security of Āzarbāyjān against all

94 The text so far has been recorded on the margin of the folio in the same hand, it seems as an afterthought by the author.
opponents and to subdue the rebellious fortresses. In response to the appeal from Alqāṣ Mirzā, His Highness pardoned Qaẓī Jahān, the previous Vazir, who was held in the fortress of Luri, and despatched orders for his release. He then left Tabriz for Ardabil in great haste to make a pilgrimage to the Sacred and Illuminated Tomb of the Šafavids. His Highness bestowed favours on the relatives of Shaykh Āvandi who are the descendants of Shaykh Šafi al-Dīn and the residents, the Šūfis and the poor of the Abode of Guidance. The royal party then left for Sultānīyya, via Khalkhāl.

The wise Amirs and the righteous Vazirs thought to extinguish the flames of enmity which raged between the two powerful generals with waters of conciliation. In the cause of good-will and to prevent war, [they] sent Qāsim Khalifa Vīrsāq, accompanied by several others, to the Ustājlū Amirs. On behalf of His Highness the said party exhorted that ignorant army to consent to reconciliation and offered appeasement. Qāsim Khalifa, the Khalifa of the Šūfī house of unity (khalīfa-i ṭauḥīd khāna) and the elder of the tribe of Vīrsāq, went to visit Kopek Sultān. He endeavoured in the interest of both sides to reiterate the advice and promises of His Highness, the spiritual guide (murshid) may he rest in paradise, but he did not succeed. After Qāsim Khalifa returned, the Grand Vazir Mīr Jaʿfar and Shaykh Šāl b. Šāl, the Mujtahid of the Age, proposed to visit those ignorant men to persuade them to accept an audience with the Shāh. Dīv Sultān who was corrupted by his own pride and depravity did not consent to the proposed mediation by the above-mentioned. He refused them permission to leave and thus inflamed the fire of [discord]. Dīv Sultān breached all principles of loyalty and called his followers and the victorious army to prepare for war. He resolved to sacrifice his relatives and fellow tribesmen. He ordered his troops to align on two fronts and to gather the lances and the swords. The following day His Highness ordered Dīv Sultān and Chuha Sultān together with the victorious standing corps of royal troops, the brave āqāyān, the just and pious Šādṛs, and the Vazirs and the powerful civil functionaries to take position at the centre.
[22a] [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] assigned Būrūn Sulṭān, Qarāja Sulṭān and Ukhī Sulṭān Tekkelū to the right flank and Demrī Sulṭān Shāmlū and Muḥammad Khān Zūl-Qadr Oğlū to the command of the left flank. Under the command of Ziad Beg Qājār close to five thousand trained young [fighters] were assigned to the reserve (ṭarḥ), to be called upon in emergency. The fortunate [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] mounted the charger to rout the enemy in what was the first battle of that sovereign of the world against the instigators of discord. Imploring God95 for assistance [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] lined the troops against the ungrateful and rebellious militia and armed, like an angry lion, stood under the banner of victory. When Köpek Sulṭān heard that His Majesty had adorned the centre with his noble presence, he too, intent on killing Div Sulṭān, stood in opposition to his benefactor and his spiritual guide (qibla- i ḥaqīqī) and took up position at the centre. [He] strengthened the right flank with the splendour of the power of Muntashā Sulṭān and adorned the left flank with the dazzle of Qazāq Sulṭān's murderous sword. [He] assigned Qāzūq Ḥamza to the reserve and himself took position. From both sides the sound of the battle drum deafened the sky.

The two armies drew closer but Köpek Sulṭān knew His Majesty's army would not commence the battle, so he rode forward and demanded Div Sulṭān. Horsemen from those two vindictive armies rode into the battle field and sought warriors. In sorrow the world yearned for these two armies to unite and conquer the enemies of the state and the faith. The deceitful and proud Div Sulṭān did not enter the battle field and sent Burūn Sulṭān and Qarāja Sulṭān into the fighting. The commanders abandoned the principles of gratitude and relationship and drew swords and lance on each other and struck with mace and spear.

Köpek Sulṭān and Muntashā Sulṭān charged with the war cry "Div Sulṭān" and the desert, drenched in the blood of the Rūmlūs, shimmered like Badakhshān rubies.

With each attack a group on both sides fell to the sword. Burūn Sulṭān and Qarāja Sulṭān fought courageously but were defeated by the seditious Ustājlūs and both

---

95 Afzal uses the epithet "vahhāb" for God.
drank from the chalice of mortality. [23a] After the killing of those brave commanders the Tekkelū army dispersed. When the Ustājlū army learnt of their killing they abandoned all rules of warfare and fearlessly pursued the Tekkelū and Rūmlū armies. Upon hearing the news of the Ustājlū bravery the warrior Shāh could no longer wait, he mobilised the centre and himself separated from the army and charged into the battlefield.

Köpek Sultan and the Ustājlū army became fearful of the royal offensive, and frustrated and broken, they fled from the battlefield. The standing corps of royal troops (qūrchi) and the courageous [troops] in the centre flank [under the command] of His Majesty, may he rest in paradise, pursued the Ustājlūs and killed scores of them. Köpek Sultan and the survivors moved to Rasht in Gilān and sought refuge with Muẓaffar Khān the Vālī of that province who was married to the sister of His Majesty, may he rest in paradise. His Majesty departed for the capital Qazvīn, consoled the notables of that region and dispensed justice. It was ordained that grand buildings be built and the architects (tarāḥān) lay down the detailed plans for a nishīman (a royal residence) and royal workshops in Qazvin, and hasten to complete the construction. [The Shāh] himself rested and engaged in leisure, and sent letters of victory to ĀzARBāyjān ordering the subjugation of the frontier regions. [His Majesty] granted the district of dār al-mūjān of Qum as fief (tīyūl) to Chūhā Sultan Tekkelū [23b] and awaited the news from the corners of the kingdom to act as was expedient.

The news of the murder of Khvāja Ḥabīb Allāh Sāvāji, the Vazir of Khurāsān, arrived in the exalted threshold and His Majesty bestowed favours on his children.

At this time it was reported [to Shāh Ṭahmāsp] that a group of Shāmlū āqāyān on the staff of the governor-general of Khurāsān Ḥusain Khān had at his instigation demanded their regular salary (mavājib) from Khvāja Ḥabīb Allāh. By the order of

---

96 For Köpek Sultan’s defeat and flight to Gilān see the commentary.
97 Reading is uncertain.
His Majesty, may he rest in paradise, Khvāja Ḥabīb Allāh had been appointed to the office of Vizārat of Ḥusain Khān. Confident of the immense authority that he exercised as Vazir, he ignored the men's plea and feigned negligence. The men shamelessly told Khvāja that if he did not intend to pay their salaries he should dismiss them from service and grant them letters of dismissal. Khvāja proudly wrote and sealed the letters of dismissal in his own hand. The aforementioned crowd took the letters to Yār Aḥmad Khalīfa, their elder (rīsh safaid). In agreement with them, Khalīfa and the lower ranking Amirs (tābinān) besieged Khvāja Ḥabīb Allāh's house. Khvāja's militia attempted to repel them and fighting broke out but they were unable to withstand the Shāmlū assault and fled. Khvāja was captured and his two sons were killed. Dervīsh Beg Rūmlū sought to protect Khvāja and hand him over to the judicious Prince Sām Mīrzā and Ḥusain Khān alive, but the strong and violent Shāmlūs murdered Khvāja. His Majesty and the grandees at the royal camp (urdū) were saddened by the murder of Khvāja Ḥabīb Allāh. The royal decree arrived instructing Ḥusain Khān to punish Khvāja's killers. [His Majesty] bestowed favours on Khvāja's children and entrusted them to the care of the Grand Vazir MiṭJacfar Sāvaji who was a relative. Tārīkh- i Ḥabīb al-siyār by the celebrated and magnanimous author Khvānd Amir which will remain in this world for many years, is left in memory of that martyred wise counsellor. [24a] It was noted in Aḥsan al-Tavārīkh, by Ḥasan Rūmlū, that Khvāja Ḥabīb Allāh's administration (sarkār) had commissioned several butcher's shops in Harat where sheep were butchered and the meat was distributed among the poor and the needy who did not have the means to purchase it. The militia of Khvāja Ḥabīb Allāh were assigned to search the city and the districts and to inquire into the lives of the poor and the needy and report back to Khvāja. They were to distribute among the poor Khvāja's favours, admit the sick to

---

98 Minorsky translates "sarkār" as both "administration" and "department", depending on the context, TM. p. 105, note 3 & p. 174. I have chosen "administration" to allow for the ambiguous use of the term.
the hospital which [Khvāja] had founded, and make every effort in his treatment. If an unknown stranger died, Khvāja's administration would arrange the burial. It appears that once in Tabriz a talented and accomplished son of a Qizilbash Rūmlū Amir, who lived in poverty, took a sour orange (nāranj) for the Grand Vazir Qāżī Jahān Sayfī and petitioned him. Qāżī did not accept the orange and told him to take it to Ḥābib Allāh the tall (dirāz) as he would have some news for him. The dervīsh asked who Ḥābib Allāh the tall was and was told that he was the Vazir of Khurāsān. The dervīsh put the orange in his bag (chihil bandī)⁹⁹ and set off for Harat.

One day Khvāja Ḥābib Allāh the tall was leaving the bath when [the dervīsh] stopped him and offered him the decaying orange. Khvāja took the orange and left him in the care of one of his attendants. The attendant was instructed to present him to Khvāja in his private quarters after the Divān assembly. As the time of the meeting approached, the attendant presented the faithful (vafā- kīsh) dervīsh at Khvāja's residence. After much kindness he was questioned as for his reasons in bringing a rotten orange to Harat, the fruit orchard of the world. The dervīsh recounted his conversation with Qāżī Jahān and apologised for the rotten orange. He then revealed his noble birth. [24b] Khvāja showed him much kindness and said that whatever accrued to him that day in the way of fees (rusūm) and profits would belong to the dervīsh. It so happened on that day the fees of four hundred tumāns came to Khvāja Ḥābib Allāh from the districts (vilāyāt) of Khurāsān and he gave the total to that dervīsh who had surrendered to the divine will (dervīsh- i tavakul- kīsh).

[Khvāja Ḥābib Allāh] also married one of the daughters of his family to the dervīsh. He then sent that fortunate but long suffering [man] with a Naurūz gift for His Majesty to the exalted threshold. The gift was so large as to expose the Grand Vazir's meanness. In the letter which [Khvāja] wrote to Qāżī Jahān he stated that in this transient world after death nothing could be expected to remain of a man but a good name. Philanthropy dictates that the bearer of this letter of friendship be enlisted in

---

⁹⁹ Reading is uncertain.
the rank of the attendants of that wise counsellor, receive the honour of prostration before the Pādishāh of the sea of benevolence and be enlisted in the rank of the servants of the threshold of the refuge of mankind. Thus, due to the efforts of the sagacious and benevolent Vazir, that unfortunate man found fortune and came to the attention of the August Emperor. He was enlisted in the rank of attendants at court and [Khvāja Ḥābīb Allāh] too left an illustrious reputation on the face of the world. Tārīkh-i Ḥābīb al-siyār which the seal of authors Khvānd Amir wrote in the celebrated name of that fortunate [man] is a categorical and clear evidence of his integrity. May God the most exalted guides all the believers on the path of benevolence and beneficence. May God have mercy on that blessed and wise counsellor.\\footnote{See also the commentary "The killing of Khvāja Ḥābīb Allah Sāvajī".}

\`Ubayd Khān Uzbek came to Khurāsān for the second time and captured the Sacred Mashhad.

After the news reached \`Ubayd Khān Chingizī that Burūn Sultān Tekkelū, the governor of sacred Mashhad, had been killed and that His Majesty had not appointed another governor to command Burūn Sultān's militia, he crossed the Oxus river to capture Khurāsān. [\`Ubayd Khān] led an expedition to the sacred Mashhad.

\[25a\] Burūn Sultān's wife (muta'āliqa) assumed the command of the triumphant Takalū warriors of the faith and the militia of the dead Sultān and ordered them to rise to the defence of the city and to erect barricades (kuchiband) throughout [Mashhad] . That illustrious woman with the heart of a lion stood opposite the exalted Pādishāh of Tūrān and provided the militia of Burūn Sultān with bounty (kharjī), horses and swords and thus encouraged them to fight. She also sent news of the siege to the Shāh and appealed to Ḥusain Khān, the governor-general of Khurāsān, for help.\\footnote{This sentence is noted on the margin.} The brave and devoted Mashhādi Tekkelū warriors put up a fierce resistance. They endeavoured from morning till evening. They [The Tekkelūs]
could not withstand a large army outside the city walls so they retreated into the city.  

‘Ubayd Khān surrounded and besieged the sacred city of Mashhad with his innumerable army. The young Tekkeṭūs, the relatives of Burūn Sulṭān and the residents of Mashhad fought the Uzbeks with bravery and valour, and for two months the lioness [the widow of Burūn Sulṭān] waged war against the Uzbek army and not for a moment did she abandon the rules of military organisation which she had learnt from her father, brother and husband. In the words of Shaykh Niẓāmī, she spared no effort, hemistitch:

"Whether it is a lioness or a lion, on the day of the battle"

Aid and assistance were not forthcoming from the Shāh the Shadow of God, or Ḥusain Khān, the governor-general of Khurāsān. Extreme hunger afflicted the besieged. The shortage of food was such that they would eat old leather and would make a meal of it. The besieged were suffering such misery that many brave young men thought that martyrdom before the fragrant tomb of the Sulṭān of Khurāsān would bring happiness in this world and the next. They made a death pact and large numbers set off on their way.

[25b] The wife of Burūn Sulṭān finally capitulated and pleaded for mercy. ‘Ubayd Khān agreed to grant Burūn Sulṭān’s household (Khāna kūch) and the Qizilbash survivors safe passage to Iraq.102 He then began to console the residents of Mashhad. After he had occupied the surrounding districts of Ğūs he left the Holy city in the care of one of his trustworthy militia. He then left to capture Āstārābād and Jurjān Zamān.

**Jaghatāy Bahādur attacked Isfarāyin. He fought Zayn al-Din Sulṭān and was defeated.**

After ‘Ubayd Khān turned his attention to Āstārābād, Jaghatāy Bahādur Uzbek, the governor of Mashhad, raised an army of three thousand young warriors to capture Isfarāyin and set off on a campaign of territorial expansion.

102 See also the Commentary "The siege of Mashhad in 932 A.H.".
When the news arrived that Jaghatay Bahadur was approaching, Zayn al-Din Sultan Shamli, the governor of Isfarayin, raised an army of eight hundred young Qizilbash fighters and vowed to remove the Uzbek menace. He also sent a petition to the threshold of the Refuge of Mankind and prepared to fight that large army. Under the command of Mahmud Beg he despatched the vanguard of the victorious army which except for the love and authority of the dynasty of Ali (dudman-i istifâ va irtiža) did not anticipate any assistance from any quarter. He himself, trusting in God, followed Mahmud Beg. Six farsaks from Isfarayin fighting broke out between Jaghatay Bahadur and Mahmud Beg. In a short time large numbers of troops from both sides fell to the swords. The Qizilbash army was agitated. Mahmud Beg was waiting for reinforcements when Zayn al-Din Sultan arrived with the Qizilbash army and the people of Isfarayin to help Mahmud Beg. They attacked the Uzbeks and killed many of them in the first offensive. [26a] The Uzbeks resisted and endeavoured to preserve their name and honour. After seven hundred young Uzbeks and three hundred Qizilbash had been killed in battle, the Uzbeks fled and abandoned all ambitions of territorial gain. They fled in all directions.103 Zayn al-Din Sultan returned to Isfarayin triumphant and at Sultanîyya presented the news of the victory to the threshold of the heavenly power, who at this time was caught in the seditious tumult instigated by the Sultanâns of the Tekkelû, Rûmlû and Ustâjlû [tribes]. His Highness rewarded Zayn al-Din for his victory which had left a token of his courage on the face of the world.

103 Reading is uncertain. The text reads "hartama" which is probably an error. It should read "harta" meaning "everywhere".
Köpek Sultan petitioned [Shāh Ṭahmāsp]. Kār Kiyā Sultan Ahmad arrived at the exalted threshold. The news arrived of the martyrdom of Mīr ‘Abd al-Vahhāb Tabrīzī in Rūm in the hands of the Ottomans (Rūmīyān).

Towards the end of this year Köpek Sultan Ustājlū who had taken refuge in the province of Gilān Rasht petitioned the Shāh for clemency for himself and the Ustājlū tribe. His Highness pardoned Köpek Sultan and his followers and ordered [Köpek Sultan] to spend the winter in Gilān before he returned to court after the Naurūz of 933/March 1527, the year of the Ape, as the chief of the illustrious Khāns.

His Highness then left for the capital Qazvīn to pass the winter and appointed the Amirs of Āzarbāyjān to safeguard the fortresses of that province and thus ensured the security of the region against opponents in Irāq and Āzarbāyjān.

At this time Kār Kiyā Sultan Ahmad, the Vālī of Lāhījān, arrived at court and expressed his sincere faith. For several days he was received at the special assembly (majlis-i khāss) and, then as was customary he returned.

In the year 921/1515, Mīr ‘Abd al-Vahhāb Tabrīzī, the righteous and sincere sayyid had, by the order of Shāh Ismā‘īl, been sent on a mission to the Ottoman Sultan. He had remained there until this time and had sown twelve thousand tāj. He had converted many who wore this habit which is a sign of sincere belief in the Infallible Imāms. At this time his secret was revealed and together with many loyal devotees of the dynasty of ‘Ali (īṣṭifā va īrtīṣa) was martyred by the army of Rūm. [26h] The Pillars of the State gave the news of his martyrdom to His Highness. His Majesty regretted the death of Mīr ‘Abd al-Vahhāb, bestowed favours upon his children and entrusted the office of the supreme judge and the army chaplain (aqẓī al-qaẓā va qiẓā-i ‘askar) of all the province of Āzarbāyjān to them. The children of the martyred Mīr ‘Abd al-Vahhāb were also granted an allowance to the value of six

104 Here “tāj” is a reference to the Qizilbash headgear wearing of which symbolised devotion to the Safavid dynasty and adherence to Shi‘ism.
Tabrizi dinar made on the poll tax of the ghabr millat\textsuperscript{105} [the Christian or Jewish communities?] of the whole of Azarbajyan. A royal patent (lughat nāma) esteemed his children and endorsed their fief (suyūrghāl), the regular salary (muqarrarlī) and the pensions (vażīfa). From that date to present that Shāh Ābbās Bahādur Khān, the son of the dynasty of Āli ‘Umran and the exalted\textsuperscript{106} Pādishāh, adorns the Caliphate (khīlāfat) and the throne of the great kings, the order (silsila) of ‘Abd al-Vahhābiyya has been honoured and respected and their grant of land (suyūrghāl) and regular salary (muqarrarlī) continue.

\textbf{The Naurūz of the year of the Ape (pīchī 'īl), the year 933 / March 1527 which was the third year of the reign of His Highness, may he rest in paradise.}

The world-enlightening Naurūz has covered the earth with resplendent verdure and has called the intoxicated and the sober alike to pleasure and enjoyment. The licentious and pleasure-loving youth have risen from inebriation to the joyful news of spring and have filled the chalice of desire to the brim. [The youth] drank to the friend-loving and enemy-destroying Pādishāh.\textsuperscript{107} His Highness, the seat of Caliphate the Shadow of God, Abu'l Fath Shāh Ṭahmāsp Pādishāh ordered the Naurūz celebration to resume and sat on the throne of prosperity. [27a] The amirs, the vazirs, the sūfis, the mayors (kalāntrān), and the notables of the conquered territories congratulated the arrival of spring and the appearance of the tulip and flowers. Each, according to their means, offered gifts (pishkīsh va nisār) to His Highness and received royal favours. A week of celebrations followed which wiped the shadow of alienation from the heart of gardens and mountains. The notables then returned to administer the political and financial affairs of the state.

\textsuperscript{105} Reading is uncertain. See chapter two "Aʃal al-Tavārīkh and Mir Ābd al-Vahhab".
\textsuperscript{106} Reading is uncertain.
\textsuperscript{107} The sentence reads: "bi tāq-i abrū-i pādishāh-i dust-navāz va dushman-gūdāz bar lab nihādī".
The Battle between Köpek Sultan and Div Sultan at Chakhür-ī Șa‘d and the killing of Köpek Sultan.

As the licentious youth continued the festivities, His Highness, on Friday the twenty-fourth of Rajab of the year 933/26 April 1527, left the capital Qazvin for Savukh Balâgh with the intention to invade Khurasân. His Highness summoned the victorious troops (‘asâkir). [The Shâh] went hunting for a few days while waiting for the arrival of the amirs to repel the Uzbeks and fly the banner of victory over Khurasân.

News came that Köpek Sultan with a large army had left Gilân and was moving towards the abode of guidance Ardabil. Bâdinjan Sultan Rûmlû who at the age of ninety was the governor of Ardabil and the custodian (mutavallî) of the Sacred Tomb of Šafaviyya together with Maqsûd Beg Chepenî and Āyyqût Beg Rûmlû, the amirs of Tâlish and Arsaq, with nearly four thousand men went to meet Köpek Sultan and the Ustâjîlî amirs. Both sides drew up their troops and were intent on eliminating each other. Muntashâ Sultan Ustâjîlî and many valiant [troops] who understood the dust of the battlefield to be the remedy for the state affairs (tūťâ-i dida-i daulat) thought it propitious to strike at the heart of the Rûmlû army. Despite his large army, after a brief skirmish, Bâdinjan Sultan dishonoured himself by fleeing before the Ustâjîlî army.108 [27b] The Ustâjîlî army followed in pursuit of the Rûmlû army and Aḩmad Āqā Châvushlû, the standard bearer (tuqấchî) of Qârûq Sultan,109 killed Bâdinjan Sultan and carried his severed head to the Ustâjîlî amirs. Köpek Sultan considered this to be the beginning of the victories he had anticipated and without delay entered Ardabil. Köpek Sultan went on a pilgrimage to the tomb of the Sultan of the Saints and the proof of excellence110 Shaykh Šâfî al-Dîn Ishâq

108. The wording of this sentence is almost an exact copy of Ahsan (p. 199) which differs from Khulâ’sa’s account. By contrast both Khulâ’sa (p. 170) and Jahân Ārâ report that Badanjan Sultan was killed after much fighting and slaughter.

109. Khulâ’sa, p. 170, and Jahân Ārâ, p. 283, introduce Ahmad Āqâ Châvushlû as the standard bearer (tuqấchî) of Köpek Sultan and not of Qârûq Sultan.

110. Reading is uncertain.
and performed the rites of servitude and Sufi probity (ṣūfigārī). He then flew the banner of departure towards the capital Tabriz.

As soon as the news of the events reached His Highness, the refuge of mankind, in Savukh Balāgh, he abandoned the plan of departure for Khurāsān and sent Div Sulṭān, Chuha Sulṭān and Muḥammad Khān Zu’l-Qadr Uqlī at the command of eight thousand young fighters and one thousand standing corps of royal troops to Alqāṣ Mirzā in Tabriz. Their mission was to fight Köpek Sulṭān. The royal camp at Savukh Balāgh too struck camp and they made for the plain (chaman) of Sulṭāniyya.

Once Köpek Sulṭān learnt that Div Sulṭān and his large army were approaching, he went to Chakhūr-i Saʿad. The amirs followed and [the armies] clashed at Sharūr of Chakhūr- i Saʿad. Köpek Sulṭān and the courageous Ustājūs drew up in battle array and fought Div Sulṭān. Div Sulṭān took position at the centre, Chuha Sulṭān on the right flank, Muḥammad Khān on the reserve, and Ḥamza Sulṭān on the left flank.

Tāj al-Dīn Beg Ustājū who was peerless in bravery saw both lines of troops and charged towards the Rūmlū army. [28a] He penetrated their line of defence, killing many brave men. From his rear, Köpek Sulṭān, Qārūq Sulṭān, Muntashā Sulṭān, Badr Beg and the young Ustājū warriors attacked and overcame the enemy. The harvest of young lives burnt in fire, and the wind of the heroes' assault rekindled the flame of hatred. On that day the Ustājūs fought with such bravery that the world forgot the story of Rustam and Esfandiyār.

With spearheads and arrows of poplar they stole the colour from the face of the Sun.

In the thick of the battle Muḥammad Khān Zu’l-Qadr Öglū attacked the flank of the Ustājū army and the Rūmlū surrounded the Ustājūs whose number did not exceed two thousand fighting men. Köpek Sulṭān, Tāj al-Dīn Beg Ustājū, Dervīsh Beg Ishīq Āqāsī Turkoman and Muḥammad Beg Beg, the son of Bāyrām Khān Qāramānīālū

---

111. Reading is uncertain. It could read "khā'īnīn" traitors or "Khānāin" the Khans, or even "jānībān" both sides.

112. Aḥsan (p. 199) puts the number of the Ustājū fighters on that day at nearly 1000.
were killed. Muntashā Sulṭān, Qārūq Sulṭān and the survivors broke the line and fled as they fought. They reached Gilān with great difficulty.

Div Sulṭān returned triumphant and in the district of Zanjān he was granted the honour of an audience with His Highness. A few days later, by the order of His Highness, Div Sulṭān who was responsible for much political intrigue and sedition was murdered in the summer camp of Güzel on Thursday 4 Shavvāl of the year 933/4 July 1527. His army (qushān va lashgar) was entrusted to Sulaymān Beg Rūmlū and the office of Vicegerency (vikālat) was transferred to Chuha Sulṭān Tekkelū. The office of Vizārat too went from Chuha Sulṭān to Khvāja Hidayat Allāh Savaji, one of the illustrious notables of Iraq and the grandson of Khvāja Zuhar. The seal (muhr) of the Vicegerent was entrusted to him. And because of his weak stature he was named Ārūq Vazir [Belching Vazir]. His Highness punished the rebels of the land and the disobedient servants of the court and returned to the capital Qazvīn.

‘Ubayd Khān attacked and captured Āstārabād. Demrī Sulṭān, Ukhi Sulṭān, and Jagarna Sulṭān were killed.

Faḵrī Ḥisbānī the author of these confused lines has already noted that after the capture of the sacred Mashhad, ‘Ubayd Khān set out to capture Āstārabād and the whole of Jurjān. His Highness ordered the Pillar of the State (rukhn al-ṣaltīna) Chuha Sulṭān Tekkelū to hasten to muster the glorious army to invade Khurāsān. While Chuha Sulṭān was busy assembling his army a letter (ʿarīza) was received from Zaynal Khān Shāmlū the governor of Āstārabād. It told of the approach of ‘Ubayd Khān and his large army towards the city and deployment of his army for battle. Zaynal Khān, Demrī Sulṭān Shāmlū, the governor of Dāmghān, and Ukhi Sulṭān Zu’l-Qadr, the governor of Baṣṭām drew up their small army in battle array against ‘Ubayd Khān. Zaynal Khān appointed Qiya Pa Beg Yīva Qājār to command a

113 It is not clear to whom the seal of Vicegerent was entrusted, to the Vicegerent Chuha Sultan or the Vazir Khvaja Hidayat Allāh Savaji. My reading of the text suggests the seal was entrusted to the Vazir. It may be a clerical error and in fact the seal of Vizarat was intended.
114 See the commentary for "The question of the identity of Ukhi Sultan Zu’l-Qadr, the Governor of Baṣṭām, and the first Uzbek conquest of Āstārabād".
group of lion hearts (hizhbar) at the vanguard (qaravuli va charkhči-gari). Qiyā Pā Beg who was a hero of his time confronted the Uzbek army and battle ensued. With a show of force and bravery he broke up the scouts of the plundering army. Once the news of the valour of the Qizilbāsh army reached the Uzbeks, their vanguard came to assistance. [The Uzbeks] then fought Qiyā Pā Beg on equal terms.

Zaynal Khān too with Ukhir Sultān and Demri Sultān, who expected assistance from nowhere but from the dynasty of Imām Āli (dūdmān-i Iṣṭifā va Irtiẓā), rode the horse of courage to the aid of Qiyā Pā Beg. They killed many Uzbeks who, in return, confident of the aid of ʿUbayd Khān and his large army, routed the Qizilbāsh by the whizz of their heart piercing arrows. [29a] Qiyā Pā Beg Qājār and his brave warriors hunted down the murderous Uzbeks with their spears as if killing wild beasts. Each flank which they attacked, scores of Uzbeks were slain by their swords. The fighting continued for nearly two (astrological?) nujūmī hours.115 ʿUbayd Khān arrived with his army and routed the Qizilbāsh. Zaynal Khān weakened and fled. Qiyā Pā Beg who did not wish to bear the dishonour of defeat, drank from the chalice of martyrdom, fighting to the last. The amirs of Jurjān Zamīn returned to their provinces. Zaynal Khān moved his small household from Āstārābād to Rayy and reported the news of their defeat to the Throne of the Caliphate.

ʿUbayd Khān entered Āstārābād and granted many favours to the Shiʿites, the sayyids and residents of that city. After a few days in Āstārābād, he transferred the governorship of that province to his favourite/successor son ʿAbd ʿAzīz Sultān and returned to the sacred city of Mashhad.

The region lying between Āstārābād and Mashhad except for Isfarāyin was occupied by the Uzbeks. The governors of Sabzivār and Nishāpūr assembled in the citadel of Isfarāyin and strengthened its fortification.

115 It is not clear what Fāzli means by "dau sārat-i nujūmī" (2 astrological hours). It is clearly a term of reference to measurement of time.
Once the news reached the just and pious Shāh, he ordered Pir Quli Sultan Kangarlū, the governor of Khvār and Semnān, Mustafā Sultan Shāmlū the governor of Sāva [29b] and Ahmad Sultan Kangarlū the governor of Rayy to go to the aid of Zaynal Khān. His Highness issued a similar order to Demrī Sultan Shāmlū the governor of Dāmghān, Ukhi Sultan Zul-Qadr the governor of Baštām, Jagarna Sultan Shāmlū the governor of Sabzivār and Bābā Ilyās Bayāt the governor of Nishāpūr asking them to put Abd al-Azīz Sultan the son of Ubayd Khān to the test of manhood.

The above mentioned Amirs hurriedly prepared and set off to capture Astārabād. As the victorious army approached Astārabād, Abd al-Azīz fled from the city in distress to deliver the news of the approach of the Qizilbāsh army. The Amirs of Jurjān placed their trust in divine favour and the royal protection and at once returned to their own provinces. The remaining Amirs in command of the reinforcement returned to their fiefs (tiyūls). Jagarna Sultan Shāmlū together with his officers and a number of Amirs captured Sabzivār. The governor of Sabzivār deserted his post and with Abd al-Azīz Sultan entered the service of Ubayd Khān who by now had reached the Oxus River (Jaihun). When Ubayd Khān received the news of the activities of the Qizilbāsh army, he assembled his vengeful army and marched towards Astārabād.

