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ABSTRACT

Previous scholarly studies of the founder of the Safawid dynasty in Iran, Shāh Ismā'īl I, have concentrated, to a large extent, on the political events of this turbulent period and have described in detail the military career of this still little-known ruler. These earlier works have used only a limited range of historical material, drawing information mostly from straightforward historical chronicles, the majority of which are heavily biased in favour of the Safawids.

The intention of this present work has been to analyse in detail the personality of Shāh Ismā'īl I and to fit this highly enigmatic personality into his social and cultural background. Particular emphasis has been placed on the religious attitudes and policies of Shāh Ismā'īl and a detailed account has been given of his imposition of Twelver Shi'ism on Iran.

Chapters I and II discuss his early life, while chapters III and IV treat different facets of his personality and the intellectual life at court. Chapter V is devoted to the relationship of Shāh Ismā'īl with the various members of his close family. Chapters VI and VII are concerned with religious matters. The final chapter discusses the leisure activities of Shāh Ismā'īl.

Throughout the thesis, extensive use has been made of primary sources, some of which have not been used before; as for those sources already discussed by other scholars, they have been studied again in this thesis to
lay stress on certain aspects of Şah Ismā'īl's reign previously overlooked.
A consideration of the primary sources which have been consulted:

I. Persian Authorities.

1. Ṣafwat al-Ṣafā.

This account of the life and miracles of Ṣaikh Ṣafī al-Dīn Ishāq b. Ṣaikh Amīn al-Dīn Jibra'īl is the recension made by Abūl-Fath al-Ḥusainī in the reign of Shāh Ẓahmāsib I of an earlier work, written between 750-759/1349-1357 by Darwīsh Tawakkul b. Ismā'īl, commonly called Ibn Bazzāz. In this recension al-Ḥusainī states that he was ordered to undertake this correction.

He organized his materials in twelve chapters (bāb) and an appendix (Khatima). A comparison between the two works shows extensive alteration, the intention being to give the founder of the line an 'Alīd genealogy and to suppress the evidence that would show him to have belonged to the Shāfi‘ī Madhhab.¹

¹ For a discussion of the discrepancies between the two versions of the work, cf. A. Kusrawī, Shaikh Ṣafī wa Tabarash, (Tehran, 1343); Z.V. Togan, "Sur l'Origine des Safavides," Mélanges Massignon, III, 345-347. In both of these works detailed bibliographical information is given.

A Turkish translation made in 954/1547 by Shaikh Nuṭ al-Dīn Jamālī is in the John Rylands Library (Manchester, Turkish Ms. no. 71).

There is also another Persian work by Darwīsh
2. Tarīkh-i Āhwāl-i Salāṭin-i Turkomān or Kitāb-i Diyar Bakriyya.

This work was written by Abū Bakr Tehrānī al-Īsfahānī who says:

"I completed this work in 875 A.H. (1470 A.D.) and entitled it Kitāb-i Diyar Bakriyya, because the city is the place of the birth, growth and rule of Şāhīb Qirān Hasan Beg."

The title Kitāb-i Diyar Bakriyya is a chronogram of 875 A.H. Khwānd Amīr tells us:

"Abū Bakr Tehrānī was a historian contemporary with Amīr Hasan Beg; however, because his work was not available to me, its information could not be used in my account of this ruler."

Tawakkul in Mashhad at the library of the shrine of the Imam Riḍā (previously no. 260, now no. 4251) dated 1042/1632. It begins:

"있التهاب الله الذي تقبل لاولياه بهؤوار الوران والماء."

and is by Abu'l-Fath al-Ḥusainī. In this Ms. Abu'l-Fath confirms that:

"لاستورص هنا بسبب جزئى كتب را الولائم حتى تكتب كره وبد ما في

See the note."


The present work records the events of the ʿAq-qoyūnlū dynasty and their rivals the Qara-qoyūnlū and is invaluable in that it is the only detailed history of these two states. However, some important events, especially those which might discredit Ḥasan Beg, have deliberately been ignored, while many others are not given dates. The book is an important source for the periods of Jahān Shāh and Ḥasan Beg and also includes information about Tīmur and his successors.\(^2\)


2. Virtually nothing is known of the author, beyond the little he tells us of himself in his work; Cf. F. Sūmer's introduction, Vol. I, p. vii. Cf. also Tārīkh-i Īlchī-yī Nizām Shāh, B.M. Or. 153, f. 11a, and Tārīkh-i 'Ālam Ārā-yī 'Abbāsī, Edinburgh University Library Ms. noa. 84 and 240. This latter work in the tehrān Ms. has been published by "Amīr Kabīr"; the reference to Abū Bakr appears on p. 19. Cf. W. Hinz, Irans Auftieg zum Nationalstaat, translated by K. Jihāndārī (Tehrān, 1346), entitled Tashkīl-i Daulat-i Millī dar Iran, p. 147, where Hinz states that the Tārīkh-i Āhwālī Salāṭīn-i Turkomān is believed to have been lost.
3. **Tārīkh-i 'Ālam-ārā-yi Amīnī.**

The author's complete name is Abu'l-Khayr Faḍl Allāh b. Rūzbihān b. Faḍl Allāh (b. Muḥammad) al-Khunjī al-Īsfahānī, surnamed Amīn (known as Khwaja Mullā Īsfahānī). He was a learned Sunnī who was forced to take refuge in central Asia by Shāh Ismā'īl I. He was in Herāt in 918/1512 where he completed his Mīhmān-nāma-yi Bukhārā, and in the same year he settled in Samarqand.

The present work was begun on 11 Safar 896/24th Dec. 1490 and completed in the reign of Bāysunghur (who reigned from 896/1490 to 897/1491). Faḍl Allāh for some reason stayed at the court of Sultan Yaʿqūb Qara-qoynūnlū to whom he dedicated his book called Bādī' al-Zamān, in Shaʿbān 892/August 1487. After this year he became


2. See C.A. Storey, Persian Literature, Section II, p. 301.

court historian and completed his present volume only after the death of Ya'qūb on 24th Dec. 1490/896.¹

In this work FadlAllāh mentions the events of the reigns of the last Timūrids of Khurāsān, the Āq-qoyūnlū rulers, and Shaibanī Khān Öz-Beg. The author's bias is Sunnī, while the events he discusses are sometimes treated differently in other similar works.²

---

1. I am using Minorsky's date given on p. 15. But on p. 112, at the end of the book, the copyist writes

"finished by the hand of Yūsuf-i Marvī in 926/1520"

and Minorsky presents another date from another copy (B) where the relevant passage runs as follows:

"finished the copy on Friday the hour of prayer, 21st Muḥarram 952" (3rd April, 1545).


This general history of the Eastern world from the earliest times to 930/1524 was written by Khwāja Humām al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn b. Burhān al-Dīn Muḥammad Shīrāzī, known as "Khwānd Amīr", a famous historian of the tenth/sixteenth century. Apart from this work, he also wrote Dastūr al-Wuzara, Khulāṣat al-Akhbār, Akhbār al-Akhryār, Muntakhāb-i Tārīkh-i Waṣṣāf, Makārim al-Akhlaq and Maʿāthir al-Mulūk.

His father, Khwāja Humām al-Dīn Muḥammad, was the minister of Mīrzā Sultān Maḥmūd (died in Muḥ. 900/Oct. 1494), the son of Sultān Abū Saʿīd, the ruler of Transoxiana (died in 873/1468). As he tells us himself, his mother was the daughter of Mīrkhwānd, the author of Rawdat al-Ṣafā. However, certain European scholars have been misled by a faulty genealogy, in which the name Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn is missing, into describing him as the nephew rather than the grandson of this famous historian.3

1. This work was edited by J. Hūmāʿī and printed in Tehran in four volumes in 1333 Sh. An earlier lithographed edition was brought out in Bombay in 1273 A.H. The biographical information given by J. Hūmāʿī is the most reliable. Cf. Storey, P.L., p. 104; Rieu, Cat. Per. Mss., (Supp.) pp. 98-100.

2. ḤabĪb, p. 7.

3. Ibid., p. 5.
Khwánd Amír was born in 880/1475 in Herát and was brought up by his grandfather at the court of Sultán Ḥusain Bayqárā and his minister Amír ʿAlí Shír Nawá T. After the death of Sultán Ḥusain in 911/1506, he was appointed as teacher in the Madrasa of Herát, and became Qādī of Herát and Khurasán under Sháh Ismá‘īl I. He died in India at the end of 942/1535 and was buried in the cemetery of Khwája Niẓām al-Dín Auliya near the grave of Amír Khusraw Dihlaví.

The Ḥabíb al-Siyar was undertaken by Khwánd Amír at the request of his patron Mír Ghiyáth al-Dín Muḥammad b. Yúsuf al-Ḥusainí, one of the Sayyids of Herát, and dedicated to Dūrmís Khán Shámlú. Volume IV of the Ḥabíb al-Siyar treats in detail the history of the reign of Sháh Ismá‘īl, as well as the Turkomán dynasties of the Āq-qoyúnlu and the Qara-qoyúnlu. It was completed in Rabi‘ I, 930/Jan. 1524, a few months before the death of Sháh Ismá‘īl I, as the author says:

1. See Rawdat al-Šafawiyya, f.120b.
3. Ḥabíb, p. 602; cf. Denison Ross, op. cit., pp. 251-2 where he states:

"Khwánd Amir completed his work (vol. IV) in 930 - one month before Sháh IsmA‘īl's death, ..... at any rate, he seems to have lived in Khurásán, and we have no mention of his having visited other parts of Northern Persia. He, therefore, did not probably obtain his information about Sháh IsmA‘īl on the spot, but got
5. **Salīm-nāma** (B.M. Ms. Add. 24/960). ¹

The author of this work is Ḥakīm al-Dīn Idrīs b. Ḥusām al-Dīn ‘Alī al-Bidlīsī. ²

He accompanied Sultan Salīm I on most of his campaigns, and is said to have written a book against Shāh Ismā‘īl’s new religion and is believed to have turned twenty-five tribes in favour of Sultan Salīm I, against Shāh Ismā‘īl I. ³ He was one of those who forced Sultan Salīm to attack Iran. ⁴ As the author’s son Abu’l-Faḍl Muḥammad mentions in the preface, his father who

his facts either from some of Shāh Ismā‘īl’s courtiers who came to Khorāsān, or from some contemporary history unknown to us.”

---

1. The other title of the **Salīm-nāma** is:

"نَاسِبِ الْصُفَانَ النََّانِيَةَ فِي أُسِبْرِ الْمُقْرَرَةِ العَتْرَةَ "

2. 


died in Dhul-"Hijja, 926/1519,\(^1\) collected the materials as an eye-witness during the reign of Sulṭān Salīm I. Abū'1-Faḍl completed this work at the beginning of Salīm II's reign (974/1566).

The work is written in both prose and verse in an elegant style, of which the author takes full advantage to show his hostility towards Shāh Ismā'īl ("Rāfiqī" and "Shaikh Ṣughī" as he calls him), and his warriors, by insulting and cursing them. Despite this hostile bias, the work's unique information makes it valuable.\(^2\)

6. **Lubb al-Tawārīkh.\(^3\)**

The present work is an abridgement of a universal history, particularly the history of Persia, from the earliest times to 948/1541. The work was compiled in

---

1. **Salīm-nāma;** but the author of **Tārīkh-i Inqilāb-Islām** says he died in 925/1519 in Istanbul and was buried in the cemetery of Abū Ayyūb Ḵānṣārī where he built a castle and a mosque. His wife was called Zaynab Ḵātūn. See **Tārīkh-i Inqilāb-Islām**, p. 58.


3. The present work was published in Bombay in 1314 A.H.

948/1541. The author of this work is Amīr Sayyid Yaḥyā b. Ḥabīb al-Husainī al-Qazvīnī, who dedicated his work to Prince Abūl-Faṭḥ Bahram Mīrzā, the son of Shāh Ismahīl I (died in 956/1549 in the early years of his life). It is believed that the author was put in prison by Shāh Tahmāsp I, where he died at the age of seventy-seven in 962/1555.

Bāb V of this book deals with the Qara-qoyūnlū and their rivals the Aq-qoyūnlū kings in two "faṣls" of which "Qism-i Chahārum" discusses the history of the Ṣafawīd


"The author was a great favourite of Shāh Ṣafavī and his account would have been of great value."

2. Rieu, cat. Pers. MSS., I, 104, while the copy of the same work in the Edinburgh U.L. gives "at the age of seventy-five". Cf. Tarbiyat, Dānishmandān, p. 72, where the author gives at the age of seventy-five in 960 A.H.
The work is written according to a Shi'ī point of view.  

7. Tārīkh-i Jahān Gushā-yi Khāqān.... 2 Or 'The History of Shāh Ismā'īl.'

This is a very detailed history of the rise of the Safawī dynasty, and the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl I. It fills the main portion of this Ms. written under Shāh Tāhmāsb I, and probably shortly after his accession, 3 since the author mentions the date 947 A.H. as a recent event. 4

1. For more details see:

Rieu, Cat. Per. Ms., vol. I,p.104; cf. Edinburgh U.L. Ms. no. 239, f. 203, and M.B. Dickson, Shāh Tāhmāsb and the Uzbeks, Ph.D. Dissertation, (Princeton, 1958), p. 192 where he states that Yahyā Qazvīnī the author of Ḥubb was a Sunni at heart, and this must be one of the causes of his imprisonment.

2. It seems to me that this title should be the real title of this Ms. rather than "The History of Shāh Ismā'īl". See 'A.A. 'Abbāsī, p. 18, or the same work, Amir Kabīr publication (1334 Sh.), p. 104.


4. Rieu, Cat. Per. MSS., I,p.34; D.Ross, op.cit., p. 252.
The author of this work gives neither a clue to his identification nor to the title of his work. But the title of this Ms. seems to be: Tarikh-i Jahān Gusha-yi Khāqān (Iskandarshāh-i Šāhib Qīrān Shāh Ismā'īl Bahādur Khān) as part of the above title appears at the top of the first folio on the right side as follows:

"تاریخ جهانشاه خاقان..."

1. Ghulām Sarwar in his work entitled: History of Shāh Ismā'īl Šafawī, (Aligarh, 1939), pp. 9-10, believes that the present Ms. was written by a certain person called Bi'jan, as is proved by the following marginal note in the author's hand, unfortunately destroyed by the book-binder:

For more details see the above Ms., f. 82a.

Then Ghulām Sarwar concludes that "therefore the work was composed between 947/1540 and 955/1548."

It should be added here that Qanbar Aqā was killed by Sulṭān Murād in 908/1502. See 'Ālam-ārā yi-Shāh Ismā'īl, ed. by Muntazār-Šāhib, (Tehran, 1341 / 1971), p. 69. Cf. Muḥammad Hasan Khān Šanī' al-Daula, Muntazam-i Naṣīrī, (Tehran, 1299), vol. II, p. 87.

2. There is a similar work with 25 miniatures entitled 'Ālam-ārā yi Šāh Ismā'īl which Falsafī believes was written in 1010 A.H. See Falsafī, Zindigān-yi Šāh Šabāš I, vol. I, p. 240. Cf. Browne's P.C. no. 74 (C.U.L. Or. 2939),
The author wrote his work by consulting the Šafvat al-Šafā and Ḥabīb al-Siyar as well as the Futūḥāt-i Shāhī, without bothering himself to mention these works. The present Ms. is invaluable; in it the most important events of Shāh Ismā‘īl I have been illustrated (21 whole page miniatures). Unfortunately some of the pages are defective.¹


However, Falsafī seems to have been misled by the present title: Tārīkh-i Jahan Gushā-yi Khāqān and thought that the present work was Tārīkh-i Jahan-ārā. He then attributes this work to Mullā Abū Bakr Tehrānī (the author of Tārīkh-i Diyar Bakriyya). As it is well known Mullā Abū Bakr Tehrānī had not composed such a history on Shāh Ismā‘īl’s life since he was the historian of Ḥasan Beg Aq-Qoyūnlū and composed his work, namely Kitāb-i Diyar Bakriyya, for him in 815/1470, and could not have lived such a long time. Therefore, the above work cannot be the same as Tārīkh-i Jahan Gushā-yi Khāqān mentioned above.

¹. See B.M. Ms. Or. 3248 or Cambridge University Library Add. 200.
8. Tarikh-i Jahan-ara

The author of this work is Qadi Ahmad "Ghaffari" or Ghafari who was a descendant of the well-known thinker Abd al-Ghifarr Qazvini, the author of Al-Hawfi al-Saghir "الله الحسنى" (died in 665/1259).

His father was a judge in Ray and was a poet.

His poetical name was Wisa'li and he died in 933/1526.

Qadi Ahmad was a poet, scribe, elegant writer and historian. To the Safawi princes and amirs he was well known, for he lived at court intermittently. Sam Mirza, the son of Shah Ismail I, writes:

"He had a sharp memory and good style in writing which was accepted among all the thinkers. He is staying with me for a while and this is his verse:

\[\text{"بِكَارْتِ عَمَرِي سَنَتَيْنَ مَرْجَعَتُ مَنْ كُنْتُ بِهِ فَرَءَعْتُ مِنْ زَوْدٍ بَضُرْعُ دِ."

Mina'vi in his introduction to the Tarikh-i Jahan-ara states:

"Qadi is a descendant of the root of "Ghifarris of Kashan" غناري قدار وفظيف and his pedigree after forty descendants goes back to Abu Dhar Ghifarr (a friend of Prophet Muhammad). One of Qadi's descendants is Abdal-'Aziz b. Ghanim Ahmad b. Abul-Faqir al-Ghifari of Kashan who was one of the learned men in the seventh century A.H. and one of his books known to us is Sharh-al-Mufassal wa Risalat al-Qalam." 2

Qādi Ahmad’s death occurred in 975/1567 and the present work was finished after 973/1564-5 during the reign of Shāh Tāhmasb I, the son of Shāh Ismā’īl I, as he states on page 270:

وَإِنَّیْ بَعْدَ سَهْنِ سَنَةٍ ثَلَاثِْ، وَسَبْعِ سَائِلِ، وَٰسَمِلْ ۚ ۖ اسْتِبِّ ۚ

Qādi Ahmad has another history called Tārīkh-i Nigaristan. ¹ According to Mīnūvī, the editor of Tārīkh-i Jahān-ārā, at present ten Mss. exist.²

1. See the statement of Aqā Buzurg Tehranī on Qādi Ahmad Ghaffārī in his book called Al-Dhari‘ah (vol. III, p. 247) quoted by Mīnūvī (Jahān-ārā, p. 7). It runs as follows:

... "... من آن الی کناره ستین سال؛ این میں چار طالب جا کہندیا، وہ کسی سے ایک مہم بنا کر گئے، یعنی تا 973 س ن بوہا، سیئل س ن بوہا، ہزار س ن بوہا، ت ویل س ن بوه

2. Jahān-ārā, p. 8 where Mīnūvī introduces the above-mentioned Mss.

For more details on Qādi Ahmad see Maulānā Ghulām Muḥammad Dīhlavī, Tadhkira-yi Khushnīvīsān, (Haft qalāmāl), edited by M. Hidayāt -Husain (Calcutta, 1239 A.H), pp. 82-3.

The author of this Ms. is Maulānā Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Lārī Ansārī, who was born in Lār (south of Shīrāz) and was forced to take refuge with Sūlţān Saлим I, who sent him to Āmid (the capital of Diyār Bakr). Maulānā was shipwrecked in a journey to holy places, and nearly four hundred of his books lost; and he himself just managed to escape to Constantinople.

Maulānā was a pupil of Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Mansūr of Shīrāz; thereafter he went to India, and was Humāyūn’s chief minister. Maulānā died in 980/1572-3 in Diyār Bakr, at the age of ninety.

Chapter IX of the work deals with the Āq-qoyūnlū (fol. 228b) which he concludes with a brief mention of his enemy Shāh Ismā‘īl I.

1. B.M. MS. Or. Add. 7650.

> "مثنيات سال غياب و سنة ما: هل دنيي سال ضاببة إنادي نست ماب تمرينة النيل؟
> البسمة مرانا معملي الدين، لزي(pid) عالم ما في رحلت نور. إياكم يا مسات ترب نودساني "لودد..."
This is a general history with invaluable information dealing with two Safawīd kings, Shāh Ismā'īl I and his son Shāh Ẓahmāsb I, because of the author's long residence at Shāh Ẓahmāsb's court. As the author himself mentions (f. 60a) he arrived at Ray in Rajab, 952/1545-6.²

The work was written by Khūrshāh b. Qubād al-Ḥusainī, who was sent to Iran as an ambassador to Shāh Ẓahmāsb I in 952/1545, by Burhān Niẓāmshāhī of Aḥmadnagar.³ Khūrshāh

1. This is B.M. Ms. Add. 153 (Guftār-i Sewwūm Az-Muqaddama-yi Shishum.)

2. Ibid. f. 60a. See also f. 60b where the author states:

3. Ibid.


3. Ibid.
remained at the court of Shah Tahmasb I for nineteen years (till 971/1564). So, as a contemporary historian and an eye-witness, his work is valuable, but often differs from the earlier sources in that his approach to the material is more objective and honest.

As the copyist himself writes (f. 122a), this work was finished in 972/1564-5.¹


This special chronicle of two kings of the Safawī dynasty (900-985/1500-1-1577), is written by Ḥasan Rūmlū, the grandson of Amīr Khān Rūmlū, a nobleman of the Safawī court of Shah Ismā'īl I and his son Shah Tahmasb I, and is said to have comprised twelve volumes of which at the present time only two are in existence.²

¹ The copyist in f. 122a states:

Cf. Ilchi, f. 45a for " ... Storey, op. cit., vol. I, p. 321 where he says that "Niẓāmshāh finished his work in Calcutta."

² The present text of the Ahsan al-Tawārīkh, ed. by C.N. Seddon, is in two volumes, published in Baroda; most of the important materials in the second volume are deliberately omitted or added by the translator. Another similar work under the same title of Ahsan al-Tawārīkh, which is a general history from the beginning till 937/1530, is in existence. The author is said to be
The work was written in 980/1572-3 and gives details of Persian affairs from 900-985/1494-1577, and was completed in 985/1577 as the author says:  

1. 

Barkhurdar b. Mahmud TurkomanFarahi a clerk of Shāh Ismā'īl I. The author has written another book called Mahbūb al-Qulūb or Shamsa wa Qahqaha. He is said to be a poet and had a "diwan". His pen-name was "Mumtāz". For more details see Shamsa wa Qahqaha, (Tehran 1336), p. 2.

This should be noted here that the above works must not be mistaken for another title namely: Ahsan al-Tawārīkh or Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh of Hasan b. Muḥammad al-Khākivash Shirāzī, composed in 1019/1610-11, in India—B.M. Ms. Or. 1649.


12. Rawdat al-Ṣafawiyya.¹

The work was commenced in 1023/1614–15 and completed in 1035/1625–6. It is a history of the Ṣafawī dynasty from Shah Isma‘īl I to the first years of the reign of Shah Ṣafī.

The author of this work, Mīrzā Beg b. Ḥasan Ḥusainī Gunābdī, at the beginning of his career applied himself to philosophy and poetry, but later turned to history.

The present Ms. is a record of the Ṣafawī dynasty up to the beginning of the reign of Shah Ṣafī, beginning:

"..."

The author says he consulted mainly the Rawdat al-Ṣafā, Ḥabīb al-Siyar and Nusakh-i Jahān-ārā, but from the date 973/1565 he collected his information from trustworthy witnesses. The present work for its unique information is invaluable.³

1. This work (B.M. Ms. Or. 3388) is available at the Edinburgh University Library (Mic. no. 0.25) in which the first page of the preface has been supplied by Mr. Churchill's care from a copy dated 1113/June 8th, 1701, in the library of Ṣan‘al Daula. The author also allocated 126 folios of this work to the reign of Shah Isma‘īl I, and his forefathers, ending with the accession of Shah Ṭahmāsb I.

2. Rawdat al-Ṣafawiyya, f. 3a.

3. For more details see Rieu, Supp. no. 58; Storey, P.L. no. 388, p. 313; S. Ray, op. cit., p. 98.
13. 'Ālam-ārā-yi Shāh Isma'īl.

The anonymous author of this work has left no clue to his identity, and this may have been deliberate, for he is at times outspokenly critical of Shāh Isma'īl I.

The account given here of the fanatical Shi'i doctrine which was implanted in the north and northwest of the Safawi domains is unique.1

Although the author was not a learned man and had little ability in prose composition, his style is simple and direct, and often violated the grammatical usages of the standard language. He used sources which were both

1. The work has been edited by A. Montazer-Šahib from a manuscript in his private possession (Tehran 1349 Sh). See pages 15-31. A portion of a work found in the C.U.L. Ms. Add 200 which appears to be based on similar sources was published by Sir Denison Ross in J.R.A.S., (1896), 264-283, under the title of "The Early Years of Shāh Isma'īl, Founder of the Safavi Dynasty." According to Montazer-Šahib there is another Ms. of the work in the private library of Waḥīd al-Mulk Shaibānī, and a fourth copy is in the Sipah Sālār Library, no. 1514 (Tehran). However Montazer-Šahib writes that he was unable to consult the Cambridge U.L.Ms. of which Sir Denison Ross published a part. There is also a similar work but with the different title of 'Ālam ārā-yi Safawī, ed. by Y. Shukrī (Tehran 1350) of which the author is also unknown.
important and reliable even though he never identifies them. At least one of these was the Tarikh-i Jahân Gushâ-yi Khâqân; for example, the words on f. 104b of the latter:

\[ \text{... و امیر کیا ... بوم کسا ...} \]

are repeated on p. 132 of the ‘Alam-ārā-yi Shâh Ismā‘îl. The editor of the text expresses the view that the author did not make use of the Habīb al-Siyar. 2 Throughout the whole work we see the uncritical favours of the author in the cause of Shi‘ism.

The work can be dated to sometime after the death of Shâh ‘Abbâs I (1038/1628-9) judging by the expression on page 377 in which the author has spoken of

\[ \text{... نوایت رضوان مکان شاه عباس سامانی عليه السلام و الفارزان ...} \]

And also on page 581 the date 1086 A.H. is mentioned incidentally:

\[ \text{... حال حضرت این ابریزه تا لیف شده و منست و نماش ابیات اسیت اولد نزی ورّن و ولی و حمید ...} \]

Translation:

"Now that this work has been composed, that is in 1086 A.H., the family of the Ghazâlî are ruling in that country." 2

1. See ‘Alam-ārā-yi Shâh Ismā‘îl, p.131 ; cf. Tarikh-i Jahân Gushâ-yi Khâqân... f. 105b. where the same words appear:

\[ \text{... و امیر کیا موفق نیت خرد درآفس آ هین که نزی ست ورّن و ولی و حمید ...} \]

which seems to be one of the main sources of Hasan Rûmilû, vol. I, p. 80.

2. ‘A.A. Shâh Ismâ‘îl, p.581.
14. 'Ālam-ārā-yi 'Abbāsī.

A history of the Ṣafawī dynasty, particularly the reign of Shāh 'Abbās the Great, the seventh king of the Ṣafawīs who reigned for 44 years and died at the age of 60, in 1038/1629, and his predecessors.

The author of this book is Iskandar Munshī Turkomān who was at the court of Shāh 'Abbās I.

The present work was originally completed (and dedicated to Shāh 'Abbās the Great) in 1025/1616, but was afterwards continued till 1038/1629.2

1. The present work (Tehran Ms.) was printed during the reign of Muẓaffar al-Dīn Shāh Qājār and reprinted in 1314 A.H. which is the more reliable edition. These printed works (Amīr Kabīr publication /Tehran, 1334 Sh. and the old edition) have been compared with two other Mss. available at the Edinburgh University Library, no. 240 and 84; surprisingly there are a lot of differences between these four works. Among these works only Ms. no. 240 is unique.

2. Takmila was written by Muḥammad Ḥusain b. Karam Ālī Isfahānī (see f. 137a) and is a collection of state letters that passed between Shāh Tahmāsb I and the others, among which one letter germane to our thesis begins:

The work is divided into two volumes of which the first volume (Maqāla-yi Awwal az Sahīfa-yi Awwal) deals with the Safawī dynasty before Shāh 'Abbās I, beginning:

1. Tārīkh-i 'Ālam-ārā-yi 'Abbāsī, (Tehran 1314 Sh.) p. 5

2. The first seven volumes have been edited and translated into English (Oriental Translation Fund, New Series), by F.F. Arbuthnot, and translated by E. Rehatsek (London, 1891).

The same work has also been edited and increased to ten volumes by M. Riḍā Quṭb Khān Ḥidāyat (Tehran, 1270).
The work was completed up to the death of the author (Herāt 942/1535), and was continued by his grandson, Khwānd Amīr, who himself wrote the well-known history entitled Ḥabīb al-Siyar.¹

Volumes VII and VIII of this work (supplement to the Rawḍat al-Ṣafā)² which were printed in 1270/1854 in Tehran, cover the Timūrid dynasty, the Āq-qoyūnlū and Qara-qoyūnlū, while volume VIII deals with Shāh Ismā'īl I and his ancestors.³

16. Tarīkh-‘Inqilāb- Islām Baynal-Khāṣṣ wal-‘Amm⁴

Fol. 324; 230 x 130; 13 lines; written in good Nasta‘līq, bound in stamped green goat leather made of paste board 345 x 215; with red heading in every section;


². Cf. Browne, op.cit., IV, p. 7 where he gives 1858 A.D.

³. The above work, namely vols. VII and VIII, written by Mīrzā Riḍā Qullī Khān Hidayat begins:

Vol. VII: "ذَلِّلَ عَلَى امْرِ صَاحِبَتِهِ مَنْـفُور..."