Jagarna Sultan did not consider it in his power to resist the Uzbek army and entrusted Sabzivār to Mir Shams al-Dīn ‘Alī, a descendant of ‘Alī (dudmān-i ʻiṣṭifā va ʻirṭizā) and to the nobility of that region. He then left for Baštām to convey the news of the approach of the enemy to Ukhi Sultan. Ukhi Sultan despatched a messenger to Astārabād to inform Zaynal Khān. [30a] He also asked Demrī Sultan for assistance. Demrī Sultan without delay organised an expedition and moved to Baštām. He also sent an envoy to the Amirs who by the universally incumbent royal decree (jahān mutā'), had been appointed to provide military reinforcements. He also reported the

---

116 For the "Kangarlū tribe" see the commentary.
117 This river is also known by the name Âmû Daryā.
news to the Seat of the Caliphate. Before the arrival of Demri Sultan, Ubayd Khan had attacked Bastam and had plundered most of the villages on his way. Jagarna Sultan who in intelligence, horsemanship and military organisation was superior to the other Amirs, deemed it wise to surrender Bastam to Ubayd Khan. He also recommended that the Qizilbash forces should assemble in Astarabad, the metropolis of Jurjan, and join forces with Zaynal Khan, the governor-general. He argued that should [the Qizilbash forces] be besieged, it would be advisable that Demri Sultan should command the fortress of Damghan and the remaining Amirs should consolidate the fortress of Mubarak in Astarabad until the royal reinforcements arrives. Ukh Sultan and Demri Sultan disagreed with this plan and having embraced the prospect of death, resolved to wage war. He uttered this verse:

The evil enemy will see nothing of me but the face of my sword and the curve of my arch.

Jagarna too contemplated martyrdom and preferred war to flight. Ukh Sultan took position at the centre and assigned Jagarna Sultan to the right flank of the army and Demri Sultan to the left flank. Ubayd Khan observed the courage and bravery of the Amirs and adorned the centre [of the Uzbek army] by his own presence. He positioned Zaynash Bahadur on the right wing and Qanbar Ali Mirza on the left wing of the army and entered the battlefield. The victorious warriors of the faith took to the battlefield and with two thousand and five hundred young warriors faced an army of twenty thousand fighters. The sound of the battle cry of the Uzbeks and the fife (nafir) of the Qizilbash echoed in the blue sky. Warriors attacked in all directions. [30b] The dust of the battleground blackened the sky and the stars were dazzled by the actions of the army.

Demri Sultan killed many of the [enemy troops] and struck at the heart of the Uzbek army. The Uzbeks launched a counter offensive and repelled Demri Sultan. Ukh Sultan, who found Demri Sultan in danger, mobilised the centre (fit) and attacked the heart of the bloodthirsty Uzbek army. Jagarna Sultan deemed weakness not
worthy of himself and followed him. The armies of the foe and the friend witnessed the three noble warriors display such excellence in fighting that could not be matched by any other human beings. Demri Sultan and Jagarna Sultan were martyred and thus sacrificed themselves for His Majesty. Ukhil Sultan was caught in the grip of destiny. He was taken captive to ‘Ubayd Khan who failed to persuade the young nobleman to agree to end the enmity and thus save his own life. Ukhil Sultan was martyred, defiant to the last. The rest of the Uzbek and the Qizilbash army dispersed. The Qizilbash went towards Iraq and the Uzbeks moved towards Astarabad with peace of mind. A group of loyal Qizilbash reached Damghan and took with them the family of Ukhil Sultan and the Qizilbash to Iraq.

The terrifying news reached the Throne of the Caliphate in Qazvin. His Highness commanded Chuha Sultan to summon the army of the conquered territories (mamlık-i mutṣarafa) and endeavour to capture Khurasan and Transoxiana and punish the Uzbeks. ‘Ubayd Khan entered Astarabad and bestowed many favours on the inhabitants of that city. ‘Ubayd Khan appointed Zaynash Bahadur to the governorship of Astarabad and left for Khurasan. He set up winter camp at Ghuriyân and despatched envoys to Transoxiana and Turkistan to raise an army.

His Highness too set up winter camp at the capital Qazvin. The Shâh sent officers of the standing corps of royal troops (qîrchi) to summon an army. His Highness waited for Naurūz to march towards Khurasan to free the subjects (ra‘âyâ) of this province from the tyranny and injustice of ‘Ubayd Khan.

[31a] Naurūz of the Year of the Fowl (takhāqiy īl), the year 934/
February 1528, the fourth year of the accession of His Highness, may he rest in paradise.

After the joys and pleasures of winter, the world- enlightening Naurūz set foot from behind the veil of gloom into the meadow of life and unveiled a new world before

118 ‘The text reads "fâdá-i farq-i mubârak-i haẓrat-i ʿalâ shudand".
119. According to Khulāsa, p. 172, Ukhil Sultan was killed in battle and Demri Sultan was taken prisoner and killed in captivity. Aḥsan, p. 202, however agrees with Afsal.
the intoxicated (and) worshippers of vanity (sensuality and ambition). The Iris, the tulip and the flowers made the earth the envy of the highest heaven. The tired earth breathed the scent of life. As was customary, His Highness engaged in a week of spring rest and festivities.  

120 After a week the Shāh bestowed robes of honour, horses, jiba121, and swords on the Amirs, the Khāns, the court officials, the honourable Mayors and the subjects. His Highness sent robes of honour to the Amirs of the frontiers of the God-protected dominions whose Naurūz gifts the Shāh had received. His Highness also emphasised the importance of securing the possession of the citadels and planned to invade Khurāsān.

‘Ubayd Khān’s second unsuccessful siege of Herat 122

As already noted ‘Ubayd Khān captured the province of Āstārabād and set up winter camp at Ghūriyān in the vicinity of Harat. Ḥusain Khān Shāmlū the Commander-in-Chief of the army and the governor of Herat repaired the tower and walls of the citadel of Harat and appointed able men to guard the gates of the city. After the Naurūz of the year of the Fowl (takhāqīy īl) which was the beginning of the spring, [31b] ‘Ubayd Khān set up the royal camp at the village of Shāmiyāna near the walls of the city of Harat and planned for war and conquest (of the citadel). He attacked the fortress and the tower of Harat three times. and each time his army was repelled by the courageous Qizilbāsh army. Every time, the Qizilbāsh turned the Uzbeks away from the gates of the city by the force of their arrows and muskets and prevented them from capturing [the citadel]. They did not permit the seditious Uzbeks to reassemble and killed a group of them. Ḥusain Khān and the Shāmlūs attacked the Uzbeks several times like fierce lions. Once it became apparent to ‘Ubayd Khān that it was not possible to capture Harat through war he stationed his troops along the roads to intercept and prevent any import of food and provisions for

---

120 See the commentary "Shāh Tahmāsp and the year 934 A.H."
121 Reading is uncertain. It could be an error for either jiba (weapon or a mailcoat) or ji̇gha (a jewel worn in the turban). I have opted for jiba since it fits the context.
122 See the Commentary "The Siege of Harat".
the army into the city. The Uzbeks also prevented the besieged inhabitants of Harat from any access to the water supply and filled the [water] canal with the soil of tyranny. It is noted in Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh that a man in the guise of a beggar took supplies of salt into the city. A wicked Uzbek brought it to the attention of ʿUbayd Khān who ordered the man to be killed in a hideous manner.

After four months' siege of Harat and death of many troops, ʿUbayd Khān lifted the siege and decided to return just as the [Uzbek] reinforcements arrived. Yārī Beg the son of Jān Vafā Mirzā whose father's bravery in the battle of Shaybak Khān123 has been noted in volume 1 of Afzal al-Tawārīkh, arrived from Turkistān with reinforcements. [Yārī Beg] was intent on capturing Herat. He criticised ʿUbayd Khān saying that his siege tactics were not compatible with the desire to capture the citadel of Herat. He thought it expedient to attack the fortress from all flanks and capture the precious jewel within two days. [32a] ʿUbayd Khān recognised the courage and valour of Yārī Beg to be a sign of good fortune124 and ordered the attack on the citadel to commence. Yārī Beg and the commanders (sardārs) who had travelled with him from Transoxiana set off to inspect the barricades (kucha-band), the city walls (hiṣār) and the moat (khandaq) and to devise a plan of invasion. He came to the lane which passed by the Grey Ash tower (burj-i khākistar) where he left his militia and continued his inspection. By chance the musketeer who guarded the tower, shot Yārī Beg. Yārī Beg who by divine intervention was unaware of the felicity of the worthy heir of the family of Shaykh Şafī al-Din Išāq, was hit and fell off his horse of authority. The proud musketeer severed the head of Yārī Beg and together with his horse and arms presented them to Ḥusain Khān. This caused jubilation [among the Šafavid troops] but nobody knew of the dead man's identity. They searched [his] belt (kamar-i fīr kish) and found a seal bearing the name of

---

123 Reading is uncertain but this could be a reference to the famous battle between Shah Ismāʿīl I and Shaybak Khān Uzbek in 916/1510 in the vicinity of Merv. Shaybak Khān was killed in this battle. Khulūsa, vol. 1, pp. 101-114.
124 Reading uncertain.
Alfabi Yari b. Jân Vafâ Mirzâ. This pleased Ḥusain Khân who saw the killing of this powerful adversary as an act of divine favour.

In the morning of the same day the news of the murder of Zaynal Khân Şâmlû at the hands of Zaynash Bahâdur the governor of Āstârâbâd [which occurred] during the campaign to recapture that city, delighted ‘Ubayd Khân. His old confidants had never witnessed such excitement and feeling of euphoria in ‘Ubayd Khân. The account of martyrdom of Zaynal Khân will be told later. Towards the afternoon the militia of Yârî Beg poured the soil of calamity over their heads and brought the news of his murder to ‘Ubayd Khân. His euphoria changed to sadness and he lost any hope of capturing Harat.

Ḥusain Khân witnessed much scarcity of provisions and famine among the inhabitants of the citadel and ordered those from the middling social groups (avsat al-nâs) who were known not to adhere to Shi‘ism to leave the fortress and their food and provisions to be confiscated.125 [32b] Prices rose so high that one mann of salt could not be found even for a price of one thousand dînârs.126 The upshot according to the author of Aḥsan al-Tavârikh was that Ḥusain Khân fought the Uzbeks for seven months in the fort of Harat and never lost control to them. Ḥusain Khân had been waiting for seven months for the arrival of the royal army when the news arrived that Shâh Ṭahmâsp and his large army were approaching Harat to eliminate the Uzbek menace.

Zaynash Bahâdur was killed in an skirmish with the advanced guard (muqaddam al-jaish) of the Qizilbash army in Dâmghân. Upon hearing this news ‘Ubayd Khân lifted the siege of Harat and escaped. Ḥusain Khân and the young warriors came out of the citadel and having been freed from the defence of the citadel, they felt a new lease of life

125 “muqarar dáshît ki jami’î rá ki bi tashâyu ishtihâr nâdâshîtand az qa’â bar âvarda âzûqa-i ișhân rá zabt namâyând.” See also the commentary “The Siege of Harat”.
126 See the commentary “Expulsion of the civilians from Harat”.

170
Zaynash Bahādur Uzbek came to Firūz Kūh and Zaynal Khān
Shāmlū and a number of Amirs were killed.

The news of 'Ubayd Khān's campaign to Khurāsān reached the loyal servants of the exalted court and His Highness summoned the army and planned to march towards Khurāsān. At this time news arrived that Zaynash Bahādur, the Uzbek governor of Āstārābād and the governor-general of Jurjān Zamīn, together with a large army had embarked on an expedition towards the district (vilāyat) of Firūz Kūh where Zaynal Khān Shāmlū and many other Amirs were stationed. While hunting the Amirs were ambushed and fighting broke out.

During the brief skirmish which followed, Zaynash Bahādur was struck by the lance of a Shāmlū soldier and fell to the ground. When the young Shāmlū soldier saw the diminutive stature of Zaynash Bahādur, he hesitated to kill him and left him. Bahādur recovered, mounted his horse, reassembled the army and attacked the Qizīlbāsh army. A courageous battle ensued but Zaynal Khān and the Qizīlbāsh Amirs could not resist the numerically superior Uzbek army and their army broke up. Zaynal Khān and Muṣṭafā Sulṭān the governor of Sāva were martyred on Sunday 21 Shā'bān 934/ 11 May 1528. Zaynash Bahādur severed the heads of the chiefs and sent to 'Ubayd Khān who was at the foot of the citadel of Herat. The killing of these amirs emboldened Zaynash Bahādur.

After this event His Highness found it difficult to delay the military campaign to Khurāsān any longer and he commanded the Pillar of the State Chuha Sulṭān to hasten to Dāmghān to avenge the murder of the Amirs and punish Zaynash Bahādur.

The account of the rebellion of the unfortunate Zulfiqār in Arab Iraq and the killing of Ibrāhīm Khān, the Vāli of Baghdaḍ.

On the 4th of Ramdān of the year 934 / Saturday 23 May 1528, the news reached the Throne of the Caliphate that Zulfiqār the son of ʿAlī Beg Turkoman, the

127. According to both Aḥsan, p. 208, and Tārīkh-i Jahān Ārā, p. 284, Jagarna Sulṭān, the governor of Sabzivar was also among the Amirs killed on that day.
governor of Gulhar, and the nephew of İbrahim Khan, the governor-general of Baghdād (dār al-islām-i Baghdād), arrived in the summer camp of māhī dasht where İbrahim Khan and a group [of his people] had camped. İbrahim Khan did not suspect Zulfiqār of any intentions of rebellion and opposition. Both publicly and privately a number of [companions] who were aware of Zulfiqār's wicked intentions warned İbrahim Khan [33b] that his arrival with such a large army signalled his rebellious intentions.

İbrahim Khan who was on his death bed did not regard his nephew's opposition and disobedience, who was like a son to him, a threat to himself. He sat in the audience chamber (divān-khāna) with a group of his companions when Zulfiqār descended on him like death. İbrahim Khan became anxious and tried to leave when Zulfiqār and his companions broke the ropes of the tent with their swords. İbrahim Khan and those inside the tent were all martyred. The inhabitants of Gulhar and the horse guards (mulāzima-i mutifariqa) at the service of İbrahim Khan, some in obedience and others in fear for their lives, obeyed Zulfiqār and accepted to enter his service.

Sayyid Beg, the son of Sayyid Muḥammad Kamūna, together with five hundred cavalry, had arrived from Baghdād as the guests of İbrahim Khan to hunt lions and fish in māhī dasht. When he heard these events he too felt obliged to enter into an alliance with Zulfiqār. Fearing for his life he bestowed on Zulfiqār the title of Khan. Sayyid Beg then led his army back to Baghdād, the abode of Islam.

The guardians of the citadel and the family of İbrahim Khan closed the gates of the fort and sent an envoy to His Highness to seek help.

[34a] It was the opinion of the young and exalted Padishāh that punishment of the opponents in Khurāsān was urgent. Therefore he ignored Zulfiqār's shameful action and directed all efforts towards Khurāsān.

Zulfiqār captured the citadel in a short time and put many of his close associates and relatives to death and ordered the heads and beards of the majority [of the inhabitants] to be shaved. Marjūmak Sulṭān the son of Amir Khān who was in the
ranks of the Amirs of Baghdād was also killed. The wicked Zulfiqār proclaimed himself the Vāli of Baghdād and the ruler (farmān-farmā) of Arab Irāq with absolute authority.\textsuperscript{128}

The Shah spent the winter in Janatābād of Qazvīn while waiting for the spring to annihilate the enemy.

[34a]The Naurūz of the year of the Dog (īl īl), the year 935 / March 1529, which was the fifth auspicious year [of Shāh Ṭahmāsp's reign]

With spring the old world renewed its life. The iris, the hyacinth, the tulip, the flower, the jasmine, the sweet basil, the pansy and arghavān painted the earth with the colours of the highest heaven. The breath of God and the dew of spirit touched and aroused the earth from winter sleep which embellished the festive gathering and the assembly of speakers.

His Majesty, the Sublime Threshold,\textsuperscript{129} ordered the stewards (kārdārān) to adorn the Naurūz assembly and the convention of prosperity. The arrival of the spring and the freshness of the plains and mountains inaugurated a new world for both the intoxicated and the prudent [men]. [The stewards] endeavoured to organise the festivities. An assembly (majlīs) was prepared where the sound and melody of the harp astounded Venus. Heaven was so jealous of that ravishing season and the joyful assembly that it plunged paradise into the infernal censer (mijmar) a hundred times.

His Majesty Shāh Ṭahmāsp, may he rest in paradise, with the exalted Amirs, the victorious centurions, the honourable Vazirs, the illustrious grandees, the court officials and the special companions (muqarrabān va makhsūsān) celebrated the Naurūz and drank from the chalice of manliness and action to the castigation of the Uzbeks and reconquest of Khurāsān. Each received a robe of honour and many royal gifts. Each presented the Shah with gifts befitting their station. The notables and the common people feasted for one week and then the royal party resumed

\textsuperscript{128} See the commentary "Zulfiqar's rebellion in Baghdād, 934-5 A.H."

\textsuperscript{129} The title reads "ḥaẓrat-i sipihr rikāb-i 'alā".
preparation for the campaign to Khurāsān and endeavoured to defeat the unfortunate enemy.

His Highness Shāh Ṭahmāsp the young Pādishāh turned his attention to Khurāsān. Zaynash Bahādur the governor of Dāmghān was besieged and killed.

During the Shāh's residence in the capital Qazvīn, every day news of new waves of attacks by Čubayd Khān, the son of Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khān, reached [the court] from Khurāsān. Čubayd Khān had already made three unsuccessful attempts at capturing this province. He had ruthlessly suppressed the inhabitants of Khurāsān and had innovated bad customs and [Sunni] orthodox laws (qavānīn-i muḥaddith). Čubayd Khān followed the impulses of his restless spirit and consistent with his base and reprehensible habits and his ignoble disposition he subjected [the people] to his cruelty. Day and night the people of Khurāsān suffered from his injustice and tyranny and many fled.

[35a] The victorious Pādishāh was indignant to learn that the poor were suffering and ordered the military inspectors (tavājiyān) to send envoys to the corners of the kingdom to inform the victorious troops of the decision to conquer Khurāsān and to punish Čubayd Khān. An immense army of victorious troops, as innumerable as calamities of the world and a number greater than the particles of sunshine, assembled under the triumphant banner. On Saturday the 1st of Ramadān 935 / 9 May 1529, the advancing army camped on the plains of Makhūr and when the crescent of the moon mirrored the lip of the thirsty, 130 the army of that powerful Pādishāh moved to the district of Semnān. In that beautiful and prosperous place [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] performed the rites of the ‘id of Ramadān and bestowed much favour on the poor and the needy. When the murderous warriors reached the plain of Sulṭān-i Maydānī, His Majesty ordained that Chuha Sulṭān Tekkelū, Ulma Sulṭān

---

130 This is a literal translation of the astrological expression. It also appears in Ahsan, p. 210, but Fazlī has modified his reading from lab-i bastīgān to lab-i tishnīgān.
Tekkelū and Zu'l-Qadr Öglü\textsuperscript{131} should launch an attack on Dāmghān to fight and punish Zaynash, who was the governor of Dāmghān and had a reputation as the best and the bravest [commander] of ʿUbayd Khān's army. After having killed Zaynul Khān, Zaynash had dreamt corrupt and depraved thoughts and had strayed [from his path under the influence of] false imagination. \textsuperscript{[35b]} He prided himself on having subjugated the citadel of Dāmghān and was impervious to the Qizilbash army. His Majesty, may he rest in paradise, resigned [himself] to the divine will and with the heroes of the killing fields followed the Amirs. [They] departed for Dāmghān which was on the border of the provinces which ʿUbayd Khān had occupied. [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] commanded the victorious troops in the order of their weapons (\textit{asbāb-i muhāriba}). The brave warriors, who [perceived] the dust of the battlefield to be the cure for the affairs of the state and sought the fountain of life in the darkness of battle, adorned themselves with armour with utmost sincerity of faith, and did not hesitate.

The Commander-in-Chief of the Qizilbash forces Chuha Sultan together with the brave young [warriors] descended on Dāmghān like a sudden calamity. [He] sounded the kettle-drum of Nūshīrvān and shouted the battle cry. The thunder of the outcry of the friends of the dynasty of ʿAlī and the sincere devotees of the saintly dynasty (\textit{khāndān-i sultan al-asfiyā}) caused tumult in the world. The dead heard the horrific sounds and their decayed bones trembled. Zaynash was unable to withstand this powerful army and reached the citadel with difficulty and was then besieged.

\textsuperscript{[36a]} Chuha Sultan Tekkelū ordered the Amirs to encircle the citadel of Dāmghān and sent an envoy to deliver the news of the siege of Zaynash Bahādūr to His Majesty who was hunting birds of prey, wild asses and beasts at the frontier station of Āhūyān on the day of his fourteenth birthday. His Majesty sent Ustād Shaykh Tūphi Bāshī with a troop of men experienced in capturing fortresses to make their utmost effort to recapture the citadel. Ustād Shaikh together with the Rūmlū and

\footnote{According to the sources this is Muḥammad Khān Zu'l-Qadr Öglū.}
Iṣfahānī gunners (*tūpchiyan*) took up a position on top of a plane tree overhanging the citadel, and opened fire on the enemy. They fired on the parapet.

The Uzbeks held their ground and bombarded the Qizilbāsh army with a barrage of gun and cannon fire. Those inside and outside the citadel did not sleep all night and in a soldierly manner kept guard, writing death certificates with tulip-coloured bloody arrows on each other's chest. During the assault on the citadel a large number of the Qizilbāsh were killed and the amirs took refuge in the sanctity of the infallible Imāms and the intercessors of the Day of Judgement. The Amirs attacked this sea of fire and penetrated the tower and the walls of this mighty fortress in several places. Two or three times Zaynash Bahādur emerged from the citadel, fighting the Sūfī army with his few able troops and each time retreated into the fortress after inflicting casualties. Finally Zaynash Bahādur could not withstand the siege and fled from the citadel. Outside the walls he met his death at the hands of the Qizilbāsh troops. The brave young warriors took his severed head to Chuha Sulṭān before storming the fortress and taking control of the walls and the defences.

A group of the Uzbeks and the rebellious inhabitants of Dāmghān were put to death and the survivors pleaded for mercy. According to the tradition of the exalted Safavid dynasty which had become customary from the time of Abu'l Baqā Shāh Ismā'īl the Ghāzī Pādishāh, whose abode is with ‘Alī, those seeking clemency were granted royal pardon. Those who wished to leave for Khurāsān and enter into the service of ʿUbayd Khān were given enough provisions, carriers and permission to leave, so that they might take the news of the bravery of the young Qizilbāsh, whose countenance was moon-like and whose fury resembled Mars, to ʿUbayd Khān. Chuha Sulṭān brought to the attention of the sovereign of the world the Pādishāh of...

132 Reading uncertain.
133 According to *Ahsan*, p. 212, Zaynash escaped at night using a rope to climb down the wall when he was captured and put to death. Fāzli Iṣfahānī clearly began to report this but changed his mind, the words "night with rope" are crossed out at mid-sentence.
the sea of benevolence the world-conquering Abūʾl Manṣūr Shāh Ṭahmāsp\textsuperscript{134} those who wished to join the rank of the loyal servants of the Sublime Threshold. [37a] Chuha Sulṭān presented the loyal subjects to the Shāh. They were enlisted into the Şūfī ranks as militia, and were granted a fief (tīyūl) and regular salaries (mavājib). Those who had escaped and those who had been granted royal permission to leave, took the news of the death of Zaynash Bahādūr and the capture of the fortress of Dāmghān, a key stronghold in Khurāsān, and coming of the Sovereign of the World to ‘Ubayd Khān. As has been related under the events of the previous year, ‘Ubayd Khān was at the time engaged in the siege of the citadel of Herat:

When the Khān heard of the khāqān’s arrival and of his intention to capture Khurāsān, Fearful of that Rustam-like cavalry, he fled Harat for Samarqand. At the foot of the fortress of Harat ‘Ubayd Khān learnt of the news of the murder of Zaynash Bahādūr who was unrivalled in bravery, the coming of the Shāh, and the murder of Yār Beg the son of Jān Vafā Mīrzā. He also witnessed the courageous and Rustam-like resistance of the young warriors in the fortress. Unable to continue his campaign in Khurāsān, with his pride wounded, ‘Ubayd Khān rose from the foot of the citadel of Harat and crossed the river Oxus to enlist the support of the Sulṭāns of Turkistān and to raise a new army.

When Ḥusain Khān Shāmlū and the besieged garrison (at Dāmghān) heard that Zaynash Bahādūr had been killed and that His Majesty was approaching, they found a new lease of life. They prayed the Almighty God for the assistance of the royal army and lifting of the siege and were thus relieved of the task of defending the citadel. Having been freed from the Uzbek tyranny by divine favour, the survivors celebrated and awaited the arrival of His Majesty, may he rest in paradise, and

\textsuperscript{134} Shah Ṭahmāsp’s titles and attributes read “khādīy-i jahān va pādishāh-i bahr-i ihsān abūʾl manṣūr shāh Ṭahmāsp”.

security and prosperity under the auspicious reign of the just Padishah in that province.

Āstārābād, Sabzivār and Nishāpūr were captured without war and His Majesty entered the sacred Mashhad. The Uzbeks left Khurāsān for Transoxiana to deliver the news of the approach of His Highness the Shadow of God.

With divine favour the fathers of the august state captured the fortress of Dāmghān, Zaynash Bahādur the most warlike of the Uzbek army was killed, and the region of Dāmghān which was the key to Khurāsān together with the entire state provinces (māmālik) of Jurjān and Āstārābād came into possession of the relatives (mansūbān) of the dynasty of Glory and Supremacy (dudmān-i ʿiz vaʿalā). His Highness, the Sublime Threshold, may he rest in paradise, entrusted the governorship of the province (vilāyat) of Āstārābād and Jurjān Zamīn to Shāhverdī Beg Ziyād Ughlī Qājār and bestowed royal favours upon the exalted sayyids of that province and then proceeded to the sacred Mashhad to visit the sacred tomb of the Sultān of Khurāsān and the qibla of the righteous, the Imām of the universe from the earth to the Pleiades, Sultān Abuʾl Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Mūsā al-Riżā and to punish ʿUbayd Khān.

The royal army camped in the plain (chaman) of Kāliyūsh and when the chamberlains (ḥujjāb) of the Threshold of the Refuge of Mankind received the news of departure of ʿUbayd Khān from Herat towards Transoxiana, [His Majesty] decided to conquer and capture Khurāsān and placed greater emphasis on the Mashhad campaign. News came that Qanbar ʿAlī the governor of Isfārāyīn, whom ʿUbayd Khān had appointed, had strengthened the fortress of Khabūshān and had declared his independence and autonomy. His Majesty commanded the Pillar of the State Chuba Sultān with the victorious Amirs to depart for Isfārāyīn to free the inhabitants of that district (vilāyat) from the injustice and tyranny of Qanbar ʿAlī Uzbek and to capture the fortress of Khabūshān and place it under the governorship
of a loyal and able servant. The Commander-in-Chief of the Qizilbash forces mounted an expedition to Isfarayin to punish Qanbar 'Ali. Qanbar 'Ali who had received the news of approach of the pugnacious Qizilbash army, the departure of Ubayd Khān for Transoxiana, the conquest of Jurjān and murder of Zaynash Bahādur, felt powerless without the supporting shield of a lord, and before Chuha Sulṭān arrived, he with his family and subjects left for Transoxiana.

Chuha Sulṭān entered the township (qāṣaba) of Isfarayin, captured it and placed the citadel and the town of Khabūshān under the control of the Chekenī warriors of the faith who had distinguished themselves in bravery. Chuha Sulṭān informed the Throne of the Caliphate of the developments and himself stayed for a few days to put in order the affairs of that region and the armies of Abīvārd, Nisā and Bāghbād. Chuha Sulṭān also reassured the landlords (arbāb), the peasants (rā'āyā) and the head farmers [of the villages] (dihāqīn). After Isfarayin was recaptured, His Highness left for the town of Sabzivār. The governor of Sabzivār and his dependants left for Transoxiana. The governor of Nishāpūr and [the governors of] other towns of Khurasan renounced any claim to their seats of governments and received the honour of service within the ranks of the militia of the Exalted Threshold, each receiving royal favours. Those who wished to leave, surrendered their territories (vilāyat) to the heir of the dynasty of Imāmate and Divinely-Ordained Authority (imāmate va vilāyat) and departed.

The Bānī Mukhtār Sayyids of Sabzivār, especially Mīr Shams al-Dīn 'Alī Sulṭān had the good fortune to prostrate before the magnanimous Pādishāh and to receive the suyurğāls and pensions (vazā'if) of the time of Shāh Ismā'īl, the valiant warrior of the faith. His Highness appointed the governors and the guardians (mustahfizān) of the citadels of Sabzivār, Nishāpūr and other regions (vilāyat) of Khurasan before departing for Mashhad.

The exalted Rażawiyya Sayyids and the notables of the city hastened to greet the Shāh and strew silver and gold on the felicitous procession. At an auspicious hour,
in deference to the Sháh of Khurášán, His Highness the Sayyid Pádisháh, the source of spiritual guidance,\(^{135}\) began to walk from the Túmí pool which lies approximately one farsakh from the shrine. [38b] On arrival at the Sacred Mashhad [the Sháh] went on a pilgrimage to the eight Imám and the seventh qibla of the pupil of the eye of the people, the martyr of Khurášán Sulṭán Abúl Ḥasan ʿAlí b. Musa al-Rižá. [Sháh Táhmásp] prided himself on having the honour of kissing this Kaʿba- like shrine and sang this couplet:

\[
\text{I had heard the dust of his quarters to be the remedy (kuḫl)} \\
\text{for the eyes,} \\
\text{Praise be to God that I did not die and saw it with my own eyes.}
\]

After offering servitude to the holy shrine and kissing it which was a prerequisite of humility and sincere devotion, [Sháh Táhmásp] bestowed gifts on the virtuous and pious Sayyid Mír Niẓám al-Mulk Ražáví, the custodian of the shrine, and the exalted sayyids of the sacred Mashhad and bestowed favours upon the dervishes (fuqará) and the needy. [The Sháh] sent robes of honour, horses and swords to ʿUsain Khán Shámlū, the governor general of Harat, and those who had shown great courage during the siege of the city, to the landlords of the province, the suffering notables and the syndics (kadkhudāyān) of the guilds, gifts befitting their station.\(^{136}\) [Sháh Táhmásp] also commanded them to repair the citadel, to obtain provisions and strengthen the defences and endeavour to be vigilant against the ever-present threat of another Uzbek offensive.

[Sháh Táhmásp] himself remained in Mashhad for pilgrimage and worship, to organise the army and to console the souls of the inhabitants of Khurášán while waiting for the return of ʿUbayd Khán and his large army. [39a] Chuha Sulṭán too

---

\(^{135}\) Sháh Táhmásp's title reads "haẓrat-i pādisháh-i sayyid-i sāhib-i irshád".

\(^{136}\) Both Khulásā, p. 179, and Iran dar rūzgār-i..... , pp. 258-9, report that when ʿUsain Khán heard that Sháh Táhmásp had arrived in Mashhad, he joined the royal camp and received much favour from the Shah and his presence at the camp "heartened and inspired the Rustam-like warriors of the faith". Aḥsan and Afzal do not report this and suggest that gifts were sent to ʿUsain Khán, possibly in Harat.
ensured the security of Isfarayin, the citadel of Khabūshān and the frontier province of Ürganjiya. He then returned to Mashhad and together with the lower-ranking Amirs (umarā-i tābin)137 who were the generals of the advancing army, received the honour of pilgrimage to the Sulṭān of Khurāsān and audience with the young Padishāh. [Chuha Sulṭān] jointly with the Grand Vazir Mīr Ja‘far Sāvaji and the commanders of the army began to train the troops.

The Account of the Battle of His Majesty Shāh Ṭahmāsp, may he rest in paradise, at Khargird of Jām with ‘Ubayd Khān Uzbek and the Sulṭāns of Turkistān and the defeat of Shāh Ṭahmāsp.138

After the siege of Harat had been lifted, ‘Ubayd Khān crossed the river Oxus to enlist the military support of Küchkūnchi Khān and the Sulṭāns of Turkistān. Now after a few days royal residence in Mashhad, His Majesty Abu’l Fath Shāh Ṭahmāsp the warrior of the faith, may he rest in paradise, received the news of his return with a large army, a great multitude beyond the patience of numbers and more numerous than desert sands. ‘Ubayd Khān was intent on defeating the just Padishāh whose army was less than a sixth of the Uzbek army in size, and on capturing the entire province of Khurāsān.

His Majesty the Sublime Threshold too commanded the tent of fortune and the portico (pishkhāna) of victory and glory to be pitched facing the Oxus water and to await divine victories and indubitable bounties. The Commander-in-Chief of the Qizilbāsh forces Chuha Sulṭān Tekkelū with all the Amirs of the vanguard

---

137 The meaning of the word "tābin" is uncertain. Naʻāvī in his list of the Turkic and Mongolian words in Ahsan al-Tavārīkh, suggests any party of people numbering forty, is a "tābin". According to the same source it also means any crowd of people who take part in warfare. In Tārīkh-i Jahān Āra, p. 288, we also find this reference "When His Majesty encamped in Zanjan, each of the Zu’l-Qadr centurions (yūzbāshiyān) departed with his tābin in the vanguard". According to Röhrborn, however, an "amir-i tābin" was a lower ranking governor (hākim) who in the later Safavid period was appointed or dismissed by the beglarbeg (the governor-general) and was the beglarbeg’s personal functionary or dārūgha. Klaus-Micheal Röhrborn, Provinzen und Zentralgewalt Persiens, im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert, (Berlin, 1966). Trans. Kaikavvus Jahandari as: Nizām-i ʿalā dar daura-i Şafavīa, (Tehran, 2537). pp. 30, 38. Röhrborn’s definition has been employed here.

138 For a commentary of the battle of Jām see chapter 2 "A Critical Evaluation of Afzal al-Tavārīkh".
(charkhchi) led the victorious army out of Mashhad. His Highness the Refuge of the Caliphate also performed the last religious rite, circumambulated (tavāf-i vidā’) the tomb of Sultān Abūl Ḥasan ‘Ali b. Musa al-Riżā for the last time and set out on the journey towards the royal camp imploring the pure spirits of his ancestors to intercede on his behalf. [39b] The notables of Khurāsān received the Shāh with pomp and ceremony and offered gifts (pīshkīsh va pīshandāz), and thus obliged him. His Highness did not accept the gifts of the notables of Khurāsān and returned them. [The Shāh] then made a gift of a robe of honour to each of [the notables], entrusting them to the care of the Sultān of Khurāsān, and set out on the journey towards his destination.

As the victorious army encamped in the district of Khargird, a dependency of Jām, news reached the Emperor [Shāh Ţahmāsp], whose sign is Pisces,¹³⁹ that a division of the Uzbek army was on the move in the area. Shāh Ţahmāsp Abūl Fath, the warrior of the faith, may he rest in paradise, sent fourteen trustworthy and able young scouts (qarāvul) who by the love of the fourteen pure souls had come from the fold of inexistence to the meadow of life, to reconnoitre the area and bring back news of the Uzbek army and scouts. The young devoted scouts were granted permission to leave and set out towards the Uzbek army. After a few farsakh they came into sight of four hundred young troops¹⁴⁰ and returned. The audacious Uzbeks pursued and captured a number of the scouts, the rest escaped unharmed and took the news to the great Emperor.¹⁴¹ The next day His Highness appointed Ulma Sulṭān Tekkelū and Muḥammad Khān Zu’l-Qadr Oğlu to the vanguard of the army and thus adopted caution and followed the rules of military profession. Muḥammad Khān Zu’l-Qadr Oğlu was the son of Gūr Shāhrukh, the son of ‘Alā’-daula Zu’l-Qadr who was the Padishāh of Ilištān and Mar’ash.¹⁴² The Amirs reached the

¹³⁹ Shāh Ţahmāsp’s title reads “Khāqān-i jamshid ʿilām”.
¹⁴⁰ Reading is uncertain.
¹⁴¹ Shāh Ţahmāsp’s title reads “khāqān-i jam iqtidār”.
¹⁴² This biographical note is recorded on the margin of this folio.
vanguard of the Uzbek army. They encountered a large army but deemed it unwise to engage in battle. They returned and informed His Highness of the magnitude of the army of the Khāns of Uzbekistān and Turkistān. That night they camped at Zīr Ābād, in the vicinity of Jām, which was two farsakhs from Farīqī, where the Qizilbāsh and Uzbek scouts (qarāvulān) clashed. [40a] After the brief skirmish between the scouts of the two armies each side knew of the close proximity of its opponent, and camped nearby to prepare for war. The dark night descended.

In that dark night, the intrepid warriors lay restless thinking to prove their bravery and manliness before their equals, peers, and their spiritual guide and the qibla of the Šūfis. 143 They contemplated accomplishing glory in life or attaining fame for bravery in the event of martyrdom, and thus assuring distinction for their children and descendants. [40b] Both armies stood guard, waiting for sun rise to draw ranks. Until near sunrise, His Highness, the shadow of God and the vicegerent of God, 144 prayed for the victory of the fathers of the august State. In the morning when the sun destroyed the legions of the stars and the universe was cleansed of darkness, [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] woke up and prayed. Chuha Sulṭān, the Commander-in-Chief of the Qizilbāsh forces, received the honour of prostration before the Shāh and requested the royal command to sound the drum of Anūshīrvān. [The Šafavid army would sound their drum] only after the Uzbeks called for battle. The military inspectors were ordered, on hearing the sound of the drum of Anūshīrvān the second, to call the Amirs, the centurions, and the standing corps of royal troops to arms. His Majesty the Shadow of God also dressed for battle and adorned his peerless body with the armour of divine protection, the assistance of the pure spirit of His Holiness the refuge of prophecy and the Infallible Imāms, and waited for the sound of the battle drum of the Chingīzī army. Following the tradition of his munificent ancestors, Shāh

143 Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s title reads “murshid va qibla-i ṣūfiyyān”.
144 Shah Ṭahmāsp’s title reads “hażrat-i zill-i subhānī khalifat al-raḥmānī”.

Ismā‘īl Abūl Baqā, whose abode is with ʿAlī, too had allowed the enemy to open fire.

[41a] As his Highness the Shadow of God dressed in the hereditary garb of courage, the sound of the Uzbek battle drum reached the World Sovereign the Shadow of God and the progeny of the Lord of the Age. The Commander-in-Chief of the Qizilbāš forces Chuha Sulṭān also ordered the drum of Anūshīrvān to be beaten and His Highness's horse to be prepared. After hearing the beat of the drums, the victorious Amirs and troops (ʿasākir) mounted the horses of hope and fear and entrusted the reins to divine will. His Highness the Refuge of the Caliphate and the Hope of the Ṣūfīs mounted a fierce horse which by night roams a man's dreams and by day leaps from the northern wind, and drew up the Ṣūfī ranks in line.

Chuha Sulṭān Tekkelū, the Commander-in-Chief of the Qizilbāš forces, Ḥamza Sulṭān Tekkelū, Aḥmad Sulṭān Afshār, Yaʿqūb Sulṭān Qājār, and Muḥammad Sulṭān Sharaf al-Dīn Oğlū Tekkelū took position on the right wing. [41b] Ḥusain Khān Shāmlū, Tabaruk Khalīfa 146, Muḥammad Khān Zuʿl-Qadr Oğlū, Pīr Qūlī Sulṭān Shāmlū, Aḥmad Sulṭān Ustājlū, Ḥasan Sulṭān Durghūd Oğlū, and Malik Beg Khuʿiy took position on the left wing. Ulma Sulṭān Tekkelū led the vanguard (charkhchī).

[Shāh Ṭahmāsp], the Grand Vazir Mīr Jaʿfar Sāvaji the court officials, the centurions, the standing corps of royal troops, and the gentlemen of the workshops (āqāyān-i kārkhānijāt) took position at the centre. The army of His Highness, may he rest in paradise, which did not exceed twenty thousand troops in number, stood in readiness for battle.

On the opposite side ʿUbayd Khān and Kuchum Khān too deployed the vengeful Uzbek army. They themselves took position at the centre. Barāq Khān, Fūlād Sulṭān, and ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Sulṭān were assigned to the left wing and Ḫānī Beg Sulṭān, Gildī Muḥammad Sulṭān, and Abū Saʿīd Sulṭān to the right wing. Sevinjūk Muḥammad

---

145 Shāh Ṭahmāsp's titles read "khādīv-i jahān va zill-i subhān va farzand-i rasūl-i ākhar-i zamān".
146 Ahsan, p. 214, identifies him as Tabaruk Khān Shāmlū.
Sultān, Qanbar ‘Alī Beg, Shaykh Dervīsh Beg, and Rustam Qulī Beg were appointed to the reserve so that they could provide reinforcements wherever the need arose. Ṭabī Khvāja and Qarāja Bahādur were appointed to the vanguard. Kaskan Qara Sultān, Qumish Ughlān, Tanish Beg, Sayyidum Mīrzā, Jughtāy Bahādur, Biyāqu Bahādur, Ḥāfīz Qanqarat and Shaykh Abū Sa‘īd Afrāsīyāb took position at the centre with ‘Ubayd Khān and Kuchum Khān. The entire armies of Transoxiana, Kāshghar, Turkistān, Andijan, Qāzāq, and Dasht-i Qipchāq and Qirqiz prepared for battle and drew up opposite the victorious army. Such a large army had not crossed the Oxus river since the time of Chingiz Khān.

More innumerable than ants and locusts, they had seized the mountains and the seas.

[42a] The victorious warriors of the faith too drew up in battle array and each man took up his position. The sound of fife and drum and the Allāh Allāh battle cry of the enemy- capturing warriors of the faith could be heard by the inhabitants of the universe. The two armies undulated like two green seas and came to grips with each other. The lion-hearted men and the enemy- destroying heroes advanced to the attack. Such battle ensued that the noise of the horses’ feet thundered through the air, and the cloud of dust concealed the sun. The mighty Qizilbāsh army kindled the flames of war with the boisterous wind of courage. The deadly poplar arrows of the lightening Uzbek troops fastened the stars of the Pleiad to the belt of Orion. [42b] In the midst of the battle, Jānī Beg Khān and a division of the Uzbek army attacked the Tekkelū Amirs. Chuha Sultān Tekkelū with the right wing of the Qizilbāsh army were unable to repulse the assault and were forced to flee the battle ground.

Muḥammad Sultān Sharaf al-Dīn Oğlū fell from his horse and the Uzbeks rushed upon him but Ḥasan Sultān Durghūd Oğlū came to his assistance and mounted him on his horse. Next came the officers of Muḥammad Sultān who took him to safety. The defeat of the Tekkelū contingent and the heavy loss of men that it sustained
prompted the Uzbeks to attack the Qizilbāsh army with greater boldness and courage.

The reserve, the right and the left wings and the vanguard broke ranks. Without pausing to stop, Ahmad Sulṭān Afshār returned to his province (ulkā) of Kermān, and Yaʿqūb Sulṭān Qājār and Malik Beg Khūʿiy returned to Semnān. The fearless Uzbeks pursued the retreating army attacking the Qizilbāsh and the army stores which were positioned at the rear of the army.

The courageous men of the army stores fought the Uzbeks killing large numbers. Finally they too were overpowered and abandoned all belongings and equipment and fled for their lives. The pious Shāh remained in his pivotal position and was not at all perturbed by the turn of events. The gunners and musketeers who were at the service of His Majesty opened fire on the Uzbeks. [43a] The air was filled with dust and in the darkness one could not distinguish friend from foe.

When the dust settled, it appeared to the Shāh that except for the centre, not one of the troops who had earlier been engaged in battle remained on the field.

The author of Aḥsan al-Tavārikh who himself was at the service of His Highness Shāh Tahmāsp the Warrior of the Faith, may he rest in paradise, as an arm-bearer in the rank of the Qūrchīs (qūrchīyān-i yarāq bardār), has noted in his history that after the sky had cleared, the Shāh led the centre, attacked and defeated Īʿbayd Khān and Kuchum Khān. The authors of Khuld Ārā, Muntakhab al-Tavārikh, Miftāḥ al-qlūb, and Maulānā Nujūmī the author of Tārīkh-i Harat va Khurāsān, have written that after all hope of any assistance from the amirs of the right and left wings had diminished, the Shāh firmly held his ground and struck many Uzbeks from their horses with his lethal lance. [The Shāh] then determined to ride to the foot of the banner when the Grand Vazir Mīr Jaʿfar, the Ṣadr Mīr Qavām al-Dīn Ḥūsain, and the Qizilbāsh centurions beseeched him to retreat, counselling him that such defeats were prevalent in warfare. [They advised him] that with divine favour, he should muster a new army to take revenge from the Uzbeks on whom the world has turned
its back. They then took His Highness away from the battlefield leaving the entire camp and the equipment of the army stores in possession of the covetous Uzbeks.

The Second Battle of His Majesty Shāh Ṭahmāsp Šāfavi, may he rest in paradise, with ‘Ubayd Khān the deaf, and the defeat of ‘Ubayd Khān. Ahmad Sultan Afshār was removed from the governorship of Kermān and that service was entrusted to his Vazir Āqā Kamālī and an account of the events.

As has already been related, His Highness was defeated by the Uzbek Sultāns who commanded an army of eighty thousand men. Following this defeat Shāh Ṭahmāsp and the company retreated from the camp and after three farsakh, they came to a nearby river where they performed supererogatory prayer. The troops of the right and the left wings who had escaped from the battlefield, regrouped and spent that night with His Majesty on the river bank, eating whatever dry bread they could find in their saddlebags, and waiting for divine inspiration (laţifa-i ghaybī).

Shaykh ‘Alī b. ‘Abd al-Šāl, the Mujtahid of the Age, the Amirs, and the Khāns, tried to console His Highness the Refuge of Caliphate that such events were common in the affairs of kingship and that with divine favour these setbacks would be avenged, but it was to no avail. His Highness, fourteen years of age at the time 147, could not be consoled and after prayer and offering servitude to God deservedly went to bed and fell asleep with a heavy heart. It was a matter of certainty to the amirs, the Khāns, and those in attendance at His Sacred Throne that whenever the Sultāns of Tūrān gained such victories, there was no alternative but to capitulate and leave the entire provinces of Khurāsān and Irāq in their possession for that year.

Four dānghs of that dark and calamitous night had passed when His Highness the Spiritual Guide and the Shadow of God woke up and commanded that Mir Niẓām

147 An emendation on the margin reads: "In fact the age of Shah Ṭahmāsp was sixteen years not fourteen as becomes clear after examination of the date of birth and the subsequent events." The date of birth given by Afsal on folio 3a, Wednesday 3rd Zi‘l-hijja haram 918 A.H., bears this statement out.
al-Mulk Rażavī, the custodian of the sacred Mashhad who was in attendance, be summoned to be told of the Shāh's dream. When the pious Sayyid entered and before His Highness, may he rest in paradise, could relate his dream, the Mīr said "what is the cause of this delay?" and advised that [the Shāh] should act upon the instructions of Their Holinesses, as prescribed in the dream. With divine favour, the fathers of the state were destined for victory. Shaykh 'Ali b. ʿĀl, the Sadr Mīr Qavām al-Dīn Hūsain, [44 a] the Grand Vazir Mīr Jaʿfar, the pillars of the State, and the grandees of the kingdom (cāyān-i saltanat) who were present rejoiced and asked His Highness, the Refuge of the Caliphate, to tell them about his dream. His Highness asked Mīr Niẓām al-Mulk who that night had been present at the gathering of his "unequalled ancestors" to recount the dream. The Ṣūfī Mīr (mīr-i sāhib-i hāl) said that His Holiness the refuge of Muḥammadan Prophecy, the Shāh whose authority is divinely ordained (shāh-i vilāyat panāh), the Guiding Imams and the grand Shaykhs who were the ancestors of His Highness, gathered tonight to focus all attention on the victory of His Highness the Shadow of God, the heir of this dynasty, and declared that unless he personally took part in battle, the banner of victory would not fly. The Ṣūfis and the sincere devotees (yikjahān va mukhlīṣān) rejoiced at hearing the news of victory, they cried Allāh Allāh and vowed to serve their spiritual leader (pīr va pīrzāda) and to shed all fear and cowardice from their minds.

There remained two hours to sunrise on the faithful morning when [the contingent] mounted the horses of hope. His Highness, may he rest in paradise, decided to leave behind some of the injured and the foot-soldiers in that camp while he himself and the able-bodied cavalrymen would fight the Uzbeks whose army was in excess of eighty thousand men. Upon hearing the news of the imminent victory, they felt relieved of their bruised bodies and troubled minds; not one man would agree to stay behind; the entire army, a total of no more than seven thousand cavalry and infantry followed their spiritual guide and qibla. Three hours (yik pās) to sunrise on Saturday the eleventh of Muḥarram 935 A.H., [the contingent] embarked on war against
eighty thousand men. His Highness, the Sublime Threshold, reassured the men with these verses by Mirzâ Qâsim:

O you valiant Rustam-like men, do not agonise over the war.
Our numbers may be small and the enemy countless, but do not fear.
As the grace of God is with us and defeat of the enemy is our vocation.
A formidable army does not perturb him who is assisted by the grace of God.
God the omnipotent is the source of victory; victory is God's and it is imminent.

Ubayd Khân and the Sulţâns of Tûrân had inflicted an imagined defeat on the army of Iran and having captured their camp, tent and equipment, they were asleep unconscious of the sleight of the hand of the juggling heavens. Near sunrise when friend could not be distinguished from foe, the cry of the Qizilbâş fife was heard but [the Uzbeks] believed it to be their own trumpeter (camala-i naqqâra) imitating the Qizilbâş fifer. At this time ‘Ubayd Khân and Kûchkûnji Khân received the news that the victorious Shâh Ţahmâsp had entered the Uzbek camp and that scores of the Uzbek troops had been killed. Hard as they tried, they could not mobilise the army to fight the small Qizilbâş force. The Şûfis and the devoted followers (yikjahân) all united, followed their qibla and ka‘ba into the camp. They ambushed the Uzbeks and swiftly killed many of them.

Ubayd Khân and Kuchum Khân too mounted their horses to repulse the enemy.

The glittering sword removed the mask of darkness from luminous faces and began its blandishment to take the lives of fearless men. The bow turned its arched back to the suspicious enemy and despatched its swift arrows bearing the inevitable message to every heart large and small. As the battlefield warmed from the heat of the ghâzîs’ flaming swords and the breeze of desire blew over the advancing ghâzîs’ meadow of hope and as the brave warriors smelled the fragrance of victory, ‘Ubayd Khân and Kuchum Khân withdrew from the battlefield and fled.

148 As in many other parts of the chronicle, here too, the author attributes the poem to Mirzâ Qâsim whose name has been crossed out.
149 This sentence has been crossed out in the manuscript.
Hūsain Beg Qūrchī Ustājū, with his mace, struck ʿUbayd Khān on the head and threw him off his horse but could not capture him because of his diminutive stature. Instead he pursued a young and handsome Uzbek. Din Qīlī Bahādūr arrived from the rear and rescued ʿUbayd Khān. From that time, ʿUbayd Khan who had received a blow to the head was known as ʿUbayd Khān the Deaf. The above-mentioned Qūrchī then followed Ṭabl Khvāja Amir Ākhūr; they fought each other with bow and arrows but finally they exchanged names and Ṭabl Khvāja told Hūsain Beg that the diminutive man whose head he had struck had indeed been ʿUbayd Khān. The two men then parted.

Hūsain Khān and the young Qızılıbāsh followed the Uzbek army for some time and having proved their courage then returned to the service of Shāh Tāhmāsp. Hūsain Khān related to the Shāh what he had heard from Ṭabl Khvāja Amir Ākhūr. Those who had witnessed ʿUbayd Khān's diminutive stature confirmed this whilst others disbelieved it, until Ahmad Sūltān Ustājū brought in his Uzbek captives. They confirmed that ʿUbayd Khān had fallen from his horse and his hearing was impaired. Shāh Tāhmāsp bestowed favours on Hūsain Beg Chāvushlū Ustājū and honoured him with the position of the bearer of the royal bow and arrow (fir va kamān bardārī).

Mir Hūsain Khān Tavakuli, the governor of Jām, had been besieged in the citadel and for many years had struggled with the Uzbeks refusing to submit to their rule. Now he was intent on joining the ranks of the Shāh's militia so he emerged from the citadel in pursuit of the army of Tūrān. He courageously killed and beheaded Kūchkuńji Khān, took his head to the threshold of the Refuge of the Caliphate and threw it at the feet of the horse of the Shīʿi Pādīshāh. 150 He received many royal favours and was ordered to return to the vilāyat of Jām, Sarakhs, and Zūrābād which were under his governorship.

150 For the killing of Kuchkuni Khan see the commentary. Shah Tāhmāsp's title reads "pādishāh-i shīʿi shuʿār".
His Highness, the Sublime Threshold, went to the royal tent (*khayma-i daulat*) which during the previous night ʿUbayd Khān had occupied, took the armour off his delicate body and prostrated himself in praise of God seeking new and endless victories. [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] also honoured Mir Nizām al-Mulk who had participated in his dream, with many favours, granting him permission to leave for the pure and sacred Rażavī Threshold [46a] to take the news of the victory of His Highness the Shadow of God to the residents, the attendants (*khuddām*), and the honourable Shīʿītes of Mashhad. He was also assigned to confer the divine bounty\(^{151}\) on the poor of that city which answered to prayers. The victorious troops all returned to their tent and place, and those without a tent or any equipment took possession of what the Uzbeks had left behind and thus they were in want of nothing.

That afternoon an army was intercepted approaching the [Iranian] camp. His Highness prepared for battle while some troops were sent to identify it. News arrived that it was the army of Jānī Beg Khān Chinglīzī who had been in pursuit of the defeated Qizilbash troops and believed that ʿUbayd Khān and the Sultāns of Tūrān were waiting for his return to camp. Unaware of the valiant conduct of His Highness and the enemy-destroying warriors of the faith, Jānī Beg had returned and had set up camp near the exalted camp. His Highness asked for a saddled horse in order to hasten towards the enemy camp. Chuha Sulṭān, however, prevented the Shāh from leaving. In the meantime, Jānī Beg Khān had heard the news of the Uzbek defeat and the courage of the Iranians and fled. Ḥusain Khān Shāmlū the governor-general of Khurāsān, Ahmad Sulṭān Ustājlū, and a number of the amirs and Sūfis pursued him, but Jānī Beg succeeded in extricating himself from danger, leaving all the booty that he had taken from the Qizilbash and his own belongings in the possession of the heir of the exalted dynasty (*manṣūbān-i dūdmān-i ʿiz va ʿalā*).
A number of the Uzbeks were killed and the survivors took the news of the strength of the arms of the enemy—routing Qizilbash to Turan. That night His Highness remained on that spot, taking account of the troops present, the absentees and the martyrs. [Shah Tahmasp] also bestowed brotherly and affectionate favours on the worthy and judicious prince Sam Mirza who acted as the vicegerent of the province (mulk) of Khurasan at Herat. [The Shah] despatched Husain Beg, the archer Qurchi (qurchi-i fir va kamān) whose mace had deafened 'Ubayd Khan, to take a precious robe of honour, a horse, a sword, a crown (taj), armour, and equipment manufactured in royal workshops in the honour of the prince, entrusting to him total control over the affairs of Khurasan. As was customary, Husain Khan Shamlū who had distinguished himself in these battles by his courage, was appointed the governor of Herat, the governor-general of Khurasan, and the tutor of Prince Sam Mirza who was ten years old. Having fulfilled his ambition [Husain Khan] received the robe of honour and royal favours and departed for Herat. [Shah Tahmasp] granted permission to all the governors of Khurasan to return to their estates (tiyūl) and himself returned to the sacred Mashhad. Following the defeat which had occurred before the victory, Ahmad Sultan Afshar fled from the battlefield and returned to Kermān without a pause to stop along the way. However, Aqa Kamāli Kermāni; his Vazir, and a group of the Sultan's militia had remained at the service of the Fortunate Throne and had made the utmost effort, therefore receiving the honour of victory. [Shah Tahmasp] entrusted the governorship of Kermān to Aqa Kamāli and appointed Ahmad Sultan as his officer and the chamberlain (ishik āqāsī garī) of his harem. [47a(62a)] Shah Tahmasp also removed Ya'qub Sultan Qajar from the governorship of Qarābāgh and Malik Beg from the

---

152 Folios 46 to 63 of the manuscript were misarranged. This has been corrected. The square bracket contains the correct number and the round bracket represents the old number.

153 It is not clear the word "taj" denotes a "regal crown" or the Qizilbash headgear which was also referred to by the same name. I have however opted for the broader meaning of the word as "crown".

154 Reading is uncertain. The text reads "jiqa" which may be a misspelling of "jiba" meaning "armour".
governorship of Khuy and issued their letters of dismissal (raqam-i 'azl). and those who had, in that campaign, shown distinguished service in the performance of their duty received royal favours and thus their every desire was fulfilled.

By the order of the Padishah, the son of the House of 'Ali, the eloquent secretaries wrote letters of victory and sent to the corners of the august empire. His Highness Shāhanshāh, the subject of divine protection, prostrated in gratitude for the victory which God had conferred on the fathers of the august state and set off on a pilgrimage to the Sulṭān of Khurāsān. After several days [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] reached the sacred Mashhad. The custodian Mīr Niẓām al-Mulk together with the stewards (khuddām) [of the shrine], the guardians and the garrison of the blessed estate, 155 the exalted Sayyids, the notables of the city and the districts of the sacred Mashhad hastened to welcome the peerless Pādishah and received the honour of prostration before the Shāh. They received [the Shāh] with the customary ceremony of pāy-andāz and scattered much money (nithār) among the poor and the needy. His Highness, may he rest in paradise, directly went to the sacred Threshold and kissed the sepulchre. [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] supplicated [Imām Rīzā] for greater prosperity and victory for the fathers of the state and conferred many favours on the stewards and the needy.

Shāh Ṭahmāsp then took leave of the Shāh of Khurāsān and set out towards the Arab Iraq to punish Zulfiqār Turkoman.

Shāh Ṭahmāsp turned his attention towards Baghdād, the abode of Islam (dār al-islām). The Murder of Zulfiqār, and the conquest of Arab Iraq.

On the way to Baghdād, the abode of Islam, the main purpose of which was pilgrimage to the holy shrines of the Infallible Imāms and his ancestors 156. [Shāh

---

155 Reading uncertain.
156 The adjective complementing the word "ancestors" is illegible. The word "his" has been inserted instead.
157 The reference to the religious purpose of Tahmāsp's expedition to the Arab Iraq is unique to Aftal and is recorded in a note, in the same hand, on the margin of the folio.
Tahmāsp stopped in Nishāpur for a few days to secure the allegiance of the Amirs of Khurāsān. At this time messengers were dispatched to the corners of the august empire to urge those who wished to go on pilgrimage to the holy shrines of the seven Imāms (a’ima-i saf'a), buried in the Arab Iraq, to join the auspicious procession. A quarter of the notables of the Persian Iraq and half the notables of Fārs and Kermān, who desired pilgrimage to the [tombs] of the Infallible Imāms, joined the camp of His Highness the Shadow of God at Jarbādqān. At an auspicious hour they crossed the old Khāneqi River which is the border between the two Iraqs and entered the Arab Iraq. At that time the world-conquering sun cast a shadow on the tower of Cancer, and the heat was so intense that the earth spread a carpet of fire, the ruby dissolved in the quarry and under the ray of sunshine the pebbles in deep waters resembled melted gem.

The villain Zulfiqār heard that His Highness the Seat of the Caliphate was approaching but paid no heed to the advice of his relatives and well-wishers and began to strengthen the fortification of the citadel of Baghādād. His face bereft of any shame, he knelt before disloyalty. The fierce warriors of the faith surrounded the citadel of Baghādād. They immediately began the task of digging shelters (ṣība) and opened cannon fire on the tower of the citadel. The villain Zulfiqār opened gun and musket fire on the royal camp and thus began the rebellion. Although his relatives advised him that opposition to one’s benefactor was beyond the bounds, he did not accept this and persisted in his rebellion. A few days passed like this. But the residents of the citadel knew that finally they would succumb to the dynasty of Shaykh Ṣafī and that in the event of the fall of the citadel, the Qizilbāş would not distinguish the innocent from the guilty, and would slaughter the young and the old alike. The residents of the citadel incited ʿAlī Beg, a grandson of Ṣuflī

158 Different spellings of the town of "Jarbādqān" appear in the sources: Jarpādqān, Niqavat al-Āthār, p. 573; Jarfādqān, Alam Ārā-i Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 510. Jarbādqān is the modern Gulpāyγān but under the ʿSaʿfāvīds it may have been a dependency of ʿIsfāhān.
159 Shah Tahmāsp’s title reads "hāzrat-i khilāfat-madār".
Khalil Mauşillū, and his brother Ahmad Beg to murder Zulfiqār. On Thursday the third of Shavval 935 / 10 June 1529, the above-mentioned killed and decapitated Zulfiqār and opened the gates of the citadel. They also sent an envoy to call upon His Highness to pardon the besieged inhabitants and to send the Šadr Mir Qavām al-Dīn Ḥusain Naqīb Īsfahānī and Sayyid Beg Kamūna to honour the children of Ṣūfī Khalil and the besieged inhabitants with prostration before the Shah. Acting on this request the above-mentioned went to the citadel and brought the afore-mentioned [individuals] to kiss the Shah's feet. The children of Ṣūfī Khalil received the honour of kissing the Shah's feet and uttered the following verse:

He who disobeys the Shah, time will ruin his fortune.