Vol. VIII: "ذِرْ ذَکْرَ هَالِيَتِ السَّابِحَة مَحْمُوْد..." both bear on the present subject.

The author calls himself: Muḥammad ‘Arif Mutarjim; he states that:

On 24th Sha'bān 921/1515, an envoy came from Shāh Ismā’īl to Istanbul. My great-grandfather (the author of this work Muḥammad ‘Arif Mutarjim) named Khayr al-Dīn Chāwush, nicknamed Ispinaqchī Üghlī, was sent to welcome him.

The author further on gives his reason for writing this manuscript and says:

"Until now, no scholars or historians have given the accurate, adequate, actual and precise events of the life and deeds of both Shāh Ismā’īl b. Shaikh Ḥaydar al-Mūṣavī al-Husainī al-‘Alavī and Sultān Salīm b. Sultān Bāyazīd b. Sultān Muḥammad al-‘Azīz al-‘Uṯmānī. All they have given are some facts by way of flattering and pleasing their patrons. And they mention the wrong doings of their opponents, but neglect the most important deeds of their patrons, who for the sake of personal benefit, killed many innocent people in the name of

1. A. Anwār, op. cit., p. 117.
2. Inqilāb-Īslām, p. 324.
3. Ibid., p. 276, cf. Anwār, op. cit., p. 116, where he says:

"His full name is: Ibn Muḥammad Ṣharīf Muḥammad ‘Arif, well known as Ispinaqchī ‘Aṣḥāḥāzāda."
protecting Islam. They exacerbated corruption, hostility, and lack of unity among Muslims. And they left long-lasting hostility among Muslims too, and broke the strength of Islamic unity, causing the enemies of Islam to take advantage of the situation.

However, they themselves had neither long life, nor long-lasting sovereignty, nor a good name in the sphere of history. Therefore, I, the author, by the order of Aqa Muhammad Hasan Khan I'timad al-Saltana who is the minister of 'Intibā'āt wa Ra'īs-i Dār al-Tarjāma' at the court of Naṣir al-Dīn Shāh Qajār, undertook to fulfill this responsibility, which I started on Thursday, 18th Ramadān 1307 A.H., and entitled it: 'Tarīkh-i Inqilāb- Islām Bayn al-Khāṣṣwāl-'Āmm'. And since I have quoted other historians' works, word for word, and have not added anything of my own attitude, therefore, I beg you, readers, to forgive my using rude words as these are not mine."

Further on, the author indicates his main sources as:

Rawdat al-Ṣafawiyya by Sayyid Beg Gumnabādī; Ḥabīb al-
Siyar; Muntażam-i Naṣīrī; Tarīkh-i Khusruwān by Jalāl
al-Dīn Mīrzā Qajār; Tāj al-Tawārīkh by Khwāja Sa'īd al-Dīn;
Haqiqat al-Tawārīkh by Ismā'īl Beg Taqī'ī; Maslahāhir al-
Islām by Wahābī Efendī; Maslahāhir al-Nisā' by Dhihnī Efendī; Qamūs al-Ālam by Sām Beg; Lughāt-i Tarīkhīyya
by Aḥmad Raf'at Efendī; Jahān-namā by Muṣṭafā Efendī
known as Kātib Chalabī; Miṣbāḥ al-Sāri by Ibrāhīm Efendī;

It is believed that Naṣir al-Dīn Shāh Qajār according to his hand-writing left in the marginal note on first page, read all the pages as he says:

"The whole book has been seen."


Munāha ʿat by ʿAlīnān Beg; Ḥadīqat al-Suʿdāʾ by Mullā Muḥammad known as "Fuḍūlī"; Āsrār-nāma by Shaikh Faridūn ʿAttār; Lubbāl-Tawārīkh by Sayyid Yaḥyā Qazvīnī; Tārīkh-i Jahān-ārā by Ghaffārī. ¹

17. Majālis al-Mūʿminīn. ²

The author of this work was Sayyid Nurallāh b. Sayyid al-Marʿāshī al-Ḥusainī al-Shuṣhtarī (killed in 1019/1610).

The present work is a biography of celebrated men of mostly Shīʿites, from earliest times up to the establishment of Twelver Shīʿism as the only state religion in Iran by the Ṣafawīd dynasty.

The work was composed between 993-1010/1584-1601. It contains twelve chapters or Majlisīs of which the Majlis-i shishum concerns us exclusively.


2. See Edinburgh University Library Ms. no. 367, unpaginated. Cf. H. Ethē, op. cit., part I, pp. 203-204. This work (Tehran Ms.) was printed in 1268 A.H. by Kitāb Furushī-yi Islāmiyyeh in two volumes.
18. Tarīkh-i Sultānī. ¹

The author of this history was Sayyid Hasan b. Sayyid Murtaḍā al-Husainī. The present manuscript was composed for Sultān Husain Šafawī in 1115/1703-4. Of its three chapters only chapter three deals with the Šafawīd dynasty from the beginning to the reign of Šāh Šafī. Folios 303a-314a deal with Šāh Ismā‘īl’s life. ²

19. Zubdat al-Tawārīkh. ³

The author of this history was Muḥammad Muḥsin Mustawfī who was in Isfahān at the time of the Afghān invasion in 1134/1722.

The present Ms. is a general history of kings and Prophets from Adam to the author’s time, in which only ffs. 180a-184a deal with Šāh Ismā‘īl’s life and his early ancestors. ⁴

² See ffs. 303a for his birth and 314a for his death which is given as 929 A.H.
⁴ See ffs. 180b for his ancestors and f. 184a for his death.
20. Tawarikh-1 Mir Sayyid Sharif (Raqim). ¹

The author of this work, as can be seen from the title of the above Ms. was Mir Sayyid Sharif, pen-named "Raqim".

The present work is a chronological account of some of the kings, learned and holy men who were active during the time of Mongol domination in central Asia, Persia and India between 736-1045 and 1335-1635. The present Ms. was copied at Shāhjahānābād (Delhi) in 1145/1732 by a certain copier called Mir Shihāb al-Dīn b. Khwāja Buzurg Shāh al-Makhdūmiyya of Khwārazm.

21. Fawā' id-i Šafawiyya. ²

The work covers the history of the Šafawīd dynasty from Šāh Ismā'īl I to Sultan Abu'l-Fath Muḥammad Mīrzā Bahādur al-Šafawi al-Mūsawi al-Ḥusainī, who lived in

1. I have used Edinburgh U.L. Ms. (no. 246, miscellaneous collections). Cf. Storey, P.L. pp. 376, 1301; and Dickson, op. cit., p. LVII: Raqim (an Uzbek history and Tazkireh to 1646-7).

exile in Lucknow as a pensioner of the East India Company.

The present Ms. was dedicated to Sulṭān Abu'1-Fath Muhammad Mīrzā by the author himself-called Abu'1-Ḥasan b. Ibrāhīm of Qazvīn-in 1211/1796-7. Begins with:

"مودتی اودی در نزدیکت ار وال حیبت ما لی سر گرفت ملکت صلی الله علیه السرور نازر ملهم".

of which only Maqāleh panjum exists in Edinburgh U.L. (no. 86). The whole Ms. is available in the library of the India Office.

22. Mīrāj al-Tawḥīd Or Žuhūriyya-ya Ṣafawiyya. ¹

The author of this work was Abū Ṭalib al-Hindī al-Iṣfahānī. The present work is a treatise on the rise and rule of the Wahhābīs of Najaf of Iraq and was finished in 1222/1807. It begins:

"بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم: يَا أَيُّ الْرِّجْلِ مِنْ كُلِّ زَرَاعٍ وَحِينَ حَلَوَتَ اللَّهُ وَسَلَامَةً وَرَكِبَةً عَلَى سَرِّ الْأَرْضِ وَخَاثِمَ الْبَيْنَانِ رَأْسَةَ الطَّبْيِنِ الطَّافِقِينِ وَحِمْجَةَ النَّارِيِنِ إِلَى ابْرَاهِيمَ. أَمْ بَعْدَهُ؟"

and ends:

"وَضُرِّبَ مِنْ ذَرَارِيْهِ مِنْ مَعْلُومِ اللَّهِ ثُمَّ يُهْلِكُهُ سَالِمًا ١٢٣٢ هَجَرِيَّ قَرَى." ²

The above-mentioned Ms. of Edinburgh U.L. is not paginated but our information comes from f. 20a onwards.

¹. This is Edinburgh U.L. Ms. no. 87 which is not paginated.
**ABBREVIATIONS**

For full details, see Bibliography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'A.A. Shāh Ismā’īl</td>
<td>'Ālam-ārā-yi Shāh Ismā’īl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A.A. 'Abbāsī</td>
<td>'Ālam-ārā-yi 'Abbāsī (Tehran 1314 A.H.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A.A. Ṣafawī</td>
<td>'Ālam-ārā-yi Ṣafawī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ātashkada</td>
<td>Ātashkada-yi Āzar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aḥsan</td>
<td>Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dānīghmandān</td>
<td>Dānīghmandān-i Āzarbāyjān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denison Ross</td>
<td>&quot;The Early Years of Shāh Ismā’īl the Founder of the Ṣafawī Dynasty&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.I.</td>
<td>Encyclopaedia of Islam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fārs-nāma</td>
<td>Fārs-nāma-yi Nāṣīrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.J.I.</td>
<td>Farhang-i Jughrāfiyā’l-yi Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghulām Sarwar</td>
<td>History of Shāh Ismā’īl Ṣafawī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥabīb</td>
<td>Ḥabīb al-Siyar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinz/Jahāndārī</td>
<td>Persian translation of Iran Aufstieg Zum Nationalstaat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasluck</td>
<td>Christianity and Islam under the Sultans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inqilāb-Islām</td>
<td>Tārīkh-i Inqilāb-Islām Bayn al-Khāṣṣwal-‘Āmm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilchī</td>
<td>Tārīkh-Ilchī-yi Niẓām Shāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahān Gushā</td>
<td>Tārīkh-Jahāngushā-yi Khāqān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R.A.S.</td>
<td>Journal of Royal Asiatic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubb</td>
<td>Lubbal-Tawārīkh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maykhāna</td>
<td>Tadhkira-yi Maykhāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muntazam</td>
<td>Muntazam-i Nāṣīrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author/Translator</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansur'i</td>
<td>Šāra Tārīkh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazzaoui</td>
<td>The Origins of the Šafawīds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musḥīrī</td>
<td>Sikkāhā-šī Shāh ʿĪsmāʿīl I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigarīstan-i Sukhan</td>
<td>Tadhkira-yi Nigarīstan-i Sukhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrushevksy/Kishāvarz</td>
<td>The Persian translation of Istoriya Irana S drevneishikh Vremen do Kontsa XVIII Veka and Islam V Irane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rūzbihān/Minorsky</td>
<td>The English translation of Tārīkh ʿĀlam-ārā-yi Amināl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rūzbihān/Sutūda</td>
<td>Mihmān-nāma-yi Bukhārā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savory, Ph.D. Thesis</td>
<td>The Development of the Early Šafawīd State under Ismāʿīl and Tahmāsp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savory, &quot;Consolidation&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;The Consolidation of Šafawīd Power in Persia&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šāh Jang</td>
<td>The Persian translation of a German text (?) under the title of Shāh Jang-i Irāniyān Dar Chāldirān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuḥfa</td>
<td>Tuḥfa-yi Sāml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zindigānī</td>
<td>Zindigānī-yi Šāh ʿAbbās Awwal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The transliteration system adopted in this thesis in general is that used in the Cambridge History of Iran.

The word Haydar is not strictly transliterated and at times Teh. is written in preference to Tehran; similarly I have preferred to write Šafawīd and Āq-qoyūnlū in preference to their forms.
INTRODUCTION

It was during my university course (1353-4/1972-3) that I was first drawn to the topic of my thesis, by the reading of N. Falsafi's five volumes of *The Life of Shāh 'Abbās I*. It was then that I noticed many remarkable facts which had been handed down about the founder of the dynasty, but overlooked by some modern scholars. I asked myself repeatedly why I should choose this as a topic when there are already in existence several histories of Shāh Ismā'īl I, in Persian and English, and it may be asked why another attempt should be made here to write a definitive personal biography. This is because almost all of the modern histories of Shāh Ismā'īl I, already written and published, do not give full weight to his personal qualities but are brief and cursory and omit many important accounts, which are to be found in the primary sources. If the wars and military expeditions of Shāh Ismā'īl or just information from one or two manuscripts are considered as the whole story of this king's life and personality, then this is clearly incomplete and neglects a discussion of his life, personality and religious qualities.

Modern scholars mostly devote only several lines to the personal qualities of this celebrated and enigmatic character of modern Persian history; this is clearly inadequate. Moreover, some historians who have dealt with Shāh Ismā'īl's life have deliberately said nothing disparaging about him. This is not an objective way of writing history, and is far from the aim of any realistic
appraisal of the truth.

The primary sources used in the preparation of this study have not been researched properly by others. Their contents have not been used in any modern work on his life although they contain a wealth of information of which the significance and importance for the life and personal qualities of the Safawid founder are immeasurable.

My main motive for dwelling critically on his personal qualities is to show Shah Isma`īl I, as he was, and not the way that he has been described to Iranians by modern scholars. Therefore this dissertation will not satisfy those who intend to obtain information about his campaigns, foreign policy and so on. It will, however, give clear evidence and information about his personal qualities and the way he established Twelver Shi'ism in Iran, which has continued for centuries and still is strong and powerful.
CHAPTER I

THE LIFE OF ŞAH İSMA'İL I

(ASPECTS OF HIS MONARCHY FROM HIS BIRTH TO HIS ACCESSION)
PART ONE

I. The Lineage of Shāh Ismāʻīl I.

On Tuesday morning the 25th Rajab 892/17th July 1487, Mahd 'Ulyā known as 'Ālam Shāh Baygum (her Christian name was Marta), the Christian wife of Shaikh (or Sulṭān) Ḥaydar, daughter of Despina Khātūn (the Christian wife of Ḥasan Beg Āq-qoyūnlū), gave birth to a child named Ismāʻīl Mirzā, in Ardabil, the major centre of the Šafawīd family.¹

Popular belief had it that this child's birth was the result of Sultan Haydar's loyal prayers to God. Although he already had several sons, he could see the chance of an auspicious monarchy in one of their fortunes. So he entreated God in His mercy to give him a son who could be his successor. The answer to his prayers was Ismāʿīl Mīrzā who was born with Scorpio in the ascendant, which conformed to the lucky star of the first Imam (of the Shi'ites) namely: Imam 'Ali b. Abī Ṭalib, the fourth caliph and the son-in-law of the Prophet Muḥammad.1 Sultan Haydar spent his time training him and treated him differently from his other sons, according him special respect and honour and making him his crown-prince.2 Ismāʿīl was given the kunya Abu’l-Muẓaffar and he also earned the title Ṣāḥib Qīrān.3

1. Rawdat al-Ṣafawiyya, f. 18b.
2. Ibid. It should be added that Ṣāḥib Ismāʿīl was a year old when his father was killed.
According to the author of *Tarikh-IIchI-yi Nizăm Shāh*, on the day Ismā'īl was born, Sultān Ḥaydar asked about his state of health. He was told that at the time of his birth, his fists were clenched and covered with blood.¹

This meant that he would be very brave and that his shedding of blood² and his cruelty would reach such a degree that during his reign, blood-thirsty Bahrām would hide himself under the tent of Nāḥīd.³ In fact, according

1. *IlchI*, 3a. Cf. *Nusakh-i Jahān-ārā*, f. 200a; cf. Angiolello, *op. cit.*, p. 103 where the author quotes a different version which runs as follows: "Ismaēl was a fiery, brave and courteous youth... This Ismaēl, when he was born, issued from his mother's womb with fists clenched and covered with blood: a remarkable fact, and when his father saw him, he said, "Surely he will grow up a bad man"; and agreed with his mother that he should not be reared; but God disposed otherwise, as when they sent him away to be put to death, those who were charged with the deed, touched by his beauty, had pity on him and brought him up. After three years, the boy giving great promise, they determined to show him to his father, and when an opportunity occurred they placed him before him, and when he, being taken with him, asked who he was, they told him he was his son, at which he was delighted, and received him with great show of affection."

2. *IlchI*, 3a. The author states "بسمه لعی پرونده سبیل دیه "بسمه لعی بیهوره سبیل دیه "بسمه لعی بوهست ودی" "بسمه لعی بوهست ودی" بسمه لعی بوهست ودی "بسمه لعی بوهست ودی" "بسمه لعی بوهست ودی" "بسمه لعی بوهست ودی"

3. Bahrām in Persian legend represents the planet Mars or an Angel and is similar to *warahrzm* or *wahrām*. Nāḥīd or Zuhra (Venus) is the nearest star to the earth which appears before sunrise or at sunset. See *'Amīd, Persian Dictionary*, p. 291.
to the author, that prediction was accurate and was fulfilled during his reign.¹

The author of the Tārīkh-Jahān-ārā is amazed that the date of Shāh Ismā'īl's birthday written out in words, according to abjad, corresponds to the words "the rise of Shāh Ismā'īl's luminary", or in Persian طلوع زرتشت اسماعیل. Both may be calculated with the result 906-1500.²

1. Ilchī, f. 3a.

It is noteworthy that Shaikh Bāll Efendī, a contemporary writer, gives a completely different account of the birth of Shāh Ismā'īl I. He states that after his father's death Sultan Ḥaydar "wandered drunk in the streets strumming his Ṭambūra. The person who at that time was sultan [Sultān Khālīl or Yaʿqūb] had a widowed sister who did not enjoy a good name or good manners. By chance they fell in love, the pregnancy of the young woman became evident, and everybody knew that the cause of it was this young man. This was an undeserved shame for all the chiefs and nobles. Consequently they married and sent him with his wife to Ardabīl."


It would appear that the above statement is not correct but libellous as Ḥaydar and Marta were married by Ḥasan Beg before his death. This account however, indicates that it was Sultan Khālīl or Yaʿqūb who had to give their sister to Ḥaydar. See Ḥabīb, p. 430, Rawḍat al-Ṣafawīyya, f. 18b, Fārsnāma, p. 84, Hinz/Jahandari, p. 88, where all agree that Ḥalīma Khātūn was the full sister of Mīrzā Maqṣūd Beg, the father of Mīrzā Rustam Beg. Cf. Caterino Zeno, "Travels in
Shāh Ismā'īl I was the son of Sultān Ḥaydar (who died in 893/1487), who was the elder son of Sultān Junaid (died in 860/1455) and grandchild of Shaikh Ṣafī al-Dīn Isḥāq Ardabilī (died in 735/1334). Shāh Ismā'īl's lineage, thus, as is well known, stretched back to the famous gnostic Shaikh Ṣafī, the descendant of the seventh Imām Mūsā al-Kāẓim, the Shī'ite Imām, as is shown by the following genealogical list:


Persia", ed. and translated by C. Grey, p. 42.

However, the date 906/1501 represents the establishment of Shī'ism in Shīrvān and the rise of Shāh Ismā'īl and his ascent to the throne of Shīrvān.


M. M. Mazzaoui, The Origins of the Ṣafavids, (Wiesbaden, 1972), p. 51, where by mistake he calls Imām Mūsā al-Kāẓim "The sixth Imam". Imām Mūsā al-Kāẓim was in fact the son of the sixth Imām, Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq. He was born on 7th Ṣafar 128/744 and was poisoned and martyred in prison in 183/798.


1. Ghulām Sarwar, writes in his work: "Fīruz Shāh-i-Zarrīn Kulān was the custodian of the shrine of Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm at Mashhad..." while the real site of this shrine is at Kāzimayn in Iraq. Unfortunately, Minorsky, in his review of this book, does not correct this mistake cf. B.S.O. S. vol. x, 1940-42, pp. 1026-1027); Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 18.

2. Ibn Bazzāz, known as Darwīsh Tawkullū, Ṣafwat al-Ṣafā, f. 118-b. The MS. is in Manchester Mic. Rylands

Turkish MS. no. 71), unintelligible. On this folio there is a story by Shaikh Ṣadr al-Dīn about the relationship between their family and that of the Prophet:

"سلطان مشاهنة في العاليم شهد سراجاً دينيًّاكم: حضرت قبر الله مسياً وردور ملككم: "تَبَيَّنْ بِسُبُكرَ دِي سَيَادَتْ وَلِيّ..."

Kasrawī, however, believes that the Ṣafawīds were not Sayyids and that Shāh Ismā‘īl was never proud of his Slyādat. He writes as follows:

"بأصل مان نحن نحن نحن نحن نحن نحن نحن نحن في نحن نحن نحن نحن نحن نحن نحن نحن نحن نحن نحن نحن نحن نحن نحن نحن...""

For a detailed discussion on the attitude of Shāh Ismā‘īl towards being a Sayyid see chapter VI, pp. 405-9.
II. The Lineage of Shāh Ismaʿīl I on His Mother's Side.

Marta (or Martha), who was known either as ʿĀlam Shāh Baygum or ʿĀlam Shāh Khatūn, was the daughter of Hasan Beg Aq-qoyunlu, the powerful king of the Turkomān tribe of Aq-qoyunlu (died 882/1478). Marta's mother, who was a Christian, was named Kyra Katrinka, or Despina Khatūn,


It should be noted that several pedigrees are given in different histories with numerous variations. To avoid mentioning all of them here, only the sources and pages are cited here: Ṣafwat, f. 11a-b; Ḥabīb, p. 409; Ḥahān-ārā, p. 258; Lubb, p. 235; Browne, "Silsilatuʿn-Nasab," p. 397; Add. 200, (Cambridge University library), ff. 1-13; Ḥahān Gushā, f. 2b; ʿĀ. ʿĀ. Shāh Ismaʿīl, pp. 1-14; Rawdat al-Ṣafawiyya, f. 1-18b. Aḥsan, pp. 487-8; ʿĀ. ʿĀ. Abbāsī (Edinburgh U.L. Mss. nos. 240 and 84, is unpaginated. Ms. no. 240 is an invaluable and well written source); ʿAbbās-nāma, p. 16; Rawdat al-Ṣafā-yi Naṣirī, vol. viii (Teh. 1270), p. 2; Tārikh-Inqilāb-Islām, pp. 5-20.


and she was the daughter of Kalo Ioannes of the noble family of the Comneni, the last emperor of Trebizond (died in 862-3/1458).¹

Iranian writers generally call Shāh Ismā'īl's mother 'Ālam Shāh Baygum or alternatively, Ḥalīma Bagī Ḥqā. In fact this latter was the name that the Āq-qoyūnlū Turkomāns and the Ṣafawīd family gave to her as a result of their religious convictions. 'Ālam Shāh Baygum, also known as Marta, was the daughter of Despina Khātūn, who married Ḥasan Beg in 862-3/1458.² Since her father had died in that year, she was sent on her uncle's advice to Diyar Bakr and thereafter she became known by her Greco-Turkish

². Hinz/Jahāndārī, p. 42.
name, Despina Khatūn, and managed to exert a strong influence in that province.¹ The offspring of this marriage was a son called Maqṣūd Beg (born in 864/1460) and three daughters, the eldest of whom was named Marta. She was almost the same age as Ḫaydar and married him in a formal ceremony at Ardabil. This would appear to have occurred in the last years of Ḥasan Beg's rule, since Shaikh Ḫaydar was less than 18 years old at Ḥasan Beg's death in 882/1478.²

This marriage produced three sons: Sultan 'Ali Mirzâ, Ibrāhîm Mirzâ and Ismā'îl Mirzâ. Nothing is known about the date of death or exact burial place of the mother of Shāh Ismā'îl. It would appear that she was very old and frail. When Ibrāhîm Mirzâ wished to travel from Lāhījān to Ardabil to see her some time before 905/1499 and he asked his brother Ismā'îl's permission to go, Ismā'îl Mirzâ replied: "My dear brother, do not break our hearts

². Cf. Browne, op. cit., iv, 407; Hinz/ Jahāndārī, p. 88; Rawḍat al-Ṣafawiyya, f. 18b; Fārs-nāma, p. 84, where all agree that Shāh Ismā'îl's mother Ḥalîma Khatūm (Marta) was the full sister of Maqṣūd Beg who was suffocated by Sultan Khalīl his stepbrother.
and be merciful to our frail old mother."¹

¹ Habib, on page 442, confirms that Ibrāhīm Mirzā went to Ardabīl:

"وبينك أرمستością إبراهين، وعلى هيئة تولت كنوزادن ردارود، تركت جهره يا راما رودان، أن ورسويا، أرز مورخشنه وديصبرناره في زرنلة في قر يرار مبارك نازاره..."

For more details on Ibrāhīm Mirzā's arrival in Ardabīl see 'A.A. Shah Isma'il, p. 37.

Despite this statement by the above authors, which clearly indicates that Ibrāhīm Mirzā went to Ardabīl and was well received by the Sūfīs and his mother secretly, Mazzaoui makes his interpretation on the basis of a misunderstanding of the word "Dāstūr". He says: "In Gilān, the two Šafavī princes, Ismā'īl and Ibrāhīm, were well-received. (After a few months Ibrāhīm either defected or went back to Ardabīl as a hostage)."

Thus, Mazzaoui gives two alternative translations for "Dāstūr", both of which are wrong. The word means neither "to defect" nor "hostage", but in this particular place means: model, fashion and manner.


Cf. Hinz, Irans Aufstieg zum Nationalstaat, (Berlin 1936), p. 86, where the author makes the mistake of naming Khadīja Baygum, Junaid's wife, as Marta's mother.

The German text runs as follows:
"Er selbst war wie einst Abū Sa'īd und sein Vater Uzun Hasan im Šafavīdenischen Ordensheiligtum abgestiegen, wo Chadīdscha und ihre Tochter Marta die Scheichsöhne 'Alī, Isma'īl und Ibrāhīm betreuten." Jahāndār does not notice this mistake in his translation, p. 105.

The above statement gives the impression that Marta had settled in Ardabīl after Ḥaydar's death, and that she definitely died and was buried there.
It is significant to note here that information exists about the death of Marta's mother, the Lady Despina, and her exact burial place. The Venetian merchant states that:

"She always celebrated the Eucharist according to the Christian custom while she lived with Ussun Cassano (Hasan Beg), which she did a long time, and always in observance of our faith. She had her chapel in a separate place, saying her prayers there whenever it pleased her. This Lady had four children: the eldest was Assambei, the others were daughters, two of whom are still alive, and Christians."

From the last part of this statement which probably dates from 913/1507 it may be assumed that Shāh Ismā'īl's mother Marta remained Christian until her death.

The only other information available on Despina Khātūn is to be found in the writings of Katrino Zeno,

1. As is generally known, Maqṣūd Beg was the only son that Despina had. Unfortunately Grey does not correct this mistake. See "Travels of a Merchant in Persia", p. 179.

2. Ibid. Cf. Minorsky, "The Middle East in Western Politics, in the 13th, 15th and 16th Centuries", in *J.R.C.A.S.*, XXVII (1940), p. 442, where the author states his belief that:

"As a sort of recognition of his title (Uzūn Hasan) to distinction, Uzun Hasan received the hand of the Princess Kyra Katerina, known to European travellers under the Byzantine title of Despina ('Lady')."

This marriage took place in 862/1458.


Hasan Beg's brother-in-law, in which the author states:

"Despina had already been separated from her husband, and lived on the confines of Riarbera (Diyar Bakr), in the city of Cavalleria (Kharput), where she died, and was buried in the town in the church of St. George, where even to this day her sepulchre is greatly honoured. Ussun Cassano had three daughters by her: the first, named Marta, was married to Secheaidare, (Shaikh Haydar) ruler of Ardauíl (Ardabil) a town towards the north east, three days' journey distant from Tauris (Tabriz)."

Most early writers omit to mention the real ethnic origins of Šáh Ismá'īl. It would appear that this omission was deliberate. What were Šáh Ismá'īl's motives in severing the hand of the Ottoman Empire from the territories of Iran, and in founding the Šafawid dynasty? It would be erroneous and the result of modern nationalist fanaticism if it were argued that Šáh Ismá'īl was spurred on by patriotism and desire to revive the greatness and power of ancient Iran and to found a single government based on nationalism, as Falsafi says. Šáh Ismá'īl knew himself to be a Sayyid descended from 'Alī's sons on his father's side and was proud of his pedigree.

3. The evidence of the religious poetry attributed to him and his letter addressed to Shaibak Khan, mentioned in chapter VI support the opposite view, as Kasrawī has mentioned before. See chapter VI, pp. 398-9.
On his mother's side, he was the grandchild of Ḥasan Beg Āq-qoyūnlū and a legitimate successor to that family after the male children of Ḥasan Beg. If this mixed lineage is to be accepted it is clear that there was very little Iranian blood in his veins. His followers and partisans were mostly from Turkomān tribes or Tātārs, who paid little attention and laid little store by the Persian race or its language, which even Shāh Ismā'īl had to learn in Lāhijān.

Similarly, it is clearly absurd to postulate that Shāh Ismā'īl was of pure Turkish origin. To assess the


statements of the historians who say he was a noble Turk, it is essential to study his ancestors as far back as possible. It will be observed that a great deal of Shāh Ismā‘īl's blood was not Turkish either.¹ According to Hinz, he was half Greek on his maternal side and inherited a little Greek blood on his paternal side too. His maternal grandfather was Greek. His paternal grandmother (who was the sister of Hasan Beg, namely Khādīja Baygum) was the daughter of an Aramaean Christian and her grandmother and great-grandmother were Trapezuntine princesses.²

The following genealogical tree would seem therefore to indicate that Shāh Ismā‘īl, who is celebrated as a national hero by Azarbāyjānī writers and poets and at the same time as the "re-creator of Iranian nationality," was neither pure Turk nor pure Iranian.³

---

². Ibid.
Sháh Ismá‘îl’s maternal ancestors were as follows:¹

¹ Hinz, p. 74.
PART TWO

I. Sultan Junaid's Attempts to Wrest Power for the Safavid Dynasty:

The coming to power of Shaikh Junaid marked a turning point for the Safavid family. It was at this moment that the religious leadership of the Safavid shaikhs was transformed into political and territorial ambitions too. Shaikh Junaid possessed the necessary qualities of intellect and political skill for this crucial task.