Shah Tahmāsp pardoned the besieged inhabitants, and bestowed favours on 'Ali Beg and Ahmad Beg 160, hung Zulfiqar's head at the gate, and appointed Muḥammad Sulṭān Tekkelū Sharaf al-Dīn Oğlu the Khan. A public royal proclamation was made [48b (46b)] that at a propitious hour Muḥammad Sulṭān should pay homage by kissing the Shah's feet and take the throne of the caliphs of Baghdad. [Shah Tahmāsp] himself crossed the river Tigris for a pilgrimage to the shrines of Imām Mūsā al-Kāẓim and Muhammad al-Javād. The Shah spent that night in prayer and conferred royal favours on the stewards, the residents, and the servants of [the shrine]. The Shah prayed and worshipped for three days and on the third day entered the blessed citadel of Baghdad, the abode of Islam. His Highness ordained that Muḥammad Khan together with the clerks of offices (mutiṣādiyān-i khadamāt) and superintendents of the gardens (mubāshirān-i raużāt) attend to the financial and administrative affairs of the whole of Arab Iraq. Zulfiqar's possessions too were surrendered to the keepers of the royal workshops (taḥvīlārān-i buyūāt). In response to pleas from Chuha Sulṭān, the head of that unfortunate [man] was buried with his body.

---

160 See the commentary.
[Shāh Taḥmāsp] spent a few days hunting in the surrounding districts of Baghdad before setting out on a pilgrimage to his magnanimous ancestor the Amir of the Believers Ḥaydār ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib and the Sayyid of Martyrs Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī, peace be upon him. [The Shāh] bestowed favours on the stewards and the residents and ordered the construction of new buildings and increased the provision of goods for the workshops (kārkhanijāt) and the kitchens (āsh-khāna). 161

[49a(47a)] [Shāh Taḥmāsp] was returning to Baghdad when on the outskirts of the city news arrived that after the defeated Sulṭāns of Tūrān had returned to their own kingdoms, ʿUbayd Khān Uzbek, the deaf, and an Uzbek contingent had returned to capture Khurāsān. And a petition arrived from Āqā Kamālī Sulṭān, governor of Kerman which declaring Ḥāmid Sulṭān Afšār's allegiance [to Shāh Taḥmāsp] sought royal pardon for Ḥāmid Sulṭān who had been appointed militia of [Āqā Kamālī]. At the same time [Āqā Kamālī] offered his resignation from the governorship of Kermān. Shāh Taḥmāsp appointed Shāh Quli Beg Yūzbāšī Afšār as the governor of Kermān and honoured him with the title of Sulṭān. The Shāh also pardoned Ḥāmid Sulṭān and appointed him and his army to the defence of the sacred Mashhad. His Highness also pardoned Yaʿqūb Beg Qājār and Malik Beg Khū'iy and ordered them to assist Ḥāmid Sulṭān in defence of Mashhad until the Shāh's arrival. [Shāh Taḥmāsp] also conferred the office of Vazir and the tax inspectorate (mumayizī) of the whole of Khurāsān on Āqā Kamālī Kermānī and conferred a dignity above all the Vazirs of the realm, on him. [Shāh Taḥmāsp] also ordained that Ḥāmid Sulṭān should receive the region of Farāh of Khurāsān as his fief (tiyūl) in lieu of salary. [Shāh Taḥmāsp] then returned to Persian Iraq to engage in pleasure. The Sulṭāns of Khūzistān and the Mushaʿshaʿ Arabs, the Kurds of Ardalān and the governor of Shahr-i Zūr and Azlūjak 162 were received at the throne of the Caliphate and obtained what they desired, each received a robe of honour.

161 See the commentary.
162 Reading uncertain.
In the capital Qazvīn, Shāh Ṭahmāsp appointed Amir Nematullāh Hillī co-Šadr with Mir Qavām al-Dīn Ḥusain Iṣfāḥānī [49b (47b)] to prescribe the Muḥammadan law and to co-operate in propagating the sacred law (sharīʿ-i sharīf).

[Shāh Ṭahmāsp] ordained the eloquent secretaries to write the letter of victory of Baghdād, the abode of Islam, and despatch it to the protected dominions (mamālik-i mahrūsa).

The Royal Farman was issued.

The dominion (vilāyat) of the powerful and the exalted Khān Ḥusain Khān Ukhlī Shāmlū, the governor-general of Khurāsān, which is blessed by royal favours and compassion, should know that God, may He be praised, daily opens the gates of new victories to our august fortune, and from the repository of [He] affords us protection and fulfilment of our desires. Thanks be to God that whatever I have desired of Him, I have been successful in that undertaking through my own endeavours.

The purpose of this composition and of these introductions is that since the beginning of our auspicious reign, the sayyids, the chiefs of the sayyids (nuqabā), the nobility of the Arab Iraq, and the residents of Baghdād the abode of Islam, have called for our victorious standard to unfurl in this direction and have implored the victorious troops in this affair. This mendicant at the threshold of God agitated for the good fortune of pilgrimage to my peerless ancestors, but I could not begin a journey to the Arab Iraq since ʿUbayd Khān Uzbek had hastened the ball of rebellion in Khurāsān, hence the mind could not rest in peace. By divine will the army of ʿUbayd Khān was defeated and the security of Khurāsān was assured.

[50a(48a)] As the news of Zulfiqār Turkomān’s rebellion, the nephew of Ibrāhīm Khān the governor of Baghdād who is related to the ʿṢafavid dynasty, arrived and the residents of the Arab Iraq became more persistent in their request [for assistance] and after return from Khurāsān and the apparent victory, which is the jewel in the conquests of all the Sultāns of the world, against ʿUbayd Khān, I endeavoured to commit my highest aspirations to the aid of the oppressed of that land, that which is
the crown of the affairs of the state and is of paramount importance in the exercise of royal power and Government of the world.

Trust in God, the rein of our determination turned towards that path. As we descended on the city of Hamadan, the great and noble Amirs of Fars and Iraq gathered under the shadow of our victorious banner and from there the royal march of the warlike troops towards Baghdad gathered pace. At a distance of ten farsakh to Baghdad the victorious army encamped and the exalted sayyids, the shaykhs, and the eminent chiefs of the sayyids and the notables and the residents of the abode of Islam [Baghdad] who were not besieged in the citadel, welcomed the glorious banners and received the honour of kissing the Shāh's feet. We sent a number of them, together with Ya'qūb Uståjlu who was an old servant of my father, whose abode is with ʿAli, to the unfortunate Zulfiqār who had hoped to gain possession of Arab Iraq. [The envoys] were to offer him spiritual guidance. But since the horoscope (tālī') did not guide Zulfiqār and he disregarded the merciful advice of our august deputies and that of his allies and relatives in the citadel, he resolved to wage war against the sincere Sūfis. Zulfiqār closed the gates of the citadel and opened gun and musket fire on the victorious camp. Indignant by his disobedience, the lion-like warriors of the faith the conquerors of citadels could not tolerate his improper transgression, they encircled the fort, built barricades and planned to capture it.

Several days passed and the troops fought courageously to capture the fort. The besieged inhabitants of the citadel knew that in a few days it would fall to the fathers of the conquering dynasty (daulat-i qāhira). Khalil Beg and ʿAli Beg, the sons of Śūfī Khalīl Maṣūlū, who had close relations with Zulfiqār, cut off his head, opened the gates, received the honour of prostration before the Shāh and threw the head under the hooves of His Highness's charger. The besieged were freed from the burden of the siege and received the honour of prostration before the Shāh. I pardoned those who were guilty of sedition and who had incited the perfidious
Zulfiqar, and issued a letter granting amnesty to the residents and the besieged of the citadel. I entrusted the government of that auspicious province to the governor Khalifat al-Khulafa Muhammed Khan Sharaf al-Din Ogü Tekkelü, and then crossed the river Tigris on a pilgrimage to the heavenly holy shrines of Kâzimia and Javâdia, which are the threshold of compassion and prayer, and was honoured with the good fortune of pilgrimage to the magnanimous Imam (Imâm al-hamâmin) my ancestor Amir al-Mu'minin 'Ali b. Abi 'Abdillâh, [51a(49a)] the Sayyid of the martyrs Husain b. 'Ali, His Holiness Imam Hasan 'Askari, the place of disappearance of the commander (sâhib-i amr) Muhammed Mihdi, peace be upon him, and the eminent men who were buried in Baghdâd, Najaf, Karbâla and Samarâ.

The Arab nomads of the Arab Iraq arrived with gifts and pious donations (nuzûrât) and received the honour of prostration before the Shâh. The whole of Arab Iraq, the dependencies and the annexations came under the control of Khalifat al-Khulafa Muhammad Khan, the governor-general and the vicegerent of the Caliphs of Baghdâd, and thus enjoyed a prosperity greater than the time of the occupation and government (tauliyat) of my father His Highness, whose abode is with 'Ali. And that sacred land was cleansed of the thorn of undeserving enemies.

[Husain Khan Ukhl Shâmlû] should rejoice at such joyous tidings and in gratitude for this excellent victory he should prostrate in praise of God and distribute gifts and alms amongst the needy and the devotees, opening the doors of happiness and joy to all subjects. [Husain Khan Shâmlû] should not neglect the affairs of the government and report to me the events and conditions in that province, and should not be oblivious to 'Ubayd Khan the deaf's deceit and treachery, he who receives the blows of the good fortune of our unrivalled august deputies and who as long as he lives will not abandon the ambition of conquering Khurâsan.

---

163 Reading of this word is uncertain.
164 Part of the sentence is illegible and this is an abridged translation.
For the occasion of this excellent victory the sum of three hundred Iraqi tumans has been paid from our own private treasury (khāṣṣ-i khud) to [our] trusted companion ʿAlī Beg Qaljilī oglū Zuqil-Qadr in order to make his utmost effort in celebrating.

Shawwal 935 / June 1529

[51b (49b)] After securing the victory of Iraq and despatch of letters of victory to the Protected Dominions (mamālik-i mahṛūsa), Shāh Ṭahmāsp returned to Qazvīn for winter camp. News arrived that after the departure of His Highness from Khurāsān, ʿUbayd Khān had returned to the sacred Mashhad and captured the whole of Khurāsān. The account of this will be related. To investigate the Uzbek domination of Khurāsān, Shāh Ṭahmāsp sent a special envoy to this province. His Highness also ordained that the victorious troops should return to their own lands for winter and prepare for an expedition to Khurāsān.

[51b(49b)] The Year of the Pig (tangūz īl), 936 / 1529-30, which was the sixth year of [His Majesty’s] Reign.

The world- enlightening Nauruz illuminated the world with splendour and verdure. Those upon the bed of repose were awakened from indolent sleep. And [Nauruz] reminded the cold world of youth and adorned the earth with flowers and colourful plants. The intoxicated and the lovers of pleasure indulged in drinking and availed themselves of the water’s edge and the garden green.

His Highness, may he rest in paradise, ordered the devoted followers to celebrate Naurūz. As was customary (bi qānūn i sābiq) [the Shāh] bestowed favours upon the nobility and the common people alike, satisfying their every wish. At the end of the festivities Shāh Ṭahmāsp turned his attention to the general affairs of the State and sat upon the royal throne.

ʿUbayd Khān, the deaf, came to Khurāsān for a fifth time and captured [the province]. Ḥusain Khān Shāmlū fled.

After the Naurūz celebration, the envoy who had been commissioned to investigate the Uzbek invasion of Khurāsān, returned and reported that Sevinjūk Muḥammad
Khān the son of Shaybāni Khān, with Ābdāl ‘Azīz Sūltān and six thousand Uzbekks had marched towards the sacred Mashhad.

[52a(50a)] Ahmad Sūltān Afshār with Ya’qūb Sūltān Qājār and Malik Beg Khuyiy who had been appointed to defend Mashhad and assist Aghzivār Sūltān Shāmlū, the governor of Mashhad, had assembled in Mashhad and had fought the Uzbek Khāns. During the two months of conflict, none of the Amirs showed any sign of weakness. The governors of Khūrāsān did not receive any assistance from Shāh Ṭahmāsp who at this time was engaged in the campaign for Baghdad. CUbayd Khān with a large army had encircled the sacred Mashhad. The sound of their large trumpet (kurnāy) distressed the exalted troops. Fortification (hišār) of the sacred Mashhad had not yet been completed. So the chiefs were unable to protect the inhabitants until the arrival of reinforcement. CUbayd Khān had engaged the entire Uzbek army in the conquest of Mashhad and he too was prepared for war.

The musketeers (tufangchīyān) of Khūrāsān and the young Qizilbāsh fought courageously and in a manner most worthy of their army. They displayed manliness and bravery since they knew that CUbayd Khān had arrived with a large army·intent on vengeance, and they would be unable to defend the city against this superior army with only barricades (kuchaband). The army of Transoxiana captured the barricades and the troops of Khūrāsān became fearful of this war and did not deem it prudent to continue to fight. Early one night Ahmad Sūltān, Aghzivār Sūltān, Ya’qūb Beg, and Malik Beg together with the Qizilbāsh troops left the city. CUbayd Khān entered the city with a large army. Nearly three hundred troops were martyred by the Uzbek army. CUbayd Khān left one of his militia in charge of the sacred Mashhad and himself set out to capture Harat.

---

165 "Sevinjuk Muhammad Khān the son of ‘Ubayd Khān” as in Afzal is an error. Sevinjuk Muhammad was in fact the son of Shaybāni Khān and the cousin of ‘Ubayd Khān. Ābdāl ‘Azīz Sūltān was ‘Ubayd Khān’s son.
166 "Aghzivar Sūltān Rumlu” in Afzal is an error.
Husain Khan and his experienced commanders knew the food supplies of the citadel were insufficient and that in the event of a siege, war and captivity of the noble Prince Sām Mirzā would not be advisable. They therefore inclined to peace. With the approval of Khvāja Ishāq Siāvushānī, an agreement was reached that ʿUbayd Khan would camp several stages away and would grant the troops safe conduct to leave with their wives, children and their belongings. ʿUbayd Khan honoured this agreement and camped several stages away, while Husain Khan and all the troops left Harat for Sistān.

ʿUbayd Khan and his army entered the city and oppressed the residents of Harat. Where the Uzbeks suspected Shiʿism and heresy, they destroyed homes and exacted fines from the respected people whom they suspected of having wealth. Many Sunnis were accused of being Shiʿites and were persecuted for the wealth they possessed. Maulānā Nuṭūmī Haravī has written in his History of Harat (Tārīkh-i Harat) that those who harboured an enmity against Maulānā Hilālī seized this verse from “The King and the Beggar”:

“Oh you master of the faithful, the least faithful of the companions”

The author of Aḥsan al-Tavārikh has written that opponents told ʿUbayd Khan that Maulānā Hilālī had written a quatrain in his criticism. The first verse (bait) of which is:

How long will you plunder and despoil Khurāsān. ʿUbayd Khan, in an act of inhumanity, ordered Maulānā to be executed in the market place (chihār-suq) of Harat. His compositions include ghazaliyāt, The King and the Beggar, Lailī and Majnūn, and "The Attributes of Lovers" (ṣifāt-i ʿāshiqān).

See the commentary "Sām Mirzā and the surrender of Harat". This first verse is missing from the main text and is found in a note on the margin, probably written in a different hand.
Husain Khan, the chiefs, and the governors, who were the representatives of the Shadow of God in Khurasan, left their districts (vilayat) for Iraq and Fars. As Husain Khan approached Sistan, Malik Mahmud Kiyani 169, the Wali of Sistan, greeted him with utmost sincerity and loyalty. The inhabitants of Zarah Sistan had rebelled against Malik Sultan Mahmud and had engaged in highway robbery. Husain Khan killed many of them and captured much booty. He then went to the region of Kij va Makran. Malik Dinar, the governor of that province (vilayat) on whose signet ring this verse was inscribed, welcomed Husain Khan and offered his services:

Had not the almighty had so many rulers, he would not have granted Kij va Makran so cheaply for a dinar.

Husain Khan at the service of Saim Mirza, the progeny of the dudman-i istifâ va irtizâ, departed for Shiraz and relinquished his position as the governor of Harat and the governor-general of Khurasan. Ubayd Khan embarked on the conquest of the whole of Khurasan with absolute power and neglected the mighty power of the victorious warriors of the faith.

Shah Tahmasp, the lion heart and the destroyer of the enemy, turned his attention to Khurasan. Ubayd Khan fled to Turkistan. The correspondence between them. The appointment of Bahram Mirza to the governorship of Khurasan and Ghazi Khan Tekkehl as his tutor (lala). The desecration of the tomb of Maulana Jami at Harat. [Shah Tahmasp] departed for Isfahan and appointed Khvaja Nimat Naylari 170 to the Vizarat of Isfahan. Winter camp in Isfahan.

When His Highness the Refuge of Caliphate and the Shadow of God Shah Tahmasp received the news of the Uzbek conquest of Khurasan, he fearlessly determined to punish Ubayd Khan. The Shah ordered the chiefs (umarâ) and the Khans to prepare

---

169 "Kiyani" is probably an error since Malik Mahmud is not referred to by that name in any other source. In Ahsan, p. 221, he is identified as Malik Sultan Mahmud and in TAA, p. 1170, as Malik Mahmud Sistani. See the commentary for his biography.

170 Reading uncertain. No reference to this individual can be found in any other source.
an expedition to Khurasan to teach 'Ubayd Khan a lesson so that he would never again aspire to capture the province. At an auspicious hour, the Vicegerent (amir al-umara) Chuha Sultan pitched the royal tent of felicity and the portico of glory from the capital city of Qazvin towards Khurasan. He also warned that those chiefs and governors who failed to be present at the plain (chaman) of Bastam, on Friday 25th Shavval/23 June, would be punished by [royal] wrath. The offending chiefs, the standing corps of royal troops and the victorious troops would be punished. Chuha Sultan himself, on the auspicious day of 'id of Ramadān which is the glory of the month of Shavvāl, left the capital Qazvin on the campaign for Khurasan.

On the appointed day of the 25th Shavvāl the royal party arrived in the plains of Bastam, and the victorious chiefs, the Khāns, the centurions, the standing corps of royal troops, the ghulāms, and the troops received the honour of prostration before the Shah, each received royal favours. For five days they remained in Bastam to review the victorious troops which according to the military recording officer (lashkar-navīs-i khāṣṣ) numbered seventy thousand young fighters, the sūfīs va irādat 171 not included.172 This military review created tumult and confusion in Turkestān and alarmed the ignorant Uzbek Khāns. On the first day of Zīqaʿda 936 / 27 June 1530 the royal army left the plain of Bastam173 for Sabzivār.

Upon hearing the news of the approach of His Highness, the governors of Sabzivār, Nishāpur, and the sacred Mashhad, unable to resist the victorious army, evacuated their domains (vilāyat) to join 'Ubayd Khan in Herat and to inform him of the [Shāh's] imminent arrival. 'Ubayd Khan too was unable to hold the citadel and also found the residents of Herat not united with him. He therefore left Harat for

171 "sūfīs va irādat" is possibly a reference to the tribal non-military and irregular troops. These were the members of the Ṣūfī orders, and the Shahsevan. Fazlī himself mustered an army comprising the regular troops (mulūzmān-i muqarrar), the Ṣūfīs and the Shahsevan during one campaign to Georgia, Azal III, 356a. See also the commentary "The military review at Bastam".
172 For the details of this important military review see the commentary "The military review at Bastam".
173 "Plain of Sultanīyāya" as in the manuscript must be an error since Sultanīyāya is situated to the West of Qazvin on the road to Azarbājān.
Merv.\textsuperscript{174} Shāh Ṭahmāsp entered the sacred Mashhad for the honour of pilgrimage to the Sultan of Khurasān.

[54a (52a)] After his departure from Harat, ʿUbayd Khan sent envoys to the Sultāns of Turkistān to seek help. His Highness, after pilgrimage to the Shāh of Khurasān and the qibla of the Shiʿites, left Mashhad for Merv-i Shāhjān to admonish ʿUbayd Khan. On the outskirts of Sarakhs, Mīr Ḥusain Khān declared his allegiance to the Shāh. Shāh Ṭahmāsp praised him for his courage in resistance to ʿUbayd Khān, which had prevented the fortress of Sarakhs and its dependencies from falling to the Uzbeks, and bestowed royal favours upon him.

The Sultāns of Turkistān who had gathered in Merv-i Shāhjān received the news of the assembly of the mighty Qizilbash army. Abū Saʿīd Khān who at this time was the Pādishāh of all Turkistān, told ʿUbayd Khān that several times we have joined forces and fought the Qizilbash army and suffered defeats with casualties on both sides. The pillars of our state gained nothing from it but loss and injury. This time we hear that an army of seventy thousand strong, without the army of the Ṣūfīs and irādat, has been mustered in Sultāniyya,\textsuperscript{175} and more recruits have joined the army in Khurasān. This brings the total to ninety thousand men. In this case, another war is not in our interest. It would be wise to be content with your own kingdom and abandon all ambitions of conquering Khurasān, since from now on, no assistance will be forthcoming from Turkistān. [54b (52b)] ʿUbayd Khān succumbed and left Merv for Bukhārā, and the Sultāns of Turkistān too returned to their lands.

His Highness was overjoyed to hear the news that the Sultāns of Turkistān were powerless and that ʿUbayd Khān had escaped. [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] sent ʿAlī Beg Qūrchī Ustājlū to deliver a letter to ʿUbayd Khān.

---

\textsuperscript{174} ʿUbayd Khan left Harat on the 21st Zuʿ-ḥijja.

\textsuperscript{175} Sultāniyya is probably an error for Bastām.
The Letter from His Majesty Shāh Ṭahmāsp Ṣafavī to
ʿUbayd Khān Chingizī

Your Excellency the throne of Caliphate, the most noble of noble Sulṭāns, the most praiseworthy of the Sulṭāns ʿUbayd Khān, we are conveying our sincere benediction.

It is as evident to all the intelligent humans as the midday sun that since the day when mankind said "yes" to the call of God "Am I not your Lord?", the world has never been without a valī or a prophet and kingship has been the prerogative of our great ancestors. Every so often, according to the circumstances of the time, the followers of Marvān and Yazīd (jamāʿat-i marvāniyya va yazidiyya) have predominated over the Infallible Imāms. The Imāms, however, did not pursue power or domination nor did they strive for equality with that sect lest they bear the dishonour of collaboration. God forbid that for reasons of impotence and weakness they should belong to that wretched crowd. Praise be to God, during all this time that sapling the exalted Solomon my father grew from the pleasant meadow of the dynasty of prophecy and divinely-ordained authority. And the world- enlightening and the enemy- scorching beacon of the sovereign dynasty of Siyyādat has come to light. [55 a (53a)] His exalted and illustrious head is crowned with that joyous crown.

"Gone the days when the Arab taunted the Persian. It is now the turn of those laudable men".

Divine favour befriended him and, in a short time, he ascended the ladder of power and glory and captured the provinces of Iraq, Fārs, Kermān, Āzarbāyjān, Khurāsān, dār al-marz [Gilān], Arabistān, Shīrvān, Shakkī, and Georgia.

When Muḥammad Khān Shaybānī, tempted by evil, expelled the sons of the late Sulṭān Ḥusain Mirzā from their old and hereditary kingdoms they entered the service of my father. For a long time Muḥammad Khān enjoyed great power in Khurāsān, divided the regions of Khurāsān among his umarā, and with confidence resided in Harat, until my father with his precious soul turned his attention to that region. He
captured and killed [Muḥammad Khān Shaybānī] and conquered the whole of Khurāsān. For several years the deputies of that Majesty acted according to Muḥammadan justice. The chief (simā) Durmīsh Khān who had been appointed to Khurāsān, [55b (53b)] strived to spread justice and eradicate heresy so that the people of Khurāsān, night and day, privately and publicly, prayed in his support. When Durmīsh Khān died and you found Khurāsān unprotected, you stretched the hand of transgression and tyranny and plundered the people of Khurāsān. This news deeply troubled our noble disposition and we, with a group of our esteemed companions, immediately travelled to Khurāsān. At Zirābād, a district of Jām, we met and fought you and the Sūltāns of Turkistān and Transoxiana. Despite the small number of the victorious troops, you witnessed what the triumphant warriors of the faith achieved with divine will. And as this proverb "remaining in one place is an impossibility" confirms you fled and did not even have a chance to look back. This fact is known to you and the world and does not need to be repeated. You are very ignorant of the affairs of kingship and you have befriended this world which, as this proverb also conveys "Love of this world is the source of all errors", is the chief of all evils. You have renounced all honour and principles thus you have returned to Khurāsān after the wounds of the mace and the sword of the exalted ghāzis had healed and continued the tradition of your ancestors and plundered the subjects of the most Holy God. This is against Islam. [56a (54a)] One who has breathed the scent of Islam never sends yurṭāval to the corners of the world. Wickedness, corruption and injustice are your inheritance, and it is the work of our august deputies to remove the wicked and suppress the corrupt. With divine favour and the guidance of the most exalted God and now that fortune has set foot in the stirrup of victory, I will advance and will turn the rein of the horse of felicity from the capital Qazvīn towards

176 Reading uncertain.
177 A verse is inserted at this point.
178 Meaning is unclear.
Khurāsān. Once the victorious troops reach the region of Bāstām, you and the few men in your service will flee, taking refuge in Khitā and Khitan.

The throne of Khurāsān belongs to my father [Shāh Ismā'īl] and he is a descendant of Solomon [Sulaymān].

The throne of the Queen of Sheba (Bilqīs) is not for demons, the only man for that throne is Solomon.

Truly if this time as in the past you escape and do not enter the arena of manliness, inevitably our royal banners will soon unfurl in Samarqand and Bukhārā, subjugating their people ignominiously. I will then turn to conquer Khitā and Khitan. If you want to free yourself from the clutches of the ferocious warriors of the faith, whose ferocity resembles Bahram's (Bahram saulat), and govern Khurāsān, it is fitting that you renounce the path of error and distinguish the truth from falsehood, dismiss the conduct of your ancestors, and profess to Twelver Shi'ism. [56b(54b)] You and we will be of one faith and could therefore meet.

That the religion of the Infallible Imams is the true religion is evident and if sometimes you openly profess the truest of religions, it will not be reprehensible.

The 'ulamā and the learned scholars (fu'zalā-i sāhib-i tadqīq) should be sent towards this path of reason so that our claim could be proved to them. Another proof of the truth of the religion of the Twelve Imāms is that it can not be aborted: our victory over you was achieved by a small and outnumbered Qizilbash force. Our victory would have been impossible without the sanctity of the infallible Imāms and the intervention of divine authority.

O you ill-starred [man], you will be vilified for your enmity towards 'Ali.

God's fury will repel any hatred you may harbour towards Ḥaydar. You stretched a hand to Yazid but see what the hand of the divinely ordained authority (vilāyat) can do.
God willing, you will soon meet your punishment.\textsuperscript{179} The bearer of this letter ʿAlī Beg Qūrčī Ustājlū will relate the additional matters in the special assembly. I plead with you not to detain him and grant him permission to leave.

\textit{va-salam}

ʿUbayd Khān's reply to His Majesty Šah Ṭahmāsp

The eminent letter of the refuge of authority, the bearer of justice, acquirer of majesty the noble Ṭahmāsp Mirzā was received at an auspicious time and an excellent hour. The statements, which were repeatedly asserted, were noted. \textsuperscript{[57a (55a)]} The destruction of Khurāsān, which has been caused by military campaigns on both sides, is a fact. Our intention is that the religion of the Prophet and the rightly guided Caliphs, which has been established in the world, should not change. If as a consequence of the corruption of the age a wrong is done to the religion and the people of the Prophet, then it is incumbent upon us to fight it where possible and to the best of our ability. From the time when the martyred fortunate Khān \textsuperscript{180} drank from the chalice of destiny, the people of Khurāsān have been enslaved by the followers of heresy and error, and for a long time either voluntarily or by compulsion they have professed to heresy and Shiʿism (\textit{tashayr}). It has become their innate attribute and for this reason they do not obey and accompany the army of Islam as they should. For that reason they face depravity. Let it be known what favours have been bestowed upon those sincere devotees who follow the army of Islam. And the injustice done to those who sow the seeds of discord and disobey Islam, will not be injustice.

"The injustices of this world, are all justice in the guise of injustice".

Otherwise, our intention is not and will not be anything other than to spread justice and to ensure the prosperity of Islam and cultivation of the country. We hope to attain what our intention merits. Also you have written that despite the defeat

\textsuperscript{179} Reading is uncertain.
\textsuperscript{180} This is a reference to Muhammad Khan Shaybani who was killed in a battle with Shah Ismaʿīl on the 26th of Shaʿban 916 A.H.
inflicted upon us last year, we have aspired to govern Khurāsān again. You know
well how the glory of Islam predominated over your army.\textsuperscript{181}

Amidst the dust after the defeat of your army, the pious warriors of the faith began to
seize your possessions, unaware that a division [of the Safavid army] was hidden in
the mist. This was destiny and in military affairs such accidents do not bring
dishonour. After a \textit{dandān}\textsuperscript{182} (?) of His Holiness the Refuge of Prophecy was
martyred in the battle of \textit{Uḥud} \textsuperscript{183}, the army of Islam gained many victories. If the
followers of that majesty were united with him, future victories would not be a
dishonour.

The sailors of the sea of Islam have sailed the ship of desire (\textit{shauq}) in the deep sea
of Holy War in search of the pearl of truth (\textit{ṣidq}) and they will not rest until they
have seized the royal pearl. And because of this temporary set back they will not
withdraw from the field of courage and manliness. Verse:

\textit{Until we have trapped that rare gem, we will not go ashore.}

If on that occasion the army of Islam was admonished, we hope this time divine
favour will reverse [the past defeats]. Verse:

\textit{Do not despair, Joseph will return to Canaan and one day the abode
of melancholy will be paradise.}

The Almighty God has admonished the army of Islam in this manner several times
before. Another of our couplets reads:

\textit{I will capture Harl [Harat] by the grace of God and surrender
Shām and Tabriz with an army.}

\textsuperscript{181} A verse attributed to Firdausī has been inserted at this point.
\textsuperscript{182} It is not clear what is intended by the word "tooth" (\textit{dandān}). This also agrees with Nava'ī’s
dition of this letter, \textquoteleft Abū al-Ḥusain Nava'ī, \textit{Shāh Tahmāsp Ṣafavī, majmūʿa-i asnād-i tārikhī
hamrāh bā yaddashkūhā-i tafsīl}, (Tehran, 1368), p. 29 and note 2.
\textsuperscript{183} The Battle of \textit{Uḥud}, 3 A.H./625 A.D., fought near Medina, was the only time that the Quraysh
achieved victory against the Prophet Muhammad.
We always think in accordance with this verse "alamūr marhūnat bā vaqātihā''. [58a
(56a)] As the eternal munificence [God] assists the army of Islam we expect to
achieve greater [victories]. Another couplet writes :184

I am the battle-hardened lion of lions, and the assault of
another lion will not move me.

Meaning that although [we] had captured the capital Harat we abandoned it to haste
back to Merv, is against the meaning of this verse. If you do not know, ask those
who are informed how at a time when the unbelievers prevailed the Prophet
Muḥammad immigrated from Mecca to Medina. The muhājirūn 185 and the anšār 186
first appeared at that time. We did not consider it prudent to remain in Harat for it
would not be in the interest of the welfare of the believers and the army of Islam. For
this reason we left.

It has been said:

Suddenly, by an act of fate, the wise man fled from calamity,
The ignorant taunted that from fate the wise man fled.
If seeking protection for a cause is not admissible, then why did the
man flee from Mecca to Yathrib (Medina).

And His Holiness Amir al-Muḥminin 'Alī has said ?.187 He himself fled in the battle
of Uhud, and thereafter great victories were achieved. If I had not emigrated (hijrat
nimī kardam), the inhabitants of that city would not have had the strength to
withstand [the war] and the subjects would have been extirpated. Praise be to God,
this emigration (hijrat) is a tradition, and in this matter anyone who taunts us taunts
the Prophet Muḥammad.

You also wrote that at the time of Durmīsh Khān, who was one of your Amirs, he
governed the city in a manner that people forgot the time of the late Sulṭān Ḥusain
Mīrzā. But at the time of Sulṭān Ḥusain Mīrzā, the schools, the Šufi convents
(khāniqāh), the places of worship (maḥābīd) and the mosques had not been so

184 Navā'i’s version writes "They/you had written".
185 Those who fled with Muḥammad to Medina.
186 Muḥammad’s supporters in Medina.
187 An unidentified Quranic quotation.
dishonoured as to be used \([58b(56b)]\) as stables for donkeys and horses, their green (zangār) tiles destroyed and the majority of mosques made into places of debauchery and wine drinking. When we entered the city, we undertook to repair the mosques, the places of worship and the Şūfī convents of Sultān Ḥusain Mirzā and the rest of the charitable buildings and we appointed teachers (muddaris) and religious students (talaba). The government of Durmish Khān becomes clear from this.

You also wrote "Beware of the tempest of the sigh of the oppressed".

Dear one, it is known to God that we have never consented and it has never been our intention or our action that harm should come to any believer from our troops. And if by reason of negligence and error, our army committed such acts, according to this divine verse "no soul shall bear another's burden"\(^{188}\) I shall be vindicated. We will be held responsible if only after knowledge of such wrongdoing we do not redress the matter.

You also wrote "Anyone who opposed the house of ʿAlī diminished".

Any believer and Muslim who hopes for eternal salvation does not lose the tradition (sunnat) of the great companions (aṣḥāb-i kibār) of the Prophet and His Holiness Murtażā ʿAlī is one of these grandees. To oppose his descendants is irreligious and far from Islam. But we have disputes with those people who have abandoned the religion and the creed of their fathers and have followed heresy and error and have dismissed the path of their ancestors and adopted heresy and Shiʿism.

Although they know that to curse the highest religious authorities (shaykhīn) in Islam is blasphemy, they have made this blasphemy their habit and claim descent from His Majesty [ʿAlī]. In accordance with this divine verse "he was no kinsman of yours",\(^{189}\) His Holiness Murtażā ʿAlī abhors such progeny. Verse:

\begin{quote}
An offspring is good who is worthy of his father; an unworthy heir is a waste.
\end{quote}

\(^{188}\) The Quran, surah al-Anā’am, verse 164.
\(^{189}\) The Quran, surah Hud, verse 46.
A mean and impious son is his father's suffering and his own tribulation.

[59a(57a)] The bringer of sure news (mukhbir-i sādiq) has related in the Quran "And when the Trumpet is sounded on that day their ties of kindred shall be broken nor shall they ask help of one another".²¹³ On the day of judgement, you shall therefore be judged by your deeds and not by your descent. Furthermore, you claim descent from Murtazā ʿAlī. You are either a progeny of that great man or not. If you are not, why do you make such claim? The Prophet has said that anyone who falsifies descent will not see the paradise. And if you are a descendant of Murtazā ʿAlī, which grave did that Holiness desecrate and whose body did he burn, and whose beard did he shave and in whose ear did he cast a ring of servitude and make the Caliph of Islam. And which licentious villain, who never prayed in his life, did he appoint as tabarrāʾī and commanded him to prostrate before him. His Holiness the Refuge of Prophecy has said that if prostration before anyone other than Almighty God was permissible, we would instruct women to prostrate before their husbands. It was ascertained that this was not permissible and that it would be blasphemy. Yet your order (silsila) is replete with such acts and despite such shamelessness and baseness you preach to us.¹⁹¹ His Majesty Amir al-Muʾminīn ʿAlī was so magnanimous that he swore allegiance to the great companions, prayed behind them and pledged loyalty. And after those Majesties he became the true Caliph for a time. If he thought that those Majesties were not the true Caliphs, why did he bury them next to the Prophet, and why did he not desecrate their graves? It was clear that they were the true Caliphs and he did not oppose them. It is universally known that Murtazā ʿAlī was the follower of the path of the Prophet and the great companions and never opposed them.

And the late Shaykh Șafi your great father was a pious man who observed the tradition (sunnat va jamīʿat). We are astounded that you follow neither the path of

---

¹⁹⁰ The Quran, surah al-Muʾminīn, verse 101.
¹⁹¹ This is followed by a verse but it is different from Navalʾi's version.
His Majesty Amir al-Mu’minin ‘Ali nor the path of your great father. So what is the
proof of descent from those Majesties?

A lion cub resembles a lion, tell us how you bear a resemblance to
the Prophet.

Doubtless anyone who for worldly desires does not follow the path of that
honourable man and falls prey to heresy and error should be a warning to us. We
should bear in mind this divine verse "Those whose endeavours in this world are
misguided and yet think that what they do is right".192

We stopped in Merv-i Shâhijân to wait for His Majesty the Khâqân Solomon
Kûjkûnji Khân and all the Khâns of Transoxiana, Samarqand, Tashkand, Turki斯坦,
Andijân, Hisâr Shâdâmân, Balkh, Bukhârâ, and Shabarghân and their large armies to
arrive. They sent many letters saying that they would soon be honoured by the glory
of holy war and besought me to postpone the war until the arrival of the victorious
troops so that they would not be deprived of such victory. During this time the
Khâqân have gathered here,193 and by Divine Providence one by one we embark on
holy war and martyrdom, God willing. The grandees of religion and the lords of the
true faith have said the following in respect of those who oppose the law of the
Prophet and commit heresy and error. Verse:

Anyone whose perfidy violates the faith, and he who does not pay
alms.

He will perpetrate injustice and will be the oppressor of Uðud.194

[60a (58a)] When you followed the path of those Majesties, we had no disputes with
you. Now that you have deviated from the true path it is incumbent upon us to
eliminate you.

If on my part there is always prejudice against you, it is not
because of worldly ambitions. It is inspired by religion.

val-salam 195

192 The Quran, surah al-Kahf, verse 104.
193 This part of the sentence is scored over.
194 Reading uncertain.
195 In Navâ’î’s edition of this letter, this is followed by verse 19 of sūrah of al-Zumar.
After Shāh Ṭahmāsp sent the harsh letter to ‘Ubayd Khān, he spent a few days travelling and hunting in Sarakhs and the environs of Jām, waiting for the return of ‘Ali Beg Qūrchī Ustājlu and a reply from ‘Ubayd Khān. Šālih Beg Bahādur Uzbek and ‘Ali Beg brought the reply, as related above, and received the honour of prostration before the Shāh. Following his arrival news arrived that ‘Ubayd Khān had left Merv for Bukhārā.

His Majesty bestowed numerous favours upon Šālih Beg Bahādur and conferred on him rewards and a robe of honour. [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] wrote the reply to ‘Ubayd Khān’s letter and granted Šālih Bahādur permission to leave. He himself, with peace of mind, set out for the capital Harat.

**Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s reply to ‘Ubayd Khān**

The astonishing letter, written by the wanderers in the desert of error and ignorance and penned by the idolatrous pen of those lost in the valleys of insolence and deception, was received by some of our secretaries and was brought to our noble attention.

First, on the subject that the purpose of coming to Khurāsān is to administer justice and eradicate heresy, let it be known that that unruly crowd, by the arrival of the malice and the impurity of their existence, have disturbed and defiled the pure cities and regions of Khurāsān and by their base efforts they have destroyed the towns and have tortured the people. They have spilled blood and violated the body and honour of the children and women of the followers of the creed of the holy war and the law of the Prophet. And they have done nothing except plunder the possessions and deceive the followers of the true religion and the straight path of the chief of the Apostles and the Infallible Imāms, may our prayers be upon them.196

Often that abominable group and that undignified tribe mistakes despoiling the believers for the revival of the religion of the chief of the Apostles and the last of the Prophets. And they regard the unjust shedding of blood as being the supreme deed.

---

196 A verse follows this.
and believe it to be the ultimate virtue and in the interest of the people of the bringer of sure news (mukhbir-i șadiq). All have deviated from the true religion and the right path and because of their extreme ignorance and insolence they consider false doctrines and corrupt desires to be Muḥammadan laws and articles of the creed of 'Ali. "It is they who are the fools, if they but knew it!" Verse :198

You are so ignorant that you can not distinguish aberration from guidance to the path of salvation.

God knows that the sacrilege of the idolaters is a hundred times better than your Islam.

[61a (59a)] Although you are endowed with thousands of faults and vices and afflicted with as many more illnesses and maladies, and are seized by delusions and corrupt thoughts with extreme ignorance and corruption you have taken it upon yourself to guide and direct the faithful and the people of the provinces. And with vain and absurd words and preposterous talk you have thrown the cowl of belief of the weak and the ignorant into the terrible whirlpool of blasphemy, infidelity and transgression. "But they deceive none save themselves, though they may not perceive it. There is sickness in their hearts which God has aggravated: they shall be sternly punished for the lies they tell."200

You have corrupt and insincere intentions and you are filled with pride. Your base efforts are known to corrupt the state and the faith, and your sinister mind is satisfied with tyranny and injustice. Your senses of hearing and sight are impaired and you cannot hear the news or see. Although the victorious warriors of the faith, who act justly and who are impetuous like 'Ali, stood fast and the lion-hunting warriors echoed the sound of the resplendent miracles in your ears with the blade of their gem-scattering swords, you did not repent and remained lost in the abyss of

197 The Quran, surah al-Baqara, verse 12.
198 This verse is different from Nava'i's edited version. Nava'i, op. cit., p. 36.
199 The next couplet is only partially written. It is therefore not translated.
200 The Quran, surah al-Baqara, verse 9.
blasphemy and error.\textsuperscript{201} [61b] Do not be exultant since this time the grace of the Lord, may He be glorified and exalted, and the assistance of the spirit of the chief of the Apostles have conspired, and the victorious army which at the time of offensive advances beyond heaven and at times it is more numerous than the stars and the planets with the sparks of their dazzling swords will destroy that wretched crowd, who are puffed with pride and whose fortune is asleep in a bed of ignorance. Verse:

\begin{quote}
The earth will move as I move, heaven will rise as I rise. \\
As my army mount their horses, they will be as numerous as the desert sand. \\
On the day of the battle we shall destroy the formidable enemy. \\
In the hour of the battle we shall shed the blood of the enemy.\textsuperscript{202}
\end{quote}

If only a superficial victory is intended, it is evident to the young and the old in every quarter of the world that in battle you did not have the strength to resist and fight. In the face of the murderous offensive of the triumphant warriors of the faith you fled back to the farthest reaches of Turkistān. The objective of the army of Islam in that great holy war was to destroy the heretics and not to capture booty. It is therefore plausible that those noble and battle-hardened lion-hunters of the bush and the destroyers of the enemy ranks should leave some belongings to those dogs. A hemistitch "His desire to throw this body in front of the dogs".

If the purpose of this\textsuperscript{203} is to alarm the warriors of the faith and the heroes of the army of Islam [62a (60a)] then it is foolish and against reason. Presently the blow of [our] swords will send those cunning dogs to the depth of hell and they will be duly punished. With the help of fortune in this year the victorious troops will eliminate this unfortunate crowd on the battlefield so that there will remain no trace of them in the world until the day of resurrection.

\textsuperscript{201} At this point a section of the letter appears to be lost. The missing section however can be found in Nava'i's edition, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 37-9.
\textsuperscript{202} The translation of this \textit{misra'\textasciitilde} is uncertain.
The author has inserted these two couplets in mid-sentence. For the ease of translation, they have been added to the end of the sentence.
\textsuperscript{203} Reading is uncertain but the translation conveys the overall meaning.
[You] erroneously claim that the flight to Merv was done in imitation of the Prophet. Prior to this claim your heresy led you to trace your obscure low descent to those luminous stars and the royal gem, the pious Sayyid, may our prayers be upon him. You have not yet suffered the consequence of that temerity that you interpret immigration (*hijrat*) as flight and flight as immigration. The infamous poet Maulānā Jāmī who is the subject of our criticism verifies this:

O you Abū Lahab, the just messenger, who is titled the Shāh of Yathrib (Medina), despises you. Among the Persians and the Arabs there is not an idolater, an infidel or an oppressor like you. My God lead you away from the path of ignorance and towards the path of truth. May the love of the Infallible Imāms be the light of your dark path.²⁰⁴

[62b (60b)] After the conquest of Khurāsān once again His Majesty by divine will entered the capital Harat without war and was welcomed by the exalted sayyids and the eminent notables. [Shah Ṭahmāsp] went hunting and visited the gardens of Harat. [He] also went on a pilgrimage to the pure tombs and the sepulchres of the martyrs of that province, doing his utmost effort to put in order the financial and administrative affairs of Khurāsān and to console the distraught inhabitants. The officials reported to Shāh Ṭahmāsp that Maulānā Jāmī was a devout Sunnī and his poems harmed the public faith. His Highness ordained that anyone who was found reading the poems of the mystic of the age Maulānā Jāmī should be punished. [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] also ordered the mausoleum of Maulānā Jāmī, which was so tall that it reached the heaven, to be destroyed. The residents of Harat obediently and reluctantly destroyed Maulānā’s mausoleum and carried away its material as sacred relics. After the tomb of that learned and prominent man had been totally destroyed His Highness himself rode to the site of the tomb of that talented man to burn Maulānā Jāmī’s bones. That day Shāh Ṭahmāsp had worn a dark cloak which is the

²⁰⁴ Whereas Fazlí ends the letter here, Nava’ī’s edition of this letter continues, Nava’ī op. cit., pp. 40-44.
sign of the Kings' troubled mind. By chance and divine inspiration, the son of the family of the Lord of the Age (*khalaf-i dīdnān-i rasūl-i ākhar al-zamān*) asked his companions if they had with them Maulānā's book of poems. Qāzī Jahān Saifī Qazvīnī, the previous Grand Vazir, reported that he had a copy. His Highness ordered [Qāzī Jahān] to open it and find out what Jāmī said about himself and us. Once Qāzī Jahān opened Maulānā Jāmī's *ghazalihāt*, this *ghazal* came:

That heavenly cloak on her delicate body, is like a stem of flower draped in a water-lily.
She appeared in the blue sky like a moon, her heavenly garb is thus befitting.
At nights I burnt before her like a candle, I burnt from within but she did not believe me.
A constant lover is he who at the home of the beloved does not turn his face as the sword is drawn on him.
A glimpse of her and I lost my mind, faith and heart, Heaven save my life if I see her again.
The world-conquering Shāh reaps the fruits of pleasure and respite from his every kingdom.
Jāmī died of love and years have passed, but his ashes still exude loyalty.

His Majesty, the Ḥusain like Pādishāh, was delighted to hear Maulānā's fine poems and remarked that Maulānā had not been without inner sincerity. Qāzī Jahān stated that the offending poems which express his Sunnī sympathies indicate that he practised dissimulation (*taqiyya*) and that there are no doubts about his [religious] beliefs. He then read this couplet from Maulānā's poems:

O Jāmī drink from the chalice of love of Ṣāliḥ,  
As the apostate is unaware of this chalice.205

His Majesty applauded Qāzī Jahān and treated him kindly. [Shāh Tāhmāsp] ordered Maulānā's mausoleum to be reconstructed and lifted the ban on reading his poems. After Maulānā's grave had been restored His Majesty asked Qāzī Jahān to take an

---

205 The text is damaged and the last word of this couplet is illegible. The translation however conveys the meaning.
augury [from Maulānā’s poems] to see what he said about the restoration of his own grave. This ghazal, the last verse of which is as follows, appeared:

If Jāmī’s grave was desecrated by the order of that angle-faced,
His name will live on even though his tomb is no longer.

His majesty was enchanted and repeated the couplet and endeavoured to patronise the scholars (fużalā) and the mystics (‘urafā). One day His Majesty was on a pilgrimage to the tomb of Pīr Ansār, one of the disciples of hażrat-i parvardīgār, and as he rode over the bridge of Ni‘matābād, a man seeking justice approached and recited this verse:

May you beloved never perish.
will you administer justice to me at this end of the bridge or at the other?

[63b]The Shāh laughed and said "this end of the bridge" and granted the wish of that wretched [man]. After touring and hunting [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] entrusted the possession and government of Harat to the judicious, worthy and capable brother Prince Bahram Mīrzā and appointed Ghāzī Khān Tekkelū tutor [of the Prince] and the governor-general of the province with absolute authority. [Shāh Ṭahmāsp] bestowed much favour on the Khāns and the notables of that province and departed for Persian Iraq. On the 16th Rabī‘ al-Awal 936/ 18 November 1529 the banner of departure unfurled towards Iraq and the residents of Harat were aggrieved by it. His Majesty travelled through the Lūt desert. His Majesty the Shadow of God crossed the desert with a large army and entered Iṣfāhān. The Ustājlu Amirs such as Muntasha Sulṭān, Qāzūq Sulṭān, Shāh Qulī Sulṭān received the honour of kissing the Shāh’s feet [64a] and were honoured with much favour.


Kuchum Khān b. Abū’l Khayr Khān Chingizī died at Samarqand, and his son Abū Sāfīd succeeded him.
His Majesty spent the winter in the capital Iṣfāhān, bestowing many favours upon the exalted sayyids, and the notables of that province. His Majesty also appointed Naṣīm al-Dīn Niṣmatullāh Nāylerī, who was known for his piety and honesty, Vazir of the crown lands (khāliṣa) of Iṣfāhān and engaged in leisure, touring and hunting in [the area]. His Majesty who was endowed with divine inspiration and the grace of the Lord, uttered this couplet:

"O Niṣmatullāh Nāylerī, you will be the Vazir of Iṣfāhān till death".

And for twenty two years until his death, he remained the Vazir of Iṣfāhān. After the death of Khvāja Niṣmatullāh his sons received many [royal] favours and were enlisted in the rank of the civil functionaries (arbāb-i qalam).

[Shāh Ṭahmāsp] engaged in prayer in the winter camp in Iṣfāhān and awaited spring.
The Commentary:

[f. 2] Sarāb is a town situated on the road between Tabriz and Ardabil. Mustaufi, the 14th century geographer, claimed that Sarāb lay three days march from Tabriz and two days from Ardabil.1 There is some disagreement as to the exact district of Sarāb where Shāh Ismā'īl died and Tāhmasp ascended the throne. Of the sources consulted only Ṭārīkh-ī ʿĀlam Āra-i ʿAbbāsī by Iskandar Beg Munshi also reports Manqūta a district of Sarāb to be where Ismā'īl died. Khulāṣat al-Tavārikh by Qāzī Aḥmad Qumī and Ṭārīkh-ī Jahān Ārā by Qāzī Aḥmad Ghaflârī Qazvīnī name the district as "Karīva-i sāyin".2 Aḥsan al-Tavārikh by Ḥasan Rûmlû records "Ṣāyīn gaddukī" of Sarāb.3 Neither Manqūta nor Ṣāyīn gaddukī or Karīva-i sāyin can be traced. Irān dar ruzigār-ī Shāh Ismā'īl va Shāh Tāhmasp by Amir Maḥmūd b. Khvānd Amir states Shāh Ismā'īl died in the summer camp of Üjān which is situated to the south east of Tabriz and on the way between Tabriz and Miyānā.4

[f.2] Date of Shāh Ismā'īl's death and the accession of Shāh Tāhmasp

Afṣaf's recording of these dates is confused. One recording on folio 2 is inaccessible. The Turki year given for this year is wrong and the chronogram cited on folio 3a yields the correct date but has been calculated incorrectly by the scribe/author. A conservation tape covers the right margin of folio 2 which conceals the first one or two letters of the initial words of each line. Unfortunately the year of Ismā'īl's death is also partly concealed. We cannot be certain whether 930/1523-4 or 931/1524-5 has been given as the date for his death but judging by the amount of text covered in

---
3 Aḥsan, p. 181. The word "Ṣāyīn" probably refers to the settlements in Azarbayjān of a group of Turkomans who had immigrated from the Golden Horde and were the descendants of Batu, Juchi's son and Chingiz Khan's grandson, According to Barthold, Persian (Safavid) historians identify the Turkomans who lived in the area between Gurgan and Atrak, as Sayin Khan, i.e. the Golden Horde (Sayin Khan was a nickname for Batu). V. V. Barthold, *Four Studies on the History of Central Asia*, trans. V. and T. Minorsky, vol. 3, (Leiden, 1962), p. 138.
4 *Irān dar Rūzīgār* ..... p. 222. Le Strange, p. 163.
the other lines this is no more than one or two letters. It is reasonable to assume that
the date given, in letters, is 930 A.H. and not 931. If this is indeed the case the hijri
date of Monday 18 Rajab 930 A.H. as rendered in Afzal agrees with the other
sources. 5

The corresponding Turkî year of Yilân îl [the year of the Snake] as recorded in Afzal,
however, does not agree with Khulûsa and Tazkira-i Shâh Ţahmâsp, the only two
sources which give the corresponding Turkî year of Pîchî îl or the year of the Ape.
Further confusion arises on folio 3 where the author cites two chronograms "jây- i
pidar girifty" [You replaced your father] in a poem celebrating the accession of Shâh
Ţahmâsp and "Khusraw-i din" [The Champion of Religion] both of which yield the
date 930 A.H. but the numerical calculation, inserted between two lines by possibly
the same hand, in two places indicates "93 " and in one place indicates "931 A.H." It
is not clear whether the author intended 93 to be 930 or 931. In any event the
calculation 931 A.H. is incorrect. In the midst of such confusion and what appears to
be scribal error we may take the chronograms to yield the most accurate date, this
means 19 Rajab 930/ 23 May 1524 and not 931. In spite of the inconsistencies
evident in Afzal, the sources agree on the night of Sunday 18 Rajab 930/ 22 May
1524 as the date for the death of Shâh Ismâ’îl and the morning of the following day
Monday 19 Rajab 930/23 May 1524 as the date for the accession of Shâh Ţahmâsp.
The only exception to this consensus of opinion is Târîkh-i Jahân Ţârî which dates
both the death of Shâh Ismâ’îl and accession of Shâh Ţahmâsp on the same day
Monday 19 Rajab 930 A.H. 6

The Politics of Accession. The account of the accession of Shâh Ţahmâsp, offered
in Afzal al-Tavârikh, presents a smooth transition of power from father to son and its
narrative of the coronation ceremony is rare and more detailed than that found in

5 These sources are Ahsan, p. 181; Khulûsa, p. 153; Iran dar rûzigâr .... , p. 953; Târîkh-i Jahân Ŵâr
p. 280-1; TAAA, p. 44; Tazkira-i Shâh Ţahmâsp, p. 2; Muntakhab al-Tavârikh, f. 600a: Ilkî-i Niżâm
Shàhî, f. 399b.
other sources. *Afżal*, however, sheds little light on the court politics surrounding the accession of Shāh Ṭahmāsp. This may be partly due to the influence of Ḥasan Rūmlū, the historian contemporary with Shāh Ṭahmāsp whose *Aḥsan al-Tawārikh* served as a basic source for *Afżal*. Rūmlū’s treatment of the Shāh’s accession is brief and superficial. On the other hand the two parallel sources *Iran dar rūţigār i Shāh Ismā’īl* and *Shāh Ṭahmāsp* and *Khulāṣat al-Tawārikh* offer evidence which are by no means comprehensive but suggest that a more intricate political climate prevailed at court at the time:

"The two shrewd, elderly and battle-hardened amirs Div Sultan and Köpek Sultan who commanded the respect of the pillars of the state and of the Shāh, feared that in the aftermath of the death of Shāh Ismā’īl, corrupt and seditious individuals in the corridors of power waited for the opportunity to act and thus endanger the welfare of the Muslims. Fuelled by this fear and acting on Shāh Ismā’īl’s will and their own confidence in Ṭahmāsp’s competence, they enthroned Shāh Ṭahmāsp."

The author of *Khulāṣat al-Tawārikh* Qazı Ahmad Qumī adds that Tājlû Begum, Ṭahmāsp’s mother, played a significant role in her son’s accession. He writes that she was fearful of potential political instability, hence she influenced Div Sultan and Köpek Sultan in their decision to bring Ṭahmāsp out of the harem and to enthrone him. According to *Tārīkh-i Iltihā-i Nizāmshāh*, Shāh Ṭahmāsp was enthroned with the full support of the army and the Amirs. It is generally agreed that Shāh Ismā’īl on his deathbed designated Ṭahmāsp as his successor and appointed Div Sultan as his guardian (*lala*).

[f. 3a] **Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s date of birth.** There is some disagreement among the sources in regards to Ṭahmāsp’s date of birth. The following list shows the different dates of birth for Shāh Ṭahmāsp as have been tabulated in the sources:
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7 *Iran dar rūţigār .....,* pp. 225-6; *Khulāṣa*, p. 155.
8 *Khulāṣa*, p. 155.
10 Ibid; *Afżal I*, f. 274.
There are therefore two different traditions. According to one tradition, Tahmâsp was ten and a half years old at his accession and according to the other, he would have been almost twelve.

[4a] Afzal is ambiguous about the timing of Div Sulṭân’s appointment to the office of Commander-in-Chief of the Qizilbâsh forces; the reader is not certain whether Shâh Ismâ’il or Shâh Tahmâsp made this appointment. It also disagrees with some of the more contemporary sources as to the identity of the office holder whom Div Sulṭân succeeded. According to both Khulâṣat and Târîkh-i Jahân Ārâ, after the natural death of Châyân Sulṭân Ustâjlû in 929/1522-3, his son Bâyazîd Sulṭân succeeded him. Bâyazîd Sulṭân accompanied Shâh Ismâ’il to the summer camp at karîva-i šâyîn near Sarâb in Æzarbayjân in 930/1523-4 where he too died. Shâh Ismâ’il then appointed Div Sulṭân Rûmlû to this exalted office.\(^{12}\)

The most contemporary source Ahsan, however, is just as ambiguous about this appointment as Afzal and the similarities of accounts suggest it was used as the source by Faẓlî Ùsfâhâni. In the obituaries for the year 930 A.H. Rûmlû briefly states Div Sulṭân was appointed to the office of Commander-in-Chief of the Qizilbâsh

forces after Châyân Sulţân died. Unlike Afzal, none of the above-mentioned sources report Kópek Sulţân as having been appointed as co-vicegerent at this time. Köpek Sulţân certainly aspired to this position but this ill-fated partnership came later after the accession of Shah Ṭahmāsp.

Afzal's report of Shah Ṭahmāsp's coronation ceremony is independent evidence not corroborated by other sources. According to Khulāṣat al-Tavārīkh and Tārīkh-i Jahān Ārā, after the coronation ceremony the royal camp moved to the summer camp at Sahand to the south of Tabriz where Shah Ṭahmāsp appointed Div Sulţân, Köpek Sulţân, and Qāzī Jahān and where Khvāja Jalāl al-Dīn was also punished by being burnt to death. Aḥsan does not mention the summer camp at Sahand but all three sources report Shah Ṭahmāsp spent the following winter in Tabriz. The reports of the summer camp at Sahand after the coronation ceremony seem more plausible.

As was customary, the peripatetic Ṣafavī court always spent the summer and possibly autumn months in the summer camps around the kingdom and only returned to a city, for winter. Ṭahmāsp ascended the throne in the month of Rajab, at the end of the spring of that year. Unless there was a compelling reason for the young Shah to be present at the capital at that time, he is likely to have spent the summer and autumn, approximately Rajab-Ṣafar/May-November in Sahand.

Sam Mirzā's letter to Kuchum Khān. Aḥsan, Khulāṣa, Irān dar rūzigār. Sam Mirzā and Khulāṣa, agree that Durūsh Khān acting on his own initiative ordered the secretary to write a reply to Kuchum Khān in the name of Sam Mirzā. The young Prince may or may not have read Kuchum Khān's letter. Afzal's version certainly assigns a more active role to Prince Sam Mirzā but is difficult to corroborate. Afzal is ,however, the only source which produces the full text of the letter. The above-mentioned sources reproduce only a summary of the letter. Although the contents are the same, interestingly they all, including Afzal, are linguistically different from one another. 