Of course, the support given already to the Safavid shaikhs by Ilkhanid rulers should not be overlooked. Before Sultan Junaid, the Safavid shaikhs had enjoyed a friendly relationship with the kings and powerful men of their period. In fact the sympathetic attitude of the famous vizier Khwaja Rashid al-Din Faqi al Allah (put to death in 1318 A.D.) towards the religious propaganda of the Safavid shaikhs, especially Shaikh Safi al-Din Ishaq, or Timur's forgiveness and alleged admiration of

1. The concern shown by Rashid al-Din Faqi al Allah is quoted by Muhammad Shafi, from the very rare collection of Rashid al-Din's letters known as the Munsha sahat Rashid, edited by Muhammad Shafi (Lahore, 1945), pp. 265-273. He offered to Shaikh Safi's monastery a yearly gift, providing that he use it on the anniversary of the Prophet's birthday and for the writer and benefactor. The Persian text
Khwāja 'Alī and Ahmad Jalāyir's favour towards Shaikh Sadr al-Din, played an important role in the advancement of Şafawīd success as a religious ideology.

runs as follows:

See also Şafwat al-Şafa, f. 35b; Kasrawī, Shaikh Şafi, pp. 10-11; Jahan-ārā, p. 260; Tarbiyat, Dānishmandān, pp. 231-5; Minorsky, "The Middle East " pp. 449-50; and Browne, op. cit., iv, pp. 33-4.

1. As is generally known, it was Khwāja 'Alī who was favoured by Tīmūr in having the Rumlū prisoners freed. See Jahan Gusha ff. 11b-12b, Browne, "Note on Apparently Unique Manuscript History of the Safawī Dynasty of Persia" in J.R.A.S. (1921) pp. 408-9 and ʿĀ.ʿAbbāsī, p. 12.


3. On this see the interesting remarks of M.M. Mazzaoui, op. cit., pp. 3, 22, 38 and 46.
After the death of his father, Shaikh Ibrāhīm (celebrated as Shaikh Sāh (851/1447-8)) Shaikh Junaid began to act as leader in Ardabīl and this made his learned and envious uncle, Shaikh Jāfar, angry that he had not been chosen as successor. (Shaikh Junaid was appointed as his father's spiritual successor from amongst his six brothers.) His uncle, Shaikh Jāfar, was put in charge of him until he should reach puberty. As Shaikh Junaid was a controversial man, he changed the secret teaching of his Tariqa which had already claimed to be Shi‘ite in the period of Khwāja ‘All. With Junaid, the doctrines became more extreme and were translated into direct political action. Then he gradually gathered many disciples till his army

1. Browne (op. cit., IV, p. 47) states that Shaikh Ibrāhīm "is even omitted entirely in the succession by the 'Ā.A. 'AbbāsI," but according to 'Ā.A. 'AbbāsI (Tehran 1314), pp. 5 and 13, and Edinburgh U. Ms. no. 240, f9r, his story and life is recorded fully in twelve lines and his succession is also mentioned on page 5, and it seems that Browne has made a mistake.

2. See Hinz/JāhāndārI, p. 162, where Hinz gives his genealogical tree.


4. See 'Ā.A. Shāh Ismā'Il, p. 14, where the author states: Shaikh ṢafI used to have secret teaching too. The Persian text runs:

"و همین نیازی نبود که ترغیب مورد می‌رود. فرد را فرد می‌کرد، دم ترغیب مورد نیز، رنگ نیز، هم لازم نبود..."
reached 10,000 according to some sources and 20,000 according to others.\footnote{1}{The fact that a large number of disciples joined this new powerful spiritual leader made Jahān Shāh very anxious for his own safety.} Since Shaikh Junaid had become a committed and zealous Shī'a missionary, Jahān Shāh had nothing to do with him, but to control his daily increasing power and to give him an ultimatum that he was the king and not Junaid. Jahān Shāh wrote a threatening letter to Shaikh Jāfar and advised him to block Shaikh Junaid's actions.

Very valuable information on this subject appears in \textit{'Ālam-ārā-yi Shāh Ismā'īl}. According to this source Jahān Shāh became so worried about Junaid's daily increasing power that he wrote to him:

"When my letter reaches you, you must remove people from yourself and your spiritual guidance and stay alone. I do not feel safe in relation to you and your Sūfīs, since they may incite you to rebel and to desire sovereignty. In my opinion, if a problem can be solved simply, why should it cost the shedding of the blood of innocent people, and the destroying of thousands of lives? If you do not accept my advice and do not do as you are told, I certainly will succeed in destroying you and your devotees."\footnote{2}{Ibid., pp. 22-23.}

According to \textit{'Ālam-ārā-yi Shāh Ismā'īl}, Shaikh Junaid gathered his disciples together to solve the problem and after a long discussion and consultation he decided to answer Jahān Shāh's letter. He wrote in the following

\begin{itemize}
  \item[1.] \cite{1}{\textit{A. A. Shāh Ismā'īl}, pp. 24-25.}
  \item[2.] ibid., pp. 22-23.
\end{itemize}
-20-

terms:

"It should not be hidden from the world-illuminating king of Iran that apparently your mind is ill and in trouble because of Shaikh Šafī's children. You should banish this temptation from your mind and heart. Satan is deceiving you because I am in a corner of my ancestor's resting place and together with my devotees, I am praying to God. I have never had the desire to rebel or conquer. If your astronomers have frightened you because of a rebellion from Shaikh Šafī's children, I am not such a rebel. Such a rebel may come from my children or grandchildren. And if the will of God is such that a rebellion should arise from Shaikh Šafī's children, the whole world will not be able to prevent it. So, be relaxed and sure. Leave us by ourselves, because I seek no enmity with you. Be sure of our honesty and afraid of God's punishment. Now, you know what is best."

After two years had passed from the first ultimatum the author of 'Ālam-ārā-yi Šāh Ismā'īl says enemies of Junaid told Jahān Šāh that the number of Šūfīs were increasing every day, and if they ever wanted to rebel against the king, their number could amount to about 20,000 men in Ardabīl alone. They went on to say that from the west to the borders of Balkh and Būkhārā, there were many devotees of Shaikh Šafī's children. The king, Jahān Šāh, became afraid of Junaid and wrote a second letter saying:

"We forbade you (to continue your activities) but you refused to do so. It seems to me that there is great pleasure in your heart. Anyway, make preparations, depart from my realm; otherwise I will come not only to destroy Ardabīl, but also to perform full-scale massacre." 2

1. 'Ā.Ā. Šāh Ismā'īl, p. 23.
2. Ibid.
Since Shaikh Jāfar benefited in two ways by this letter he willingly handed it to Shaikh Junaid and for the sake of his ancestral resting place and his life Junaid left Ardabil.¹

II. Shaikh Junaid after his Expulsion from Ardabil

It seems that after his expulsion Shaikh Junaid deliberately chose to live in Anatolia, since he knew that Shi‘ite leanings existed among some Ottoman subjects. "He felt that a wider scope for his enterprise would open with his own move in the same direction."² But his religious activities aroused the suspicion of Sultān Murād II (1403-4/1551)³ who was the patron of Sufis and darwīshes and on the advice of his minister, Khalīl Pāshā, he sent gifts to Shaikh Junaid and asked


him to leave his territories at once. However, Shaikh Junaid received similar treatment in other territories, including Egypt, till he took refuge with Hasan Beg Āq-qoyūnlū in Diyār Bakr.

Shaikh Junaid, who was now disappointed and frustrated, decided to try his last chance by joining the enemy of his enemy, namely Hasan-Beg who also wished to destroy Jahān Shāh the Qara-qoyūnlū. Junaid set out for Diyār Bakr to meet Hasan Beg. Hasan Beg, who was nick-named "Uzūn Ḥasan", because of his huge body, had ruled in Diyār Bakr since 858/1453, and his territories were increasing day by day. Since Hasan Beg was a patron of all darwishes, regardless of their particular beliefs, and was not a religious zealot himself, he welcomed Junaid warmly. As soon as he heard of Junaid's coming, he ordered his commanders and scholars, dignitaries and other great amirs to go to meet Junaid respectfully, when he was two days distance away. And he himself personally went to see him when he was one day away.

2. For more details on Junaid's activities before his arrival in Diyār Bakr see pp. 23-37 of Hinz/Jahandarī or Hinz (German Text), pp. 25-32.
3. 'Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 24; cf. Hinz/Jahandarī, p. 37; 'Ā. A. 'Abbāsi, p. 13. The Persian text on Junaid's arrival in Diyār Bakr runs in 'Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 24, as follows:

"فزه کردن، اعدام سنگینیان باز بود. روز، در سفر بود. بگیرید و خود بگیرید. بنده از کنار بود. بنده و همگی را در بابل کردند و روزانی را دیدند، بگیرید و سلطان آن سال همیان را رودید..."
Shaikh Junaid stayed in Amid, the capital city of Diyār Bakr, for three years, and Hasan Beg gave them good positions. Junaid seized the opportunity, and although he already had a wife, he asked for the hand in marriage of Hasan Beg's sister, Khadīja Baygī ʿAqā.

Finally Hasan Beg agreed and his sister was officially married to Junaid about 862/1458 or at the latest in 863/1459.

Shaikh Junaid, who experienced no difficulties in spreading his ideology in Amid and its districts, studied the political events and in particular the social unrest in Iran. His position in Amid allowed him to send out spies to Iran and to keep himself well-informed. With Hasan Beg's agreement, he sent some of his messengers to nearby countries and all the provinces which were under Hasan Beg's control, to gather new

---

followers. When he had succeeded in gathering more followers, he returned to Ardabil in 864/1559. Thereafter, he left Ardabil for the third time, and set out to conduct a raid into Circassian territory as a jihād (holy war). At the instigation of Shaikh Jāfar, (Junaid's uncle), and with the help of Abu'l-Ma'sūm Khān the amīr of Ṭabarsarān and Jahān Shāh's auxiliary forces, Sūltān Khalīl, king of Shīrīvān, succeeded in murdering Junāid on his way back to Āzarbāyjān after the raid on Circassia. He was killed in the Qara Sū valley to the west of the Albūrz, on Thursday 21 Jumādā I 894/14th March 1460. According to the author of 'Ālam-ārā-yi 'Abbāsī, he was buried at a village called Qūryān in the Ṭabarsarān area.

The author of 'Ālam-ārā-yi 'Abbāsī, who is the only Shi'ite historian who talks frankly about the exact place of Shaikh Junāid's grave, states:

"According to the custodians of Shaikh Šafī's resting-place, after the death of Shaikh Junāid a few Ṭabarsarānians

2. Ibid.
3. Hinz/Jahāndārī, p. 53; Rūzbihān/Minorsky, pp. 64-65, where Minorsky, according to Bakikhanov, gives "Qulhan" now called "Hadrā". Cf. 'Ā.Ā. 'Abbāsī, Edinburgh U.L. Ms. no. 240, under Junāid; Ḥabīb, p. 426, and 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 25."
who were always Safawid devotees and faithful to them, took his body from the battlefield and buried him in Qūryān near that battlefield."

He goes on to say:

"The reason why the author of Ḥabīb al-Siyar did not mention his exact burial place was because his corpse was not secure and had to be kept a secret to all." ¹

No doubt the enemy would have dismembered his body, as they had already dishonoured his head. ²

1. This statement only appears in f. 10a (or p. 10) of ʿĀ.Ā. Ābbāsī, Edinburgh U.L. Ms. no. 240, and I have not seen it in any other similar work or copy. Cf. ʿĀ.Ā. Ābbāsī, p.14; Amīr Kabīr edition, p.18.

2. See Rūzbihān/Minorsky, pp. 64-65, where Rūzbihān Khunji states:

"But finally victory was with the banner of Sharvān, and the head of Junaid, for which the basin (ṭās) of the green vault (gunbad-i khaḍrā) would not suffice, was placed in a vessel before the amīr."

However, the above burial place is variously called "Qūryān", "Qūrbāl" "Quryal" and "Qudiyal". Cf. Browne, op. cit., p. 47; Minorsky, review of W.Hinz's _Irans Auf stieg zum Nationalstaat_ , in B.S.O. S. Vol. IX, 1937-39, p. 243.
PART THREE

I. The Āq-qoyūnlū and Qara-qoyūnlū Turkmāns and Their Origins.

Before discussing the origin\(^1\) of these two Turkoman tribal federations, and their policy towards the Šafawīd shaikhs, it seems appropriate to consider briefly Iran and its condition before the 10th/16th century.

In 857/1453 the Ottoman Sulṭān, Mehmed II, conquered Constantinople, and brought to an end the thousand year old Byzantine Empire, replacing it by a powerful state, whose expansionist ambitions aimed at the entire Islamic world.\(^2\)

The Ottoman Turks, after conquering all of Asia Minor, took Syria, Palestine and the eastern Mediterranean

---

1. It is believed that these Turkoman federations lived in the far east between the Tigris and the main area of Lake Van. Their tribal names are common among the Turkmāns and most probably refer to the kind of herds belonging to the tribes. For more details see Minorsky, "The Middle East", p. 440. Cf. C.E. Bosworth, "The Political and Dynastic History of the Iranian World (A.D.1000-1217)" in Cambridge History of Iran, vol.V., pp.1-10.

coast. After annexing the Balkans, they turned their eyes towards Iran. Anyone who opposed the Ottomans was dubbed by them an infidel (Mahdūr al-Dam).¹ This aggressively expanding state was now Iran's immediate neighbour to the west.

Further afield in 15th century Europe, Spain and Portugal were the greatest imperial countries and their soldiers and sailors annexed many hitherto unknown lands in the names of their kings. This challenge created a major problem which Pope Martin V tried to solve in 833-4/1430 by dividing the world into two hemispheres. He issued a papal decree by which the Western hemisphere was granted to the king of Spain and the Eastern hemisphere to the king of Portugal.² After his division the south of Iran witnessed the arrival of troops and ships from Portugal whose presence was intended to distract the Ottoman empire in the East and consequently to prevent their advance in Europe.³

During these dark times, two tribes of Turkomans, the Āq-qoyūnlū and the rival Qara-qoyūnlū, were disputing control of Iran.⁴

---

2. Ibid.
4. Mahdawi, op. cit., p. 11. For the ambitions of the Ottoman Sultāns towards Iran cf. also Inqilāb-Islām, pp. 53-55; Modern Iran, p. 53.
The original centre of Qara-qoyunlû activity seems to have been at Arjîsh, on the northern bank of Lake Van, while the home of the Aq-qoyunlû was in Diyar Bakr in upper Mesopotamia. Probably they had settled in that area before the coming of the Qara-qoyunlû and the period of Timûr. ¹


It should be noted here that the founder of the Aq-qoyunlû was Bâyundur and the founder of the Qara-qoyunlû was Hârânî (see Rawdat al-Şafâ, old ed., vol. VII). The latter confederation probably occupied their territories at the time of the Saljûk invasion and their religion was Shi'ite (see A.Kasrawî, Musha'isha'iyan, (Teh., 3rd ed., 2536) pp. 26-27) while their rivals the Aq-qoyunlû were Sunnî (Minorsky, "The Middle East p.440: "The Aq-qoyunlu naturally turned northwards and westwards, and so were bound to come to grips with the Ottomans. They therefore hailed Timur as a great ally."


The Qara-qoyunlû were expanding eastwards and their chief struggles were with the Timûrids. "They made efforts to establish friendly relations with the Ottoman Turks, but judging by Ottoman sources, the Turks treated the Qara-qoyunlu with some reserve and suspicion because their beliefs
The greatest of the Āq-qoyūnlū rulers, Ḥasan Beg (known in the sources as Ḥasan Pādīshāh or Ḥasan Beg or Uzūn Ḥasan and in the European sources as "Ussun Cassano") ruled in Āzarbāyjān, Armenia, Mesopotamia and most of Persia between 872 and 882/1467 and 1478.2

In order to clarify the rise of the Āq-qoyūnlū and their links with the Šafawīds, it may be useful to give a brief introduction to this most powerful man of the Āq-qoyūnlū confederation who gave shelter to certain members of the Šafawīd family; namely Shaikh Junaid and Shaikh Ḥaydar.

II. Ḥasan Beg.

The most famous individual of his line who was to become ruler of most of Iran, was Ḥasan Beg (died 882/1478).3 He is provided in the favourable sources with and way of life seemed tinged with heresy " (Minorsky, Jīhān-Shāh, p. 273). Cf. Inqūāb- Islām, pp. 61-3. The author gives valuable information on these Turkomans' origin.


2. Hinz/Jahāndārī, pp.81-2, where he notes Ḥasan Beg's death at the age of 54 in 882/1478 and that he was buried in the Madrasa-yi Naṣīriyya in Tabrīz.

3. Hinz/Jahāndārī, p.82 .
a genealogical line going back to Adam. Of course, one cannot accept such genealogies, but they are interesting in that they betray an aspect of the mentality of the historian who produced such work. The line thus presented can, however, be regarded as having some validity for the more immediate ancestors of Ḥasan Beg, details of whom would certainly be known to many contemporaries.¹ He was

1. Abū Bakr· Tehrānī gives this genealogy which appears thus:


However, Ghaffārī omits forty names mentioned by Abū Bakr between خون خان and Adam.

For more details see Kitāb-i Dīyār Bakriyya, pp. 1-34, Jahān-ārā, p. 251, ‘A.A. ‘Abbāsī, (Edinburgh U.L. Ms. no. 240) f. 4b. This manuscript has a similar genealogy which goes back to Adam and agrees to some extent with the above-mentioned names.
the son of 'Ali Beg b. 'Uthmān Beg from the tribe of the Āq-qoyūnlū Turkomān. After the death of 'Ali Beg (died in 844/1441 in Shayzar) the power and territories of the Āq-qoyūnlū tribe fell into the hands of Jahāngīr Beg, the eldest brother of Ḥasan Beg. However, because of some disagreements, Jahāngīr left his brother and

1. Abū Bakr. Tehrānī, op. cit., vol. I, p. 168, cf. Hinz/Jahāndārī, p. 167, where he states that: "Uthmān Beg had seven sons; one of them named Bāyazīd died in the battle of Erzerum along with his father." He also adds "Bihiṣhtī (?) in his History writes: (f. 185b) 'Uthmān Beg had a son named Murād Beg.'"

According to Abū Bakr, who was a contemporary chronicler, 'Uthmān Beg's sons were: "'Ali Beg (died in 844/1441, see Hinz/Jahāndārī, p. 31) who was in Dīyār Bakr, Ḥamza Beg in Kamākh, Yaʿqūb Beg in Arzinjān and Māḥmūd Beg, Muḥammad Beg and Qāsim Beg" (op. cit., vol. I, p. 114.) Cf. Hinz/Jahāndārī, p. 167.

'Uthmān Beg died in Ṣafar 838/August 1434–5 in Erzerum as a result of being wounded by Iskandar, the son of Qara Yūsuf. For more details see Kitāb-i Dīyār Bakriyya, vol. I, p. 114; Jahān-ārā, (Tehran, 1342 Sh.) p. 191; Ḥasan Rūmlū, Ahsan, part 9, p. 48 and Hinz/Jahāndārī, p. 166. It should be mentioned that except for Abū Bakr, who gives the date 838/1434 for the death of 'Uthmān Beg, the other contemporary historians give 839/end of August 1435 for his death. Cf. the sources mentioned above.
took refuge with his rival, Jahān Shāh Qara-qoyūnlū, the powerful king of Iran, who appointed him as the ruler of Arzinjān in 857/1453. Jahāngīr was deposed by Ḥasan Beg in 857/1453 and finally beheaded by order of his brother on the Euphrates near Malāṭya. This occurred when Jahān Shāh was fighting against the Musha'sha'īyān of Southern Iran.

Jahān Shāh (the "Giansa" of the Venetian travellers) was himself killed by trickery at the hand of Ḥasan Beg

2. Kasrawī gives the date 858/1454 for this fighting. See Musha'sha'īyān, p. 27.
3. Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Lārī Anṣārī in his history called Mirāt al-Adwār wa Mirqāta l-Akhbār (B.M. Ms. Add. 7650, f. 220)

Cf. Kitāb-i Diyār Bakriyya, vol. II, p. 406, Nusakh-i Jahān-ārā f. 191a, where the author states that Ḥasan Beg had 6 to 7 thousand soldiers while the same work under the title of Jahān-ārā (Tehran publication) mentions six thousand soldiers (see p. 252 of the same work). The second figure is obviously more likely to be correct as Abū Bakr agrees with it (see Abu Bakr, p. 422, vol. II). and Yaḥyā Qazvīnī, Lubb, pp. 217-18.
on the 1\textsuperscript{st} Rab\textsuperscript{a} II, 872/30 Oct. 1467 and lost his crown and life in one day.\footnote{Hinz/Jahāndārī, p. 64; Lubb, pp. 217-18, says 3000 were killed. Cf. V. Minorsky, "Jihān-Shāh" p. 295.}

After overcoming Jahān Shāh and Abū Sa'īd in 873/1468-9,\footnote{Lubb, p. 220 where the author says: "3000 were killed. Cf. V. Minorsky, "Jihān-Shāh" p. 295.} Ḩasan Beg took tribute from Georgia and ruled over Diyār Bakr, Āzarbāyjān, the two 'Īraqs, Kirmān, Fārs, Kurdistan and Armenia.

According to Hinz, Ḩasan Beg attacked Georgia five times from 862/1458 to 881/1477, ostensibly waging a jihād.\footnote{Hinz/Jahāndārī, p. 57.}

---

1. Hinz/Jahāndārī, p. 64; Lubb, pp. 217-18, says 3000 were killed. Cf. V. Minorsky, "Jihān-Shāh" p. 295.

2. Lubb, p. 220 where the author says:

Cf. Abū Bakr Tehrānī, op.cit., vol. II, pp. 488-491 where Abū Bakr states:


III. Hasan Beg and His Policy in Accepting Shaikh Junaid as His Son-in-Law.

It seems that the obvious reason for Junaid being accepted in the capital of Diyār Bakr was the enmity between Hasan Beg and the powerful king of Iran, Jahān Šāh Qara-qoyūnlū, who had driven Junaid out of Ardabil because of his daily increasing power.

It has already been said that Hasan Beg, who was waiting for such an occasion and who was glad to find another powerful aid, sent out a welcoming envoy to Junaid as soon as he heard the news of Junaid approaching Amid. Accordingly he strengthened his alliance against Jahān Šāh and established a warm relationship with Junaid.

Hasan Beg was keen on a marriage alliance with Junaid, probably because of that Šafawīd shaikh's authority and spiritual influence over the people. So Hasan Beg followed the policy of previous kings and rulers who used to seek the help of influential spiritual leaders in consolidating and perpetuating their power. Therefore, he agreed to the marriage of Junaid to his sister Khadīja Baygī Āqā in order to derive benefit from Šafawīd spiritual influence, and to suppress his enemies,1 a task he completed by fulfilling the final marriage with Sultan Haydar after overcoming Jahān Šāh.

IV. Sultan Haydar's Marriage to Marta, Hasan Beg's Daughter, and His Character.

It is clear that Hasan Beg obtained great spiritual profit from Shaikh Junaid's marriage to his sister, and to cement this relationship he gave his daughter Marta to his nephew, Sultan Haydar, who was to assume the Safavid leadership at his father's death.¹

¹. Sultan Haydar was under Hasan Beg's guardianship till 873/1469, when Hasan Beg overthrew the Qaraqoyunlu dynasty by murdering Hasan 'Ali, son of Jahan Shâh, the last remaining ruler of the Qaraqoyunlu. [See Hinz/Jahandaeli, pp. 53-87].

According to the Inqûlab - Islâm, Jahan Shâh felt insecure and dissatisfied with Junaid's activities [See chapter I, p.19]. As a result of the spying initiated by Jahan Shâh, an ultimatum was given to Junaid that he should cease his activities or leave Ardabil.

Of course, Jahan Shâh's dissatisfaction resulted in the scattering of Haydar's devotees, most of whom became the disciples of Shaikh Ja'far and Haydar's enemies. For this reason, Haydar chose the solitary life. "Although his situation was ruined, he was still the light of Hasan Beg's eyes." [Inqûlab - Islâm, p. 18]. Hasan Beg knew very well that Haydar would be very helpful in any victory over Iran and Asia Minor. Therefore, according to the situation described above, when Hasan Beg destroyed Jahan Shâh in 872/1467, and after the death of Abu Sa'îd (873/1469), he claimed that this victory was the result of Haydar's experience, knowledge and understanding, not of his own. Therefore, his respect for Haydar increased and he gave his daughter 'Alam Shâh Baygum (Marta) to Haydar in marriage, see Inqûlab - Islâm, pp. 18-19.
Sultan Haydar was the man who "added the role of warrior to the profession of saint"¹ and tried to avenge his father's blood with great zeal. For this purpose he did his best to arm his family devotees and partisans during his enforced solitary life in Ardabil (after 874/1470). It was even said that his own sitting-room was changed into an arms depot.² In another tale, it was reported that he armed most of the people in Ardabil who were his devotees.³ A brief glance at 'Alam-ārā-yi 'Amin⁴ gives useful information on this subject. The author states:

"It is true that by nature he was a brave man and acquired great proficiency in archery and the use of the sword, the pike and the lasso, and in these arts would have put to shame Rustam and Afrāsiyāb (f. 141a). All his time was spent in physical exercises befitting a stalwart, and in the fashioning of arms for thrusting and cutting he was unique. I have heard that he made several thousand pikes, coats of mail, swords, and shields without any help from armourers, because he had made a vow to make them and because he wished to teach his adepts (murīd) as their leader (murshīd). When all these things were ready according to his wishes, innumerable crowds rallied round him - outwardly Sufis and murids, but inwardly rebellious demons (dīv-i marīd); he issued to them arms from his arsenal (qūr-khāna), and they were all obedient to him - youths, robust (jald) and warlike, sword-slashers in clever fighting (maṣāff-i-farhang).⁴

Hinz speaks of Sultan Haydar as a determined man who succeeded in changing the followers of the way of

---

3. Ibid.
4. Rūzbihān/Minorsky, p. 68.
the *darwīsh* into warlike people in a better way than his father, and in using them to reach his aim, which was to gather political influence and strength. The uniformed army known as the *Qīzīl-Bāsh* which was formed during his lifetime was a clever means by which he became able to show his influence and power to the rulers of Iran.¹

¹. Hinz/Jahandārī, p. 91.
PART FOUR

I. Sultan Haydar's Purpose in Forming the Qizil-bash.

It seems that Sultan Haydar realised that until he gathered the followers of his family and uniformed them, it would not be possible for the Safawi family to acquire political power. He was aware that by uniforming his devotees, he would be able to detect the differences between a faithful and loyal Sufi and an unreliable devotee. According to the traditional accounts, Sultan Haydar saw the Imam 'Ali in a dream, with the other Imams, advising him to separate a group of his own devotees in order to differentiate between Sufi and non-Sufi. When Haydar woke up, he thought that he should create clothes by which to distinguish his devotees from others. For this purpose according to the sign revealed to him in his dream by the Imams he created the Twelver crown (Tāj-i Dawāzdah Tarak) of woollen cloth (scarlet). 1

1. See Bustān al-Siyāha, p. 431 where the author says:

"سلطان جهانی در عالم واقع عرضت علی را سایری یافت دید که بیان می‌کند: 'ای فرزند لر، از جهت اشتباه خلقان از رسایل سرمان علی Cô می‌گشت و فریب می‌ماید و می‌گفته: ومنا فقی می‌خوای؟ و چیزی از دروپ بیاگرد در قسمت الأُم پر از دست را گرفت که از انحراف از عزیز خداوند تیره و متفاوت که این اشاره خیابانی را داشته، که را بر سرشار اسرار بر بی‌توجهی دادد."

See Bustān al-Siyāha, p. 431 where the author says:
Although the sources vary in detail about this dream, the main gist in all of them is similar. For example the *History of Shāh Ismā'īl* gives the following account:

"One night the prince of the throne of Guidance and Sanctity, that is to say the Commander of the Faithful ('Alī), upon whom be the prayers of God, appeared in a vision to Sultan Haidar and said to him: 'Oh my son, the time is now at hand when my child from among your descendants shall arise and sweep Infidelity from off the face of the earth. It now behoves you to fashion a hat for the Sufis and your disciples, and you must make it of scarlet cloth.' So saying, His sanctity cut out with a pair of scissors which he had in his hand a pattern of a hat with twelve triangular points or tarak. On awaking Sultan Haidar remembered the form, and having cut out a hat to that pattern, ordained that all the Sufis should make for themselves hats like it and wear them. They gave it the name of Taj-i Haidar or Haidar's crown; and as in the Turkish language "Kizil" or (Qizil) means scarlet, this holy body became known as the "Kizilbash" or "Red-Heads"."

---


I have changed the word "cap" into hat or crown since it seems that Ross with his rendering, "Haidar fashioned a cap with twelve points out of crimson cloth..." did not give the right translation. Cf. A. Houtum-Schindler, "Shāh Ismā'īl" in *JRAS*, 1897, pp. 114-117. The author believes that "cap" is "the so-called Shab kulāh."
However, there are differences among medieval and contemporary historians about the exact date of the appearance of this hat (crown). Some of them believe that Ḥasan Beg saw this hat, and received it gladly. He then ordered all his family to wear it. The only person who did not obey him was Sultān Yaqūb who after this event became hostile to Sultān Ḥaydar. Others say that this happened after Ḥasan Beg's death.