---

13 Aḥsan. p. 181. See also Savory, "The Principal Offices, Shah Ṭahmāsp". pp. 77-8.
14 Aḥsan. p. 186; Khulāṣa. p. 158; Irān dar rūzigār...., p. 230-31
Div Sultan Rumlu. Div Sultan Rumlu, the powerful chieftain of the Rumlu tribe, was a key military commander whose distinguished military career began with Shah Isma'il's rise to power. We can date the start of his career as a military commander and a provincial governor to 919/1513-4 when Shah Isma'il sent him to capture Balkh and take control of its government. However, at the end of the year 921/1515-6, famine in Harat and frequent Uzbek attacks on the province of Khurasan forced Div Sultan to leave his governorship at Balkh and return to Tabriz to seek help from Shah Isma'il. He remained at court until the following year, 922/1516, when Shah Isma'il sent Div Sultan with several other amirs to launch a holy war against Georgia. He captured many citadels and towns and forced several of the Georgian governors, Qarqara, Davud Beg, Lavand Beg and Manuchihr to declare their allegiance to the Safavids and enter into his service. Back in the winter camp at Nakhjiván, Shah Isma'il rewarded Div Sultan for his successes in Georgia with immense affection and bounty. This marked the beginning of Div Sultan's role as the chief executor of Shah Isma'il's foreign policy in Georgia. Later in 922/1516, Div Sultan returned to Georgia to suppress Manuchihr who had rebelled against Qarqara, a vassal of Shah Isma'il. Div Sultan defeated Manuchihr and restored the rule of Qarqara. The struggle against Manuchihr continued in the following year 923/1517 when Div Sultan encountered the combined forces of Manuchihr and his Ottoman allies. Div Sultan was back in Georgia again in 924/1518 in support of Qarqara, the Safavid vassal.

The development of Div Sultan Rumlu's career during this period which coincided with the last ten years of Shah Isma'il reign, must have a direct bearing on our understanding of the key role he played during the civil war period of 931-3/1524-6.

---

15 Habib al-siyar, p. 540.
16 Ibid, p. 552.
17 Ibid, p. 571.
18 Ibid.
19 Ahsan, p. 168; Khulasa, vol. 1, p. 140. Div Sultan captured the citadels of Luri and Suram and entrusted them to Qarqara.
It is important to note that prior to the battle of Chaldiran Shāh Ismā‘īl would have personally led such military campaigns against Georgia. However, after his humiliating defeat at Chaldiran Shāh Ismā‘īl totally withdrew from any military activity against either external or internal enemies and entrusted such affairs to his senior generals. Thus Div Sulṭān resumed to play the key role in implementing the Šafavid foreign policy in Georgia almost to the time of the death of Shāh Ismā‘īl. This placed him in an extremely powerful and prestigious position as the commander of a large section of the Qizilbāsh army. As the civil wars of the early years of Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s reign would later illustrate, he would use his power and influence over the rival uymaq leaders to disastrous effect. We also see the signs that Div Sulṭān had begun to act independently of Shāh Ismā‘īl and also of the Commander-in-Chief of the Qizilbāsh forces Chāyān Sulṭān Ustājlū. In 927/1520-1 during another military campaign to defend Shāhān against Lavand Khān of Georgia, who had attacked this Šafavid vassaldom, Div Sulṭān personally ordered the execution of Charkīn Ḥasan Tekkelū, the father of Ghāzī Khān Tekkelū. Charkīn Ḥasan was one of Shāh Ismā‘īl’s most eminent amirs and his execution on the charge of misconduct and failure to manage the army was a bold act on the part of Div Sulṭān. Clearly Div Sulṭān had overstepped his authority and in this affair he had acted without recourse to a higher authority: Shāh Ismā‘īl. Div Sulṭān’s activities in Georgia and his decision to execute a powerful amir suggests that he was already beginning to assume the principal royal prerogatives: holy war and dispensing justice.

Political circumstances also helped Div Sulṭān in his ambitions to gain greater political authority. In 929/1522-3 Shāh Ismā‘īl’s powerful Vicegerent (vakīl) Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain was murdered and was succeeded by his junior minister and close friend Jalāl al-Din Muḥammad Ṭabrīzī. In the same year Chāyān Sulṭān Ustājlū,

---


21 Khulāṣa, p. 147.

22 For the circumstances surrounding Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain’s murder see Ḥabīb al-siyyar, pp. 595-597.
the commander-in-chief of the Qizilbash forces (amir al-umārā) too died of natural death and his son Bāyazīd succeeded him. Neither the vakil Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Taβrīzī nor the amir al-umārā Bāyazīd Sulṭān appear to have exercised much power and influence during their brief tenure. Finally in the spring of 930/1523-4, Bāyazīd Sulṭān Ustājlū also died in the summer camp at Sarāb. This must have happened days before Shāh Ismāʿīl’s death.

With Shāh Ismāʿīl on his death bed and his powerful vicegerent Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain also dead, Dīv Sulṭān Rūmlū moved to fill the political power vacuum created by their absence. His first move was to take control of the office of the commander-in-chief of the army. This must have sown the first seeds of enmity and rivalry which were to develop between Dīv Sulṭān and Köpek Sulṭān Ustājlū and which culminated in two civil wars. Köpek Sulṭān was the brother of Chāyān Sulṭān and after the death of his nephew the commander-in-chief of the army Bāyazīd Sulṭān, he naturally aspired, following a family/tribal tradition, to seize this office. The power struggle between Dīv Sulṭān Rūmlū and Köpek Sulṭān Ustājlū continued after Shāh Ismāʿīl died on 18 Rajab 930 A.H. From the time of accession of Shāh Taḥmāsp, on 19 Rajab, sources generally refer to Dīv Sulṭān as both the commander-in-chief of the Qizilbash forces (amir al-umārā) and also the vicegerent (vakil) and thus assumed authority over both the bureaucracy and the army. Dīv Sulṭān took control of the most powerful office of the state, the office of vicegerency (vīkālat), after he instigated the execution by burning of Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Taβrīzī, who had succeeded Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain to this office, in Tabrīz.

23 Khulāṣa, pp. 152-3; Tārikh-i Jahān Ārā, pp. 280-1. See also Savory, op. cit., p. 100.
25 In the latter part of Shah Ismāʾīl’s reign the office of vakil and vazir appear to have been merged and the office of vakil had lost much of its former importance. During the military governments of the first 10 years of Shah Taḥmāsp’s reign however, both the office of vakil and amir al-umārā (Commander-in-chief) regained much of their former prestige. Savory, “The Principal Offices, Shah Taḥmāsp”, pp. 71-2. See also the above commentary “The appointment of Dīv Sulṭān”.
26 Afzāl II, f. 9a. Qāzī Ahmad Qumī too states that Dīv Sultān was instrumental in Shah Taḥmāsp’s decision to execute Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad, Khulāṣa, p. 156.
However, the Ustajlū tribe was too large and powerful to be excluded from the principal offices of the state and Div Sultān had to share power with Köpek Sultān as his co-vicegerent. This was an uneasy partnership which came to an end during two civil wars. The first civil war occurred in the spring of 932/1526 at Sultāniyya. The Ustajlūs were defeated and forced to retreat to Gilān where they remained until the following year. The second battle took place in the spring of 933/1527 at Sharūr on the way to Tabriz. Köpek Sultān was killed in this battle and his tribe went into exile in Gilān where they remained until 936/1529-30 when Shāh Tāhmāsp summoned them back to court.27 Thereafter Div Sultān declared Chuha Sultān Tekkelū, his main ally against the Ustajlūs, as his co-vicegerent.

Div Sultān's alliance with Chuha Sultān Tekkelū was born of political expediency. He possibly calculated that Chuha Sultān as an ally would be less likely to pose a threat to his political ambitions. There is also another possibility. Div Sultān Rūmlū did not have a large tribal force at his command. By the 930s/1520s the majority of the Rūmlūs led a sedentary existence in towns and villages and unlike leaders of the other uymaqs who served as governors in the provincial administrations and commanded their own military contingents, the Rūmlū elders acted as khalifa or the high priests of the urban Ṣūfī orders.28 This explains why the chronicles name so few Rūmlū amirs acting as provincial governors during this time. At the beginning of Shāh Tāhmāsp's reign we encounter only two Rūmlū provincial governors named by the sources: Bādīnjān Sultān Rūmlū, the governor of Ardabil, and Āyyūt Beg Rūmlū, the governor of Arsaq, both of whom fought in the civil war of 932-3/1525-6. Therefore Div Sultān may have planned to bring the Tekkelū tribal force under his own command through a political alliance with Chuha Sultān.

27 For the Ustajlu-Rumlü hegemony and the ensuing civil war period see the translation of Aflal al-Tavāriḵ above, ff. 15b-18a, 20b-23b; Ahṣan, pp. 187-194, 198-200; Khulāṣa, pp. 159-160, 162. See also Roemer, "The Cambridge History of Iran", pp. 233-34; Dickson, pp. 51-77, 93-7.
28 Sumer, trans, Isharaqi and Imāmī, p. 105.
Whatever Div Sultan’s scheme may have been, he was unsuccessful and his political career as the all-powerful vicegerent was short-lived. After the battle at Sharur on Thursday 5 Shavvāl 933/ 5 July 1527, Div Sultan Rūmlū was killed. Although Fāzī Iṣfahānī claims Shāh Ṭahmāsp ordered Div Sultan’s killing, Ḥasan Rūmlū claims that Chuha Sultan Tekkelū instigated his murder and transferred his troops to one of his officers Sulaymān Beg Rūmlū. With both Köpek Sultan Ustājlū and Div Sultan Rūmlū eliminated, Chuha Sultan became the vicegerent (vakil) and the period of the Tekkelū hegemony commenced.


[f. 16a] Div Sultan Rūmlū and the royal seal. Afzal’s report that Div Sultan was asked to leave his seal at court contradicts Rūmlū’s account in his Ahsan al-Tavārīkh. According to Aḥsan, Div Sultan left the court under the pretext of military campaign to Khurāsān and also took the royal seal with him. At Lār he sent letters to the governors of Kāshān, Qum, and the rest of Iraq, summoning them to join him in battle against his rival Köpek Sultan Ustājlū and sealed them with the royal seal. This was clearly intended to give his attempt to enlist the support of the provincial governors in the civil war the appearance of royal authority. The evidence in Afzal is clearly distorted.

[f. 21a] The Versāq tribe. The Versāq were originally one of the Turkoman tribes of ʿĀrsūs in Anatolia. The Versāq were among the first tribes who declared their

---

29 Aḥsan, p. 205; Afzal, ff. 27a, 28a.
30 Dickson, 23.
31 Aḥsan, 183.
32 Aḥsan, p. 188.
allegiance to Shaykh Ismā'il and joined forces with him during his Anatolian campaign of 905/1499-1500. Thereafter the members of the standing corps of royal troops (qūrchiš) were recruited from this tribe.33

[f. 21a] Khalifa of tauhid khāna. In the Ṣafaviyya Ṣūfī order, Khalifa was the representative of Khalīfat al-Khulāfā, the supreme commander of the Ṣūfis in the provinces.34 The duty of khalifa of tauhid khāna or the Ṣūfī House of Unity was to follow the rule established at the time of Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn, namely to gather the Ṣūfis and the dervishes in the tauhid khāna every Thursday night and to keep them repeating the pious formula "There is no God but Allāh".35 Both Rūmlū and Qāẓī Ahmad Qumī corroborate the role Qāsim Khalīfa played in mediating between the warring factions.36 However, of the sources consulted only Afzal reports the proposed peace-making role of the Grand Vazir Mir Ja'far and the Twelver Shī'ī cleric Shaykh 'Ali b. ʿĀl to the Ustājlūs.

[f. 23a] The Ustājlū retreat to Gilān. Aḥsan offers a more extended account of Köpek Sultān Ustājlū's retreat from battle and his flight to Gilān than Afzal. According to Aḥsan, under attack from the advancing royal qūrchiš, the Ustājlūs fled towards Gilān via Abhar. At the same time the Vāli of Gilān Muẓaffar Sultān despatched an infantry of eight thousand men to the aid of the Ustājlūs. When Ṭahmāsp heard this news, he left the camp (urdū) in Khalkhal to the south of Ardabil and set off in pursuit of the Ustājlūs. The Shāh had already sent Div Sultān, Chuha Sultān and several other amirs with the vanguard of the army. The royal army attacked and defeated the Ustājlūs in the vicinity of Kharzvil. Köpek Sultān and Muntasha Sultān reached Gilān with great difficulty and the majority of the Ustājlūs

---

33 Sumer, trans. Ishrāqi and Imāmī, pp. 27, 62.
35 ṢM, p. 55.
were massacred in the jungles of Gilân. According to Khulāša, the people of Gilân were responsible for this massacre.

[f. 25] The Uzbek siege of Mashhad in 932/1525-6. Interestingly Afżal is the only source which reports that the wife of Bûrūn Sultan commanded the Tekkelû troops in defence of Mashhad during the siege. Ahsan attributes the defence of the city to the warriors of the faith (ghâzîyân) in general. Khulāša in its brief account and Iran dar rûzigâr ....... credit the "people" of Bûrūn Sultan with the defence of the fortress of Tûs. However, in an earlier passage under the events of this year, Khulāša and Iran dar... report that before his departure for the court, Bûrūn Sultan left his family and tribe in the charge of one of his sons at the fortress of Tûs. Although both sources are silent on the actual matter of the leadership of the army, they implicitly attribute this role to Bûrūn Sultan’s son. However, Afżal’s account of the role which Bûrūn Sultan’s wife played in the defence of Mashhad is sufficiently detailed to be authentic.

There is also confusion among the sources as to whether the Uzbeks besieged Mashhad or the neighbouring Tûs or both. Afżal is quite clear that the Tekkelû troops were stationed in Mashhad. Iran dar rûzigâr.... first reports the Tekkelû garrison was stationed in the fortress of Tûs and later uses the ambiguous term "the sacred province" (vilāyat- i mutabarika) to refer to the district defended by the Tekkelûs. According to the most contemporary source Ahsan, Bûrūn Sultan’s family and the Tekkelû garrison were stationed at Tûs and not Mashhad and its brief account concerns the siege of Tûs. As noted above Khulāša concurs with Ahsan. Only Afżal claims that the Tekkelûs were stationed in Mashhad.

---

37 Ahsan, pp. 193-4.
38 Khulāša, p. 162.
39 Ahsan, p. 196.
40 Khulāša, p. 171: Iran dar rûzigâr ......., p. 250.
41 Khulāša, 169: Iran dar rûzigâr ...., p. 249.
42 Ahsan, p. 196.
Faced with such contradictory evidence Dickson believed on this occasion that the Uzbekks were more likely to have besieged Tūs rather than Mashhad although he does not dismiss the possibility of the presence of some troops in Mashhad. Dickson bases his argument on the extent of development of Mashhad’s fortifications and his calculation of the duration of the siege. He refers to the siege and the capture of Mashhad by the Uzbekks in 935/1528-9, as elicited by both Aḥsan and Afżal, and argues Mashhad had not yet developed sufficient defensive fortifications (bārū va ḥiṣār) to withstand a long siege. In 935/1528-9 the Qizilbāşh defenders of the city admitted they could not defend the city against the Uzbek multitudes with only barricades and as was predicted the Uzbekks overran the barricades and captured the city without resort to a long siege. Indeed an assessment of the city’s defences in 935 A.H. should also be valid for the siege under discussion in 932/1525-6. This favours the evidence in Afżal and partly explains why according to this source the siege only lasted two months. Dickson however disagrees and argues the usual descriptions of the hunger and the food shortages which afflicted the city suggest the siege lasted at least four months and only the citadel of Tūs was able to resist for so long.43 Despite Dickson’s assertion it can be argued that the usual descriptions of hunger and food shortages, eating of leather shoes, cats and dogs, drinking of horses’ blood, are more likely to be a standard literary formula derived from folk culture to which most chroniclers subscribed rather than historical fact. Such descriptions, therefore, can not be used as a very accurate yard stick to measure the duration of a siege.

The authenticity of Afżal’s account of the siege of Mashhad can be supported indirectly in a number of ways. A closer scrutiny of Aḥsan and Afżal reveals that Afżal’s version of the 935 A.H. siege is, with the exception of some minor editing, an exact copy of Aḥsan. On the other hand Afżal’s account of the 932 A.H. siege offers independent evidence. The author clearly had access to additional sources, possibly one of the inextant histories he refers to, notably Maulānā Nujūmī Haravī’s Tārīkh-i

43 Dickson, p. 90.
Harat va Khurāsān. Another indirect support for Afzāl’s evidence of resistance (and siege) in Mashhad is offered by the 18th century Uzbek source Tārīkh-i Qipchāq Khānī by Qipchāq Khan. In its account of the Uzbek atrocities following the fall of Mashhad (or Ṭūs), Qipchāq Khān writes that a number of Shī‘i soldiers took refuge in the shrine of Imām Rīzā but they were nonetheless killed and cut to pieces.44 This report comes very close to Afzāl’s assertion that “large numbers of brave young [Qizilbāš] thought that martyrdom before the fragrant tomb of the Sulṭān of Khurāsān [Imām Rīzā] would bring eternal prosperity. They made a death pact and large numbers set off for the shrine”. Notwithstanding such ambiguities the later Šafavī and Uzbek sources indicate that there was military presence and resistance in Mashhad.

It is possible that Mashhad was gaining importance as a provincial centre but had not yet entirely superseded the older neighbouring Ṭūs as a defensive centre. An examination of the sources supports the notion that Mashhad had already gained much prominence and had become the political and the military centre during the reign of Shāh Ismā‘īl. The earliest source Ḥabīb al-siyār writes ‘Ubayd Khān occupied Mashhad in 917/1511-12 and Shāh Ismā‘īl sent Khalil Sulṭān, the governor of Shīrāz, to liberate the city from the Uzbeks.45 ‘Ubayd Khān fled from the city before Khalil Sulṭān’s arrival and took many of the city’s grandees with him. Again we find that in 919/1513-14 Shāh Ismā‘īl moved to Khurāsān to liberate Mashhad from ‘Ubayd Khān. In 928/1521-22 Būrūn Sulṭān was appointed the governor of Mashhad. The process of transition from Ṭūs to Mashhad as the defensive stronghold had certainly been completed by the year 942/1535-6 when during yet another Uzbek invasion the family of Ṣufyān Khalīfa, the governor of Mashhad, are reported to have taken refuge in the safety offered by the city walls.46

---

44 Cited by Dickson p. 92, note 1. Dickson does not give the page/folio reference.
46 Iran dar rūzīgār...... p. 295.
[f. 28a] The murder of Div Sultān. Curiously, Khulāsa does not report the killing of Div Sultān. Whereas Afzal attributes the decision for his execution to Shāh ʿĀlāʾ, Jahān Arā and Aḥsan report that Chuha Sultān Takalū instigated the murder of Div Sultān. Afzal’s report is consistent with the author’s tendency to attribute all the major decision to Shāh ʿĀlāʾ and to make light of the power of the Qizilbāš chiefs at court in this period. Thus Fażlī presents Shāh ʿĀlāʾ as a more powerful monarch than he actually was during his minority. The dates reported for the execution of Div Sultān are as follows:

Aḥsan Thursday 5 Shavvāl 933/5 July 1527
Jahān Arā Thursday 25 Shavvāl 933/25 July 1527.47

[f. 28b] The question of the identity of Ukhl Sultān Zu’l-Qadr the Governor of Bastām & the first Uzbek conquest of Āstarābād. There is confusion among the sources as to the real identity and tribal affiliation of the governor of Bastām on the eve of the Uzbek attack on Āstarābād in 933/1526. Afzal refers to him as Ukhl Sultān Zu’l-Qadr who in alliance with Zaynal Khan Shāmlū and Demrī Sultān Shāmlū defended Āstarābād against ʿUbayd Khan. Other sources however explain his presence in the battle of Āstarābād by referring to him as Ukhl Sultān Tekkelū the governor of Qazvīn.48 This evidence in Khulāsa, in particular, is rendered unreliable by its earlier report that Ukhl Sultān Tekkelū was killed almost one year earlier on the 14th Shaʿbān 932/26 May 1526 in the civil war battle waged between the Ustājlūs and the Rūmlū-Tekkelū alliance in Āzarbāyjān.49 If Ukhl Sultān Tekkelū had indeed been killed in the previous year, the Ukhl Sultān identified at the battle for Āstarābād was clearly a different individual and Afzal’s identification of him as a Zu’l-Qadr may be construed as reliable. Dickson too has discussed the problem and has concluded that Afzal’s Ukhl Sultān was in fact the well known Tekkelū Sultān and his Zu’l-Qadr affiliation, as recorded only in Afzal, was also correct and arose

48 Khulāsa. pp. 171-2; Tārīkh-i Jahān Arā. p. 284
49 Khulāsa. p. 162.
from particularly close ties between the two Tekkelü and Zu'l-Qadr uymaq.50 Dickson’s conclusion is of limited value since it reflects no awareness of the evidence, however contradictory, given in Khulasa.

Afzal’s unique identification of Ukhî Sultan, the governor of Bastâm, as a Zu'l-Qadr is also consistent with its independent version of the Qizilbash defence of Ästârabâd. In 933/1526 ʿUbayd Khân’s army captured Ästârabâd, lost it to the Qizilbash Amirs and recaptured it again. Sources, including Afzal, agree that after the fall of Ästârabâd for the first time Shâh ʿAhnìsp who must have still been in Âzarbâyjân ordered Demri Sultan and Ukhî Sultan [Tekkelü or Zu'l-Qadr] to join the forces of Zaynal Khân, the governor of Ästârabâd, to wrest the city back from ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz Uzbek. The Qizilbash Amirs recaptured the city without recourse to war since ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz Sultan Uzbek fled as the combined forces of the Amirs advanced towards Ästârabâd. Therefore there is no disagreement about the presence of Ukhî Sultan and Demri Sultan during the later phase of the campaign. There was subsequently a lull in the Uzbek activity until ʿUbayd Khân heard about the loss of Ästârabâd and demobilised the army to retake the metropolis.

Disagreement however arises over the earlier phase of the campaign when Ästârabâd fell to ʿUbayd Khân for the first time. Both Ahsan and Khulasa concur with the view that Zaynal Khân alone defended Ästârabâd against ʿUbayd Khân. Qiyâ Pâ Beg, the commander of the vanguard of his army, could not hold out against the Uzbeks and Zaynal Khân was forced to retreat and capitulate. There is no report of the participation of Ukhî Sultan and Demri Sultan in this battle. This is the point where Afzal significantly differs from both Ahsan and Khulasa.51 According to Afzal the Amirs of Jurjân, the governor of Dâmghân Demri Sultan Shâmlû and the governor of Bastâm Ukhî Sultan Zu'l-Qadr, joined forces with Zaynal Khân the governor of Ästârabâd in the defence of the city.52 More importantly only Afzal presents the
military alliance of the three Amirs as a local initiative in response to the Uzbek invasion. There is no indication of the royal sanction of such an alliance. This is more than likely since the court was too preoccupied with inter-tribal factionalism and the ensuing civil war in Āzarbāyjān to pay any attention to the Uzbek threat in Khurāsān. It also suggests that neither Demrī Sulṭān nor Ukhī Sulṭān were involved in the civil war being fought at court. Aفزāl clearly represents an independent historical tradition, possibly drawn from the inextant source Tārīkh-i Harat va Khurāsān..

[f. 29a] The Kangarlū tribe: This is a rare reference to the Kangarlū who were a sub-tribal group of the Ustājlū uymaq. After immigration to Iran, the Kangarlū settled around Nakhjivān in Qarābāgh. It appears that by the reign of Shāh Tahmāsp the Kangarlū tribe held governorships and were settled in the centre, the north and the east of the country. Sūmer claims that also during Tahmāsp's reign the Vālī of Kermān was a Tīmūr Khān Kangarlū.53 This however can not be verified. According to Tārīkh-i Kermān during most of the 16th century the Afshār tribe held the governorship of Kermān.54

[f. 30a] Both Rūmī and Qāżī Ahmād Qumī attribute the proposal to wait in the town for the arrival of the royal reinforcements and thus avoid engaging in a premature and potentially disastrous battle with the Uzbeks, to Demrī Sulṭān.55 Both sources only refer to Ukhī Sulṭān as the sole opponent of this plan. According to Khulāṣa, Demrī thought it "prudent to go to the town and send an envoy to Shāh-i jam jāh and act according to the royal command." The sources not only disagree on the identity of the proponent of this idea but also on the expectations of the Amirs. Aفزāl's account clearly anticipates the arrival of royal reinforcements whereas Khulāṣa and Aḥsan are less clear as to whether such reinforcement was expected at all.

53 Sūmer, trans. Iṣhrāqi and Imāmī, pp. 109, 199.
[f. 31a] Shāh Ṭahmāsp and the year 934/1527-8. There is general agreement among the sources that Shāh Ṭahmāsp spent Naurūz of this year in or around Qazvin. Both Afzal and Khulāša concur with the view that the Shāh celebrated Naurūz of 934/1527-28 in Qazvin. Curiously Ahsan misses the year 934 A.H. and relates the events of this year under the heading of the year 933/1526-27. This is possibly due to the fact that despite the Uzbek invasion in the east and rebellion in Baghdad, the young Shāh appears to have been unable or reluctant to take any action to suppress the external and internal enemies. Contrary to the claim by Afzal that at Naurūz the Shāh was concerned with the security of the realm and planned to liberate Khurāsān, the choice of the summer camp at Kharqān, reflects the Shāh's failure to take effective action. Kharqān, a district to the west of Qazvin on the way to Hamadān, was not a logistically obvious choice for mustering an army to liberate Khurāsān since it placed the royal party even further from the province which at this time was occupied by the Uzbeks. The Qizilbāsh Amirs in Khurāsān had repeatedly pleaded with the Shāh for reinforcements but as Khulāša reports Shāh Ṭahmāsp was at the time preoccupied with the Naurūz celebrations. He "spent the Naurūz as it pleased him" and the royal camp moved to the summer quarters (yailāq) at Kharqān in the following month of Rajab/March when" it was spring and the number of hours of daylight and night were equal and vegetation began to blossom and grow". Although Afzal attributes the decision to summon the army to liberate Khurāsān to Shāh Ṭahmāsp, under the events of the year 934, it was the following year 935/1528-29 before the Shāh actually departed for Khurāsān.

[f. 31a] The Siege of Harat. Afzal's account of the second siege of Harat by the Uzbeks is almost an exact copy of Ahsan al-Tavārīkh. Afzal offers no independent information concerning this event. The author has however altered the text. In

56 Ahsan, pp. 198-209.
57 Afzal II, f. 31a.
58 Khulāša. p. 172.
places he has simply reworded passages, has omitted sections or has inserted a new sentence here and there. The alterations are often minor but significant in meaning. Where the author adds to the text, it is often in conformity with his own ideological or historical perspective. He usually alludes to the divine kingship of Shāh Ṭahmāsp and the legitimacy of the Šafavi dynasty as the true, deserving and felicitous ruling family chosen by God. The narrative of the killing of Yārī Beg, the powerful Uzbek commander, during the siege of Harat clearly illustrates this point. Whereas Aḥsan simply reports the manner of Yārī Beg’s death, which was caused by a musket fired by a Qizilbāsh guard from the citadel, Aẓal’s account attributes his killing to divine intervention. The author also seeks legitimacy for the rule of Shāh Ṭahmāsp as the worthy heir of the founder of the Šafavi dynasty Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn Ishāq on whose behalf God intervenes. This helps the author to account for the political and military adversities befalling the young Shah Ṭahmāsp at this time in terms of divine will rather than the historical reality of the young Shah’s minority. This tendency to elevate the divine rule of Shāh Ṭahmāsp is a key feature of Aẓal al-Tavārīkh which distinguishes it from the most contemporary chronicle Aḥsan and indeed from any other chronicle concerning Ṭahmasp’s reign.

[f. 32a] Expulsion of the civilians from Harat. As has already been noted in the previous commentary, the author Fazlī Ḡṣfāhānī has used Aḥsan al-Tavārīkh as his basic source for the narrative of the siege of Harat. However, one minor linguistic alteration in Aẓal has produced a profoundly different reinterpretation of the Qizilbāsh expulsion of the civilians of Harat during the Uzbek siege. We are told that to solve the problem of severe shortage of food in Harat, the governor-general of Harat Ḥusain Khān Shāmlū ordered the expulsion of the residents of the city. According to Aḥsan "avṣāt al-nās and those who were thought not to adhere to

---

61 During the Uzbek siege of Harat in 937/1530-31, which lasted for a year and a half, the Tekkelu administration too expelled the inhabitants and expropriated their food supplies and belongings. Iskandar Munshi notes that in that event much injustice (ṣitam va ta’dī) was done to the subjects, TAAA, p. 59.
Shīʿism" were expelled from the citadel. This differs from *Afzal* which reads "*avsat al-nās* who were thought not to adhere to Shīʿism" were expelled. It is not possible to determine whether this alteration is due to a clerical error in copying or informed editing by the author of the source material. Whatever the reason *Ahsan*’s version is in fact more revealing. It points to an urban society marked by complex social tensions. Further evidence suggests that this urban tension and conflict which was only brought to surface by the Uzbek siege and the hardships which this inflicted on the inhabitants of the city, was less clearly defined by Shīʿi-Sunnī sectarianism than by differences in the wealth and material fortunes of its citizens. Sectarian differences were used as a pretext for expropriating the property of the wealthy. During the later siege and capture of Herat in 936/1529-30 ʿUbayd Khan destroyed homes and persecuted inhabitants who although Sunnī were rumoured, because of their wealth, to have been Shīʿi. In his actions in 936 A.H., ʿUbayd Khan was probably guided by the same local rivalries and politics of envy which also prompted Ḥusain Khan Shāmlū to expel the more prosperous citizens (*avsat al-nās*) regardless of their religious proclivities. Curiously *Afzal* does not report some of the more interesting details cited in other sources, concerning the expulsion and/or flight of people of Harat and the tyranny and injustice perpetrated by Ḥusain Khan Shāmlū and the Qizilbāsh in that city.

Both *Ahsan* and *Iran dar rūzigār* ... report that following these expulsions, the city of Harat was so empty of people that scarcely a peasant or urban inhabitant would be seen in the bāzār. And Maḥmūd Khvāndmir in *Iran dar rūzigār*.. reports that the middle classes, the poor and the contemptible, and the noble people, some willingly and others reluctantly, set off for the city gates with few belongings and their families. The rush to leave Harat was such that many would queue for days and

---

62 *Afzal II*, f. 50b; *Ahsan*. 222.
63 Dickson, p. 158.
64 *Ahsan*. p. 207 and *Iran dar ruzigar*...... p. 257.
65 *Iran dar ruzigar* i ........ p.256.
nights at the gates. When their turn arrived, the Qizilbāsh men would strip the men and their women folk would undress the women to search for money and valuables and thus prevent smuggling such valuables out of the city. After such horrific inspections a sum of one hundred and fifty Tabtizl amars would be demanded from the khāna kūch [household], which consisted of a man and a woman, before they would be given permission to leave. A similar treatment awaited them in the fortifications (kūcha band) outside the city walls.