In any case, it would appear that there was a long legendary association of the colour red with the Ṣafawīd family. As the author of Inqilāb - Islām points out:

"Some of the historians say after Timūr's overcoming Yildirim Bāyazīd, he took captive some of the nations of Asia Minor and took them to Azarbāyjān, in order to send them to Turkestan. When the captives arrived in Azarbāyjān, they were sent to Shaikh Ṣadr al-Dīn's monastery to ask his forgiveness. Shaikh Ṣadr al-Dīn tore his red upper coat (cloak) and made it into small pieces. He then ordered the chiefs of each tribe to put those pieces on their hats to show that they were Ṣafawīd devotees. They did as he told them. When Timūr came to visit the shaikh, he said to Timūr: 'It is said that you have taken captive some of our devotees and

<references>
</references>
brought them here to be sent to Turkestan. They are the defenders of religion and the guardian of the Islamic borders. You shouldn’t scatter them from their mother-lands. It is necessary to have them as protectors of the borders against Ottoman invasions of the Muslims and to keep them out of danger. Amīr Timūr acted accordingly.1

It is even believed that the Qizil-Bash hat appeared at the time of Shāh Ismā’īl I. For instance, the author of Jahān Gushā-yi Khāqān points out that when Shāh Ismā’īl

1. Inqilāb – Islām, p. 11. Cf. Abū-Ḥasan b. Ibrāhīm Qazvīnī, Fawā id-i Ṣafawīyya, Edinburgh U.L. Ms. no. 86 (Maqāla -yi-Panjum ). The Persian text of Inqilāb– Islām appears as follows:

The Persian text of Inqilāb– Islām appears as follows:

crowned himself in Tabriz, a Sayyid from Tabriz named Mir 'Abd al-Wahhab presented him with a crown with a flower on it.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) The Persian text runs as follows: 

\[\text{Jāhān Gushā, ff. 76b-77a.}\]


He believes that the author of the above Ms. is Mullā Abū Bakr Tehranī. But as is generally known, there is no such book (Tārīkh-Jāhān-ārā) attributed to Abū Bakr, and I believe that Falsafi is referring to the Tārīkh-Jāhān-Gushā-yi Khāqān which has already been mentioned.

However, there was a similar term at the time of Shāh Ṭahmāsb I; the phrase Tāj-i Ḥaydar Ṭahmāsbī". See Dānishmandān, p. 124. Cf. A. Houtum-Schindler, op.cit., pp.114-17.

It should be noted here that Crowfoot states on the authority of Sir C. Wilson:

"The term Kizil bash (red-head) came into use during the rise of the Šafawi dynasty, which reigned over Persia for more than two hundred years
II. The Appearance of the Qizil-Bash Hat and Its Origin.

The basis of this crown was a hat made of red wool (felt carpet عَرْضُ) which was joined to a long red conical shape made of wool. This part of the hat, as a sign of the Twelve Imāms, had twelve folds or slits. Round the red hat, there was a white or green Turban made of wool or silk.¹

This particular hat with the twelve fold was called "Tāj-i Wahhāj" (flaming hat) or "Tāj-i Ḥaydarī".²

(1499-1722). It was used to distinguish the Persianised Turks, or Turkish Shi'as, who formed the ruling class and wore red caps, from their enemies the Sunni Turks and Tatars to the East, who wore green felt caps and were called "Yeşil-bash" (green-head). When the term was first used in Asia Minor I do not know, but I suppose it must have been after the campaign of Selim I in Persia (1514 ), when Shi'a Turks from Persia were settled in Asia Minor, apparently under the belief that they would eventually become Sunnis."


Its common name was "The Qizil Bash Crown".\(^1\)

"Qizil Bash" is a Turkish word, meaning "red-head". In Persian the term is used to denote the Turkish tribes who declared allegiance to Sultan Haydar and helped to further his ambitions. They were especially important to his son Shāh Ismā'īl I, the founder of the Șafawīd dynasty who established Twelver Shi'ism in Iran as the only state religion. It is believed that these Turkish tribes were called "Qizil Bash" because of their red hats.\(^2\)

Before the adoption of the red hat a Turkoman turban (Taqiya-yi Turkomānī) was worn from the time of Sultan Ḥaydar until the conquest of Tabrīz (907 /1500-1) by Shāh Ismā'īl I.\(^3\)

---

1. A. H. Nawā', Shāh Ismā'īl Șafawi (Teh. 1347 Sh.), p. 27, where the author quotes:

2. See Jahān Gusghā, f. 20b.


Cf. Denison Ross, op. cit., p. 288, where, by mistake, he translates "Parnākî head-dress (Tākiya)." It should be corrected to read: "Parnākî head-dress (Tākiya)."

There is a very interesting theory presented by Husain Masrūr, which discusses several important aspects of the whole issue of the Qızıl-Bāsh. According to Masrūr, this fashion appeared at the time of Sultan Ḥaydar and he points out that the phrase "Qızıl Bāsh" is the Turkish for "golden hat".

The title "golden crown" was given to the first powerful member of the Šafawīd family, Firūz Shāh Zarrīn Kulāh. According to many historians, past and present, Firūz Shāh was a great and powerful man of the Yaman, who set out for the districts of Mughān and Aṣrān and then moved to the area of Ardabil. It is said that Firūz Shāh's emigration from South Arabia to Āzarbāyjān occurred in 569-70/1174. And the reason why he settled

1. H. Masrūr, Dah nafar Qızıl-Bāsh, (Teh. 1335, Marjan publication), introduction.
2. Hinz/Jahandari, p. 161 (Appendix). Jahandari (according to Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Munajjīm Yāzdī in his Tarikh-ī Ḥabībī, f. 2b.) states:
in a village called Rangin, was because the place was suitable for his enormous herd. 1

According to the author of 'Alam-ara-yi Shah Isma'il, Firuz-Shah received his honorary title from Sultan Adham who visited Firuz-Shah and gave his golden crown to him and said: "I give you the title of Sultan Firuz-Stlah Zarrin Kulah." 2

Masrur argues that the titles "golden crown" and "golden shoes" were given in the past as marks of distinction and dignity to the sasanian kings of Iran. 3 Just as the phrase "Qizil-Ayaq" does not mean "golden foot" but "golden shoes" so too the words "Qizil-Bash" (according to Masrur) denote not "golden head" but "golden hat" or "golden crown." 4 Masrur concludes that Firuz Shāh might be a son of Firuz the king of the Sasanian dynasty who held the title "golden hat" in the Turkmans translated "Zarrin Kulah" into the Turkmenic "Qizil-Baş." The phrase, with its historical associations, was adopted by the Ṣafawids but modified to suit their own ends and given a "Twelver" slant at the right historical moment by the use of the phrase "Qizil-Baş." 5

2. 'A.A. Shah Isma'il, p. 2, where the Persian text runs: "..." where the Persian text runs: "..."
5. Kasravi believes that Snah Isma'il probably received his Shī'a belief from Lahijan. See his work, pp. 45-46. Cf. Petrushevsky/Kishawarz, Islam in Iran, p. 55.
folds: Taj-i Dawāzdaḥ Tarak.¹

Leaving aside the claims made by the Šafawīd family to being of the Prophet's descent, the Šafawīds, according to the analysis above, probably attached themselves for sound political reasons to the ancient kings of Iran in order to legitimize their aim to take over the country.² Their legitimization was therefore a two-pronged one. If their religious claims failed then there remained their links with the ancient Iranian past.

1. According to the author of Bustān al-Siyāḥa, the custom of having or wearing the Qızıl-Başh crown (hat) was current up to the last Šafawīd king, Sultan Ḥusayn. In his time, because of his negligence, the practice was interrupted for a while. Now (1247/1831) the name of "Qızıl-Başh" in Iran is very famous and in the speech of the people of Turān (Turkey) and India, anyone who is Shī' a and is from Iran, is called "Qızıl-Başh". In Rūm and Syria, practising Shī' a are called "Qızıl-Başh". In Iran everyone who is in the army is called Qızıl-Başh, and since at the beginning all these tribes were Turks and the owners of the sword, spear, and heavy mace, they were called "Ṣūfīyān-i Qızıl Başh". See above-mentioned work, p. 431, old ed. Cf. Dānishmandān, p. 124, and Crowfoot, op. cit., pp. 305-6. op. cit., pp. 36-7.

2. See H. Masrūr, introduction, cf. Kasrawī, op. cit., who states that at that time a person could be proud of being a Sayyid.
III. The Great Tribes of Qīzīl-Bāsh.

As has been mentioned, the Ṣūfīs and disciples of the Ṣafawīd confederation and dynasty were called "Qīzīl-Bāsh". This title was applied to the devotees who were the friends and assistants of Shāh Ismā'īl I in his conquests and propagation of "Twelver Shi'īsm" in Iran from the beginning of his reign till the end of his life. These supporters may be divided into nine major tribes and two lesser tribes. Most of these were of Turkish origin.¹

1. The Rūmū Tribe:

It is said that the Rūmū tribesmen were the captives set free by Tīmūr through the mediation of Shaikh Ṣadr al-Dīn or Shaikh Khwāja 'All. According to one contemporary historian, some of them stayed in Ardabīl in the "Mahalla-yi Rūmīyān" and the rest returned to Rūm.² According to Falsafī, this tale is mentioned in none of the histories written about Tīmūr,³ and as Iskandar Beg Munshī Turkomān, the clerk of Shāh 'Abbās I has doubts about this story, it cannot be


². 'Ā.Ā. 'Abbāsī, pp. 12 and 155.

taken for granted, since he uses the word Baynal-jumhūr "according to general opinion".

The Persian account of this story may be translated as follows:

"Amīr Timūr had in mind during his visit to Șaikh Sadra al-Dīn in Ardabīl three conditions which would form the key to his obedience to Sūltān Sadra al-Dīn and since all three conditions were met he gave the hand of obedience to the Șaikh and asked him to request a favour. The Șaikh asked for the freedom of the Ottoman captives who were called the captives of Rūmlū: (غُرْمِل) . Amīr Timūr placed the finger of acceptance upon his eyes and fulfilled his request and settled them in a place called Kūra-yi Ardabīl "(آردابیل) " and its suburbs. He bought lands with his own rightful money and dedicated it to Șaikh Safī's resting-place and made it a place of refuge, in order that the prisoners be protected there. He also waived the taxes of Ardabīl to the Safawīd dynasty. And it is from then that these Rūmlū tribes became the devotees of the Safawīd family; they are still with them."1

However, Iskandar Munshī indicates:

"I could not trace any book or written poetry or prose-composition to substantiate this story, but as it is generally well known among the people of this age I am following their belief. There is also an old decree in the Mongolian language, issued by Timūr and sealed by him, which was found by warriors on their campaign against Balkh, after capturing the fort of Andkhūd, and was presented to Շահ /'Abbās/. In it are described the 1

miraculous powers of Sultan Khwaja 'Ali and some of these stories.'

It is said that Qaraja Ilyas Bayburdi from the Rûmlû tribe, together with many other, joined Shah Ismâ'îl's service in 905/1499. Their origin was the region of Mount Ararat and Asia Minor.

2. The Shâmlû Tribe:

It is believed that the people of this tribe were the first disciples of the Safawid family and originated from Asia Minor. The author of 'Âlam-ârâ-yi 'Abbâsî states that:

"The Shâmlû tribe was the greatest tribe of the Qizilbash and was more faithful than the others in seniority, good service,

1. 'A.A. 'Abbâsî, p. 12. The Persian account of this story runs as follows:


loyalty and willingness to sacrifice their life in favour of the Šafawīds, during the emergence and establishment of Šah Ismā'īl's power. His great and important amīrs were from this tribe, for instance: Ḥusain Beg Lala Shāmlū, the tutor of Khāqān Ṣulaimān Ṣhān Šāh Ismā'īl Bahādur Khān.¹

3. The Ústājlu Tribe:

This tribe, like the other tribes, was one of the great influential tribes among the Qızıl-Bāsh from the beginning of the Šafawīd sovereignty in Iran. Men from this tribe, commanders like Muḥammad-Ústājlu, tried to make Twelver Shīʿīsm the state religion under Šāh Ismā'īl's banner, and were with Šāh Ismā'īl I during his concealment in Lāhījān. One of the great amīrs of this tribe, the above Khān Muḥammad-Ústājlu, who was the governor of Diyar Bakr till 920/1514, was killed at the battle of Chāldirān.² Muntashā Sulṭān Ústājlu and Khīḍr Āqā Ústājlu³ were other amīrs of Šāh Ismā'īl's court. This tribe, like some others, is believed to have come from Syria.⁴

¹. Ḥā.Ḥ. ʿAbbāsī, (Amīr Kabīr edition), p. 104. The Persian text runs:


³. Ibid., pp. 148-149.

4. **The Qājār Tribe:**

   According to Falsafī, this tribe was related to Qājār Nūyān, the Mongol commander who lived during Ghāzān's period, 1 (694-703/1294-1303). Different groups from this tribe settled in Armenia and Syria after the downfall of the Ilkhanids, and like other Turkish tribes they raided and invaded the surrounding areas. 2 It is known that when Timūr was returning to Iran from Rūm he brought as captives some of these Turkomāns who used to raid Shām (Syria), Armenia and Asia Minor. Some of this tribe were settled in Ganja, Yerevan (Irwān) and in the area near Qara Bāgh. During Shāh Ismā'īl's invasion of Shīrvān, these became his devotees. 3

   According to the writer of Fawāḍ-i Șafawīyya, this tribe numbered about 12,000 and was divided into two major groups: the "Yūkhārī Bāsh" and the 'Aṣhāqa Bāsh". The same author states that because of being looked after by the Șafaward dynasty, especially by Shāh Ismā'īl I, and other Sultāns, the "Yūkhārī Bāsh" group always held positions of commanders, amīrs and commanders-in-chief in Iran. This story is told in full in the histories of 'Ālam-ārā-yi ʿAbbāsī, Khūlid-i Barīn and others. The numbers of families of these two groups in Iran from the Dār al-Mūminīn of Astarābād and elsewhere were not more

---

than 600 families. They had privileges and advantages over the other Qızıl-Baş in the military career.\(^1\)

5. The Afshar Tribe:

This tribe is said to have been one of those Turkoman tribes whose members emigrated from Turkestan during the Mongol occupation, and settled in "Azarbāyjān during the first years of Shāh Ismā'īl's rise to power. It is also said that this tribe was divided into several major groups: Qāsīmlū, Arkhlū or Qūūqlū) Nadir Shāh Afshār was from the latter one. The Qūūqlū tribe was forced to migrate from "Azarbāyjān to Khurāsān by Shāh Ismā'īl I, and settled in the north of Khurāsān, in Abīward, Bākharz, and as far as Marw, to prevent invasion by the Öz-Beg and Ottoman troops. The name of the Afshār tribe was taken from the name of Aushār or Avshār, the elder son of "Yildiz" (Yulduz) the third son

\(^1\) Fawā'id-i Safawīyya, f. (ق) The Persian text runs: "قد روا "کویر "نامه و مولود، از کوه مینه و از کوه" سرشناس که پرسته، به داش و پرستی سرگرم وینه که که نهی می‌گردد، منصد گلی که بی‌صرفه و سپس نیست و چه‌گونه؟ دنیا را به انسان ترک کرده و چنین فیصله‌داده که این که نهی در سال‌های بی‌تکرار، ماه‌های آن و دو چندی و فیروز را می‌کند و خاک دسته‌ای دو پر.IN ماه و نیز دهنده ماه باز و فیروز را می‌کند. سپس، و مسانده او".

Cf. 'Ā.Ā. 'Abbāsī, pp. 155-6.
of Oghuz, son of Abaqa Khan, son of Hulegu son of Chingiz Khan.¹

The author of Būstān al-Siyāha believes that the Afšār tribe was very numerous and was divided into several clans (Oymaq or Īl). He writes:

"Each of these clans is divided into small families (Ojaq). All the Afšār tribe are from the Turkomān tribes, and it is said also that these Turkomān tribes are not originally Turks but they are similar to Turks, and because they mixed with the Turks, they are called Turkomān. Their real original place of settlement was Tūrān and Turkmanistān. Because of their bravery and their troublesome habits, the great Hūk (as the author says (قلا ), scattered them. They are now settled in most Islamic countries. Their family in Rum (Turkey) possibly numbers about 30,000 and their religion is Sunnī and Ḥanafī. In Āzarbāyjān, Fārs, Persian ‘Īraq, Kirmān, Khurasān and ‘Īraq-‘Arab, they account for about 200,000 families, and in Tabaristān, Zabulistān, Kābul, Kāshmīr, India, and Tūrān they number 100,000 families.²

The same author states:

"The religion of all in Iran and India is ’Twelver Shi‘ite’ and most of the Afšār tribes are impolite, scurrilous, and wicked, but they are also very brave and clever... and from this tribe some good, great, polite, powerful and wealthy people have appeared, for instance: Nādir Shāh Afšār." ³


² Ibid.


For their earlier activities in Iran (as early as the sixth century A.H.) see A. Kasrawī, Chihil Maqāla, "Afšārha-yi Khūzistān", ed. by Y. Žukā, (Tehrān, 1335), pp. 80-85, and 122-128.
6. The Tekelû or Takka-lû Tribe:

It is said that this tribe came to Iran from the Tekka or Taka-âlû province, which is in Southern Asia Minor, near the Mediterranean Sea. Relations between this tribe and the Safawîds were so good that Sultan Haydar had chosen Hasan Khalîfa, who was believed to be a Shi'a disciple of the Safawîds in Anatolia, as his deputy in that province. It is written in Ahsan al-Tawârikeh that Hasan Khalîfa came twice to Sultan Haydar's place of prayer (جَلِّة خان), where he stayed for forty days.

The names of Hasan Khalîfa and his sons are written in most of the histories of the early Safawîd period. Most of this tribe came to Iran in 917/1511 from the provinces of Tekka, Qarâmân and Menteshe in Asia Minor. Hasan Khalîfa's son, Shâh Quli, who was nicknamed "Shaytân Qull" (the son of Satan) by the Ottoman Turks, was killed


2. Ibid.


4. Salîm-nâma, f. 51b which calls him (مُعَمَّرُ القَعِد). Cf. Inqûlab-İslâm, pp. 91-92, which calls him and his father followers of the Jalâlíyân sect.
by the chief minister of Bāyazīd II, 'Ali Pāshā, in 917/1511. 'Ali Pāshā was himself defeated in that battle and Shāh Qūlī's devotees scattered through lack of a strong commander. On their way to Iran they plundered and murdered a caravan of merchants from Tabrīz.

For several reasons, one of which was the desire to break the strong influence they might exert in his camp, Shāh Ismā'īl scattered these tribesmen amongst his amīrs.1 Historians number them around 15,000. The author of Tārīkh-i Inqīlab-Islām calls them "Jalālīyān"2 whilst Bidlīsī in Salīm-nāmā states:

"Shāh Qūlī carried out a rebellion on Shāh Ismā'īl's behalf in Qızīl Qiyād in the Takka province. He was able to gather about 20,000 bloodthirsty, inhuman and seditious people around himself. He rebelled against Sultān Bāyazīd and crucified and murdered the commander-in-chief of Anatolia, namely Qara Gūz Pāshā. This battle took place in the area called Gūk Khanī in 917/1511."3

Since the commander of this tribe, Shāh Qūlī, was killed, his devotees were scattered. Without any delay or lingering they set out for Āzarbāyjān pillaging and plundering. On their way to Tabrīz they attacked a big


caravan from Tabriz and without having mercy on anyone, killed all of them. Shaikh Ibrahîm Shabistarî and his son were two of them. This tribe plundered all their wealth. When they arrived in Tabriz, Shâh Ismâ'il was in Persian 'Iraq. The Shâh was disgusted with this incident and sent one of his commanders to welcome this bloodthirsty tribe and to pretend friendliness. Because winter was approaching, Shâh Ismâ'il ordered that they should disperse to the camps of other commanders and send their major commanders to him. Finally, Shâh Ismâ'il invited 300 of them to his feast and killed them all.

7. The Dhul-Qadar Tribe:

This tribe originally came from Diyâr Bakr. They migrated to Iran when Sulṭân Junaid returned to Ardabil before 864/1459. They stayed in Iran after Junaid's death and continued their service to the Safawid family. It is said that some of these tribesmen entered Shâh Ismâ'il's

1. Salîm-nâma, ff. 51b-52b; cf. Dânîshmandân-i Azarbâyjân, P.16. He was nicknamed Burhân al-Dîn and was a follower of the Naqshbandî sect. He is the author of Nihâyat al-Bâhja (a long poem) and Anbiya-nâma. Tarbiyat states that he was going to Mecca, but was murdered on his way there. The author does not say who killed him.

2. Salîm-nâma, ff.51-2. Cf. Inqîlāb-Islâm, p. 91-97; b b Sûmer, op. cit., p. 47. He believes their reason for coming to Iran was because of Shâh Qulî's rebellion.
service a few years after the death of 'Ala' al-Daula Dhu'l-Qadar. Because of his hostile policy towards Sultan Salim, 'Ala' al-Daula was attacked and killed by him in 921/1515, a year after the battle of Chaldiran. His death caused his army to be divided into three parts. The first part went to Sultan Salim, the second to Shāh Ismā'īl and the third to 'Ubaid Khan Ûz-Beg. The account of Tārīkh-Jahān Gushā-yiKhāqān about these events runs as follows:

"When Shāh Ismā'īl was in his winter quarters at Tabrīz in 928/1521, he was informed of the recent arrival of Sultan Warkhān, son of 'Alī Beg Dhu'l-Qadar Ughlī in his camp. This event occurred after Warkhān Sultan, son of 'Alī Beg-i Dhu'l-Qadar, had been defeated by Sultan Salim's army. After several years, living in secret during the reign of Sultan Sulaimān Khan, Salim's son and successor, Warkhān (1526-1566 A.D.) ran away from Farhād Pāshā, commander-in-chief of Sulaimān, and joined Shāh Ismā'īl I. After distributing gifts, according to his previous policy, Shāh Ismā'īl divided the Dhu'l-Qadar tribe into three parts; one section to his own camp, one to Khurāsān to Dūrmīsh Khan's service and the rest to Shīrāz."

From this tribe we can name several distinguished amīrs, for instance Jahān Sultan Dhu'l-Qadar and his

brother Khalīl Sulṭān, the personal messengers of Shāh Ismā'īl I, and his bodyguards Abdāl Beg Dhu‘l-Qadar, the governor of Ray before 915/1509.

According to the Tarīkh Jahān-ārā and Rawḍat al-Safawīyya, the devotion of this tribe to Shāh Ismā'īl I and his family was so great that when the auspicious order summoning the Sūfīs of Dhu‘l-Qadar to Shāh Ismā'īl reached that group, a certain bridegroom left the party on his marriage night without going into his private room, mounted his horse and set out for Shāh Ismā'īl's camp in Arzinjān in 906/1500.  

1. Shāh Jang, pp. 286-287  

---

1. Shāh Jang, pp. 286-287  

The Persian text runs as follows:

"...از چون مربیت بحر دوامت درم دو بستنی، و از را هم فراستن باید تا گوی اتمام می‌کان نفرت اتمام با نام کریم، و فرزندان و خانواده‌ای نامبلان که می‌خواهند فریفه‌گزار و بیایند بکشند با کلیه‌ی مسئاً می‌پرده..."

"...از خانگیت هارمه، دوستانی سیا، و از پسران نامبلان که می‌خواهند فریفه گزارند با کلیه‌ی مسئاً می‌گرده..."
8. The Varsaq Tribe:

Unfortunately there is not much information about this tribe, and no reliable facts about them have been revealed up to now. According to accounts of the battle of Chaldiran, Sufis and disciples of the Safavid family from this tribe fought to the death. It is said that several folk-singers at Shahr Ismā'īl's camp spoke Varsaqī and used to sing Varsaqī songs in order to arouse the warriors against the Ottoman Turks.¹

The place of origin of this tribe is believed to be Qara mān in Asia Minor. However, Sümer writes the following statement:

"Kanuni devrinde de Tarsus ve Adana bölgesinden bir çok Varsak oymaklının kizil başlığı kabul ederek İran'a gittikleri, Osmanlı tahrir defterlerinde kırmızı murekkep ile kaydedilmişтир."²


Unfortunately the German title could not be traced.


9. The Qara Bāghī Tribe:

According to its name, the place of origin of this tribe was Qara Bāgh. The most famous commander-in-chief of this tribe was Shāh Muḥammad Qara Bāghī who was sent by Shāh Ismā'il as a scout to the Qara Bāghī district in 920/1514 to obtain information on enemy actions. Ghulām ʿAlī Qara Bāghī was another commander who, because he brought good news at the battle of Chāldirān, was given the title of Khūsh Khabar Khan. He brought 2,000 of his tribesmen to Shāh Ismā'il's camp.

10. The Talishī Tribe:

It is said that the Talishī soldiers participated in the battle of Chāldirān and in other battles without armour. They had several trained dogs with them and used them in the battle. This tribe believed that helmets and armour made them too heavy and unable to fight freely. At the battle of Chāldirān, the strength and brutality of these dogs surprised Sulṭān Salīm so much that he ordered

several of them to be caught alive. He wanted to take them back to Turkey. However, he was unsuccessful in this attempt.  

1. Talish soldiers used these dogs to carry messages between two different camps, especially during the night. These dogs were chained at all other times. The area of origin of this tribe was the Talish range in Gilan. Dada Beg Talish was one of several Shī'is who were with Shāh Ismā'īl in Gilan from 900/1494-5 to 905/1500.  

11. The Sarī Qamīsh Tribe:  

This tribe, whose members were all Anatolian Shī'ites,  

2. Jahān Gusā, f. 30b. It seems to me that the Venetian travellers were referring to the Talish tribes when they mentioned having seen tribesmen who used to fight without armour. See chapter VII, p. 440-1. Cf. ‘A.‘Abbāsī, p. 156 for the great leaders of this tribe.  
3. Ḥasan Rūmī in Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh (vol. I, p. 479) gives:  

But according to Azarbāyjānī dialect "Sarī Qamīsh" is more likely to be correct and means زر "the place of yellow rush". Cf. Ịlchī, f. 22b: یورت ساروقین; Jahān-āra, p. 276: یورت ساروقین near Ray. See also Inqilāb-Īslām, pp. 117-118 which is at variance with other sources. The author believes that the cause of the Shī'ite massacre of Anatolia was the fact that Sulṭān Salīm wanted to assure himself that no one would rebel against him in his absence. The same author believes that the book of Shaikh Faḍl Allāh Ḥaydarī which was written on Jalālī belief was another excuse for these killings.
escaped from Anatolia at the time of Shi'ite persecution

1. It is astonishing that most contemporary Shi'ite historians said nothing about this massacre of Anatolian Shi'a in the Ottoman Empire, but according to Abü'l Faḍl Muḥammad b. Ḥakīm al-Dīn Idrīs b. Ḥusām al-Dīn 'All al-Bidīlṣī. This massacre of the Shi'ites in Anatolia took place during the reign of Sulṭān Salīm I. He states:

(See f. 52a-b)

According to Bidīlṣī, these Shi'ite inhabitants of Anatolia were outside any Islamic sects and therefore the shedding of their blood was a kind of Islamic duty and honour, as he says:

He goes on to state that killing one Rāfiqī is equal to seventy infidels taken as captives in war. Sulṭān Salīm ordered that those who had not been killed should be branded on the forehead in order to be distinguished. On this subject, see Salīm-nāma, f. 52a-b. Cf. Browne, op. cit., vol. IV, pp. 72-73 where he quotes the translation of the above seven verses from Von Hammer, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, II, p. 403; Inqūlab- Islām, pp. 117, 216-217 and 582, where it says Sulṭān Salīm killed 40,000. Jalāliyān also adds that the same Salīm killed 220,000 people during his life; and Minorsky, "Shaykh Bālī", p. 441.
with all their belongings. The commander of this brave tribe was called Aşlân. These Shi'ites of the Ottoman Empire entered Iran in the spring of 920/1514, before the beginning of the battle of Châldirân. Since it was New Year, Şâh Ismâ'îl ordered that a celebration should be held because of their arrival. Then because these tribesmen had lost much of their wealth on their way to Iran, Şâh Ismâ'îl gave them 3,000 sheep from his own private flocks, and settled them in an area on the eastern shore of Lake Urmîye. Aşlân was killed at the battle of Châldirân in 920/1514.\*1

\*1. See, Şâh Jang, p. 321. This is a unique statement.
PART FIVE

I. The Religious Beliefs of Sultan Haydar.

The major source on this subject is the Tarikh-i Inqilab-ī Islām. Some of the information from this work is also confirmed in the Salīm nāma and ʿĀlam-ārā-yi Aminī.¹

In spite of the Sunni bias of the last two writers and the obvious propaganda elements in their work, there is undoubtedly useful information to be gleaned from them. Moreover, the writer of Tarikh-i Inqilab-ī Islām is a much later source (1307/1889), and clearly more restrained and unbiased in his approach. His work is invaluable, especially since there is a great lack of contemporary or near contemporary Shi'ite sources to shed light on this subject. These were apparently destroyed in the reign of Shāh Tahmāsp I.

The contemporary Sunni and Ottoman historians mentioned above state that the religion of Shāh Ismā'īl, Junaid and Haydar was different from the Islamic faith.

According to the author of Tarikh-i Inqilab-ī Islām, whose account is corroborated by the writers of the Salīm-nāma and ʿĀlam-ārā-yi Aminī, Sultan Haydar's

religious beliefs were the same as those of the Jalālī movement in Anatolia. The same author indicates that if one studies carefully the letters which were exchanged between Sultan Ya'qūb and Sultan Bāyazīd II about Sultan Ḥaydar's death, one may easily see that Sultan Ḥaydar had created a madhhab called Ḥaydariyya.

Because he established this new faith, Sultan Ḥaydar was hated by all other Islamic Sultāns contemporary to himself. Above all, the author stresses that Sultan Ḥaydar's beliefs were not even Shi'ite at all.²

---


For this letter see Browne, op. cit., IV, p. 67.

2. According to the author of Inqūb- Islām, there were nineteen Shi'ite sects in Islam but Sultan Ḥaydar did not belong to any of these sects. They were: 625-636

"Mufaddala, "Kāmilīyya "Kāmilīyya
"Ulyā'īyya "Manṣūriyya "Manṣūriyya
"Khaṭṭābiyya "Ḥiṣāmiyya "Ḥiṣāmiyya
"Nu'māniyya "Yūnusīyya "Yūnusīyya
"Naṣīriyya "Jīnāhiyya "Jīnāhiyya
"Azābiyya "Zawāmiyya "Zawāmiyya
"Zawwāriyya "Mufawṣalā "Mufawṣalā
"Bīdā'īyya "Banāniyya "Banāniyya
"Bāṭiniyya "Zaidīyya "Zaidīyya
"Imāmiyya "Imāmiyya "Imāmiyya

However, the author of Ma'rīfāt al-Madhāhib believes that there existed twelve inferior sects in the
According to this source, the followers of this religious doctrine were to be found even in his own time in some parts of Anatolia. They wore the Baktash costume and were called Haydariyya, Kaziyya and Sab'iyya. The author goes on to say:

"Even nowadays [1307/1889], darwishes of this sect put on a red cap with seven slits and a gown with 40 patches. They often have a stick or an axe in their hands. These darwishes, instead of a cup or a beggar's cup, hang a goatskin bag at their waist and in it hide their 'Hashish' smoking equipment, which is hated by people. In their opinion and belief, a part of God's divinity penetrated into Hadrat-i 'Ali, the son-in-law of the Prophet Muhammad, and because of this power,"

Shi'a community:


2. Inqilab- Islam, pp. 32-35.
he became able to root out the door of Khaybar. After him, this power was transferred to 'Abd al-'Ali, who transmitted it to Imām Zaynāb, then to other Imāms till Abū Muḥammad Abūl Qāsim Ḥamza the forefather of Shaikh Ṣafī al-Dīn Isḥāq Ardaibīlī. It should be noticed that after Abū Muḥammad Abūl Qāsim Ḥamza, the Imāmat was interrupted and changed into Shaikhīs. So, it was transferred to Ahmad al-Aʿrābī, and through him to Jālāl al-Maʿṣūr Haydārī, Sultan Haydārī. Sultan Haydārī wanted to reveal this power, but since he did not have permission from God, he did not do it.

When Shāh Ismāʿīl appeared, by God's permission, he took revenge on his ancestor's foes and put them all to death. He then developed God's faith, but after him, people fell into deviation and error because of their spiritual temptation and wrong doing. ¹

According to the author of the Salīm-nāma, ʿAlam ʿArā-yi Amīnī and especially the author of Taʾrikh-Inquāb Islām, the Ḥaydariyya believe that ḥaṣḥīsh is the mirror of secrets, wine makes love exciting, ḥaṣḥīsh smoking eases breathing, drinking wine makes a person feel happy, a lover is the mirror of beauty, kissing is like picking a flower, sodomy is the aspiration of the soul, a mistress is the splendour of the heart and embracing is creation. ²

The same author says:

"In their belief, sodomy is lawful between two males if both agree. If a married woman gives her husband half of her dowry, she may take another man as spouse in the absence of her husband."³


They believe that the spiritual reward of killing a Sunni whom they call "dog", has five times more blessing than killing an unbeliever. It is not right to marry a Sunnite subject. Shedding their blood and plundering their wealth and making them slaves is right and good. It is necessary to cut their pregnant women's bellies and kill their male child with the spear. Selling or buying Sunnis is a lawful right, because they are outside Islamic doctrine. It is necessary to call 'All's name 110 times every morning and it is a sworn custom to dissimulate to everyone except those who are one's religious brothers.1

II. Sultan Haydar's Death

Sultan Haydar was no more than 22 years old when, along with some of the tribes and his father's disciples (in 888/1483) he set out to wage holy war against the Circassians. It may be assumed that Haydar's main purpose in this was to obtain plunder and to attract more devotees and warriors who would be willing to join him if only for the sake of wealth.2

After a campaign against the infidel in the Mughanat districts, Sultan Haydar went back to Ardabil and a little later his son Ismā'īl Mirzā was born.3 The date of

1. Inqilāb-Islām, pp. 32-5.
3. Hinz/Jahāndārī, p. 101, states him to have been the second son of Haydar by Marta.
Ismā'īl Mīrzā's birth is not mentioned in the Šāh-nāma. It is generally given as the 25th Rajab 892/17th July 1487.

In 893/1488, when Ismā'īl Mīrzā was about one year old, Sultan Ya'qūb was in his winter quarters in Qum. Sultan Haydar seized his opportunity and sent his beloved mother to Ya'qūb, primarily to ensure a good relationship between himself and the king, secondly to inform him that he was keeping to his oath and thirdly to obtain permission to raid the Circassians as a Jihād. She managed to bring back an order which was to be given to the king of Shīrvān, Farrukh Yasar, stating that he should make every effort to facilitate the raid on the Circassians by Sultan Haydar. After receiving Ya'qūb's permission to raid Caucasia Haydar set out at once.

During this campaign Haydar successfully plundered and sacked the district of "Jalpert." Thereafter, Sultan Haydar was determined to avenge his father's death and to kill the Shīrvān Shāh, on whose vulnerability to attack Haydar had received reports from his spies.

On Haydar's arrival, the Shīrvān Shāh locked himself in the fortress of Gulistan and the Sūfīs began to

3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p. 72. See also, Hinz/Jahāndarī, p. 106.
massacre the defenceless inhabitants of the town. "Wails rose among the people and the Sufis filled Shamakhl with blood up to the brim, making no difference between high and low, learned and ignorant." Sultan Haydar was on the point of completing his victory over the Shirvān Shah, when he heard that Sultan Ya'qūb was coming against him towards Shirvān to help the Shirvān Shah. After hearing the news of Ya'qūb's campaign and his sending auxiliaries against himself, Sultan Haydar temporarily gave up the Gulistan fortress in order not to be trapped and ordered his Sufis to withdraw. The Shirvān Shah thought this action was prompted by fear. So, he came out of the fortress, but seeing Haydar's Sufis attacking took refuge in the nearby fort of Salūt.  

Sultan Haydar decided to retreat to Caucasia by way of Darband along its narrow plain, but he was expelled by the people of Darband because of what had befallen them in 892/1487. After several days' fighting Haydar realized that the auxiliary force sent by Ya'qūb under the command of Shujā' al-Daula Sulajmān Beg had become

4. For more details see Hinz/Jahāndārī, pp. 104-107.
apprehensive of his move, therefore he withdrew towards Tabarsarān.

On the other hand, Sulajmān Beg "hurried after him by forced marches and found him at the foot of Mt. Alburz (in the Caucasian range).

On Wednesday, 29 Rajab 893/9th July, 1488,"...the black spot of Ḥaydar's army appeared at the foot of the Alburz, standing with its back to the mountains and face towards the battle." The fighting flared up and "an arrow sent by the hand of Destiny struck the jugular vein of the rebellious Shaykh (Ḥaydar)." Later on the Sūfis saw that Shaikh Ḥaydar was dead. "The Sufis at once like(fidāżīs)('vowed to death') returned to the battle and fought courageously. No mortal had ever seen an army fight thus after the loss of the commander," Rūzbihān says, "but the royal army massacred them and left their headless bodies to the wild beasts."3

We are told that his head was taken to Yaʿqūb.

On Tuesday 6 Shābān 894/16th July 1488 the messenger reached the yūrt of Arvānakūh. As in the eyes of the king (bandagān-i Pādshāh) this carrion (jīfa) stuffed with straw did not have the value of a nose-bag (tūbra) of straw, it was not thought necessary to send it on to

1. Rūzbihān/Minorsky, pp. 78-79.
3. Ibid., p. 80.
one of the kings, as is usually done, and an order was issued that for publicity's sake (tashhīr) the head should be exposed (bar-dārānd) for a couple of days and then remitted to the mother, \( \text{Khādīja Baygum, Uzūn Ḥasān's sister}\).

---

1. Rūzbihān/Minorsky, p. 81. Cf. Hinz/Jahāndāri, p. 109 where the author states on the authority of Aḥsān, part IX, f. 157a that Ḥaydar's skull was brought to Shāh Ismā'īl and was given a good reward.

It is important to quote here the statement of the unknown merchant, who says:

"His head being cut off was presented to Alumut Sulṭān [should be Ya'qūb Mirzā] who commanded it to be carried on a lance all through Tauris (Ṭabrīz), with martial instruments sounding in honour of the victory, and afterwards taken to a maidan, where executions took place, and there thrown to be eaten by dogs. For this reason, the Suffaveans hate dogs, and kill all they come across."

See "The Travels of a Merchant in Persia", p. 186. Cf. K. Zeno, op. cit., p. 46, where the same statement appears; Browne, "Not on an apparently unique manuscript History of the Safawi Dynasty of Persia;" pp. 411-12, where Browne gives at the age of 20 on Thursday 20 Rajab 893 (June 30, 1488); Crowfoot, op. cit., p. 311;

CHAPTER II

THE YEARS OF CONCEALMENT
PART I

I. Shaikh Ḥaydar's Children after His Death.

It is appropriate at this point to give a brief analysis of the rule of Sulṭān Yaʿqūb and the other successors of Ḥasan Beg.

After the death of Ḥasan Beg (882/1478), 1 Sulṭān Khalīl, his eldest son, succeeded him. After his coronation in Tabrīz (882/1478), he forced his brothers, Yaʿqūb Mīrzā and Yūsuf Mīrzā, to leave Tabrīz for Diyār Bakr along with their mother Saljūq Shāh Baygum, in order to have no rivals in his capital. He also suffocated his stepbrother, Maqsūd Mīrzā, the only son of Despina Khatūn. Sulṭān Khalīl was murdered six months

later in 883/1478-9, at the hand of his exiled brother Ya'qūb Mīrzā, who took his position and territories. Sūlān Khānīl was about 36 years old at the time of his coronation, whilst Ya'qūb was around 20 years old.

It is believed that Sūlān Ya'qūb took the wrong path (بیشتر به دنبال تغییرات وابسته), and sent his commander-in-chief, Sulaimān Hījin, equipped to help Farrūkh Yasar, the king of Shīrvān who was also his father-in-law, to "martyr" Sūlān Ḥaydar (Shāh Ismā'īl's father). After the murder of Sūlān Ḥaydar, Sūlān Ya'qūb imprisoned Ḥaydar's sons along with their mother Marta. They were

2. Cf. chapter I, pp. 70-1; Jahān-ārā, p. 254; and 'Ā.A. 'Abbāsī, p. 15.
3. An unknown merchant who was in Iran in the early 16th century, has a different story about this event:

"Immediately on the news reaching Ardouil [Ardabil] the three sons fled, one going to Natolia, another to Aleppo, and the third to an island which, as it has been mentioned before, is in the Lake of Van or Vastan (Grey writes: 'the island of Ak Tamar, the seat of the Armenian Catholicos') and contains a town of Armenian Christians. Here this son, named Ismael, who was a noble youth about thirteen or fourteen years old, remained four years in the house of a Papa or priest. After four years Ismael determined to leave Armenia (Grey writes Arminig) and went to Gilan, where he lived a year with a goldsmith [Shaikh Najm ad-Dīn Zargar Rashtī], a great friend of his father's who kept him in secret with great care and respect."


Muntagām, p. 80 and Hātb, pp. 435-6.
accordingly taken to the fort of Iṣṭakhr, one of the ancient forts in Fars.

Sultān Ya'qūb reigned about thirteen years and is said to have been poisoned by his wife in Safar 896/Dec. 1490.²

Immediately after the circulation of the news of Ya'qūb's sudden death, Şūfī Khalīl and the other lords


2. See Jahān-ārā, p. 254, where the author states:

"یعقوب بیت درعم بریمی به یارم صرنس ست و شین، رخاب ۱۰۹۰، یا بیک کات کرد."

Cf. 'A.ʿA. ʿAbbāsī, p. 17, where he states that he died in Qara Bāgh; Hinz/Jahāndārī, pp. 112-113 which suggests that Sultān Ya'qūb was murdered by his Shirvānian wife (Farrukh-Yaṣār's daughter), because of her affair with one of Ya'qūb's generals. For more details see Ḥabīb, vol. IV, pp. 431-434.

3. However, the account which was given by Sultān Ya'qūb's chronicler differs from that of other historians. Rūzbihān states that:

"Briefly, the illness took a long course, signs of calamity appeared on the king's cheeks and on 11 Safar 896/24th December, 1490, he left this world...."

See Rūzbihān/Minorsky, p. 111. Cf. Lārā, Mirʾāt al-Adwar f. 229b where he says:

"یک سال در شیران نشان داشم و روز روز بیکت بیک، روز روز مال می‌گیرم و روز روز می‌گیرم، موصل نیا در داران حضرت رازیان، ۱۰۸۳، مال می‌گیرم، ثانیا مال می‌گیرم، ثانیا مال می‌گیرم، ثانیا مال می‌گیرم."

"نظر به روز روز نشان ۲۸۷، خاکی، مال می‌گیرم و لازم است، در روز ۲۸۷، خاکی می‌گیرم، در روز ۲۸۷، خاکی می‌گیرم..."
of the Muṣillū tribe seized their opportunity and crowned the young Māysunqur (who reigned only a year and eight months). ¹

However, the Bayunduri and Purnāk tribes claimed that Masiḥ Mīrzā (Sultan Yaʿqūb's brother) deserved the crown whilst others believed that Rustam Mīrzā b. Maqsūd Mīrzā should be given the sovereignty.² These internecine struggles continued for several years until Masīḥ Mīrzā and 'All Mīrzā (the son of Sultan Khalīl) were murdered at the hand of Rustam Mīrzā b. Maqsūd Mīrzā,³ who was suddenly released by the Bayunduri prince of a lateral line, Ibrāhīm b. Dānā Khalīl, known as Ayba Sulṭān.⁴

At last, Rustam Mīrzā was crowned in Tabrīz, at the end of Rajab 879/1499.⁵


One of Rustam Padishāh's first actions, which was to the benefit of the Safavid dynasty, was his release of Sultan Ḥaydar's sons and his wife Marta from prison, and his encouraging them to take revenge on their common enemies, (for instance the Ḍaq-quyūnlū princes like Gūdā-Aḥmad b. Aḡūrūlu Muḥammad, Muḥammad Mīrzā b. Yūsuf Beg b. Ḥasan Beg, Alwand Beg b. Yūsuf Beg and Sultan Murād b. Yaʿqūb Beg)¹ for their father's death. He did this on the advice of his courtiers and noblemen. In this way, Rustam Padishāh hoped to follow a policy similar to that adopted by Ḥasan Beg who had protected the Shaikhs Junaid and Ḥaydar and thus exploited their considerable influence to serve his own ambitions. After masterminding the murder of Bāysunqur at the hand of Sultan ʿAll Mīrzā (the eldest son of Ḥaydar), and suppressing other enemies of his, Rustam Padishāh then tried to dispose of Sultan Ḥaydar's sons in their turn. Once they had served his purpose in disposing of some of his opponents, Sultan ʿAll Mīrzā became aware of this conspiracy and fled to Ardabil secretly. However, before reaching the city, he was killed by Rustam Padishāh's general, Ayba Sultan.² The

². Shāh Ismāʿīl, p. 10, cf. Ḥahān Gushā, f. 28b-29a:
author of 'Alam-`arā-yi Shāh Ismā'īl describes this sequence of events as follows:

"So Ayba Sultān gathered his army and set out to fight with them. He reached Sultān 'Alī Mirzā with all speed about 31 farsakhs from Ardabil. When Sultān 'Alī Mirzā looked over his shoulder, he saw a cloud of dust. So he summoned Ismā'īl Mirzā and said: 'I desire you to avenge me and your ancestors by shedding the blood of Ḩasan Pādīshāh's Ḩasan Beg children. For the die of Heaven's choice has been cast in your name, and before long you will come out of Gilân with a world-conquering sword like a burning sun, and eliminate the colour of Idolatry from the face of the world forever.' So he took Ḥaydar's crown, placed it on Ismā'īl Mirzā's head and, fastening his own turban to his waist, whispered to him the advice inherited from his ancestors. Then he appointed seven of his best devotees and enîrs called: Ḥusain Beg Lala, Qara pîrî Qâjār, Abdâl Beg, Dada Beg Tâlish, Khâdîm Beg, Bâyân Beg and Sârî Ghûrâ-qûrî Bâshî, to take Ismā'īl Mirzā, Ibrâhîm Mirzā and Sulaimān Mirzā to Ardabil and from there to Gilân and to stay there in the service of the Pādishāh of Lâhîjân until the time of the rising, while he himself stayed where he was to bar the road to Ayba's troops until he was killed."

The Safawīs, though apparently only 700 in number,  

1. 'Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 10, cf. Jahān Gushā, fs. 28b-29a; Add. 200, f. 29a; and Denison Ross, op. cit., p. 283.
2. See Angiolello, "The Life and Acts of King Ussun Cassano", p. 101; cf. Hīdâyat, Rawdât al-Ṣafâ, p. 4; and Jahān-ārā, p. 263, where Ghaffārī states:
fought valiantly like lions and were killed as martyrs.¹


Habib, vol. IV, pp. 440-1, under the year 898 A.H.; Add 200, f. 29a, gives 900 A.H.
; Denison Ross, op. cit., p. 263; and Ghulam Sarwar, op. cit., pp. 28-9 where he indicates:

Sultan 'Ali Padishah was killed at the end of 892/middle of 1494 at "Shamsi" along with 300 followers who had joined him en route.
PART TWO

I. Isma'il Mirza after Sultan 'Ali Mirza's Death.

As already mentioned, before taking any hostile action against Rustam Mirza's army under the command of Ayba Sultan, Sultan 'Ali Mirza appointed Isma'il Mirza as the Safawid crown prince and then sent him to Ardabil along with several Sufis, in order to go to Gilan. Isma'il Mirza went to Ardabil along with his brothers and followers from the summer-quarters at Baghram, and tried to deceive the enemies of the Safawid dynasty, pretending that Haydar's children had left Ardabil. Ayba Sultan pursued them into Ardabil in search of the princes. He treated the inhabitants violently in his house-to-house search, indulging in plunder and murder.

3. See 'A. A. Shāh Isma'il, pp. 34-35, where the author states:
When the Sufis found out that Ayba Sultan would soon succeed in capturing and destroying them, they came to the conclusion that it was unwise to hide the Safavid children near the Safavid mausoleum. The children were transferred to the house of Qadi Ahmad Kakuli, who was one of the old Sufi supporters of the Safavid dynasty and lived near the mausoleum. After three days they moved to the house of a woman called Khan Jän and, after a month, transferred again, this time to the home of a woman of the Dhuil-Qadar tribe, called Ubba Jarräuha.

These moves were made after consultation with Ismai'Il Mirzä's aunt, Pashä Khätün, Muḥammad Beg's wife. We are told that Ubba Jarräuha was Ismai'Il Mirzä's previous wet-nurse who lived in the "Maḥalla-yi Rūmiyän" in Ardabil. On her advice Haydar's children were hidden in the dome of Allah Wirmişh Aqa. It is believed that

2. See the sources mentioned-above.
3. Ahsan, I, p. 4. Cf. 'A. A. Shâh Ismai'IL, p. 35; Denison Ross, op. cit., p. 265; and Add. 200, f. 30a.
5. Ahsan, vol. I, pp. 4-5, Jahân Gushâ, f. 30a; Add. 200, f. 30a; Denison Ross, op. cit., p. 267; and Ghuläm Şarwar, op. cit., p. 31.
this last place of concealment was even kept a secret from 'Ālam Shāh Baygum (Marta the Christian wife of Sulṭān Ḥaydar), no doubt because she was one of Rustam Mīrzâ's relatives (aunt), and had also been tortured by Ayba Sulṭān.\(^1\) Khadīja Baygum, Junaid's wife, knew her weakness and did not wish to tell her the exact whereabouts of her children.\(^2\)

Finally, one of the Sufīs who had been wounded in the battle between Sulṭān 'All Mīrzâ and Ayba Sulṭān, and had escaped to the Ardabīl district, came to Ubba Jarrāḥa to have his wounds treated. He was informed that Ḥaydar's children were hidden in that woman's house; he went directly to the Baghrāvū mountains\(^3\) which were near Ardabīl and informed the other Sufīs who had gathered there after the battle of Shāmāsbi.\(^4\) They came immediately to the Jāmī' mosque at night and took the...

---

1. Jahān Gushā, f. 30a; cf. 'Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 35; Add. 200, f. 30a; and Denison Ross, op. cit., p. 266.

2. See the above-mentioned sources.

3. For Baghrāvū Mountains see R. Tapper, op. cit., p. 20, map I.

children to Kargan, a village near the Baghrau mountains. They stayed at the house of Khatib Farrukh Zad Kargani for three days and along with Rustam Beg Qaramanlu, Bayram Beg Turkoman and other Sufis like Husain Beg Lala, Mansur Beg Qipchaq, Qurq Sayyid ‘Ali (ورع درعی), Chulbun Beg, Khadim Beg Khalifa, Dada Beg Talish and others, they set out for Gilan.

1. Kargan, a village near Kalkhuran in the Ardabil area (9 km. to the north east of شالی باختری رودبیل). See F.J.I., vol. IV, p. 415. It had 950 houses. All of them were Shi'a and their language was Turkish.

Cf. Tadhkirat al-Muluk, p. 191, footnote 2. Minorsky believes that "Krkân is very possibly a mis-spelling of Karkân, the latter being now the name of the river flowing down the northern slope of Baghrow to the south-west of Khoy.") It seems that Minorsky is referring to a river called Kargan flowing down the eastern slope of Bustanabad, but not the slope of Baghrau; Ghulam Sarwar, op. cit., p. 31 where he writes "Gurgan", being misled by a city in the north-east of Iran.


3. See Jahân-ârâ, p. 270 جهان بیب, the governor of Khalkhal and Tarum who was killed by Shâh Ismâ‘îl in 911/1505. Cf. Ghulam Sarwar, p. 31 where he writes "Ju’llbun Beg; and Ahsan, vol. I, p. 6, جهان بیب.

4. It is said that there were between 80 and 200 Sufis. Cf. Ahsan, p. 6; Jahân Gushâ, f. 31a; Habib, vol. IV, p. 441; Ghulam Sarwar, op. cit., p. 29; Denison Ross, op. cit., p. 267; and Add. 200, f. 31a.
The reason for their going to Gilân is given as the friendship that Pāshā Khātūn, wife of Muḥammad Beg, and Aḥmadī Beg, brother of Muḥammad Beg, had with the family of Amīra Ištāq who was the local king and ruler of Rasht and its districts.¹ They set out for Gilân and on their way stayed in Tul for a few days. Meanwhile, Amīra Muẓaffar who was the governor of Tul (تُل) district had received a letter from Rustam Pādīshāh, king of Iran, ordering him to hand over Ḥaydar's children to his envoy.² Meanwhile, another letter was received by Amīra Muẓaffar from Jāgīr Beg Purnāk³ the governor of Tul and Khalkhāl districts ordering the same thing.⁴

The Sūfīs realized that they should leave Amīra Muẓaffar at once, otherwise he might change his mind. They went instead towards Kaskar, to Amīra Siyawūsh's house in Kaskar. They were put in the charge of Aмир Nūsh, one of Amīra Siyawūsh's servants in Dīnā Chār (دیناخر) province to take them to Kaskar.⁵ They camped there for

¹ Jahan Gusnah, ff. 30b-31a, cf. Denison Ross, op. cit., p. 268; Add. 200, f. 31a; Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 31; Aḥsan, vol. I, p. 6; Ḥabīb, p. 441; and Petrushevsky/Kishāvarz, pp. 265 and 280.
⁴ Ibid.; and Jahan Gusnah, f. 31b.
⁵ Aḥsan, p. 7.
three days and from there set out for Rasht, while Ahmad Beg and Muhammad Beg went back to Ardabil, leaving them in Kaskar.

Amira Siyawush personally accompanied the Sufis to Rasht. The chronicles say that Isma'il Mirza's other brothers, including Sayyid Hasan Mirza, Sayyid Suleiman Mirza, Sayyid Daud Mirza, Sayyid Mahmud Mirza and Sayyid Ibrah I m Mirza accompanied him on that journey. Other sources say that they joined him in Rasht. Still others believe that Isma'il Mirza and the Sufis went to Masaula (in the district of Fuman) by way of Aq-Dagh (the White Mountain) the area known as Chockektu, and then went to Rasht.

According to Hasan Rumi, there was no one left with them who could be trusted. Rumi concludes: that it seems to be true that Isma'il Mirza's brothers accompanied him to Rasht.

2. Ahsan, I, p. 7. See Hāfiz, iv, p. 726 "Chockektu = عجبیئ "
4. Ibid., where he states:
In Rasht, Isma'īl settled with his Sūfīs in a mosque called the "White Mosque" and for several reasons, most probably including that of security, they stayed there in spite of Amīra Ishaq's insistence on transferring them to his place, for a period of between one week and a month, according to different stories.1

Because of the lack of security in that mosque or in his province, Amīra Ishaq consulted with Kārkiyā Mīrzā 'All, the ruler of Lāhījān (Biyeh Pīsh),2 and decided to send the fugitives to Lāhījān. Because of

---

1. Jahān Gushā, f. 31b, op. cit., p. 8; Denison Ross, op. cit., p. 269; Add. 200, f. 31b, and Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 31.

2. Biyeh Pīsh, or Lāhījān. Gīlān was divided into two parts, the first "Biyeh Pīsh" which is Lāhījān and its districts and the second Biyeh Pās or Rasht and its provinces. According to Bāhjat al-'Ālam, Biyeh was the local word for river and because the "Sūfīd Rūd" passes through Lāhījān and Rasht its two arms were called: "Biyeh Pīsh" and "Biyeh Pās". The Persian text runs as follows:

"ذَلِكَ بِبَابِ لَهَوْجِيْحَانِ وَلِيَّاءِ مِنْ لَهْوَجِيْحَانِ تَحْتَ مَعِينَتِهِ مَنْذُ لَهْوَجِيْحَانِ وَلِيَّاءِ مِنْ لَهْوَجِيْحَانِ تَحْتَ مَعِينَتِهِ مَنْذُ لَهْوَجِيْحَانِ وَلِيَّاءِ مِنْ لَهْوَجِيْحَانِ تَحْتَ مَعِينَتِهِ مَنْذُ لَهْوَجِيْحَانِ وَلِيَّاءِ مِنْ لَهْوَجِيْحَانِ تَحْتَ مَعِينَتِهِ مَنْذُ لَهْوَجِيْحَانِ وَلِيَّاءِ مِنْ لَهْوَجِيْحَانِ تَحْتَ مَعِينَتِهِ مَنْذُ لَهْوَجِيْحَانِ وَلِيَّاءِ مِنْ لَهْوَجِيْحَانِ تَحْتَ مَعِينَتِهِ مَنْذُ لَهْوَجِيْحَانِ وَلِيَّاءِ مِنْ لَهْوَجِيْحَانِ تَحْتَ مَعِينَتِهِ مَنْذُ لَهْوَجِيْحَانِ W. For more details see Bīstān al-Siyāḥa, p. 207; Ḥudūd al-Ālam, Ms. no. 247, section گک-جیلان, ed. and trans. by V. Minorsky (London, 1937) pp. 136-7, 388-9; and H.L. Rabino, Rulers of
the tendency of the people of Lahijān towards Shi‘ism\(^1\) the Sūfīs accepted his suggestion and made the journey, after which they stayed opposite Kīyā Fardūn's school,\(^2\) at the beginning of 900/end of 1494.\(^3\)

On the other hand, on Rustām Mirzā's insistence, Ayba Sultān had discovered the previous hiding place of Ḥaydar's children, where he arrested Ubba Jarrāḥa and took her to Tabrīz. After torturing her, he discovered the children's whereabouts and then hanged her in a

Kasrawī, Ghilī Maqāla, p. 9, on the authority of Tarīkh-i Gīlān wa Dailamistān, by Sayyid Žahir al-Dīn Mar‘ashi, ed. by H.J. Rabino, (Rasht, 1330), who states:

"Kārkīyā Mīrzā ‘Alī was the Imām of the Zaydī sect in Lahijān who was killed along with his brother, Sayyid Ḥasan, in a battle which took place in 791 A.H.\(^{\text{sic}}\) between Amīra Muḥammad Raqhtī and Amīra Dūbbaj."