[f. 32b] **Shortage of salt in Harat.** Concerning the shortage of salt in the city, both Aḥsan and Iran dar rūzigār... provide the same anecdote about the affluent citizens of Harat who would hide a piece of salt rock in a cloth and when eating they would secretly taste it on the tongue before concealing it in the cloth again. It is said of Khvāja Muẓaffar Butakchī who was a royal amir (az ʿadād- i umarā- i shāhī būd), that he placed a little salt in a bag and sealed it.

[f. 32b] **Fīrūz Kūh** was a fortress on the slopes of the mountain of Damāvand in Māzandarān.66

[ff. 33, 34a, 47 & 48] **Zulfiqār's rebellion in Baghdad, 935 A.H.** The author Fażlī Ṣafāhānī interrupts his narrative of the rebellion in Baghdad with the account of Shāh Ṭahmāsp's campaign to Khurāsān to liberate the province from the Uzbeks. This style of narrative which is also common to Aḥsan al-Tavārīkh and Khulāṣat al-Tavārīkh, faithfully reflects the chronology of the events as they unfolded. Zulfiqār entered the summer camp of māhī dasht, near Moṣūl in Iraq,67 on the 14th Ramadan 934/4 June 1528. The news of his rebellion reached the court in Qazvīn in the same month of Ramadan/June but Shāh Ṭahmāsp decided to defer any military action to suppress this rebellion until after the Khurāsān campaign.68 Ṭahmāsp defeated

---

66 Le Strange, p. 371.
68 Khulāṣa, p. 175.
‘Ubayd Khān at Jām and liberated Khurāsān from the Uzbeks and almost one year later at the end of the month of Ramadān of 935/June 1529 Shāh Ṭahmāsp and his army reached the vicinity of Baghdād.

Afzal-Tavārīkh offers one of the most detailed accounts of the liberation of Baghdād. Except for Aḥsan al-Tavārīkh, however, it is not possible to identify the remaining source(s) from which the author has derived his evidence. Fażlī Iṣfahānī has used Aḥsan to a limited extent. He has copied word for word from Aḥsan the prose and verse which describe the intensity of the heat of the summer as Shāh Ṭahmāsp and his army crossed the river Khāneqī into the Arab Irāq.69 As the historiographical examination of the Battle of Jām has also shown, verbatim adoption of literary embellishments of this kind from Aḥsan is a hallmark of Afzal al-Tavārīkh. The similarities with Aḥsan however end here. Although Afzal offers a detailed narrative we gain a complete picture of the events only when Afzal is read in conjunction with Khulāṣat al-Tavārīkh.70 Afzal's version of the events does not contradict the different historical tradition found in Khulāṣa but rather complements it.

Unlike Afzal, Khulāṣa offers invaluable insight into the political context of Zulfiqār's rebellion.71 According to this version Ibāhir Khān with an army of five thousand troops was on his way to Ṭahmāsp's court when he was murdered by his nephew Zulfiqār at the summer camp of māḥī dasht. Ibāhir Khān had been summoned by Tājlū Begum, Ṭahmāsp's mother, who had been troubled by the inter-tribal feuding between the different uymaqā at court. Tājlū Begum was a relation of the Turkomāns and no doubt she had invited the support of her kinsman Ibāhir Khān in the hope of striking a more positive political balance in favour of her own faction at court.

Although, in the absence of sufficient documentary evidence, it is difficult to delineate the interest groups representing this faction, we can conjecture that this was a pro-Ṭahmāsp faction. We can also conjecture that this was a move to counter the

---

70 Khulāṣa, pp. 175-6 & 189-90.
71 Khulāṣa, p. 176.
Tekkelū hegemony at court. Chuha Sultan Tekkelū had eliminated his rivals, Div Sultan Rumlū and Köpek Sultan Ustajlū, and the powerful Ustajlū tribe was in exile in Gilān. His other arch rival Ḥusain Khan Shāmlū was in Khurāsān and was preoccupied with the defence of the province against the ever-present threat of the Uzbeks. Therefore, Chuha Sultan Tekkelū exercised absolute authority as the vakil or vicegerent and denied the young Shāh Ṭahmāsp any effective political authority. The ongoing power struggle among the uymaqī at court and the absence of his uncle and his large army from Baghdād clearly provided Zulfiqār with the opportunity to take control of the reins of the government of Iraq and break away from the Ṣafavid state. Again Khulāṣa sheds light on Zulfiqār's political intentions. Having gained control of Iraq, Zulfiqār sent his vakil Nadār Beg to the Ottoman Sultan Sulayman to forge an alliance and also "threw his tāj". This refers to the Qizilbash tāj wearing of which symbolised allegiance to the Ṣafavid rule and Twelver Shi‘ism. This was clearly a symbolic act by which Zulfiqār renounced Shi‘ism and reinstated Sunnī orthodoxy into Arab Iraq.

Afżal al-Tāvārīkh does not report the fact of Iraq's cession and Zulfiqār's religious policy but it does shed light on the nature of Ṭahmāsp's liberation campaign. Faẓlī presents the royal expedition to Arab Iraq not as a military campaign to suppress the rebellion but as a pilgrimage to the Shi‘i shrines of Iraq. We are told that Shāh Ṭahmāsp despatched envoys to the corners of the empire to call the faithful to join the royal procession on its pilgrimage to the Shi‘i shrines of Iraq. A quarter of the notables of Persian Iraq and half of the notables of Fārs and Kerman joined the royal party at Jarbādqān and proceeded towards Baghdād. Faẓlī was so anxious to present this as a pilgrimage that he added this note in the margin "[Shāh Ṭahmāsp] set off for Baghdād to punish Zulfiqār but the main purpose of this [campaign] was pilgrimage to the shrines of the infallible Imams and his ancestors".73

---

72 Khulāṣa, p. 176.
73 Afżal II, f. 47a(62a).
A reading of the first volume of *Afżal al-Tavārikh* reveals similarities between this account and the account of Shāh Ismā'īl’s conquest of Baghdād in 914/1508. Fażlī notes in the first volume of his history that Bāyirak Beg Purnak, the governor of Baghdād, had already declared his allegiance to Shāh Ismā'īl. He had hoped that his recognition of Ismā'īl’s sovereignty would protect his own sovereignty over Arab Iraq and halt the Ṣafavid expansionist impetus. He sent gifts to Ismā'īl’s court in the hope of dissuading the Shāh from invading Iraq. But the existence of the Shī'ī shrines in Iraq meant that this province could not remain a mere vassal state and had to be fully incorporated into the Ṣafavid polity. Shāh Ismā'īl did not accept the governor’s gifts and reiterated “that the purpose of his expedition to Iraq was pilgrimage and that Bāyirak Beg had to come forth in obedience and servitude”. Implicit in this view is that the political subjugation of the province of Arab Iraq was a logical and inevitable consequence of the Ṣafavid religious revolution. The act of pilgrimage would inevitably entail political incorporation of the province into the Ṣafavid state. It is not surprising that at a time when the shrines (*'atabāt*) had again come under the Sunnī rule in 935/1528 Fażlī brings the same political and religious interpretation to bear upon Ṭahmāsp’s efforts to recapture the Shī'ī heritage.

[ff. 35-38] The Royal Campaign to Liberate Khurāsān, 935/1528-9. *Afżal al-Tavārikh* offers the most detailed and extended account of the liberation of the towns of Khurāsān prior to the battle of Jām. Two aspects of *Afżal*’s account require historiographical examination:

1. Liberation of Dāmghān and evidence of sectarianism: Several strategic towns of Khurāsān had been occupied by the Uzbeks and their liberation was the key to Shāh Ṭahmāsp’s plan to regain control of the province. Dāmghān was the gateway into Khurāsān and was the first of these key strongholds to be liberated. The sources in general record this event in a cursory manner but there is agreement that Chuha Sulṭān, Ulma Sulṭān and Muḥammad Khān Zu'l-Qadr Ughlī besieged the citadel of

74 *Afżal I.*, ff. 159-64.
Dāmghān and, according to Afzal, employed Rümlû and ʿĪṣāfānī musketeers to crush the Uzbeks.75 Zaynash Bahādur and the Uzbek contingent could not withstand the Ṣafavid firepower and one night when Zaynash attempted to flee the citadel, he was captured and beheaded and the citadel fell into Ṣafavid hands.

Afzal concurs with the above version of the events but it also offers some additional evidence. The evidence suggests that among the inhabitants of Dāmghān there existed religious and political dissent against the Ṣafavids. When Chuha Sultān and his fellow Amirs entered Dāmghān they ordered the execution of a group of the Uzbeks and also significantly a group of "rebellious inhabitants" of the town.76 The survivors sought clemency and as had been customary from the time of Shāh Ismāʿīl, they were pardoned. Those who wished to join ʿUbayd Khān were granted permission to leave and were offered assistance to make the journey. Those who wished to enter the service of Shāh Ṭahmāsp were enlisted into the ranks of the Ṣūfis and also in the list of the militia (mulāzimān). They also received grants of land (tiyūl), and salaries. This rare evidence however disagrees with Ahsan which claims that the Ṣafavids killed all the Uzbek troops and sent their heads to Shāh Ṭahmāsp who by this time had reached Bāstām.77 Afzal's evidence suggests that a number of the local inhabitants of Dāmghān had welcomed the Uzbek rule of their town and had indeed collaborated with Zaynash Bahādur. In the absence of sufficient evidence we cannot delineate any common interest which would have motivated the Dāmghānis to collaborate with the invaders. It is however likely that collaboration with the Uzbeks arose from shared religious tendencies. Some of the Dāmghānis possibly identified more with the Sunnism of the Uzbeks than with the Shīʿism of the Ṣafavids. Although Fażlī presents the expulsion of the inhabitants of Dāmghān as a customary act of compassion which had been inaugurated by Shāh Ismāʿīl, it could

75 The sources consulted here are: Khūlāṣa, pp. 178-9. Ahsan, pp. 210-13. Iran dar rūžgār-i..... pp. 256-9, does not chronicle this phase of the liberation of Khurāsān and its account is only concerned with the battle of Jam. Takmilat al-ʿAkhbār, p. 64, Jahān Ārā, p. 284.
76 Afzal II, f. 36a.
be interpreted as a calculated act by Chuha Sulṭān to rid the realm of the Crypto-
Sunnis. Expulsion of those suspected of being Crypto-Sunni from the towns of
Khurāsān was a recurring pattern in the Şafavid policy at times of war with the
Uzbeks. During the Uzbek siege of Harat in the previous year, Ḫūsain Khān Shāmlū
the governor of Harat had also taken similar measures, albeit in a less humanitarian
manner, to expel the suspected Sunnis from the city.⁷⁸
This rare insight into the sectarian tensions which existed in Khurāsān may serve
several purposes. It points to the presence of a Sunni population of a considerable
size in the province and therefore questions the depth and extent of the success of the
Şafavid religious policy 34 years after Ismā‘īl’s accession.⁷⁹ It also suggests that a
large section of the civilian population of Khurāsān may not have been passive
victims suffering endless wars but actively facilitating the Uzbek occupation of the
province.

2. Liberation of Isfarāyin and Khabūshān [modern Qūchān]: After the liberation of
Dāmghān several of the other towns of Khurāsān were also recaptured by the
Şafavids before the Qizilbāsh and the Uzbek armies met on the battlefield at Jām.
The sources are however inconsistent in their reporting of these campaigns. For
example only Afżal and Aḥsan chronicle the recapture of the towns of Isfarāyin from
Qanbar ‘Alī, the Uzbek governor, and also Khabūshān. Khūlsa, in particular, is
silent about the recapture of these towns by Chuha Sulṭān and company. In fact its
account of this stage of the campaign to liberate Khurāsān sharply contrasts that
given by Aḥsan and Afżal. Khūlsa reports that after the Dāmghān campaign Chuha
Sulṭān rejoined the royal camp at Khabūshān.⁸⁰ In the first place, this conceals the
fact that Khabūshān had been under Uzbek control and on the other hand it may

⁷⁸ Afżal II, f. 32.
⁷⁹ Dickson, pp. 42-6, also points to the resurgence of Sunnism in Khurāsān after each Uzbek
occupation in this period. For a discussion of the persistence of Sunnism in Iranian cities in the 16th
century see Rosemary Stanfield Johnson, "Sunni Survival in Safavid Iran: Anti-Sunni Activities
⁸⁰ Khūlsa, p. 178.
imply that it was Tahmāsp himself who reoccupied the citadel after the Uzbeks fled. We know, from Afzal and Ahsan that at this time Tahmāsp was not in Khabūshān but at Kalpūshān and on his way to Mashhad and had delegated the mission to recapture Khabūshān and Isfarāyin to Chuha Sulṭān.81

[f. 38a] Abīvard, Nisā and Bāghbād form a line of oasis which forms the modern Turkmenistān.82

[f. 38b] Khulāsa and Iran dar rūzigār .... report that when Ḥusain Khān heard the news of Shah Tahmāsp's arrival in Mashhad, he joined the royal camp where he received much favour from the Shāh and his presence at the camp "heartened and inspired the Rustam-like warriors of the faith (ghāzīyān)". Neither Ahsan nor Afzal report his presence at the royal camp but it is understood from the reading of these sources that gifts were sent to him, possibly to Harat.

[f. 38b] Ürganjiyya, also known as New Khvārazm and Urgange, was the capital of Khvārazm which was built after the Mongol invasion.

[f. 39b] "Pishandāz" was a ceremonial manner of welcoming a prince or the king. In such a ceremony, the road was covered with brocades of gold and silver and lined on each side by his militia and domestic servants to form an avenue through which the king would proceed. Each member of the militia held a gift, often of wool, silk or gold, to be offered to the king.

[f. 45b] Fażlī claims that the grand Khān of the Uzbek confederacy Kuchkunjī Khān was killed at the battle of Jām and his head was presented to the Shāh. This is an error since, following the Uzbek defeat at Jām, Kuchkunjī Khān retreated back to Transoxiana safely where he died peacefully in Samarqand in the following year, 936/1529-30.

[f. 47a] Tahmāsp's visit to Mashhad and his pilgrimage to the shrine of Imām Rīzā after the victory at Jām, is not reported by any of the other sources. The author could

81 Ahsan, p. 212.
82 Dickson, p. 125.
have excerpted this from one of the lost sources and until these sources come to light it can not be verified. However, another plausible explanation is that the author superimposes on the reign of Ţahmāsp what was Šāh ʿAbbās's practice of pilgrimage to Mashhad.

[f. 47b] Khāneqi River. According to an 8th (14th) century account Khāneqi River was the stream which passed by Qaṣr-ī Shīrīn, now in the Kermānshān province in western Iran and on the border with modern Iraq, and Khāneqīn which is located inside Iraq. Both Ibn Rustah, the 3rd (9th) century geographer, and Yāqūt describe a great bridge over this river near Khāneqīn which by Yāqūt's time, in the 7th (13th) century, had 24 arches. The Khurāsān road crossed this bridge. 83 The citadel of Māhi dasht was situated in the vicinity of Khāneqīn in the Moṣūl region of Iraq. 84

[f. 48a] After Ţahmāsp recaptured Baghdad from Zulfiqār, he rewarded the two brothers who had murdered Zulfiqār. Šāh Ţahmāsp appointed ʿAlī Beg as the governor of Sāva and Jarbādqān [modern Gulpāygān] and Āḥmad Beg was appointed to Ţahmāsp's own royal corps of regular troops (mulāzimān i Khāṣṣ). 85

[f. 48b] "Kār-khānijāt" is another term for "buyūtāt" or the manufacturing workshops which produced the necessary goods for the Safavid household. The royal household maintained a number of workshops which produced anything from food to weapons. However, the reference here must be to the workshops in Baghdad which manufactured goods for the provincial government. "Āsh-khāna" literally "soup kitchen" appears to have been part of "kārkhānijāt-ī khurākī" or the workshops concerned with food. These kitchens provided food for the royal household but the kitchen referred to here clearly served the members of the provincial government in Baghdad. 86
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83 Le Strange, pp. 61-3.
84 Sharafnama, p. 16, note 5.
85 Khulāṣa, p. 190.
86 TM, f. 17.
(f. 49) Malik Beg Khuiyy: It is not possible to determine Malik Beg's tribal affiliation, if any, but his name "Khuiyy" suggests that he was a native of Khuy situated in the north west of Lake Urūmiyya in Āzarbāyjān. He was also the governor of Khuy until 935/1528, when he was dismissed from his governorship.

Fazl notes that, for his distinguished service during the battle of Chaldiran Malik Beg Khuiyy had been enlisted into the high rank of Amirs and at the court of Shāh Ismā'īl he had enjoyed great esteem and honour. Despite the high rank and the privileged position that Malik Beg obviously enjoyed at Ismā'īl's court it is difficult to construct a full picture of his life and career. The available evidence however suggests that after the death of Shāh Ismā'īl, Malik Beg was consistent in his opposition to Shāh Ṭahmāsp and participated in the religious and political factionalism at court against the Shāh.

During the minority of Shāh Ṭahmāsp Malik Beg's name first appears in the accounts of the battle of Jām. Following his desertion from the army during the battle of Jām, 935/1528, Malik Beg was dismissed from the governorship of Khuy but in the same year he was appointed to an unspecified, but possibly low ranking, military post in Mashhad. Although on this occasion Malik Beg was pardoned for his desertion at Jām, this event indicates his dissenting tendencies. Evidence suggests that Malik Beg was consistent in his reluctance to support Ṭahmāsp in his wars against both the Ottomans and the Uzbeks. In 940/1533 during the Ottoman invasion of Āzarbāyjān, in Yelqiz Āqāj where the advanced guard of the Ṣafavid army under the command of Alqāš Mirzā and Bahram Mirzā clashed with the Ottoman army, disputes broke out among the Qizilbash Amirs, one of whom was Malik Beg. The dissenting Amirs including Muḥammad Kháñ Zīr'ī-Qadr Oğlū, Ḥusain Kháñ Shāmlū and Malik Beg

87 Aftal II, f. 81a. Aubin, "Revolution Chīte et Conservatisme". p. 6, has argued that in the areas where the Turkish population was not tribalised, Shāh Ismā'īl conferred the title of Oğlu (sons of the House of the Ṣafavids) on the local lords and thus attached them to the Qizilbash movement. This category particularly applied to the lordships of Khuy. It is possible that the elevation of Malik Beg Khuiyy was part of this policy.
88 Aftal II, ff. 47a & 49.
89 Khulāṣa, p. 231.
Khu'iyy were reluctant to engage in battle against the much larger Ottoman army and infighting broke out in the Safavid camp. Many of the Amirs including Malik Beg Khu'iyy fled and Muhammed Khan Zul-Qadr Oglu defected to the Ottoman camp. In the meantime Shah Tahmasp also reached Azarbajjân and moved to besiege the citadel at Van where Ulma Sultan Tekkelû and a few other rebellious Amirs had taken refuge. It was at the foot of the citadel of Van where Shah Tahmasp was finally convinced that a political conspiracy to overthrow him in favour of his younger brother Sâm Mirzâ was rapidly unfolding. The mastermind of this rebellion was Husain Khan Sha'mlu who Shah Tahmasp feared would join the pro-Ottoman rebellious Qizilbash Amirs inside the fortress. Finally on 25 Jamâdi al-Awval 940/12 December 1533 Shah Tahmasp ordered Husain Khan to be executed. Malik Beg Khu'iyy too was suspected of collaboration with the Ottomans and of conspiracy with Husain Khan to overthrow the Shâh and was duly executed, and, his army, ulkâ, and his considerable followers were entrusted to Alqâs Mirzâ, Tahmasp's brother.

The little that we know about the military career of Malik Beg Khu'iyy offers a fresh insight into the pattern of political divisions and factionalism at court which had undermined the authority of Shah Tahmasp during his minority. What is significant about Malik Beg's hostility to Tahmasp and his affiliation to the opposition groups is that it does not strictly conform to the pattern of tribal factionalism which had paralysed the Safavid administration in the period 931-7/1524-30. During this period the Rûmlû, Ustâjlû and Tekkelû tribes had fought each other to gain tribal ascendancy within the existing administration. No evidence has as yet come to light

90 Khulâsa, p. 231.
91 Afzal II, f. 81a.
Khulâsa, p. 241, reports a different and more ambiguous version of Malik Beg's death. Qâzî Ahmad Qumî notes that Malik Beg Khu'iyy was killed in Tabriz in the following year 941/1534, most likely by royal command. In this year Tahmasp was near Van when the news reached him that the Ottoman Sultan Sulaymân had departed from Baghdad for Azarbajjân. Malik Beg too was in Tabriz at this time and Shah Tahmasp also hastened back to the city. This coincided with Malik Beg's killing. Qâzî Ahmad Qumî simply notes that "There, Malik Beg Khu'iyy who was the residue of discord was killed."
to suggest that they fundamentally challenged the sovereignty of Shāh Tāhmāsp. However, Malik Beg Khu'iy's participation in the faction opposed to Shaykh 'Alī b. 'Abd al-ʿĀl Karākī (hereafter Karākī) indicates a shift in the focus and nature of political dissent at Tāhmāsp's court. It may also explain the roots of his reluctance to support Tāhmāsp in his military campaigns.

The other names associated with this faction are the Ṣadr Mir Ni'matullāh Ḥillī, the Shi'i cleric Shaykh Ibrāhīm Qāṭīfī, the jurists such as Maulānā Ḥusain Ardabīlī, Qāzī Musāfir Tabrizī, and the courtier Muḥammad Beg Muhrdār. Mir Ni'matullāh Ḥillī is reported to have been the main political force behind this opposition group. Although Ḥillī had been a pupil of Karākī he had later turned against his old mentor and had attempted to form alliances with the opponents of Karākī, both in the Shi'i circles and also at court.

As we can see there is an overwhelming presence of the Shi'i clerics and jurists in this faction and the focus of its opposition was Karākī. Shaykh Karākī had maintained a powerful presence at court since Tāhmāsp's accession in 930/1523-4. He appears to have accompanied Tāhmāsp's peripatetic court for most of the time and was also with the Shāh during the battle of Jām. Karākī's power and influence at court reached its zenith in 939/1532 when Shāh Tāhmāsp elevated him to the position of the Mujtahid of the Age and the Deputy of the Hidden Imām. Shāh Tāhmāsp is reported to have said to Karākī "You are more worthy of kingship than I because you are the deputy of the Imam. I am one of your agents and will obey your

---

92 Qāzī Musāfir Tabrizī was the army chaplain (qāzī 'askar) of Āzarbāyjān. Ironically Shāh Tāhmāsp appointed him to take the body of Karākī to Mashhad for burial. Afżal II, f. 81b.
93 Khudāsā, p. 237.
94 Khudāsā, p. 237.
95 Qāzī Ahmad Qumī notes in his obituary of the Ṣadr Mir Ni'matullāh Ḥillī that the Ṣadr had been a pupil of Karākī but had later shown his ingratitude to the Mujtahid. Qāzī Ahmad implies that Ḥillī's early death which occurred ten days after Karākī died in 940/1533, had in fact been his punishment for his opposition to his former mentor, Khudāsā, p. 237.
96 Khudāsā, p. 237. For a discussion of the Arab Shi'ite opposition to Karākī see Newman, "The Myth of Clerical Migration".
commands." The farman of Karaki's investiture, issued in 940/1533, which confirms him as the Seal of the Mujtahids and the Deputy of the Hidden Imam confirms the extent of the political powers and the authority which were delegated to him. It grants him the power of appointment and dismissal of religious and military officials anywhere in the kingdom. All officials and notables of the realm were ordered to consider him "their guide and model" and to obey him in all affairs. He was also granted property in Arab Iraq, tax exemptions and immunities. The political and the economic dimension of Karaki's rise to the position of the Seal of the Mujtahids was clearly resented by both the political and religious hierarchy and consequently Mir Ni'matullah Hili had little difficulty in enlisting the support of disaffected Amirs like Malik Beg Khuriy and Muhammed Beg Muhrdär.

[f.49a] Shāh Quli Beg Yūzbāšī Afšār: Or Shāh Quli Sultan Afšār as he was titled in the year 935/1528 when Shāh Tāhmasp appointed him the governor of Kermān. Thereafter Shāh Quli, the son of Khalīl Khān,101 loyally served Shāh Tāhmasp throughout his reign. He was one of the powerful provincial governors who at the command of his provincial army supported Shāh Tāhmasp in the major military campaigns of his reign. In the year 951/1544 Shāh Tāhmasp appointed Shāh Quli Sultan to accompany Humāyūn Pādishāh who had taken refuge at the Ṣafavīd court, in his campaign to recapture Qandihar, Kābul and Ghaznāin.102 In 953/1546 we find Shāh Quli Sultan in the company of Shāh Tāhmasp in Tabriz during the crisis of Alqās Mirzā's rebellion.103 Here Shāh Quli Sultan Afšār was involved in an inter-tribal conflict between the Afšār and the Zu'l-Qadr tribes which threatened to develop into an armed conflict in the city. Shāh Tāhmasp personally intervened and

99 Ibid.
101 According to Tārīkh-i Kermān, p. 266, the father of Shāh Quli Sultan Afšār was Muṣṭafa Quli Sultan Afšār. This however cannot be corroborated.
103 TAAA, p. 73.
ended the hostilities. The tribal chiefs (amirs) including Shāh Qūlī attended the royal palace (daulat-khāna) and pledged never to fight each other in their lifetime.\textsuperscript{104} The leaders individually or collectively made a gift of one thousand tumans to the royal treasury.\textsuperscript{105} Similar inter-tribal feuds such as that between the Rūmlū and Ustājlū tribes, 931-2/1524-5, had led to a civil war during the minority of Ţahmāsp. By 953/1546 Ţahmāsp was powerful enough to be able to prevent another civil war.

Shāh Ţahmāsp’s army mainly consisted of provincial tribal forces. These troops were stationed in the provinces and were under the command of their tribal chief who also acted as the governor of the province. At times of war they would be called to join the Shāh in his military campaigns. Not only the military fortunes of the Shāh but also the power and prestige of a tribal chiefs [governors] depended on the size of their provincial armies. During the Ottoman war of 955/1548 Shāh Qūlī Sulṭān joined Shāh Ţahmāsp at Qarāchadāgh with one thousand men, Ibrāhīm Khān the governor of Shīrāz with two thousand and five hundred troops and a few lesser chiefs with troops numbering three to five hundred.\textsuperscript{106} Although not in the same rank as Ibrāhīm Khān, Shāh Qūlī Sulṭān commanded a considerable army and this explains his presence in all the military campaigns of the period. In this war Shāh Qūlī is reported to have attacked and pillaged the environs of the castle of Qārīṣ on the border with Georgia (Gurjistān). Shāh Qūlī returned bringing with him all the livestock he could find: five thousand horses, one hundred thousand sheep, and fifty thousand cows.\textsuperscript{107}

[f. 52a] The 936/1529 siege of Mashhad. Aghzīvār Sulṭān Shāmlū, the governor of Mashhad, had three to four thousand horsemen under his command.\textsuperscript{108} According to Afzal there were also a corps of musketeers who defended Mashhad but their number is not clear. They were able to resist the siege for two months and on one occasion

\textsuperscript{104} Khulāsā, p. 316.
\textsuperscript{105} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{106} Khulāsā, p. 328.
\textsuperscript{107} Khulāsā, p. 330.
\textsuperscript{108} Ahsan, p. 221.
they even repulsed the Uzbeks as far as Turuq, near Mashhad.\footnote{Khulâsa, p. 191; Ahsan, p. 221.} However, in the absence of any royal reinforcement, the Qizilbash chiefs finally succumbed to the Uzbeks and capitulated. Dickson argues that the Vicegerent Chuha Sultan had vetoed any military expedition to Khurasan that year in the hope that Husain Khan Shâmlû, the tutor of Prince Sâm Mirzâ and the governor of Harat, would be defeated by the Uzbeks or even perish.\footnote{Dickson, p. 153.} He was motivated by a sense of rivalry and animosity against Husain Khan who had distinguished himself in the battle of Jâm. Chuha Sultan himself had fled during the first phase of the battle.\footnote{Ibid.}

After their flight from Mashhad, Ahmad Sultan Afshâr returned to his governorship at Farâh in southern Khurasan, which Shâh Tahmâsp had granted him a few months earlier after the battle of Jâm. Malik Beg Khu'iy and Aghzivâr Sultan went to Mazinân, near Sabzivâr.\footnote{TAAA, p. 57.}

[f. 52a] The Uzbek army in the siege of Mashhad. This was not an all Uzbek army. It was the private project of the Shâh-Budâqîd clan. 'Ubayd Khan himself did not arrive until two months after the siege of Mashhad had begun.\footnote{Dickson, p. 146.}

[f.52b] Sâm Mirzâ and the surrender of Harat. Dickson asserts that the decision to surrender Harat to the Uzbeks was based on a secret marriage alliance between the Safavid Prince and the Uzbeks. The daughter of the "Grand Khân" was to marry Sâm Mirzâ, and Abu Sa'id was to marry the daughter of the late Durmîşh Khân [she would be the niece of Husain Khan]. The marriages were contracted in the garden of Nażargâh. Dickson, citing Târîkh-i Ilchi-i Nizâmshâhi, attributes the evidence not to a historical but a literary source: a poem (mathnavî) from Qâsim Junâbâdi's \textit{Shâhnâma-i Shâh Tahmâsp}.\footnote{Rümlû and Khvândamir also report that the Shî'î population of Harat were among those who left the city with Prince Sâm Mirzâ and the governor.\footnote{Dickson, p. 146.}
Maulānā Hilālī was a native of Khurāsān and belonged to the surviving school of Harat. Hilālī was born in Āstārabād, the Persian province of Gurgān, and belonged to the ethnic group Chāghātāy Turks. In his youth he had been patronised by ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾi. He was also intimate with Prince Sām Mīrzā, Shāh Tāhmāsp’s brother. According to Sām Mīrzā, Hilālī was learned in all the sciences and literary attainments and excelled in poetry. Sām Mīrzā also notes that towards the end of his life Hilālī had become a Sunnī. His conversion however did not prevent ʿUbayd Khān from executing him. The Prince also remembers him as a mean-spirited and petty man who had been much criticised.

Malik Maḥmūd. We can trace the life of a Malik Maḥmūd, the Vāli of Sistān, to the year 1002/1593 when he was killed by Prince Rustam Mīrzā. He must therefore have been very young when Ḩūsain Khān and Sām Mīrzā arrived at his seat of government in 936, maybe not much older than the young Shāh Tāhmāsp himself. Although it seems unlikely that Malik Maḥmūd lived through the reigns of three Šafavīd monarchs, Shāh Tāhmāsp, Shāh Ismāʿīl II, Shāh Muḥammad Khudābanda, until 1002, it is worth noting the biographical evidence which appears in the chronicles under this name.