According to contemporary sources, Kārkīyā Mīrzā ‘Alī was alive after 905/1499, when Shāh Ismā‘īl I left Lahijān for Ardabīl and Amīra Dūbbaj was murdered by Shāh Ṭahmāsib I, in 942 A.H.\(^{\text{sic}}\). Therefore Kasrawī must be wrong. The Persian text runs as follows:

Cf. Chapter V, Pp. 360-1.
1. Petrushevsky, Khwāwarz, Islam in Iran, pp. 265-6 and 280.
2. Āhsan, I, p. 9; Jahān Gushā, ff. 31b-32a.
square in Tabrīz because of the help she had given to the Šafawīd family. ¹

Then, Rustam Pādishah decided to deceive Kārkiyā by sending a kindly and friendly letter to Kārkiyā. At first, Rustam Mīrzā ordered his men to carry off all the fortune and booty which Muḥammad Beg had possessed,² because of his participation in that escape. Then Rustam Mīrzā wrote a letter to Kārkiyā Mīrzā ʿAlī, asking him to send back Haydar's children to Tabrīz. Kārkiyā Mīrzā declared in his answer that he did not know where Haydar's children were, but he would tell him if he received any news. Since Rustam Mīrzā's envoys returned without succeeding in finding their prey, he sent a group of his spies again out to Lāhijān dressed as Qizil-Bāsh to find out where they were hiding. By making use of the simplicity of the local people and by introducing themselves as disciples of the Šafawīd dynasty, these spies found out the exact whereabouts of the children and returned to Tabrīz at once.³

This time, in accordance with his usual tricks,

---

Rustam Mirza wrote a letter to Karkiya Mirza "Ali and expressed his regret at Sultan "Ali Mirza's murder, pretending that he wanted to serve Haydar's children in order to atone for his sins.\(^1\) After consultation with the Safawids Karkiya Mirza "Ali sent back Rustam's envoys without their having achieved anything. Rustam Mirza, who was sure that Haydar's children were concealed in Lahijan, threatened Karkiya in another letter saying that, if he refused to deliver Haydar's children to his men he himself would invade Lahijan and massacre all the inhabitants.\(^2\) Karkiya Mirza "Ali became worried this time and decided to hand over the children to Rustam's envoys but, according to some sources, he was visited in a dream by Hazrat-i "Ali (the Prophet Muhammad's son-in-law), who prevented him from doing this. Afterwards Karkiya learned that Isma'il Mirza had had a similar dream. He therefore gave money to the envoys and assured them that he would inform Rustam Mirza if he received any information about their hiding-place in his provinces.\(^3\)

\(^1\) Shāh Ismai' al, p.35; cf. Jahan Gusha, f.34; Denison Ross, op. cit., p. 276; Add. 200, f. 34b.
\(^2\) 'A.A. Shāh Ismai' al, p. 38; cf. Jahan Gusha, ff. 35a-b; Denison Ross, op. cit., pp. 277-280; and Add. 200, 36b.
\(^3\) Jahan Gusha, ff. 35a-b; cf. Shāh Ismai' al, p. 40; Add. 200, f. 36b; Denison Ross, op. cit., pp. 277-280; and Ghulam Sarwar, op. cit., p. 32.
II. Ismā‘īl Mīrzā’s Concealment in a "Zamblil". 1

As already mentioned, Rustam Mīrzā who was anxious to kill Ḥaydar’s children sent his last ultimatum along with three hundred qūrchiṣ to Lāḥījān, notifying Karkiyyā Mīrzā that he had been informed of Ḥaydar’s children being there by one of Karkiyyā’s relatives. He then ordered him to hand them over, alive or dead, to his commander in charge, Qāsim Beg Turkomān. Otherwise his men would stay in Lāḥījān until he personally invaded the area. 2 Karkiyyā Mīrzā ‘Allī was frightened by the last letter but since he had dreamt of Ḥadrat-i ‘Allī and been advised by him, he hung Ismā‘īl Mīrzā in a tree in a zambīl and then took an oath that Ḥaydar’s children were not in the lands of Lāḥījān. 3 Of this incident the

1. Zamblil or zamblil is a basket made of palm leaves. According to the Persian language and local pronunciation, both forms are used. We cannot call zamblil a "box" or "basket" without mentioning the materials from which it is made. Cf. Browne, op. cit., p. 50; Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 32; and Steingass, op. cit., p. 624.

2. 'Ā.A. Shāh Ismā‘īl, p. 38, cf. Jahan Gushā, f 36b; Denison Ross, op. cit., p. 280; and Add. 200, f. 36b.

3. 'Ā.A. Shāh Ismā‘īl, pp. 38-40, cf. Jahan Gushā, ff. 35b-37a; Denison Ross, op. cit., pp. 281-2; Add. 200, f. 37a; Ghulām Sarwar, who has (op. cit., p. 32) omitted this dream; and Browne, op. cit., Iv, p. 50.
ordered Kiya in his dream to call for Qasim Beg ten days later and to say, 'I sent my men to search for them, house to house, in this province carefully and diligently, but they returned without any clue. If you do not believe me, I will swear by God and His Book (Qur'an) that they are not in my province.' To do this you have to fasten a rope between two trees and put Haydar's children in a zambil and hang them from it. Then you may touch the Qur'an and swear that they are not in your territories.

On this occasion, Karkiya was able to convince Rustam Mirza's men that they should search for Haydar's children elsewhere than in his territories. Thereafter Isma'il Mirza seems to have had a peaceful life at Lahijan.

In Lahijan, with the help of his tutor, Maulana Shams al-Din Lahiji, who later became his minister, Isma'il Mirza learned to read the Qur'an, Arabic and Persian. Amir Najm al-Din Zargar (a gold-smith) who had been very kind to Isma'il Mirza in Rasht, used to visit Isma'il Mirza and to express his loyalty and friendship. During Isma'il's stay in Lahijan, his

---

1. Ṣāheb Isma'il, p. 40; cf. Jahan Gušā, f. 37a; Denison Ross, op. cit., p. 281; Add. 200, f. 37a. Both Ghulam Sarwar, op. cit., p. 32 and Browne, op. cit., p. 50, omit this dream and in fact ignore the whole story.

2. Jahan Gušā, f. 32a; Ahsan I, p. 9, cf. Ḥabīb, pp. 490-491; 'A. A. 'Abbāst, p. 19; Denison Ross, op. cit., p. 271; Add. 200, f. 32a-b; Mazzaoui, op. cit., p. 80 where he quotes from Nahрава́н (not Nahраvа́п, as given by Mazzaoui) Kitāb al-A'lam, pp. 233-34.
followers and Sūfis visited him from all the outlying districts, especially from Rūm, Qarāja Dāgh and Ahar. Since it was not safe for them and for him to stay there, he advised them to return at once.¹

According to the author of 'Alam-ārā-yi Shāh Ismā'īl, after four years, two of Ismā'īl's brothers, Sultan Ibrāhīm and Sūlāmān Mīrzā, wanted to go back to Ardabil, and asked Ismā'īl Mīrzā's permission to visit their mother. Ismā'īl Mīrzā replied that:

"destiny might be unkind and Sultan 'Allī Khān, the governor of Ardabil, might find them and kill them or hand them over to Rustam Mīrzā, the king of Iran. He then asked Ibrāhīm Mīrzā to have pity on them and not to break their old mother's heart."²

Ibrāhīm Mīrzā said that he would take off his turban and replace it by a Taqīya-yi Turkomānī and no one would know him. Since he insisted, Ismā'īl Mīrzā consulted with Karkīyā who replied that they should consult the Holy Book. If it gave permission they could go; if not, they should not go. Then Mullā Zayn al-'Ābidin Rashtī, who was also their teacher, consulted the Qur'ān and it

---


gave them a favourable response, so they set out for Ardabil. 1

After the departure of Ibrāhīm Mīrzā (and Sulaimān Mīrzā), Ismā'īl Mīrzā became ill and his illness lasted a year. During his illness, a doctor called Maulānā Ni'mat Allāh did his best to cure him. At last, he recovered and since he wished to eat special crumbs of blessed bread from the Dār al-İrāhād, he asked his aunt Pāshā Khātūn to send him some. His aunt acceded to his request and Ismā'īl Mīrzā sent Gūg 'Allī, one of his personal servants, to Rasht to bring the bread to

1. ʻA.A. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 37, where the unique Persian text runs:

Lāhījān. Ismā'īl Mirzā also received some letters from his mother and brothers and other relatives. It is believed that after Ismā'īl Mirzā had eaten pieces of that bread, his illness was completely cured. After three days he sent the Ilchūs to Ardabīl with some expensive presents with which, with those gifts that had been provided by Kārkiyā Mirzā 'Alī, the ruler of Lāhījān, and Amīra Ishāq, the ruler of Gīlān, Muḥammad Beg could redeem his properties which had been forfeited by Rustam Pādīshāh. This action made Rustam Pādīshāh think that Ḥaydar's children must be concealed in Lāhījān. He then sent an envoy to Kārkiyā Mirzā 'Alī, asking him to fulfil the king's request. Since Kārkiyā had hidden Ismā'īl Mirzā in Lashta-Nishā (near Lāhījān towards Māzandarān) the envoys were able to discover nothing.

The years 902-905/1494-1499/1500 were torn with disturbances and anarchy caused by territorial rivalry between the last Āq-qoyūnlū rulers and there was no opportunity to kill Ḥaydar's children. During these

2. See the sources mentioned in no. 1.
3. Jahān Gushā, f. 33a-b, and Add. 200, f. 33a-b.
disturbed times, the only people who reaped any benefit were the disciples of the Ṣafawīd dynasty who met their "murshid" freely and spread his message to others.¹

1. Nusakh-i Jahān-ārā, f. 200, and Jahān-ārā, p. 264 state that:

"آ خبرت ترقب شیخ سال ورکی دریان ولادیان ترقبی داشتم و در آن از این فریب ان صادقی هایان روآا فرمایی که نفرین داری نمایید بودند این وصی تنها نسی نشد..."

Cf. Add. 200, f. 37b; and Jahān Gushā, f. 37a-b

where the author points out:

"وهندان نتیجه از ارکی سال بنیان دریان به یافته که به همگر در افتادن که می‌ثابت فریب رازی ان‌هرند فرید..."

See also Lubb, p. 240;

"دهان درنت آق در زنگی مهربان دنیا که بانو جوز و وری به یاد که مردم عامی پایان تام و می‌گیرند و کاری به‌نام جوز و نظام بین‌النهر و نمایش مثمن..."...لاهات بزند..."

and A. Kasrawi, Chihil-Maqāla,

pp. 303-309
PART THREE

I. Conditions in Iran After the Death of Rustam Pādīshāh.

After the account of the concealment and wanderings of Ḥaydar's sons, it is appropriate to give a brief discussion of the Āq-qoyūnlu monarchy in Iran, and more especially show the conditions existing in Iran before 905/1499-1500.

In 902/1497 Gūda Aḥmad b. Aghūrūlu Muḥammad b. Ḥasan Beg rebelled against Rustam Pādīshāh (Mīrzā Rustam Beg) and with the help of Ḥasan Beg 'Alī Khānī, the son-in-law of Aghūrūlu Muḥammad, killed Rustam Mīrzā. (This was the second battle of which the chronogram is given in 901/1496.)

For his wrongdoing and misbehaviour Gūda Aḥmad met death in 903/1497 and Muḥammad Mīrzā b. Yūsuf Beg b.


The author of Mīr'āt al-Adwar (f. 230b) states of Rustam Mīrzā:

"Rustam Mīrzā, the son of Ḥasan Beg, had a difficult time in Sultan Ya'qūb's period of power, feeding himself by begging food and other needs."

The Persian text runs as follows:

"..."
Hasan Beg took over the throne of Azarbajjan in 905/1499 (Shawwal - May).1 In 905/1499 Muhammad Mirza himself was defeated by Alwand Mirza in Asgaran of Isfahân and in 905/1499, because of the intercession of a certain darwîsh called Babâ Khayr Allâh, made peace with his brother Sultan Murad, on the condition that Iraq, Fars and Kirman should belong to Sultan Murad, and Azarbajjan, Mughanât, Arran and Diyar Bakr (in Turkey) to Alwand Mirza, with the river Qizil-Uzûn forming the boundary between these two kings' territories.2


2. Habîb, p. 446; cf. Jahân-âra, p. 257; ... Lubb, pp. 230-231 where the author states:

A historian who writes about the Bâyunduri dynasty has to repeat the words "was killed" again and again, since their stories are about murder and killing rather than anything else.
II. Ismā'īl Mīrzā Leaves Lāhijān (Middle of Muharram 905/22 August 1499.)

When Ismā'īl Mīrzā and his special Şūfīs heard about the riots and rebellion of the Turkomān amīrs in Iran, they were determined to go back to Ardabīl and with the help of their numerous devotees and the holy spirits of their great ancestors to seize the power. It would appear that they considered the moment favourable to the acquisition by Ismā'īl of the throne of Azarbāyjān.

Most of the earliest sources are in agreement that Ismā'īl Mīrzā chose an ideal time to move. Internal unrest prevailed, the roads were unsafe for travel, and many petty rulers fought one another to the detriment of stability within the region.

It is worth mentioning at this point the unique account given in the recently published work of Ḥāfla Husain Karbalā'ī Tabrizī, the Shī'ite Şūfī of the 10th/16th century, which has not been used up until now

1. See p.96, footnote 1.
by biographers of Shāh Ismā'īl I. The full account is as follows:

"Since Ḥadrat-i Shāh-i Jamjāh Ismā'īl Mirzā had become tired of the muddy land of Lāhijān and its weather, he decided to leave there but he was afraid of the hostility of the Āq-qoyūnlū. He therefore sent Khādīm Beg, one of his teachers, to Alwand Beg, to obtain permission to go to Ardabīl and stay in the neighbourhood of his ancestor's grave. Alwand replied to him in a letter, saying that he did not need to get permission from anyone. The sovereignty was appointed to him by the supreme ruler of the world (God), and he had to set out to conquer the whole world."

In the letter there was also a verse saying:

"There are many kings on the seashores of power, each of whom is attended by crowds of followers, All of them will be drowned if the royal ocean casts up a wave."

Alwand Mirzā also sent a present of a sword and a bow to Ismā'īl Mirzā and encouraged him to rebel. According to the same statement, Alwand Mirzā foretold Ismā'īl's monarchy before he became king.¹

---

¹ Ḥafiz Ḥusain Karbalāʾī, Tabrīzī, Rawḍat al-Jīnān wa Jannātā l-Jīnān, vol. II, ed. by Jāfār Sulṭān al-Qurājī (Teh. 1349), p. 160. The Persian text runs as follows: "بِحُرُ الْمَكْرَمِ عَلَى هَاشَمٍ فِي نَجْفَةٍ فِي هَيْدَانٍ بَنُونِ ذِلِّكُمْ وَلَا يُعْطِى كَلْمَاتٗ فِي نَجْفَةٍ حَتَّى يَلْيَضُ بِهِمْ بَنُونِ ذِلِّكُمْ ۚ حَتَّى يُعْطَى كَلْمَاتٗ فِي نَجْفَةٍ بَنُونِ ذِلِّكلُمْ ۚ حَتَّى يُعْطَى كَلْمَاتٗ فِي نَجْفَةٍ بَنُونِ ذِلِّكُمْ ۚ حَتَّى يُعْطَى كَلْمَاتٗ فِي نَجْفَةٍ بَنُونِ ذِلِّكُمْ ۚ حَتَّى يُعْطَى كَلْمَاتٗ فِي نَجْفَةٍ بَنُونِ ذِلِّكُمْ ۚ حَتَّى يُعْطَى كَلْمَاتٗ فِي نَجْفَةٍ بَنُونِ ذِلِّكُمْ ۚ حَتَّى يُعْطَى كَلْمَاتٗ فِي نَجْفَةٍ بَنُونِ ذِلِّكُمْ ۚ حَتَّى يُعْطَى كَلْمَاتٗ فِي نَجْفَةٍ بَنُونِ ذِلِّكُمْ ۚ حَتَّى يُعْطَى كَلْمَاتٗ فِي نَجْفَةٍ بَنُونِ ذِلِّكُمْ ۚ حَتَّى يُعْطَى كَلْمَاتٗ فِي نَجْفَةٍ بَنُونِ ذِلِّكُمْ ۚ حَتَّى يُعْطَى كَلْمَاتٗ فِي نَجْفَةٍ بَنُونِ ذِلِّكُمْ ۚ حَتَّى يُعْطَى كَلْمَاتٗ فِي نَجْفَةٍ بَنُو
This new account by Ḥāfīz Ḥusain Karbalā'ī Tabrīzī agrees with the other stories of this move by Ismā'īl in that it stresses the propitious moment chosen. It differs, however, in the way in which the author takes great pains to point out that Ismā'īl Mīrzā got permission from Alwand Mīrzā, the ruler of Āzarbāyjān, before moving back to Ardabīl. The author even goes on to say that Alwand Mīrzā replied to the letter sent by Ismā'īl Mīrzā and actually encouraged him to rebel and seize power. The other sources merely say that Ismā'īl was encouraged to bring back stability and law and order which had broken down at that time and that Ḥadrat-i 'Alī appeared to him in a dream supporting this course of action.

An analysis of this account could be made in one of the following two ways:

1. The account of the permission to rebel granted to Ismā'īl by Alwand Mīrzā is a later interpretation by a proponent of a pious Shi'ite viewpoint.

2. The account shows Alwand Mīrzā encouraging Ismā'īl Mīrzā to rebel, not against himself, but rather against his rivals, a policy already followed by Ḥasan Beg and Rustam Mīrzā. Most probably, the account is an expression of a pious Shi'ite attitude, different from other Shi'ite versions of the same incident. The author carefully stresses the legality of Ismā'īl's move.

1. See chapter II, p. 102; cf. Ḥabīb, p. 447.
It seems more reasonable to accept the statement of the author of Lubb al-Tawārīkh, pointing out that Ismā'īl Mīrzā, along with all his devotees, set out to destroy disorder and anarchy throughout Iran, or the statement by the author of 'Ālam-ārā-yi Shāh Ismā'īl that Ismā'īl Mīrzā should wait in Lāhījān till the right time came.¹

Ismā'īl Mīrzā's first step was to send a Ṣūfī to the ruler of Lāhījān, Kārkīyā Mīrzā 'Alī, to obtain permission to set out for Ardabīl. Because of his youth and shortage of men, Kārkīyā rejected his request and refused to let him go to Ardabīl. After a while, Ismā'īl felt compelled to visit Kārkīyā personally and he declared his serious intention of leaving. Kārkīyā had no alternative but to accept Ismā'īl Mīrzā's request. He brought them to Lashta-nishā under the pretext of hunting.²

---

1. Lubb, (1315 Sh., Khāwar edition), p. 24, where the author states:

"... وقین درست آق قتیر تیروی به نواحی درمانگر ایران هر چه می‌گردد ... رایت این ..." 

Be Maz'mūr Khāna-ye Emām wa Nāma-yi 'Ulūm wa Tūbī-yi Ardabīl dar Kārūn Akā..."

Cf. 'A.Ā. Shāh-Ismā'īl, p. 32.

Cf. Inqilāb- Islām, pp. 52-55, where he mentions the lack of unity among the Āq-qoyūnlū dynasty; and Ḥābīb, p. 447.

2. See Ḥābīb, vol. IV, p. 448; Lubb, p. 24 where the author calls this place Sāmān "سمن " in the district of Daylamān; Jahān Gusha, f. 42a; Add 200, f. 42a; and 'A.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 40-41.
III. ʿĪsāʾī ʿAṭīr Receives Intimation from the Lord of the Age that he is Looked upon by Him with Favour.

The earliest accounts of Shāh ʿĪsāʾī's life record a legendary meeting at this point between ʿĪsāʾī ʿAṭīr and the Mahdī. The sources generally agree on the date and place of this encounter, which they claim occurred in 905/1499 at Lashta-nisba, about two years before the conquest of Tabrīz. The emphasis placed by the earliest Shīʿite writers on this meeting stems from their desire to show ʿĪsāʾī ʿAṭīr's religious pedigree and legitimacy.

The main versions of this encounter in the sources are strikingly similar and are based on one account, that of ʿArākh-i Jahān Gushā-yi Kháqān, written in the early years of Shāh Tāhmāsb's reign. In view of the extraordinary details of this incident it is cited below in full in the English translation by Denison Ross of Ms. Add. 200 (C.U.L.). It is a remarkable example of the kind of propaganda used by the Baktashī Shīʿites at the time of Shāh ʿĪsāʾī and Shāh Tāhmāsb to legitimize both Shāh ʿĪsāʾī's rule and that of his son after him.

According to the sources, ʿĪsāʾī ʿAṭīr left his attendants in Lashta-nisba and crossed a narrow stream

---

1. For instance, Jahān Gushā, f. 42a; Add. 200, f. 42a and ʿA.A. Shāh ʿĪsāʾī, pp. 40-41.
3. See the above sources.
ordering his men not to follow him but to wait there until he came back. After some hours he returned and joined his followers, wearing a turban and with a sword at his belt. Dada Muḥammad, a Baktāshī follower of the Safawīd dynasty and a Baktāshī Sūfī who visited Shāh Ismā'īl in 907/1501 in the square of Šāhībād in Tabrīz, describes how he saw Ismā'īl Mīrzā in the desert of Mecca, in the presence of the Mahdī, the Twelfth Imām. Dada Muḥammad, as a darwīsh of pure life, was a disciple of Ḥasan Khalīfa Takallū who himself was a disciple of the Ṣafawīd Shaikhs. He had once visited Sultān Junaid and

1. The author of Jahān Gushā gives "پیامرساقی" and Add. 200 gives: "بیت ما بیرن اکمردن". But the author of 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl gives this statement instead: "ومباندی دوتم فردکردن دختم باذامه فرمت شده امیت. لیا امیر فرخنال شده قرن ای ای میکرت بریزند دختم فرخنال شده قرن ای امیر". Jahān Gushā gives 12 as does Add. 200.

Here, the author does not mention the Lashta-nishā event but gives Dada Muḥammad's account in detail. See Jahān Gushā, f. 42a-b, Add. 200, 42a-b, and 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 41.


3. For Takallū or Tekkelū, see Hasluck, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 142 and 165.
twice Shaikh Ḥaydar, who had given him a promise with regard to the rise and rebellion of Ismā'īl Mīrzā his son.1 On leaving this world Ḥasan Khalīfa bequeathed his powers of spiritual guidance to his son, Ḫābā Shāh Qulī, and gave him an ablāq 2 saying that he should give that present to Ismā'īl Mīrzā on such and such day.

According to the sources mentioned before, Dada Muḥammad decided in 905/1499 to make the pilgrimage to Mecca, asked permission of Ḫābā Shāh Qulī and according to Dada Muḥammad, he was ordered to give that ablāq to Shāh Ismā'īl in 907/1501 in Tabrīz on his way back to Takka.3

The sources then add that Dada Muḥammad had made the pilgrimage to Mecca and after visiting Medina, he turned to Baghdād. It was between Medina and Baghdād that he lost trace of the caravan and when he became weary of searching he was overcome by sleep. On awaking

1. Jahān Gushā, f. 42b-3a; Add. 200 42b-3a; ‘Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 41-42. It should be added here that, according to Baktashi Qizil-Bāsh belief, "the twelfth Imam is in hiding, and the Kizilbash await his coming" (Hasluck, op. cit., vol. I, p. 145).

2. ‘Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl describes it as a badge since he says: "بئسَتُ لَكَ سَلامُ بِرا دَارَ مَسَانِعٍ وَلائِنَ الْبَلَقُ وَديَّ "کُمْ بِضَبَاتَ خُرْبَةً وَلائِنَ زَنْتَ رَا مِي دَهْيَ کَرَ در نَدْرَ هَلْتَ تِمْ بِكَرَیْنِ اتْسِبُ فِرْضَ بِنْبَنَداً". Cf. Denison Ross, op. cit., p. 328, footnote, 6.

3. The sources generally agree with each other.
he could find no trace of the caravan and for three more
days he wandered about; finally he fell exhausted to the
ground and because of thirst and hunger he longed for
death. At noon, on the third day, he saw "an Arab youth
riding towards him, who coming up to him said: 'Oh!
dervish, arise, for thou art not far from cultivated land.'
The dervish indicated by signs that he was too feeble to
walk. The youth then took his hand, and no sooner was his
hand in that of the youth than he felt all his strength
return. So he arose and was led by the youth towards a
hill; when they reached the summit of the hill he looked
around and saw that, as far as the eye could reach, the
plains were covered with verdure and roses and tulips,
and that gold-embroidered tents and silk canopies had
been spread out. Turning to his companion he said: 'Oh!
Arab youth, no one ever saw such a place as this in the
deserts of Mekka and the Najaf-i Ashraf. What place is
this? and who is the Lord of these tents and palaces?'
The young Arab replied, 'You will know afterwards.' He
then walked by the young man's side, until they came to a
palace whose cupola out-rivalled the sun and moon. They
then entered, and a delightful apartment met his view,
the like of which he had never seen. Golden thrones were
arranged side by side, and on one of the thrones a person
was seated whose face was covered with a veil. Dede
Moḥammad, placing his hand on his breast, made a salutation,

whereupon an answer to his salutation came from the veiled one, who having bidden him be seated, ordered food to be brought for him. The like of this food he had never seen in his life before. They also brought some cold water, which Dede Moḥammad drank, nor had he ever tasted such refreshing water. As soon as he had finished his repast, he saw that a party of men had entered, bringing a boy of about fourteen years of age,¹ with red (surkh) hair, a white face, and dark-grey eyes; "سیاه" on his head was a scarlet cap. Being entered he made a salutation and stood still; the veiled youth then said to him: 'Oh! Ismā'īl, the hour of your "coming" has now arrived.' The other replied: 'It is for Your Holiness to command.' The prince then said: 'Come forward.' He came forward, and His Holiness, taking off his belt, three times lifted it up and placed it on the ground again. He then, with his own blessed hands, fastened on the girdle, and taking (Ismā'īl's) cap² from his head, raised it and

1. The exact age of Ismā'īl Mīrzā differs from one account to another. The author of Jahān Gushā, f. 42a, gives it as 12 years old and several pages later, on f. 43b, he gives it as about 1⁄4 years old. This agrees with Add. 200, but contrary to the above-mentioned sources the author of 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 42, says about 13-14.

2. Here Denison Ross instead of giving Ismā'īl Mīrzā's name refers to Belt by giving "it". See his translation, p. 330. His meaning would be clearer if "him" were substituted for "it"—the Mahdī lifted the boy by his belt.

3. Hat is more accurate than "cap".
then replaced it. He wore a Kurdish belt-dagger; this His Holiness took from him and threw to the dervish Muhammad, saying 'Keep this, for it will stand you in stead.' His Holiness then told his servants to bring his own sword, which, when brought, he fastened with his own hands to the girdle of the child. Then he said, 'You may now depart.' Having recited the Fatiha, he entrusted the child to the two or three persons who had brought him in...."  

According to these historians, after Ismā'īl Mirzā had received this intimation from the Mahdī, the Lord of the Age and the twelfth Imām of the Shi'a sect, he left the desert and set out for Ardabīl, to gather more followers

1. The sources generally agree that the dagger was Kurdish, which is surprising why should Ismā'īl Mirzā wear a Kurdish dagger since most of the Kurdish inhabitants were Sunni? Does it refer to his Kurdish origin as Kasrawī believed. See his Sheikh Safī, pp. 36-37, where he states: 'Firūz-Shāh Zarrīn Kulāh was a Kurd of Sinjār'?

2. I have quoted D. Ross' English translation as I did not want to ignore his skill in translation, since the sources generally agree with each other. However, Dada Muhammad claim that the above-mentioned youth was the Mahdī, the Twelfth Imām, and the child was Shāh Ismā'īl who visited him in that desert—which seems considerable propaganda.

For the rest of the story see Denison Ross, op. cit., pp. 330-331.
and propagate Twelver Shi'ism. On that day he introduced himself as its sponsor and said farewell to Kārkiya Mīrzā 'All near Arjūvān. Then he went towards Daylamān along with his seven Sūfīs, Ḥusain Beg Lala, Abdāl 'All Beg, Dada Beg, Khādim Beg Khalīfa, Rustam Beg Qārāmānlū, Bāyām Beg Qārāmānlū, Ilyās Beg, Ightūth-Ūghlī and Qara Pirī Beg Qājār. They camped in Tārum and it was

1. There are many varying statements about Ismā'īl Mīrzā's first camping place. Ḥabīb, p. 448 gives: "(ورچان)" which seems to be Arjūvān. Lubū, p. 24 gives "Sāmān", Jahān Gushā gives Tārum and Add. 200 agrees with this. But 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl gives this account which seems incorrect:


3. Jahān Gushā, f. 44; cf. Aḥsan, I, p. 26, where Rūmlū says: 1500 followers were gathered in Tārum; 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 44; Ḥabīb, p. 449 (300 only); Jahān Gushā, f. 45a, gives 1500 as does Add 200, f. 45a.

4. As already mentioned above.
there that, according to different accounts, he gathered between 200 and 1,500 followers.¹ Since he did not trust Amīra Ḥusām al-Dīn, the governor of Tārum, he set out to Khalkhāl where he stayed in a village called .jbossة یورن .² The next day he went to a farm called Mazra‘a-yi Shāmlū which was known as Shām-i Qızīl Uzūn or Uzān.⁷ Since he was fond of melons he stayed there for a while. Shaikh Qāsim, the owner of the melon-bed, sacrificed 40 sheep for Ismā‘īl and his entourage. A few days later Ismā‘īl Mīrzā went to a village called Nisāz (نیسا) in the Khalkhāl area. From there he and his Sufīs moved to a village called یاورن خیال or یاورن خیال to the house of Malik Muẓaffar Tūqāchī (مظفر توقی) the Tūqāchī of Sulṭān ‘All Mīrzā b. Sulṭān Ḥaydar, his elder brother, who was known also as Khulafā Beg. In this village it is said that they stayed for a month.⁵ Then they moved to the village of Ḥefzābād near Ardabīl, and from there to another village called یاورن یاورن .

¹. As already discussed above.
². See F.J.I., vol. IV, p. 88 "Barandaq" (?).
³. Ibid., p. 526: "Nesāz" (ناسز).
⁴. Ibid., p. 193.
⁶. See F.J.I., p. 178: "کوئی خیال".
There is a unique account in 'Alam-ārā-yi Shāh Ismāʿīl about the thought and belief of Ismāʿīl Mīrzā and the generally powerful influence wielded by his seven Sūfīs over Ismāʿīl Mīrzā in his early career. It was they, not he himself, who usually dictated policy.

From اَلورق, Ismāʿīl Mīrzā decided to go straight to Ardabīl. As his mother became aware of his intentions, she sighed sorrowfully and sent an Ilchī to her son saying that it was not a convenient time to come to Ardabīl. Then she persuaded him to wait at least six months until his followers returned from their summer-quarters. The Ilchī

1. At this point, Ḩabīb, vol. IV, p. 448, Jahān Gushā, f. 45a-b; Add. 200, 49-1b and Ḥāsān, vol. I, p. 27 generally agree that Ismāʿīl entered Ardabīl and that it was after the pilgrimage to Shaikh Ṣafī's shrine that he was told to leave Ardabīl. But, according to the author of اَل. Shāh Ismāʿīl, they did not go to Ardabīl, as the Persian text goes on to say:

(Transliteration of the text in the Persian source)

...
left Ardabil the same night that 'Ali Beg was setting
out on the campaign against Ismā'īl Mīrzā who is said to
have been encamped in Qara Darra (قرا دار) and reached
Ismā'īl Mīrzā and his Šūfs at prayer time. He gave the
message to Ḥusain Beg Lala who informed Ismā'īl Mīrzā
at once and asked him to fulfil his mother's request.
Lala told him that his mother, 'Ālam Shāh Baygum (Marta)
was right, for it was not a fortunate time to go to
Ardabil. But Ismā'īl Mīrzā said:

"According to the statement of the Lord of
the Age, if my rebellion is right, why is
my going to Ardabil not expedient?"

Lala replied:

"The rebellion is auspicious and you may go
anywhere, and by the help of God, you could
come to Ardabil after a while."

Ismā'īl Mīrzā was satisfied and returned to Tarum with his
500 Šūfs.

The account goes on to relate that later, on the
first day of the Persian new year, they went secretly to
Ardabil after it had been announced to him by his spies
whom he had stationed in Ardabil that the political
circumstances of Ardabil were favourable for him and his
devotees to attack the city. This was a moment when
Alwand Mīrzā had recalled his regiments from Ardabil to
Tabrīz and therefore 'Ali Beg was alone, with only his
private guards.1

1. 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 49.
The source says that Isma‘il Mirzā seized the opportunity and that on that day he made a surprise attack on ‘Ali Beg’s guards. The people of Ardabil joined Isma‘il Mirzā’s men and murdered many of the guards. They besieged ‘Ali Beg’s house and surrounded his guards.¹ They went into the house and arrested ‘Ali Beg, the governor of Ardabil, put him into chains and handed him over to Isma‘il Mirzā. Isma‘il Mirzā asked him to curse the caliphs who betrayed ‘Ali b. Abī Tālib, and to profess “‘Ali is a friend of God,” otherwise he would be killed. But he refused and he was therefore burned alive.² Then Isma‘il left 7,000 of his devotees in Ardabil in charge of his mother and brothers, and with the rest of his devotees, 7,000 in number, he went towards Diyār Bakr. When they reached the Aras river they met

¹ The Persian text runs as follows:

² The exact number of the guards is given in the source as 10,000, although it contradicts the early analysis of the moment being favourable to an attack because ‘Ali Beg was vulnerable, with only his guards to defend him.

---

¹ A.A. Shāh Isma‘īl, p. 49. Cf. Jahān Guşā, f. 49b; Denison Ross, op. cit., p. 326; Add. 200, f. 49b.

² For more details see A.A. Shāh Isma‘īl, p. 49.
Unlike the author of 'Alam-ārā-yi Shāh Ismā'īl, the other sources state that, after the pilgrimage to the Ardabil Shrine, they were forced to take the threats of the governor seriously and to leave Ardabil, because he had made it clear that if they did not leave they should be prepared for war.  

Ismā'īl Mīrzā and his Sufis set out for the village of Mīrnil, moved on from there to their winter-quarters

1. 'Ā. A. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 49. On the contrary the other sources generally agree with the fact that it was in Arzinjān that Ismā'īl gathered his devotees.
2. For instance, Jahān Guşha; Add. 200; Ḥabīb to some extent; Ahsan, I, p. 27; Jahān-ārā, p. 264; Lubb, p. 246.  
4. According to F.J.I. Mīrnil is a village near Kalkhūrān, only 10 km. to the north-east of Ardabil (vol.iv,p.519). Cf. Ahsan, vol. I, p. 27 (G′); Jahān Guşha, f. 45b (G′); Add 200, f. 45b (G′); Denison Ross, op. cit., p. 333 (Mīrnil) and Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., pp. 32-34. It seems that Ghulām Sarwar did not mention the above village.
At Talish. At the invitation of the governor of the
Talish district, Mirza Muhammed Seltan, they stayed in
the village of Arjuvan1 in the province of Astara2 for a
month. They then decided to move to another place when
they found out that Mirza Muhammed Seltan's mother and
Amir Hamza Talish Amir Ulwan were going to murder
Ismail Mirza.3 Since this attempt was exposed by Amir
Aqa Gilani and Mirza Muhammed Sultan apologized for his
intentions, the prince and his Sufis remained there for
a while, and it was there that Ismail Mirza dismissed
his Qizil-Baghes to go to their homes and he and his
Sufis spent their hardest winter in Yurt-i Qishlaq,
where he exposed another assassination plot.4

IV. Ismail Mirza Frustrates the Scheme of Sultan

Husain Baran1.

After this successful raid in Ardabil, Ismail and
his followers were advised to leave and to gather more

1. The sources agree with "Arjuvan" but there is no
such name in F.J.I except on page 11, vol IV,
"Arjistan" (ارجستان), one of a number of villages in
the eastern area around Ardabil.
2. This village must be (المستان), as explained above.
3. Jaham Gusha, ff. 46a-46b. Cf. Add. 200, 46a-b, and
supporters. It is clear that they enjoyed considerable support at this stage from the population of Ardabil.

During the events of 905/1500-1, the sources indicate that while Isma'il Mirza was on his way to Arzinjan to gather his disciples, he stopped at Gükcha Tan'ikţ (؟) where he met one of the survivors of the Qara-qoyunlu, called Sultan Husain Marānī. Sultan Husain, who was aiming to occupy the throne of Jahān Shāh, his grandfather, visited Isma'il and declared his allegiance to him. Then he invited him to his camp. But the Sufis, who were aware of Husain's schemes, refused to allow Isma'il Mirza to go to his camp personally, claiming, as an excuse, that Isma'il Mirza was ill.2

2. Ḥabīb, p. 449. ʿA.Ā. Shāh Ismāʿīl makes this statement:

The author does not mention how they moved but, contrary to the above-mentioned sources, adds that Ismāʿīl Mirza himself killed Sultan Husain near the Aras river. For more details see ʿA.Ā. Shāh Ismāʿīl, p. 51-52.
When night came, all the Sufis were ordered to light fires and to put many large pots over them to make it appear to the people in other camps in the distance that they were preparing food in Ismā'īl Mirzā's camp. Then they were to load up large camels and swift mules secretly and set out for Chūkhrūr Sa'd the same night.1

It would appear that the reason for leaving the camp in that manner was the knowledge that the Safawīd troops were out-numbered by Sultan Ḥusain's forces on that occasion. Otherwise the Sufis would not have left without fighting to the death. When Sultan Ḥusain heard of their departure, he pursued them but to no avail. From there Ismā'īl Mirzā went to Duqqūz Alam and camped there.2

According to the sources, in this village Qarājā Ilyās and a group of Sufis joined Ismā'īl and complained that Muntish Sultan Kurd had plundered their property, on their way to his camp. Accordingly, Ismā'īl Mirzā suddenly surrounded Shūrā Gil castle, Muntish's stronghold,

---

1. ʿAlī Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 51-2; cf. Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 34.
but Muntish managed to escape. Ismā'īl Mīrzā then took the castle. Many of Muntish's men were put to the sword while the zeal of the Sūfis was in ample evidence.¹

Then Ismā'īl Mīrzā went to the summer quarters of Sārī Qaya,² somewhere around Turjān, to hunt. He stayed there for two months. Next he went to Arzinjān where many of his followers joined him.³ Among these Turkomān tribesmen was Muḥammad Beg Ūstājū, accompanied by 200 followers, and 'Abidīn Beg Shāmlū, with 300 men. After this gathering, Ismā'īl Mīrzā asked the advice of the

1. See Ḥabīb, pp. 451-2; cf. Jahān Gushā, f. 52b; Aḥsan, p. 35, A.A. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 51.
3. These tribes have already been mentioned in chapter I. See also Aḥsan, vol. I, p. 35:

It is noteworthy that the author of Ḥabīb and the author of Aḥsan state that, after invading the fort of Muntish Kurd, Shāh Ismā'īl went to the summer quarters of "Sārūqīyā" (as has already been mentioned above). The correct rendering of this name should be Qārī Sārūqīyā as in modern times there are many villages in Azarbāyjān which bear the suffix preceded by the village name. For instance seven villages exist in Azarbāyjān and many others bear the same suffix in Sarāb such as: Qīzīl Qaya, Qara Qaya, Ğamīsh Qaya and so on. See F.J.I., vol. IV. p.259. 
leaders of the tribes as to what his next step should be. Finding that there was no unanimity, he decided to consider the various suggestions before proceeding any further.¹

V. Ismāʿīl Mīrzā Consults the Holy Qurān about his Next Move.

At this point (906/end of 1500), groups from various different areas had assembled in Arzinjān, after, according to some sources, they had been sent a summons by Ismāʿīl Mīrzā to meet him there. Amongst this gathering were people from Ardabīl and the districts of Bāybūrd, Tawalīsh and Mughānāt who had been supporters of the Šafawīds from the days of Sultān Ḥaydar.² As mentioned already, the troops of Ismāʿīl Mīrzā also contained tribes from Anatolia, Syria and Diyār Bakr who had fled to him at various times. No doubt many of these tribesmen were attracted to Ismāʿīl Mīrzā as much by the promise of booty as by religious motives.³

¹. See Ḥabīb, vol. IV, p. 453, where Khwānd Amīr gives Ismāʿīl Mīrzā's age as only 12 years old, while Aḥsan states he was 13 years old - see pp. 36:

"خاتمًا شیرین با وحیدر بیبیم سیره سالم برز "

Cf. Jahān Gūshā, f. 53a; and 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismāʿīl, pp. 50-53, where the author does not mention this event.

². See chapter I, the tribe of "Qızıl Bāsh".
Cf. 'Ā.Ā. 'Abbāsī, p. 20.

³. See chapter III, p. 122 infra.
Some of these Turkish tribes had joined him because of political unrest in their native lands. For instance, it is believed that some of the two tribes called "Hamyd-ll" and Tekke-ll had hated the Ottoman attitude towards them.\(^1\)

The historians of the 10th/16th century believed that this gathering in Arzindan numbered between 7,000 to 8,000.\(^2\) Then, because of the diversity of their opinions, they set up an assembly in order to determine what steps should be taken. Some of them said that they should remain in Arzindan until more followers arrived there. Many others believed that they should undertake a Holy War against Qar Qara (oJJ).\(^3\) Another faction suggested going to Chukhur Sa'd.\(^4\)

After the meeting, the Sufi amirs announced to Ismā'īl Mirzā that they could not agree on their next move. Ismā'īl Mirzā suggested that they should consult


\(^2\) See Ḥabīb, p. 453 & Ḥ. Ṭ. Mīrzā Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 49, where the author says Ismā'īl Mirzā had left seven thousand in Ardabil to guard his mother and brother and had taken the same number with him.

\(^3\) Ḥ. Ṭ. Mīrzā Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 49.\(^4\) gives eight thousand; Ḥ. Ṭ. Mīrzā Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 49.\(^5\) eight thousand; Ḥ. Ṭ. Mīrzā Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 49.\(^6\) seven thousand.


\(^5\) Ibid. It seems that Ḥabīb Rūmī copies the statement in Ḥabīb al-Siyar.
the Holy Qur'an, and that all the Şūfi leaders must agree to what the Blessed Book would tell them to do.¹ The next day Ismā'īl Mīrzā recalled all his amīrs to his camp telling them:

"It was revealed to me that the best thing to do is to go to Shirvān,"² and they could say nothing.

According to the sources, Ismā'īl Mīrzā told his amīrs that he had been informed in a dream of the right course of action. No doubt, whilst being careful to appear to listen to the views of the various groups of his followers, Ismā'īl Mīrzā was influenced by his small core of close advisers, the seven Şūfis, who knew that this was a good moment to make an aggressive move against the Shirvān Shāh, the avowed enemy of the Safawīd cause. Victory at this stage would be beneficial in several ways. First, Ismā'īl Mīrzā would be able to acquire great prestige as a warrior of jihād. Secondly, he

---

¹ See Ḥābīb, vol. IV, p. 453 where Khwānād Amīr states:

"... نَشَبَ ذِيَ اسْتِحْيَا سَبِيرَ فَرَاهَمْ بُرْدُ وَمُهَبَّتْ أَشَالَ دَيْرُ كَتِبَ فَرَاهَمْ بُرْدُ وَمُهَبَّتْ أَشَالَ دَيْرُ..." ُعْلَى اسْتِحْيَا وَقَبْعَ ىَ دِرْعُ فَرَاهَمْ بُرْدُ وَمُهَبَّتْ أَشَالَ دَيْرُ..."

Cf. Aḥsan, vol. I, p. 42 where Rūmūlī gives a similar sentence:

"كان نشب ذي استحيا سبیر فراغم برد ومعبط الشال دير كتیب فراغم برد ومعبط الشال دير كتیب..." ُعْلَى اسْتِحْيَا وَقَبْعَ ىَ دِرْعُ فَرَاهَمْ بُرْدُ وَمُهَبَّتْ أَشَالَ دَيْرُ..."

² Ḥābīb, p. 453; cf. Jahān Gushā, f. 53a-b.
would be seen to be avenging the death of his father and could visit his father's secret grave. A successful campaign would bring valuable booty and this was a temptation which Ismā'īl Mīrzā's Šūfīs understood very well.

VI. Ismā'īl Mīrzā's Invasion of Shīrvān (in the middle of 906/end of 1500).

After a short time Ismā'īl left for Shīrvān. When he reached the Pāsin region (in Armenia), he despatched Khulafa Beg to invade Georgia. Later on the successful amīr came back along with large booty, and received a

1. Habīb, p. 453. The other sources give a similar story.

Cf. 'Ā.Ā. 'Abbāsi, p. 20, where Iskandar-Munshi states that after leaving Ardabil Ismā'īl Mīrzā went straight towards Qara Bāgh and it was there that he gathered his followers before he moved to Arzinjān where he could gather about 4,000 Šūfīs. The author adds that from Arzinjān he attacked Shīrvān:

higher position as a reward. In the same year, Ilyâs Beg Ighût (or Iqút) Ughli, who had been sent to suppress the Muntish rebellion in his castle, arrived in the camp. He also brought many of the rebels who wished to beg for a royal pardon. They wore white shrouds and carried their swords round their neck. Ismâ’îl Mirzâ forgave them and this forgiveness caused Muntish himself to come to him and ask for forgiveness too. This was also granted him.

In order to find a passage through the Kur river, Ismâ’îl Mirzâ sent Bâyram Beg Qârâmânî with a regiment from the Dhûl-Qadar and Tekkellû tribes to look for a suitable crossing point. Because of the depth of the water in that river they could not cross, and stayed in Qoyûn-olûmî "the sheep ford" until Ismâ’îl’s arrival. As soon as he became aware of the problem, he bravely crossed the deep river on his horse. This courage prompted the others to follow him at once.

---

Ismā'īl Mirzā marched towards Shamākhī about Jumādā I, 906/December, 1500. On his way, he heard that Farrukh Yasār, the King of Šīrvān, was ready to fight with him. According to the sources, Farrukh Yasār had gathered 27,000 infantry and cavalry troops. When he reached Shamākhī, Ismā'īl Mirzā found that the city was deserted, but he was told that the Farrukh Yasār had pitched his camp in the area between the forts of Gulistān and Bayqurd Hisār (در میان کل گنبدان زمین پیژند ), so he set out for that area and before the Šīrvān Shāh took refuge in Gulistān Castle they met each other in Jabānī, and Farrukh Yasār was killed by one of Ismā'īl Mirzā's Qızıl-Bash.

After Ismā'īl Mirzā's conquest of Šīrvān, and the beheading of Farrukh Yasār, the King of Šīrvān, near the castle of Gulistān, Ismā'īl Mirzā ordered that the head should be stitched back onto his body and then burned. So many of the inhabitants were killed that a minaret was built from their severed heads.

1. See Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 35.
3. Ḥābīb, p. 457 gives کو که بیدر, but Aḥsan, p. 43 gives بیدر.
According to the sources, the main reason for the defeat of the Shirván Shāh's army was that his infantrymen were trampled underfoot by his own cavalry. The Qizil-Bash could therefore push through the enemy's front line and attack their scattered army.  

As already mentioned, Ismā'īl was greatly helped by his experienced Ṣūfī leaders who had chosen a very opportune moment to attack the Shīrvān Shāh.  

Khwānd Amīr, who like other flatterers of the king, wrote eloquently about the killing of the Shīrvānīs, and composed verses in celebration of this victory.  

Ismā'īl Mirzā then attacked Baku Castle in the Shīrvān area and occupied it by making several drainage trenches and filling the moats of the castle with stones and bushes. Then he ordered Khulafā Beg to enter the castle and to bring the Shīrvān Shāh's treasures to him.  

Khulafā Beg accordingly discovered a hoard of gold, jewels, pearls and many other precious articles and brought them to the presence of Ismā'īl. He also exhumed

2. Abu'l-Qāsim Ţahirī, Tarīkh-i Siyāsī wa Ijtima'-yi Iran, (Teh. 1354), p. 150.  
3. Ḥabīb, p. 459. The Persian verses run as follows:  

"His name was forever blessed by God. 
He was the savior of the world and the land. 
He was the leader of the people. 
He had a horse and a sword. 
His body was adorned with jewels."

The same verses are cited in Jahān Gushā, ffs. 59b-60a.  
4. Jahān Gushā, f. 63b; Ḥabīb, iv, pp. 458-9; Aḥsan, I, p. 46.
the grave of Sulṭān Khaḷl, the previous King of Shīrvān, who had taken part in the killing of Shaikh Ḥaydar in 893/1488. Then Khulafā Beg destroyed many buildings and levelled the tombs of all the former rulers of Shīrvān. Thus Ismā‘īl's vengeance for his father's death was complete. Khulafā Beg was rewarded generously for his pains.¹

After occupying Bākū Castle, Ismā‘īl Mīrzā officially ascended the throne of Shīrvān. He then decided to take the castle of Gulistān. Therefore he sent a letter to the son of Qāḍī Beg who had occupied the castles of Bayqurd and Surkhāb,² ordering him to give the castles up. The son of Qāḍī Beg refused and said that Ismā‘īl Mīrzā could occupy the castles only after he had conquered Gulistān Castle. Ismā‘īl Mīrzā knew that such a conquest would be difficult, but he ordered his Sūfīs to build a trench to undermine the strong pillars of that castle in order to effect an entry.³ It was clear that

¹. Jahān Gūshā, f. 63b; cf. Ḥabīb, pp. 458-9; Aḥsan, p. 46; Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 37; and ‘Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā‘īl, pp. 53-4 where the author presents a different view.
². See Ḥabīb, pp. 460-2; cf. Jahān Gūshā, f. 64a-b; Aḥsan, p. 47; ‘Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā‘īl, pp. 53-4; and Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 36-37, where the above statement does not appear.
³. See Ḥabīb, p. 462; cf. Jahān Gūshā, f. 64b; Aḥsan, p. 47; and Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., pp. 36-37.
If Ismā'īl Mīrzā could take this castle, it would be an important strategic victory for him and major resistance to him from the inhabitants of the region would be at an end. Probably the delaying measures used by the son of Qādī Beg were intended to allow them to fetch help, as they had done in Ḥaydar's time.

Ismā'īl Mīrzā himself besieged the castle. It was located at the top of a mountain, and was very hard to conquer.¹

Ismā'īl Mīrzā and his Šūfis realised that they could not take the castle at this point. In order to keep his military prestige and spiritual power intact and to avoid being trapped in this area, as his father had been, a decision was taken by his experienced Šūfis to withdraw. They had, after all, participated in Ḥaydar's disastrous campaign in 893/1488,² which had culminated in the death of Ḥaydar and many Šūfis. It was announced accordingly to the Šafawīd troops that divine inspiration had revealed to Ismā'īl that he should go at once to occupy the throne of ʿAzarbāyjān and forgive

---

1. For more details see Ḥabīb, pp. 462-3 where Khwānd ʿAmīr explains Ismā'īl Mīrzā's dream, cited in Jahān Gushā, f. 64b; Āpsan, I,p.47.

2. See chapter I, pp.70-3.
the inhabitants of the Gulistan Castle.¹

Most contemporary Safawī historians comment on the causes of his retreat very ambiguously. But the move by Alwand Mirza from Tabriz to thwart Ismā'īl Mirzā's plans and block his return to Azerbaijan is the most likely reason for his going right away from this area. Ismā'īl Mirzā made the move after receiving news from his spy of Alwand Mirzā's approach.²

1. This dream appears in full in Ḥabīb, pp. 462-3, and Jahan Gushā, f. 64b. Ahsan, p. 47 mentions that:

"ذَٰذَٰنِي اِلّهُ رَبَّي ٌسَلَّمَ قَالَ مَعَنِي لَعْبُسُمُهُمُ الْخَيْرِ لَعَلَّهُ يَزِيدَهُمُ الْهُدَىِّ. "

Cf. A.A. Shāh Ismā‘īl, p. 54 where the author does not mention the above dream, but states in contrast to all the above sources that Ismā‘īl Mirzā conquered Gulistan Castle. The Persian text runs as follows:

"جَلَّ ذَنَبُهُ مَلَكَ بَيْنِیَ زَرَأَهُ مَرَضَ عَابِلَ نَزَدُهُ ـ مَرَضَ مُنْدَنْكَ قَرْنُكَ لَمْ يَكُنَّ مَرَضَ عَابِلَ. "

This statement seems to be wrong as we have evidence that Ismā‘īl re-conquered Shirvān and the castle of Gulistan in 915/1509-10. It was at that time that he brought back the remains of his father from Ṭabarsarān. See A.A. 'Abbāsī, pp. 15-16.

2. Ḥabīb, p. 463, cited in Jahan Gushā, f. 64b, and Ahsan, p. 57. Ḥabīb on the subject of this withdrawal states: "p. 4637

"درشتان این وپا تا وزن چندین نرد لَعَبُسُمُهُمُ برَفْضِیِّ عِنْدَهُ وظِفْنِیِّ حَلَّابِنُ نِحَّابِنُ وظِفْنِیِّ حَلَّابِنُ نِحَّابِنُ ."
VII. *Ismā'īl Mīrzā* and the Decisive Battle of 907/1500-1 in Shīrūr.

It has been mentioned in the foregoing summary that when *Ismā'īl Mīrzā* was besieging the castle of Gulistān he was informed that Alwand Mīrzā had sent Ḥasan Beg Shukūr Uḡlī to block the road at Garmārūd leading to Shīrvān. Alwand Mīrzā was aware of the threat posed to him by *Ismā'īl Mīrzā*’s campaign and decided to make a last attempt to dispose of *Ismā'īl Mīrzā* before he did the same to him.  

According to Ḥābib al-Siyar, *Ismā'īl Mīrzā* sent out his front line under the command of the champion Pīrī Beg Qājār to bar the way to Ḥasan Beg Shukūr Uḡlī. Before they fought against each other, and without any confrontation, Shukūr Uḡlī withdrew towards Alwand’s camp in Nakhchivān, but since Pīrī Beg followed, his troops were able to kill some of them and go back to *Ismā'īl Mīrzā*. When Qara Chaqāy Beg and other Turkomāns

---

1. Ḥābib, p. 463; cf. Aḥsan, p. 57. Both give: شغول which is a common Turkish name. But Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 37 writes "Ḥasan Beg Shikar Uḡlī" which is certainly wrong.

2. Ḥābib, p. 463.

3. Ibid. Cf. Aḥsan, p. 58; Jahān Gushā, f. 66b; and ‘A.Ā. Shāh Ismā‘īl, pp. 54-55, where the author gives a different story.
heard of Ismā'īl Mirzā's approach they ran away to Alwand Mirzā. ¹

However, in a battle which took place between Piri Beg Qājār and Ḥalwāchī ʿUḡlī (the hunting master) from Ismā'īl Mirzā's camp on the one hand and a certain person called ʿUthmān ² from Alwand's side, 'Uthmān was defeated and killed by Ismā'īl Mirzā's order and this defeat caused Alwand to go towards the Chukhūr Sa'd and camp in Shurūr.

There is some definite evidence which would tend to suggest that before the two sides began to fight, they tried to settle their differences by negotiation.

According to ʿĀlam-ārā-yi Shāh Ismā'īl, the sole source which reports such details, Alwand Mirzā wrote to Ismā'īl Mirzā inviting him to keep the peace and to maintain their relationship. Alwand said that Ismā'īl was not proceeding as was customary in a family, but that he (Alwand) did not intend to fight Ismā'īl. ³

¹. Ḥabīb, p. 463; cf. Aḥsan, p. 58 and ʿĀ. ʿĀ. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 55-6 where the author mentions that Qara Piri - Qājār was killed.
². Ḥabīb gives ʿUthmān (p. 464); Aḥsan, p. 58 gives Amir ʿUthmān and ʿĀ. ʿĀ. Shāh Ismā'īl gives ʿUthmān Sultan (p. 56).
³. ʿĀ. ʿĀ. Shāh Ismā'īl presents this letter on pp. 57-58.
Some sources suggest, moreover, that Alwand Mirza was planning to capture Isma'il Mirza when he came to his camp to discuss the peace-treaty. But Isma'il Mirza sent him the following reply:

"The descendants of Hasan Padishah (Hasan Beg) have brought dishonour on the descendants of Shaikh Safi and they have disgraced them without any reason. In spite of their severe injuries to our Majesty, I do not intend to avenge my ancestor's blood upon you, and I have never aspired to the throne and monarchy. My only intention is that I want to propagate the religion of my ancestors, the immaculate Imams. As long as I am alive, I will draw my sword for the sake of God and His immaculate Imams and the true religion until justice will be confirmed in its right place. You should ask help from the pure spirits of the Immaculate Imams with sincere belief and you should repeat and profess: 'Ali is the friend of God' constantly in order to receive salvation in both worlds and become the most prosperous king among all others. And if I conquer any territory, I will engrave your name on the coins and they will bear your name. In the Khutbah I will regard you as my elder brother. If you refuse to accept this salvation because of your obstinacy that is your affair and you are welcome to come to the battlefield. In that case, I can avenge my innocent brother's blood upon you. Peace be upon you."

The author of 'Alam-ara-yi Shah Isma'il adds that

2. 'A. Shah Isma'il, p. 59. Cf. Jahan Gusha, f. 40a-b; and Add. 200, f. 40 a-b.
when the letter reached Alwand Mirza, he sent this reply:

"I will never do so and am going to fight.
Do your best and neglect nothing."\(^1\)

Ismail Mirza received the letter, and when he arrived in Nakhchivan, he appointed Amir Qara Pir Qajar, who was nicknamed "Tuz Qaparan Beg",\(^2\) and Amir Ilyas Beg Halwachi Ugghi Qajar, his master of hunting, as his commanders-in-chief, all of which has already been mentioned.

However, according to the sources, these amirs participated in the ensuing battle of Shurur:

'Abdal 'Ali Beg Dada, Husain Beg Lala, Khadim Beg Khalifa, Muhammed Beg Ustajlu, Bayram Beg Qaramanlu, 'Abdal Beg Shamlu, Qaraja Ilyas Beg Bayburdlu, Sari 'Ali Beg Takkellu (the keeper of the seal), and 'Ali Beg Rumlul, nicknamed Dil Sultan.\(^3\)

According to the sources it seems that the most important reason for the "Qizil-Bash" victory in battle was Ismail Mirza's personal participation and bravery.

---

1. 'A.A. Shah Ismail, p. 59.
2. A person who throws the rival troops into disorder. See Jahann Gusha, f. 66b; Jahann-ara, p. 266.
His presence gave strong encouragement to his troops, most of whom wore no armour, and were ready and willing to risk their lives.  

In contrast, Alwand just stood and watched from the top of a nearby hill like a statue, hoping that no one could cross the line of camels chained together at the back of his lines of troops. It is said that because he feared possible disaffection to Ismā'il Mirzā's side, he ordered the camels to be chained along the edge of his battlefield thus in order to prevent retreat.

According to the sources already mentioned Ismā'il Mirzā was armed in this battle with a shield, sword and spear and mounted on a horse. His courage inspired similar bravery in his followers. Shouts of "I sacrifice myself for you, I am your sincere friend, O my spiritual guide, O my Lord," which were common battle-cries among the Qızıl-Başh, were heard from the right and left corners of the battlefield.