Malik Maḥmūd belonged to an ancient family of the rulers (vālis) of Sistān who claimed descent from the Šaffārīd dynasty which governed the southern and eastern Iran during the early ‘Abbāsid period in the 3rd (9th) century. Although Malik Maḥmūd is reported as the governor of Sistān in 936/1529-30, it appears that later in the reign of Shāh Tāhmāsp, he and the old ruling elite of Sistān were superseded by the new elite, the Qizilbash chiefs, who were appointed as governors and vālis of the

---

114 Dickson, pp. 154, 219-222.
115 Ahsan p. 221, Iran dar rūzīgār-i ...., p. 270.
117 Tuhfa-i Sāmī, p. 94.
118 TAAA, p. 478.
province. For example we find Ahmad Sultan Şâmîlu as the Vâlî of Sijistân (Sistân) in 951/1544. After the death of Shâh Ismâ’îl II, however, Malik Mahmûd fought the governor Ja’far Sultan Afsâr to regain his hereditary governorship. Following his victory, Malik Mahmûd proclaimed his independent rule in Sistân. Iskandar Munshi reports that Malik Mahmûd restored peace and stability in Sistân. Shâh Abbâs was impressed by the political stability of Sistân. On his accession to the throne Shâh Abbâs who wished to revive the ancient families of the realm, possibly motivated by his desire to curtail the power of the Qizilbash, recognised Malik Mahmûd’s independence and issued a royal patent (manshûr) to this effect in the 7th year of his reign in 1002/1593. Malik Mahmûd however found himself at the centre of the territorial ambitions of Muţafar Hûsain Mirzâ and Rustam Mirzâ, the sons of Sultan Hûsain Mirzâ and the grandsons of Bahram Mirzâ, whom Shâh Abbâs had appointed to the governments of Qandihar and Zamin Dâvar respectively. The young princes aspiring to greater power allied with the dissident Amirs of Sistân against Malik Mahmûd. Malik Mahmûd was finally murdered by Rustam Mirzâ, in 1002/1593.

[53a (51a)] Zarah was the area which is now Western Afghânistân. The main natural landmark of Zarah was Lake Zarah or the present day Lake Hâmûn Şâberî, which is now situated on the border between Iran and Afghânistân. Four major rivers of Farah, Helmund, Khvâsh and Hărûd converge into the lake. Owing to plentiful water Zarah was reported by the medieval geographer Istakhti, 4th (10th) century, to have been a fertile land where food-stuffs grew abundantly.

119 Khulûsa, p. 309.
120 TAAA, p. 478.
121 TAAA, pp. 478-9. Shâh Abbâs’ policy in regards to Sistân was not consistent with the general principle of centralisation to which he adhered. In an effort to centralise the state, Shâh Abbâs abolished the independent tribal rulerships such as the Zu’l-Qadrs in Fârs and the Afsârs in Kerman. He also incorporated the vassaldoms of Georgia (1029-1033/1620-4) and Makran (1017/1608-9). Roemer, Cambridge History of Iran, p. 269.
122 TAAA, pp. 478-484.
123 Le Strange, pp. 334-9.
Under the Ṣafavids, a fertile region such as Zarah would bear a heavy fiscal burden imposed on it by the provincial governor and the chancery (divān). Amir Ḥamdūd b. Khvānd Amir also reports non-payment of taxes and dues to the chancery as aspect of their lawlessness.¹²⁴

[53a (51a)] Makrān was the province which lay to the south of Sīstān by the Sea of Omān and Kij was one of its towns. Both the medieval and modern geographers refer to the region only as Makrān. "Kij va Makrān" was possibly a term of reference styled by the Ṣafavids. The region was not rich or politically significant in the earlier period and although by the 6th (12th) century it had acquired the trade from Hurmūz, by 936/1529 it had again fallen into ruin.¹²⁵ In 1022/1613 at the time of conquest of the castle of Bin Fahal by Ganj ʿAlī Khān the governor of Kermān, Iskandar Munshi writes "this region is so remote that its rulers have never left the kingdom and know nothing of the kings of the world but their names" and that "the people of that land are Shāfī".¹²⁶

[53a (51a)] The Shāmlū-Ṣafavid campaign in Makrān. The sources Khulaṣat al-Tavārikh, Irān dar rūzigār, and Aḥsan al-Tavārikh report a different and more revealing account of Ḥusain Khān Shāmlū and Sām Mirzā's campaign in Makrān.¹²⁷ The evidence given by these sources is verbatim therefore its independence and accuracy are difficult to ascertain. According to these accounts, the Shāmlū campaign was a military raid into this province and not a peaceful mission aimed at forging political alliance with the ruler, as Fażlī Ḵᵛāhānī implies. It became known to Ḥusain Khān that there were immense riches in the province of Kij va Makrān and its governor Malik Dīnār was very weak and timid. Consequently Ḥusain Khān and company raided the province and the Shāmlū militia (mulāzimān) captured an immeasurable amount of booty. Thus Malik Dīnār was subdued by force.
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¹²⁴ Iran dar rūzigār, p. 271.
¹²⁵ Le Strange, p. 329.
¹²⁶ ʿAAA, p. 862.
¹²⁷ Khulāṣa, p. 192; Iran dar rūzigār, p. 271; Aḥsan p. 222.
Considering that Fażlī Ḥisbānī has derived much of his history from Aḥsan al-
Tavārīkh, this discrepancy cannot be easily explained. The most likely explanation is
that Fażlī Ḥisbānī revised the history in the light of the political and military
advances which Shāh ʿAbbās had made into Makrān by 1030/1620. Until the reign of
Shāh ʿAbbās Makrān had been part of the Sind region and had paid tribute to the
rulers of India.¹²⁸ In 1022/1613 Ganj ʿAlī Khān the governor of Kermān captured the
castle of Bin Fahal, the seat of government of Makrān, and took Malik Shams al-
Dīn, Malik Dinār's son, and his children and relatives hostage and sent them to
Ḥisbānī.Overawed by the power of Shāh ʿAbbās and fearful of his expansionist
ambitions, in 1030/1620-21, Malik Mīrzā, the Vāfi of Makrān, paid homage to the
Ṣafavī Shāh.¹²⁹ Seen in the light of these military and political advances into
Makrān, Fażlī may have revised the evidence.

[53a(51a)] The Uzbek campaign in Khurāsān, 936/1529-30. Omitted from Afzal's
account of the Uzbek invasion of Khurāsān in 936, is ʿUbayd Khān's campaign to
Farāh which was a district to the south of Harat. On the 11th of Shaʿbān 936/10
April 1530, after capturing Harat, ʿUbayd Khān set out to capture Farāh which was
on the road southwards from Harat.¹³⁰ Shāh Ṭahmāsp had granted Farāh to Aḥmad
Sūltān Afshār after the latter's disgrace and dismissal from the governorship of
Kermān in the aftermath of the battle of Jām. The Uzbek offensive into Farāh took
place nearly two months before Ṭahmāsp and his army left Sultāniyya for Sabzivār
in Khurāsān.

ʿUbayd Khān possibly did not know or anticipate the Ṣafavid mobilisation at this
time and decided to extend his conquest further to the south. There is evidence to
support the view that ʿUbayd Khān aspired to conquer the whole of the Ṣafavid
empire. Khvāja Shahāb al-Dīn Aḥmad Khvāfī who was a Sunnī and a confidant of

¹²⁸ TAAA, p. 958.
¹²⁹ TAAA, p. 958. See also Cambridge History of Islam, vol 6, p. 269
¹³⁰ TAAA, p. 58; Aḥsan, p. 225; Le Strange p. 431; Dickson, p. 163.
‘Ubayd Khán defected to the Safavid camp at Alang near Jām. On arrival he revealed that this time jāneqi\(^{131}\), or the Council of the Sulṭāns of the Uzbek confederacy, and they ['Ubayd Khán] had determined to capture and the whole of Khurāsān, Iraq, Āzarbāyjān, Fārs, Kermān, and Khuzistān to the Ottoman borders. They planned to apportion the empire among the Sulṭāns and thus reestablish a Chingizid empire.\(^{132}\) Had ‘Ubayd Khán's incursion into Farāh succeeded, the conquest of the southern provinces of Sīstān and Kermān would have followed. In the event Aḥmad Sulṭān and the Afshārs had strengthened the defences of the citadel of Farāh so that the Uzbek siege ended in failure with ‘Ubayd Khán returning to Ḥarāt.\(^{133}\)

**[53b (51b)] The Military Review at Baṣṭām.** While Aفزal gives a brief notice of the military review, Khulaṣat al-Tavārikh offers a detailed account of this review which curiously has been ignored by modern scholars. For the account of Shāh Ṭahmāsp's second military campaign to Khurāsān, Dickson mainly relied on Aفزal's revāyat and seems to have been unaware of the important evidence in Khulaṣa.\(^{134}\) Only Klaus Röhrborn appears to have noted the significance of Qāżī Aḥmad's rare and detailed account of this military review.\(^{135}\) The minority of Shāh Ṭahmāsp was dominated by civil wars and the wars against the Uzbek. Therefore it is hoped that detailed attention to this military review will shed some light on the strength, character and the social composition of the Safavid army in this period. The following commentary will first examine the political background to the parade and then give a translation of the detailed account found in Khulaṣa.

---

\(^{131}\) Jāneqi is Turkish for "council" and is probably the same as "qurāltāy" or the "assemblege of peers". Dickson, p. 31.

\(^{132}\) Khulaṣa, p. 212. See also Dickson pp. 163-4. Dickson cites the Uzbek sources which also suggest that ‘Ubayd Khán had grand designs for central Iran but dismisses these claims as no more than gloating.

\(^{133}\) Ahsan, p. 225.

\(^{134}\) Dickson, p. 177.

\(^{135}\) Röhrborn, trans. Jahāndārī, pp. 70-73. Röhrborn's summary of the review is based on the Berlin copy of Khulaṣat al-Tavārikh and there appear to be some differences with the Iran-i Bastan Museum copy on which this commentary is based. Such discrepancies will be noted.
(a) The Political Background to the military review (‘arż):

Due to the Vicegerent Chuha Sulṭān's political intrigues the Šafavid liberation army was not mobilised until after the winter of 936/1529-30 during which ‘Ubayd Khān and his Uzbek army had occupied the whole of Khurāsān. Chuha Sulṭān still exercised immense control over the young Shāh and due to his influence Shāh Ṭahmāsp did not immediately turn his attention to Khurāsān but instead camped in Qazvīn and waited for spring. Chuha Sulṭān's main motive for this delaying tactic had been his desire to imperil the career and possibly the life of his political rival ᴴusain Khān Shāmlū who at the time of the Uzbek invasion was the governor-general (beglarbegī) of Khurāsān and tutor (lala) of Prince Sām Mīrzā the titular governor of the province.¹³⁶ In spite of Chuha's intrigues Shāh Ṭahmāsp succeeded in asserting his authority. He first called Chuha Sulṭān's main adversaries, the Ustājlū tribe, back to court from exile in Gilān. Two months later, in the month of Shavvāl 936/end of May-June 1530, Ṭahmāsp ordered Chuha Sulṭān to mass the army on the plains (chaman) of Bāstām, on the road from Qazvīn to Khurāsān, in preparation for the second campaign to Khurāsān. As Dickson has rightly argued, this marked a significant point in the minority of the young Shāh. His success to overrule Chuha Sulṭān and to call to court Chuha Sulṭān's tribal enemies signalled the Shāh's growing power and prestige after his victory at Jām. With the arrival of the Ustājlū chiefs at court in the spring, the second Khurāsān liberation campaign was under way.¹³⁷

Sometime in the month of Ramadān/April Shāh Ṭahmāsp instructed Chuha Sulṭān to muster the army. This was the Viceroy's call to arms:

"At an auspicious hour, the Viceroy (amir al-umāra) Chuha Sulṭān pitched the royal tent of felicity and the portico (sarāparda) of glory from the capital city (dār al-saltana) of Qazvīn towards Khurāsān. He commanded that those chiefs, and the Khāns who failed to be present in the plain (chaman) of Bāstām, on Friday the 25 Shavvāl/23 June, would be punished. The offending chiefs, the standing corps of royal troops (qūrchiyān) and the victorious troops (‘asākir) would be punished." ¹³⁸

¹³⁷ Dickson p. 177.
¹³⁸ Ažal 2. f. 53b.
Chuha Sulțān clearly resorted to coercion to enlist the military support of the Qizilbāş tribes. This is plausible. Only one year earlier during the first phase of the battle of Jām and as soon as the Šafadvî army, heavily outnumbered, had appeared to be losing the war, most of the commanders of the tribal battalions including Chuha Sulțān himself had fled from the battlefield. Ţahmāsp's final victory had been achieved with a much reduced force consisting of mainly the standing corps of royal troops.

(b) The military review (‘arz):

In Khulāsa, Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī is attentive to the details of the identities of the Amirs, the numbers of their levees, their tribal affiliations, and the Šafadvî firepower, and importantly to the participation of the religious and administrative notables in the parade. His prose narrative is interspersed with poems which the princes and Amirs are reported to have recited in approbation of the Šah as they paraded before him. Historically in such a review the military elite and the notables would have dismounted from their horses and after prayer and praise they would have presented the Šah/ruler with a gift (pîshkhîsh).139 It appears that in the Baštām review panegyrics alone were offered. It is also likely that Qāżī Aḥmad uses the poems as a literary device to create an epic. The effect is that the style appears as too much on the spot reporting which seems unreal but it does succeed in reconstructing a medieval pageant.

Shâh Ţahmāsp arrived in Baštām on the day of the review, 25th Shavvāl/23 June. Also present at Baštām were the Uzbek envoys who had been sent to the Šafavid court by each of the Sulṭāns of Tūrān. Their mission was to convey to Ţahmāsp the readiness of the Uzbek Sulṭāns to wage war and to seek from the Šah the location where this battle would take place:

139 In a similar military review in 881/1476, Sulṭān ‘Ali Mirzâ dismounted from his piebald charger, knelt down on a rug spread for him on the roadside, recited prayer and praises and, following the custom of parades, presented a gift (pîshkhîsh) of a an excellent horse with gem-studded saddle to Sulṭān Khalîl Aq Quyunlu. Vladimir Minorsky, "A Civil and Military Review in Fârs in 881/1476", BSOAS x (1939-42), p. 155.
Each one of the Uzbek Sultans had despatched an envoy (îlchî) to the [court] of the exalted Shâh. Each carried the news that the Sultans and the Khâns of the east had gathered in Merv-i Shâhiyân. [The Uzbeks] wished to know where [the Shâh] would choose as the battleground and they with their army would be present there too." 140

Tâhmâsp would not release the envoys until after the military review. This was no doubt to impress upon them the military might of the Šafavids. 141 This had the desired effect since, after the news of the review reached the Uzbek Sultans, they decided against war. 142

At sunrise on the day of the review Tâhmâsp ordered the Uzbek envoys to take position on the highest point for the best view. The Shâh then ordered the illustrious Princes, the exalted Amirs, the victorious standing corps of royal troops and the troops to dress for battle and company by company (fûj fûj) appear on the muster ground. The Shâh also commanded the Music Bands (naqâr khânâh) to assemble at a distance of a quarter of a farsakh 143 and begin to sound the small kettledrums (naqâra), drums (tabl) and large kettledrums (kus). The gun carriages carrying the Frankish cannon (tup-i farangi), bâdlij [a kind of cannon] and the artillery (zarbzan) were to take position behind the music band. Behind the artillery stood 3000-4000 riflemen who fired [into the air]. 144

Then Shâh Tâhmâsp ordered the formation of the right (maymana) and the left (maysara) flanks. The military inspectors (tavâchiyân) and the messengers (munhiyân) announced the arrival of Prince Alqâs Mirzâ and four thousand horsemen. 145 Tâhmâsp entrusted the right wing to his brother Alqâs. In another direction came Prince Bahram Mirzâ with three thousand horsemen. Bahram Mirzâ recited prayer and praise and was appointed to lead the left flank. 146 Next, Chüha

140 Khulâsa, p. 197.
141 Tâhmâsp noted this in his letter to 'Ubayd Khân Uzbek, Khulâsa, p. 207.
143 One farsakh is approximately three and a half miles or the distance normally covered by a mule in an hour, Lambton, Persian Grammar p. 259.
144 Khulâsa, p. 198.
145 Ibid.
146 Ibid, p. 199.
Sultan Tekkelü arrived with his children and relatives numbering nearly eight thousand horsemen. Following Chuha Sultan, the most exalted of the Amirs, came the remainder of the Tekkelü tribe, Quduz Sultan with two thousand horsemen, Ulma Sultan and Ghāzi Khan with their troops, numbering nearly five thousand Tekkelüs. The Tekkelü force then joined Alqās Mīrza on the right flank.147 After the Tekkelüs came the Ustājlū Amirs. Abdullah Khan, ‘Abdullāh Khān, ‘Abdālasp’s sister’s son, entered with two thousand young [men]. With his golden mace on his shoulder he paraded before the Shāh and offered to sacrifice himself. Then came Badr Khān, Ahmad Sultan Ṣāfî Oğlū, Shāh Quli Sultan and his brother Shāh ‘Alī Sultan and the rest of the Ustājlū Amirs with the total of sixteen thousand horsemen. The Ustājlūs joined Bahram Mīrza in the left flank.148 The Ustājlūs were not only a political pawn which ‘Abdālasp used to counter the Tekkelū hegemony at court but their numerical strength clearly boosted the Safavid military power.

This was the formation of the right and the left flanks as far as Khulāṣa reports. The parade continued as follows but Qāżī Ahmad gives no indication as to the formation of the tribes. Ahmad Sultan Afshār with his three thousand mounted archers led the Afshārs. Alvand Sultan, the governor of Kūh Gilviyya, with the three thousand cavalry too joined the Afshārs. The remaining Afshār chiefs, Shāhrukh Sultan, Shāh Quli Sultan, Timūr Sultan, Sanjab Sultan, Budāq Sultan, Ḥasan Sultan, Murād Sultan, Shīr Muḥammad Sultan, Sunduk Sultan and many others also joined the parade.149 Among the above Afshār Amirs, Qāżī Ahmad extols Ahmad Sultan for twenty years of service fighting the Uzbeks in Merv, Sarakhs, Mashhad, Tūs and Farāh.150 However, his inclusion of Ahmad Sultan Afshār in the review is problematic. We know that after Ḥubayd Khān captured Harat, he invaded Farāh, which Ahmad

148 Ibid.
149 Ibid, p. 201. The figure for the Afshār contingent may be incomplete. See also Röhrborn, op. cit., p. 71, note 277.
150 Ibid. p. 200.
Sultan governed, in Sha'ban 936/April 1530, no more than a month and a half before the review. Although the Uzbek siege did not last very long, it is doubtful that the Afshârs would be able to reach Baštâm in time for the review. Furthermore ʿUbayd Khan did not retreat to Merv until the month of Zu'l-hajja/August, almost two months after the review at Baštâm. It is therefore unlikely that Ahmad Sultan and his three thousand mounted archers would have left Farâh to take part in a military parade several hundred kilometres to the west. This would have left Farâh defenceless and vulnerable to renewed Uzbek offensive. However, it is possible that greater political considerations overrode urgent military exigencies. That for the Afshârs participation in the military review was of greater political consequence than safeguarding their provincial stronghold against the Uzbek. The Shâmlû tribe followed. Aghzâvar Sultan, Tabaruk Sultan, Qarâ Sultan, Ḥasan Sultan, ʿAlî Sultan, and Mâhmûd Khan with a force of 9150 horsemen were recorded (bi qalam dar āmad). After that Ghâzî Khan-i Tavâchî led the elephantine (kūh-paikar va fil manzar) Zu'l-Qadr Amirs and recited a poem praising his own military prowess and declaring his loyalty to Shâh Ṭahmâsp. Shâh Quli Khalîfa, ʿAlî Sultan, Mûhâmmad and several other Zu'l-Qadr chiefs with a force of 8000 cavalry joined their fellow tribesmen. Then the Qajar followed. Yaʿqûb Sultan, Gûgija Sultan, Shâh ʿAlî Sultan and the rest of the Qajar Amirs with 6200 cavalry men paraded past. The Mauṣilû Amir Mûhâmmadî Beg led 1000 cavalry and ʿAlî Sultan Zulfîqâr Kush, Shams al-Din Sultan, Ḥasan Sultan and several other Amirs paraded with 4000 men/women (nafar).  

151 *frâr dar ruzigâr*.... p. 274. See the commentary above [53a(51a)].  
152 *Khulâsâ*, p. 201. Röhrborn, *op. cit.* , p. 71, estimates the Qajar cavalry at 6000.  
153 "Tavâchî" was a military inspector or an advance guard (jilâu-dâr). Here however it is presented as part of Ghâzî Khan's name.  
154 *Khulâsâ*, p. 201.  
155 Ibid.  
156 Ibid. Röhrborn, *op. cit.*, calculates the Mauṣilû cavalry at only 1000 and not 5000 which we calculate.
The Amirs of the other tribes (*tavā'if-i uymaqāt*) such as the Chipnl,157 Turkoman, Bāyundūriyya,158 Chekenl,159 Kurds, and the ‘Arabgīrlū160 led a total of 15550 horsemen onto the muster ground.161

Next came the sayyids, the chief of the sayyids (*nuqaba*), the ulamā, the learned scholars (*fużalā*), the shaykhs, and the stewards (*khuddām*) who had arrived from the holy shrines. This group numbered 4000 and Shāh Ṭahmāsp announced that they together with the Șadrs were to lead the parade.162 The clerical estate was followed by a few individuals: Khvāja Muẓafar Butakhlī with 1000 archers; Khvāja Turshīzī and Zīā al-Dīn Ṣulṭān also with a 1000 archers.

400 Tabrā'īyān also joined the procession and were followed by the civil servants.163 The civil servants comprised the vazirs, the *mustaufis*, the *munshīs*, and the rest of the writers (*nīvīsandīgān*) and the accountants (*muḥāsībān*) form among the men of

---

157 The Chipnl were descended from the 24 Ughuz tribes and played an important role in the conquest and the settlement of the Turkoman in Anatolia. A large majority of them had traditionally been Shī‘ī. In the 16th century a group of them were settled in Ḥalab (Aleppo in Syria). Another important settlement was in Amasiya, Sivas and Tuqāt in Turkey. Under the Șafavids, the Chepenīs were one of the influential tribes and the members of the standing corps of royal troops (*qūrchīs*) were recruited from this tribe. Sūmer, trans. Ishraqī and Imamī, op. cit., pp. 63, 102

158 In Rashīd al-Dīn’s history Bāyundūriyya appear as one of the 24 Ughuz tribes which immigrated to Western Asia in the 5th/11th century. It is supposed that the Āq Qūyunlū were a clan of the Bāyundūriyya tribe and in some sources the two names are used as synonyms. Roemer, *The Cambridge History of Iran*, pp. 152-3. Although some of the Bāyundūriyya opposed Shāh Ismā‘īl and took refuge in Rustamdar, the tribe was eventually reconciled to the Șafavid rule. This was partly achieved through marriage alliances between the house of the Șafavids and the Bāyundūrs. For instance, the mother of Șulṭān Muḥammad Khudabandā, the father of Shāh ʿAbbas I, was Șultanum, the daughter of Mūsā Șultan Șuṣilī Turkoman who was a powerful Bāyundūr Amīr, *TAAA*, p. 125.

159 The Chekenl were one of the three major Kurdish tribes. Bidlislī notes that during the reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsp the tribe lacked a chieftain as none of its Amirs or sons of Amirs had survived. Thus the tribe scattered in Iraq and ʿĀzarbāyjān and took to highway robbery. They caused such disruption to trade that the merchants complained to Shāh Ṭahmāsp and appealed to him to restore law and order in the kingdom. Shāh Ṭahmāsp ordered that any Chekenl who was found killing or stealing should be expelled from the Șafavid domain. They could go anywhere they chose but if they did not comply they were to be killed. *Sharafnāma*, pp. 17, 429-30.

160 ‘Arabgīrlū is today the name of a district of Maltālīyya in Turkey. A group of them emigrated to Iran under the Șafavids, Sūmer, trans. Ishraqī and Imamī, op. cit., pp. 63-4. During the reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsp, the office of Vazīr of the standing corps of royal troops (*qūrchīs*) belonged to the ‘Arabgīrlū. By the end of Shāh ʿAbbas’ reign however, the ‘Arabgīrlū had been incorporated into the Shamlū tribe. *TAAA*, pp. 164, 1084.


162 Ibid.

pen, totalling 1700 cavalry. The men of pen, divided in ethnic groups, presented worthy gifts to Shāh Ṭahmāsp and took their place.\textsuperscript{164}

Then the craftsmen of the royal workshops, who numbered 3800, paraded past. Next came the elite of the army (\textit{khavāss-i lashkar-i Islam}) the standing corps of royal troops (\textit{qūrchīyān}). The commander of the \textit{qūrchīs} Dūrāq Beg Qūrchī-bāshi, who was the most senior of all the Amirs and the pillars of the state, paraded past with 5000 \textit{qūrchīs} and recited a panegyric of Shāh Ṭahmāsp.

The troops continued to march but it was sunset and a third of the army had not yet paraded. Shāh Ṭahmāsp decided to continue the review throughout the night. He ordered the torches, candles and the lanterns to be lit and he reviewed a total of 120000 troops until sunrise.\textsuperscript{165} At midday Shāh Ṭahmāsp retired and the troops assembled around the royal parasol (\textit{chatr}) and cried \textit{Allāh Allāh}. The cries of 400000 people at the royal camp and the firing sound of 5000 muskets, 120 Frankish cannons, the sound of the royal Music band (\textit{naqār-khāna}), the drums, the kettle-drums (\textit{kus}), and the trumpets (\textit{kurnā}) created tumult in the heavens and earthquake on earth.\textsuperscript{166}

\textbf{[55a(53a)]} Afzal’s reference to "Sultān Ḥusain Mirzâ" is in fact to Sultān Ḥusain Bāyqarā (r. 873-911/1469-1506), the ruler of the Timūrid empire of Herat. After Sultān Ḥusain’s death in 1506, his two sons Bādī’ al-Zamān and Muẓaffar Ḥusain were in conflict over the issue of succession until the following year 1507 when Muḥammad Khan Shaibanī, the Uzbek ruler of Samarqand, attacked and captured Herat. Muẓaffar Sultān died soon after and Bādī’ al-Zamān fled first to the court of Shāh Ismā’īl and then to Istanbul where he died in 932/1517. This marked the fall of the Timūrid empire of Herat and brought the Uzbeks and the Safavids into direct conflict. Shāh Ismā’īl Ṣafāvī, partly in response to the appeals from Bādī’ al-Zamān and partly to reduce the Uzbek threat to the new Ṣafavid empire, launched a

\textsuperscript{164} Ibid, p. 203.
\textsuperscript{165} Ibid, 204-5.
\textsuperscript{166} Ibid, 205.
campaign against the Uzbeks in the winter of 916/1510. Muḥammad Khān Shaibanī was killed in the battle at Merv and Shāh Ismāʿīl captured Herat and appointed Lala Beg the governor.]

[56a(54a)] "Khitā and Khitan" refers to the far reaches of the Uzbek territory. "Khitan" were originally a proto-Mongol tribe who set up their own empire in Manchuria in the early 10th century.

[62b(60b)] The desecration of the tomb of Maulānā Nūr al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Rahmān Jāmī. Jāmī was the great Timūrid poet, scholar and mystic, who was born in Khargird in the vicinity of the town of Jām in Khurāsān on 23 Shaʿbān 817/7 November 1414 and died in Herat on 18 Muharram 898/9 November 1492. Jāmī belonged to the Naqshbandi Șūfī order which had strong loyalty to Sunnīsm. His work includes a treatise devoted to Naqshbandiyya, Sar-rishta-i tārīkh-i khvādjagan. Jāmī's tomb was first desecrated by Shāh Ismāʿīl in 1510 during his conquest of Herat.

Fazlī's version of Ţahmāsp's attempt to desecrate Jāmī's tomb, which seeks to establish the poet's loyalty to Shīʿism, is therefore very curious and does not appear in any other source. Furthermore, the presence of the Grand Vazir Qāzī Jahān who made divination from Jāmī's dīvān at Herat at this time is also problematic. Qāzī Jahān, who was a Sunnī, was in prison in Gilān at the time for the part he had played in the tribal factionalism at court. He remained in prison until 942/1535. Dickson has suggested that this anecdote may be apocryphal. As the analysis of the three case studies in chapter 2 of this thesis has also shown, this is characteristic of Fazlī's

---

167 Cambridge History of Iran, vol. 6, pp. 118-25, 217: Takmilat al-Akhbār, p. 50.
170 Arjomand, "Religious Extremism", p. 11. Repressive measures such as digging up and burning the corpses of the prominent Sunnis have been recognised as archaic Turco-Mongol/Qızılbash practices. Jean Calmard "Les Rituels Shīites et le Pouvoir, L'imposition du shīisme safavide: eulogies et maledictions canoniques" in Jean Calmard (ed.), Etudes Safavides. (Paris, 1993). p. 117. note. 42.
171 Dickson, pp. 190-3.
inventive approach to writing his history. This account however can not be dismissed as pure fiction and merits further research. It is likely that by the early 17th century, this anecdote had evolved within the oral historical tradition. It is also representative of the dilemma which the Safavids faced in coming to terms with the heterogenous religious traditions existing in the domains under their control. Safavid chronicles readily identify prominent individuals as Shi'i when such identification may not always be warranted. For instance, when examining the history of Shi'ism in Iran, 'Abdi Beg Shirazi, the author of *Takmilat al-Akhbar*, writes about the attempts made by Sultan Husain Bayqara, the Timurid ruler of Harat, to make Shi'ism the official religion. According to Shirazi, Sultan Husain wanted to include the names of the twelve Shi'i Imams in the *Khutba* but the people were so angered that they pulled Sayyid 'Ali Qapini, the prayer leader, from the *minbar*.

Rumlu, the author of *AhSan al-Tavarih*, too reports this incident. He also adds that Sultan Husain Bayqara sought the opinion of the poet Jama'i who cautioned him against any attempt to proclaim Shi'ism as the official religion. This incidently contradicts Fazli's assertion that Jama'i was a Shi'i. However, the version rendered by the Sunni historian Mu'in al-Din Asfuzari counters both Shirazi and Rumlu. In *Ruzat al-Jinat fi Ausaf Madinat Harat*, Asfuzari claims that a few ignorant Shi'i believed that because Sultan Husain had adopted the *nom de plume* "Husaini" for his poems he was a Shi'i. They therefore tried to read the names of the twelve Imams in the sermon.

---

172 *Takmilat al-Akhbar*, p. 41.
174 *Takmilat al-Akhbar*, p. 175.
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