2. Ahsan states of this particular case (p. 52)
In short, Ismā'īl Mīrzā defeated Alwand, who fled to Arzīnjan along with some of his companions. His troops were trapped by the lines of camels which were linked to each other like chains. It was said that about 8,000 men were killed in this battle.¹

VIII. The Conquest of Tabrīz in 907/1501

After Alwand Mīrzā's defeat and retreat to Arzīnjan, Ismā'īl Mīrzā entered Tabrīz. At first a group of Shi'ite inhabitants of Tabrīz came out of the town to welcome him. They brought him gifts on many trays, including many trays of jewels.² They accompanied him to the court of Ḥasan Beg (Khwānd Amīr states that he ascended the throne of Azarbāyjān³ in 907/1501.

1. See Jahān-āra, p. 266:

"واعظم ۲۲۲ رازی بانی‌نور، پرن فارغ‌خواهی را، از لطف بیب و سر دیگر، بیب افداه پیست که باصت ۲۲۲ عزان، نزدیک به آن..."

2. Jahān Gushā, f. 72b, which confuses Ghulām Sarwar who notes:

"He was received with great éclat by the dignitaries of the city."


3. Ḥabīb, p. 467.
Then Šāh Ismā‘īl took possession of the treasures of Alwand Mīrzā and instantly distributed them to the Qīzīl-Bāsh. When he ordered that the public sermon should be preached in the name of the Immaculate Imāms the amīrs respectfully replied that "of the two or three hundred thousand inhabitants of the city at least two-thirds were Sunnīs; that the Shi‘a formula had not been publicly uttered from the pulpit since the time of the Imāms themselves; and that if the majority of the people refused to accept a Shi‘a ruler, it would be difficult to deal with the situation which would then arise. To this Šāh Ismā‘īl replied: 'I am committed to this action; God and the Immaculate Imāms are with me, and I fear no one; by God's help, if the people utter one word of protest, I will draw the sword and leave not one of them alive.'

The following passage is the translation of the account found in 'Ālam-ārā-yi Šāh Ismā‘īl:

Šāh Ismā‘īl said: "By the help of God, I will ascend to the pulpit next Friday to preach the Twelver way." But he himself was irritated because he knew the amīrs were right. As he fell asleep he dreamed of Ḥadrat-i ‘Alī who told him: 'O son, do not be disturbed in your mind; order all the Qīzīl-Bāsh to wear armour under their army uniforms and order that one

1. Jahān Gušā, f. 72b.
of them should stand between every two people present at that ceremony. Then preach the sermon. If anyone moves while you are preaching the khutba, the Qizil-Başh should kill him. By this means you can perform the public sermon.¹ Then Şâh Ḩusayn awoke and called his amirs and Ḩusain Beg Lala to him. He described his dream and the amirs accepted his idea and said:

'It is true that without this instruction it cannot be performed.'²

However, the author adds that on Friday morning Şâh Ismā'îl went to the Friday mosque in Tabriz and ordered Maulānā Ahmad Ardabīlī, who was one of the religious authorities, to climb up to the pulpit while he himself stood at the top most point of the pulpit like a shining sun, holding his bare sword in his hand. Maulānā Ahmad Ardabīlī began to preach while the people set up an uproar. One third of the people thanked God, according to the author of 'Alam-ārā-yi Şâh Ismā'îl, but the rest, who intended to resist, realized that they would be killed by the young Qizil-Başh if they made any protest. So they could not move. After the sermon was over, the King held the bare sword in his hand, mounted on his horse and went into the streets of Tabriz to curse the three caliphs of the Sunnīs, Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān, while Darwīsh 'Ishqī Tabarrānī and the other officials went in front of him, cursing the enemies

---

1. 'Ā.Ā. Şâh Ismā'îl, p. 60.
2. Ibid.
of the Shī'ites. The people had to pronounce this chant over and over again:¹ "May it be more, not less" and they had to suffer death in case of refusal.

According to the author of Abwāb al-Jinān, on that day, by the order of Shāh Ismā'īl, the preachers, the public crier (mualūdhīn), and the tabarrayān (whose function it was to curse the enemies of the Immaculate Imāms), and other authorities and sectarians, who had long been waiting for such an opportunity, drew their battle-axes, went into the streets and repeated the Shī'a chant, with all spirit and courage.³

The author of 'Ālam-ārā-yi Shāh Ismā'īl states that when Shāh Ismā'īl finished the public cursing in the

1. 'A.A. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 60, where the Persian text runs: "... إِنْ شَاءَ الَّهُ فَآمَنُوا مَعَهُ وَإِنْ كَانَ فَخْطَبُ يُصَدِّقُنَّهُ حَتَّى أَعْشُرُوا عَشْرَ رَأَيْنَا..." آمَنُوا مَعَهُ وَإِنْ كَانَ فَخْطَبُ يُصَدِّقُنَّهُ حَتَّى أَعْشُرُوا عَشْرَ رَأَيْنَا..."
2. Ibid., 60-61; cf. Jahan Gusha, f. 72b; Browne, op. cit., IV, p. 54; Ahsan, p. 61; Hābīb, p. 468.
streets he went back to his court and commanded that letters should be sent to the outlying provinces saying that, if any of the rulers embraced his doctrine and pronounced the Shī'a formula, they might govern their states, otherwise the Sūfīs would cut off their heads. It is also reported that as the letters were handed to the governors of the Āzarbāyjān districts and their subjects, some of them renounced and others disobeyed, while many of them escaped to Fārs to Sultān Murād whilst others fled to Qara Bāgh and Qara Ḫāml to join Alwand Mīrzā. ¹

It was at this point that Shāh Ismā'īl commanded that gold official coins should be minted² and inscribed with his familiar name (بناه شا وا لاییت) "The Servant of ('Alī) the King of the dominion" and that the names of the Immaculate Īmāms should encircle the coins, with the Shī'a formula:

on the reverse of the coins.³

---

1. 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 59; cf. Ḥabīb, p. 468, where Khwānd Amīr talks about this event: ¹

2. According to H.L. Rabino, Album of Coins, Medals and Seals of the Shahs of Iran, (Oxford 1951), pp. 1-4, in time the nearest gold coin available is dated 910/1504 and was minted in Tābrīz. See chapter II, p. 142 (infra),

3. Ḥabīb, p. 468; cf. Jahan Gushā, f. 74b; Aḥsan, p. 61; 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 60; and Jahan-ārā, p. 266.
It is noteworthy that the date of the establishment of Twelver Shi'ism and the khutba accorded with the words (أَنَّهُ قَدْ آمَنَ). According to abjad calculation, the date of Isma'il's ascent to the throne of Azarbajjan was calculated according to the formula "Striking Sword" Shamshirzan (شَمْشِيرْزَن) that is, the years 906 and 907 respectively. The date for the establishment of the Twelver formula was calculated from the conquest of Shirvan in 906/1500.¹

¹ Jahan Gusha, f. 75a.
PART FOUR

I. The Coins of Shāh Ismā'īl

The contemporary Ṣafawīd sources generally mention only gold coins minted by Shāh Ismā'īl during his reign and there is no record of silver or copper coins.

Stuart Poole states that "the copper coinage of Persia under the Shahs is until the present reign, with insignificant exceptions, autonomous. It presents on the obverse a type, usually the figure of an animal, and on the reverse the name of the mint, preceded by ١."

There is, however, one single reference to a silver coin in Ṣawdat al-Ṣafawīyya, in which the author mentions the ceremony of the aqīqa, or the cutting of the hair with which the child came into the world; this being the custom in that period. The author adds that in 926/1520 when Shāh Ismā'īl was at Qum, he had Sām Mīrzâ's head shaved, and gave the equivalent weight of the hair in silver as alms to the poor. This coin must have been minted to symbolize his propitious fortune.

It is said that gold coins were not available to the common people and it was only the king and his great amīrs

2. Ṣawdat al-Ṣafawīyya, f. 104a.
who had the privilege of using them.\(^1\) For instance, we see sometimes that Šhāh Ismā‘īl or his amīrs and ministers made gifts in cash to a poet or person who praised them or for some other reason, but we do not hear that a common man possessed any gold coin unless he was made a gift of it.

It is believed that "a royal command was issued that gold coins should not be taken abroad."\(^2\)

The weight of the gold coins varied from 11.9 grains to 73 grains,\(^3\) and some of these are still in existence.

---

   Stuart Poole, op. cit., pp. xxii-xxviii.

2. Bastānī-Pārlīzī, op.cit., p.75.
   However, apart from economic motives it seems that Šhāh Ismā‘īl, owing to his desire to avoid the sacred formula falling into the hands of non-Muslims who were believed to be unclean, did issue such a legal decree prohibiting the gold coins from leaving Iran. For instance, we see the 'Ā.Ā. 'Abbāsī talking about Šhāh Ismā‘īl II's decree about the religious slogans on his coinage. See 'Ā.Ā. 'Abbāsī, p. 156, cited in The Coins of the Shahs of Persia, p. lxxvii.

3. See Rabino, op. cit., p. 54. According to Rabino, each grain is equal to 0.064 grammes; cf. Mushīrlī, Sikkabā- yi Šhāh Ismā‘īl I, (Teh. 1351 Sh.), p. l4.
On the obverse of the coin close to Shāh Ismā'īl's accession, \(^1\) the words:

"Al-Sultan al-'Adil al-Kāmil al-Hādī al-Wālī
Abū 'l-Muẓaffar Shāh Ismā'īl Bahādur Khān
Khallada Allāh Mulkahu wa Sulṭānahu."

are engraved, and on its reverse are the words:

"Lā Ilāha Illā Allāh Muḥammad Rasūl Allāh
'All Wali Allāh"

On its rim are found the names of the twelve Imāms. \(^2\)

The weight of this particular coin is not given but the place where it was minted was Tabrīz. \(^3\)

---

1. According to the contemporary historians such as Khwānd Amīr, Yaḥyā Qazvīnī and Ghaffārī, the date of Shāh Ismā'īl's accession followed the minting of his coins in 907/1501.

It seems that there are no extant coins which can be dated to 907-909, although there are references in the written sources to the existence of such coins. The first available coin dates from 910/1504. See Mushīrī, op. cit., p. 31 on the authority of P. Thorburn. Cf. Fārs-nāma, p. 91; Rabino, op. cit., pp. 1-2; Jahān-āra, p. 266; Lubb, pp. 1-4.


II. The Epigraphic Content of the Coinage of Shāh Ismā'īl I.

Besides the statements of unity "La Ilāha Illā Allāh wa Muḥammad Rasūl Allāh", and other religious epigraphs on the coinage, which were intended to emphasise that Iranian Islam differed from other Shi'ite Islamic sects, Shāh Ismā'īl placed on his coins the words "'Ali wali allāh" and the names of the twelve immaculate Imāms. The coins had various designs on them. For instance the Shi'a set phrases which were placed systematically on the coins of Shāh Ismā'īl included the following religious slogans:


"Yā Şāhib al-Zamān."

"Naṣrun Min Allāh wa Fathun Qarīb wa Bāshāhir al-Mū'minīn Yā Mahdī."\(^2\)

The names and titles which Shāh Ismā'īl assumed on his coins number twenty; most of them are similar to each other except for a few words. For instance:

"Al-Sultān al-Kāmil al-Hādī Abū'l-Muẓaffar  Shāh Ismā'īl Bahādur Khān Khallada Allāh Mulkhū."

"Al-Sultān al-'Adil al-Ghāzi Fi Sabīl Allāh Abūl-Muẓaffar Shāh Ismā'īl al-'Abd Ismā'īl b. Ḥaydar Şafawī."\(^3\)

---

2. See the sources mentioned above.
3. See the sources mentioned above.
III. The Epigraphy of the Seals of Shāh Ismā‘īl.

The inscription of the seal shown in the photograph below reads as follows:

"Allāhumma Salli 'Ali Muḥammad Muṣṭafā
'Ali Murtadā Ḥasan Raḍī Ḥusain Shāhīd
bi Karbalā 'Ali Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn Muḥammad
Bāqir wa Jaʿfar Ṣādiq Mūsā Kāẓim 'Ali b.
Mūsā Riḍā Muḥammad Taqī 'Ali Naqī wa Ḥasan
'Askarī Muḥammad Mahdī al-ʿAbd Ismā‘īl b. Ḥaydar Ṣafawi."¹

It is written in large ʿNaskhī script and the seal itself is egg-shaped.²

Besides this well known seal, there was another seal which belonged to Shāh Ismā‘īl I, which is described by the late Mirzā Ḥasan Fasā'ī in his book, Fārs-nāma-yi Nāṣirīl. According to him, this particular seal bore the words: "Ya Allāh" on the King's crown and the words:

Ghulām Shāh - Mardān Ismā‘īl b. Ḥaydar on its blank circle, with the verse:

Charkh Bar Dūsh Kashad Ghāshiyā-yi Shāhī-yi Mā,
Gar Kūnad Badraqa-yi Luṭf-i tū Hamrāḥī-yi Mā. ³

3. H. Fasā'ī, Fārs-nāma, (Teh, 1312) p. 91, where the Persian text runs:

"The wheel carries the dignity of our kingliness,
If you (God) look upon us with your favour."
The only available seal of Shāh Ismā'īl I, dated 914 A.H.

1. Mushīrī, op. cit., p. 16.
There appears to be only one contemporary reference to the seals of Shāh Ismā'īl. This is found in the anonymous account of a merchant in Persia at the time of Shāh Ismā'īl's second visit to Tabrīz in 908/1502.

The merchant saw him in person. It is not clear from the description given below to which seal the merchant is referring; it may well be that the reference is to yet another seal, but according to the date given above it must have been a very early one.

According to this merchant who saw Shāh Ismā'īl's seal, his seal - with a sign resembling a "Z" - was in the hands of Shāh Ismā'īl's seal keeper "Mirbec" ʿĀmir Beg Mušillī. The above-mentioned merchant states:

"The decree was written in Ismael's name in large letters, and sealed with his seal with a sign resembling a "Z", by the hands of Mirbec, the ruler of Mosul, who wears the seal of Ismael on a chain round his neck; it is made out of a diamond set in a beautifully worked ring of gold; it is about half the size of a nut, and is engraved in minute letters with the name of Ismael surrounding the twelve sacraments of their sect." ¹


It should be noticed that the words "twelve sacraments" refer to the names of the Twelve Imāms. Cf. Rabino, op. cit., p. 48, and Mushīrī, op. cit., pp. 15-17.
CHAPTER III

SHĀH ISMĀ‘ĪL’S PHYSICAL APPEARANCE,
PERSONAL HABITS AND INTELLECTUAL LIFE
I. Physical Appearance.

Unfortunately, Iranian sources are poor in giving information about Shāh Ismā'īl's figure and face, except for a few references which are inadequate for our purpose. For example, the author of Tarīkh-i Jahān Gushā-yi Khāqān states:

"A party of men had entered, bringing a boy of about fourteen years of age, with red (surkh) hair, a white face, and dark-grey eyes, who had a red crown [hat] on his head." 2

The main sources of our knowledge are the writings of Venetian travellers who went to Iran at that time (15th-16th centuries).

According to Angiolello, he had a noble face and a kingly manner. He had inherited the white colour of his skin from his mother Marta. 3 On this particular subject the Italian merchant states:

"At present he is about thirty-one, very handsome, of a magnanimous countenance,

2. See the sources cited above; cf. Denison Ross, op.cit., p.330.
and about middle height; he is fair, stout, and with broad shoulders, his beard is shaved and he only wears a moustache, not appearing to be a very hairy man. He is as amiable as a girl, left-handed by nature, is as lively as a fawn, and stronger than any of his lords.”

This description is confirmed in the following passage of Angiolello:

"This Sophi is fair, handsome, and very pleasing; not very tall, but of a light and well-framed figure; rather stout than slight, with broad shoulders. His hair is reddish; he only wears moustachios, and uses his left hand instead of his right. He is as brave as a game cock, and stronger than any of his lords.”

According to both Persian and European historians, Shâh Ismā‘îl seldom felt relaxed. He was always travelling about and visiting, feasting and drinking wine with his people. Angiolello says that he always had such dignity and excitement and agitation in his walking and speaking or looking that Angiolello thought he could become a


However, contradicting all the information given above, we have another statement which seems to be inaccurate. ‘Izzat Chāpīn who was Sulṭān Salīm's chancellor and spy was sent to Iran before the battle of Chaldirān, returned to Sulṭān Salīm and gave his personal report on Shâh Ismā‘îl's physical appearance as follows:

"He is a man of short height, black-haired, blue-eyed, [dark-grey], his beard is shaved, but he has a droopy moustache. And when he speaks, his teeth show, small and white."

For more details see Shâh Jang, p. 49. See also Crowfoot, op. cit., p. 311.
great leader in future.¹ Many of the Persian historians talked about him in the same way as Angiolello did:

"His features were noble and he had a kingly manner. There was a mysterious power in his eyes and his features were in conformity with his handsome appearance."²

As Caterino Zeno confirms:

"This youth, who was called Ismail, was thirteen years old, of noble presence and a truly royal bearing, as in his eyes and brow there was something, I know not what, so great and commanding, which plainly showed that he would yet some day become a great ruler. Nor did the virtues of his mind disaccord with the beauty of his person, as he had an elevated genius, and such a lofty idea of things as seemed incredible at such a tender age."³

II. Personal Habits.

We are told that Shāh Ismā'īl always fought at the head of his army and loved to participate in all the battles, while carrying a sword and a battle axe or a spear with him. Since the other kings and rulers of the time used not to participate in the battles, watching away from the battlefield for fear of being killed, he alone was active in all parts of the battlefield and always enjoyed victory until 920/1514.

Shāh Ismā'īl delighted in killing the enemy's

1. Angiolello, op. cit., p. 111.
2. Ibid.
champions with his own hands. On the hunting field he was in the habit of going first; after that his amirs could join in. No one could precede him on the hunting field, unless he had first satisfied his blood lust for killing all kinds of animals.¹

No one dared to oppose his ideas in any circumstances.²

It is said that when he was resting and had nothing to do, he used to hold a rosary and count the beads constantly.

On one occasion, Aşlân, a subject of Anatolia, who was the head of the Sârî Qamîsh tribe, describes his personal visit to Şâh Ismâ'îl. The latter's simple and natural behaviour made Aşlân compare him with Sultan Salîm I. Aşlân realized that the Şûfîs respected Şâh Ismâ'îl because of his sincere kindness to them, but not out of fear. When Aşlân met him, he was astonished by Şâh Ismâ'îl's appearance and unaffected behaviour as he talked with everyone and tried to make them feel at home. No one was frightened or embarrassed in the presence of Şâh Ismâ'îl. Besides, he talked to all Aşlân's attendants, asking them whether they felt comfortable in their new home or not and how many children they had. He used to partake of cake and

1. For instance see Ḥabîb, pp. 482, 499, or Jawâbîn, f. 305a.
2. Except on one occasion, see chapter IV, Najm al-Thañî.
3. Şâh Jang, p. 49.
juice in front of Aşlân's attendants, inviting them to eat or drink with him. 1

The above story shows how simple and humble a person the Shâh was to his loyal subjects.


It should be noted here that the above account would appear to be unique.

The Persian text runs as follows:

However, there is a similar name Sârî Qamîsh which is a small village in Murâvâ Tappa, in the province of Gunbad-i Qâbus, fifteen km. away from the eastern border of Murâvâ Tappa. See F.J.I. vol. III, p.259. According to another report there is another village, also called Sârî Qamîsh, between Sanandaj and Bâneh. For more details see Shâh Jang, pp. 171-176 and F.J.I. ,III,p.259 .
PART TWO

The Intellectual Life of Shāh Ismāʿīl I and His Court

The contemporary historians tell us that Shāh Ismāʿīl was interested from his childhood in studying various sciences and arts. It was said that when he was only a child, he studied the Persian and Arabic languages (as well as the native tongue of Lāhijān called "Gīlakī").

His teacher of religion was Shaikh Zāda Lāhijālī, but according to another statement he had in addition Khādīm Beg as his second teacher. During his youth, he associated with many Shiʿite scholars, philosophers, lawyers and poets with whom he had discussions.

The use of the Turkish language at the court of Shāh Ismāʿīl was widespread. This is not surprising since it was the language spoken by Shāh Ismāʿīl himself.

---

1. Jahān Gushā, f. 33b; Add. 200, f. 33b; Ḥabīb, p. 468; Aḥsan, I, p. 9.
Although he had learned Persian too, he more commonly spoke Turkish, the language of most of his followers. This preference for Turkish and for the patronage of his Turkish-speaking subjects on the part of Shāh Ismā'īl no doubt was an important factor in the dearth of Persian literary works written in the early Safawīd period.

But this is not the whole picture. Shāh Ismā'īl himself apparently composed a few poems in Persian, as did his courtiers. But generally speaking, the Turkish language was destined to remain in vogue at court until the end of the Safawīd period (907-1144 or 1145/1501-1722).

1. See Jahān Gushā, f. 305a; Dānishmandān, p. 137; Ātashkada, vol. I, p. 57; Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 101 where on the authority of B.M. Or. 3248, f. 304b (Jahān Gushā) he states:
   "Shāh Ismā'īl composed two Dīwāns, one in Turkish and the other in Persian verse."

   It should be added here that the Persian text appears on f. 305a as follows:
   "آخترت اریا عالم و فتحی رازی بیا رمز و شری رایا رزره سلیم ارناشمردی و ماری دیلیارد.

   see also F. Manṣūrī, Rāzhāf az Dīlī-Tārīkh, (Teh. 1337) p. 15 where the author on the authority of Badāyī al-Waqā'ī', (vol.I,p.8) gives Shāh Ismā'īl's concern for the Persian language.

Arasli asserts that Shâh Ismâ'îl believed that:
"The people who do not know their mother-tongue and their national literature, would not be able to realize the importance of their country and their nationality." 1

Azarbayjânî critics and scholars stress that Shâh Ismâ'îl's support for literature written in their area in Turkish was a decisive factor in the progress of a literary tradition independent of Persian influence. 2

1. Arasli, Introduction to Diwan-i Shâh Ismâ'îl, in Azarbayjânîn Iran ila Madani 'Alâqa Jam'îyatin Nashriyathî, (Baku, 1946), p. 39; cf. Z. Ibrahimof, in his introduction to the same Diwan', p. 34. (Both introductions are in Turkish.)


It should be noted here that apart from a few Persian verses, there is no other trace of Shâh Ismâ'îl's Persian Diwan. These Persian verses are:

"* * *

* بیستون ناتلی زالم چپ نیزدان

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

* خواهی لنزآن خویشک ل دوختنم جمیتن

* بیستون ناتلی زالم چپ نیزدان

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

"* * *

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

* خواهی لنزآن خویشک ل دوختنم جمیتن

* بیستون ناتلی زالم چپ نیزدان

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

* خواهی لنزآن خویشک ل دوختنم جمیتن

* بیستون ناتلی زالم چپ نیزدان

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

* خواهی لنزآن خویشک ل دوختنم جمیتن

* بیستون ناتلی زالم چپ نیزدان

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

* خواهی لنزآن خویشک ل دوختنم جمیتن

* بیستون ناتلی زالم چپ نیزدان

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

* دلکنده آن مرگ ل من روی توانت

* خواهی لنزآن خویشک ل دوختنم جمیتن

* بیستون ناتلی زالم چپ نیزدان
I. Shâh Ismâ'îl and the Art of Poetry.

It is generally believed that Shâh Ismâ'îl had an excellent talent for composing poems, and was particularly interested in writing Turkish poems. His pen-name was Khaṭâ‘î. Iskandar Munshi states that since Shâh Ismâ'îl was a contemporary of Sultân Salîm (died in 926/1520), Maulâna Umâdî (died in 925/1519 or 930/1523-4) pointed to this pen-name of Shâh Ismâ'îl in the word-play contained in the following couplet:


1. This holds true, except for one modern scholar, Mansûri, who says in a subtitle to his book:

"Shâh Ismâ‘îl shâ‘îr mabûdeh-wa shîrî nasrûda."

See his book entitled Râzhaî az Dîl Târîkh, (Teher. 1337 Sh.).

2. ‘A.A. ‘Abbâsi, p. 33. See also Ḥabîb, IV, p. 496, where Khwând Amîr says that Islâmî and Khaṭâ‘î were the names of two styles of engraving:

If the word is vowelled Khaṭâ‘î the meaning would be quite different—"Chines" Vis-à-Vis Islamic.
This may be the only explicit statement about Shāh Ismā‘īl Khaṭā‘ī left by historians of Iran contemporary with him. In view of the large corpus of religious poetry and many other poetical works which are attributed by many scholars to Shāh Ismā‘īl Khaṭā‘ī, this lack of contemporary references is rather surprising.

It is astonishing, too, that some historians believe that Shāh Ismā‘īl followed the literary style of a strong opponent of the establishment of Shi‘ism in Herāt,1 ‘Allī Shīr Naqūšī (died in 906/1500) and that from him he nicknamed himself Khaṭā‘ī.2 But there were other possible derivations for this nickname. One such account was produced by the Baktāshī order3 in Anatolia: When Shāh Ismā‘īl conquered Baghdad (in 914/1508), he ordered Ḫurr’s grave to be exhumed.4 When they opened the grave,

1. See chapter VI, p. Cf. Ārāsfī, op. cit., p. 45, who gives Khaqānī’s style of writing as a model.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid. It should be added here that the Ḫurr had been on Mu‘āwiya’s side, but later on, at the Battle of Karbala’, he had defected to the third Imam, Ḥusain b. ‘Alī and died as a martyr under his flag. On Ḫurrb. Yazīd, see Muḥammad Najī, Astamī, (Istanbul, 1308), pp. 112-113.
Shāh Ismāʿʿīl noticed that some fresh blood was still on his wounds, and the same handkerchief with which Imām Ḥusain dressed his wound was still there too. Seeing this, Shāh Ismāʿʿīl realized that he had made a mistake. Thereafter he pen-named himself Khatāʾā which was taken from his exclamation, "I have made a mistake."¹

The principal works on the attribution of Shāh Ismāʿʿīl's poetry have been written by Minorsky, Ārāsī, and Tourkhan Gandjei,² all of whom believe that he was the author of these poems.

A dissenting voice is raised by Manṣūrī, who believes that Shāh Ismāʿʿīl did not write any book or compose any poems, and that all the poetical works which are believed to have been written by him are merely attributed to him. Manṣūrī discusses his view at some length and gives his reasons for opposing the general opinion. He attributes the Diwān to the Bāktāshī order in Anatolia.

1. Manṣūrī, op. cit., p. 88, quoted from the Diwān-i Pir Sulṭān 'Abdāl, ed. by 'Abd al-Ḥaqī Gulpīnārīlī, Bakhshī Lughāt wa Iṣṭīlāḥāt, p. 157. Cf. Tarbiyat, Dānīshmandān, p. 137, where he says there was another Khatāʾā in Tabrīz before Shāh Ismāʿʿīl, who had a book called Yusūf wa Zulaikhā. He dedicated his work to Sulṭān Yaʿqūb Āq-qoyūnlū.

Manṣūrī is right to cast doubts on the authorship of the poetry attributed to Shāh Ismā'īl but some of his specific arguments do not stand up to close scrutiny. ¹

While one cannot totally repudiate all the claims that have been made about Shāh Ismā'īl's abilities as a poet, one cannot accept that absolutely all these attributions are accurate. But, supporting the majority of critics, we accept the idea of his having had some

1. An example of Manṣūrī's reasoning which he produces to prove his hypothesis is the following. In the Diwān he mentions that the author speaks of the year 1000 A.H. as the present time, saying

"It is narrated in the Ḥadīth attributed to the Prophet Muhammad Mustafā,

It is now 1000 A.H., therefore those who are asleep (dead) should rise again."

Manṣūrī adds that Shāh Ismā'īl died in 930/1524 and could not therefore have composed this Diwān. (op. cit., pp. 94-95 and 100-102).

All this argument in fact proves is that Shāh Ismā'īl did not write this particular section of the Diwān.
poetical ability. Many critics believe that Shāh Ismā'īl composed about 10,000 couplets in the anthology called Mathnavī-yī Dah-nāma; Naṣīḥat-nāma, Manaqib al-Aṣrār Wa Bīḥjat al-Ahrār and Diwān-i Ashār-i Rubā'ī.  

What draws attention in the works attributed to Shāh Ismā'īl is their fluency and clarity. The reason is obvious: "He was not writing for his own heart's delight. He had to address his adherents in a language fully intelligible to them, a language which stemmed from their daily life." A short glance at the kinds of poems attributed to him in Dah-nāma gives the impression that, although Shāh Ismā'īl was a king, he knew that poems and the art of poetry could be a great blessing and a source of joy to his people. For example, in Dah-nāma he states:

"Winter is over and spring has come again, Flowers have grown and the tulip garden has become full of flowers. All the birds have burst into song, The fire of love has filled my heart again."

By using simple language, and addressing his adherents

---

1. See for instance 'A. A. 'Abbāsī, p. 33 where Iskandar Munshi states:


in their own tongue, Shāh Ismā'īl could communicate with his disciples. The following couplet from his Diwan demonstrates his concern at losing his beloved one, and is a good example of his art:

"I am burned by the fire of sorrow of the other world,
I have lost my beloved who shared my sorrows...."

It has been mentioned that the content of Shāh Ismā'īl's poetical works was at first humanity, then religion and politics. Ārāslī says that in order to express his political aims to his followers, Shāh Ismā'īl transformed them into verses. The Āzarbāyjānī folk-singers called 'āshiqs, who were always in his camp, used to sing in their celebrations and in battles the poems of their murshid. Here is a selection of his political and didactic poems:

"If you want greatness, make the first move, step by step, as on a ladder,
The son of Sultan Ḥaydar has conquered the world, and his men have become rich by this conquest."

Or, this moral and admonitory couplet:

1. Ārāslī, op. cit., p. 48.
2. Ibid.
"The pleasure of this world is not more than three days, But its oppression and sorrow are more than its pleasure."\(^1\)

What did Shāh Ismā'īl intend by composing these kinds of poems? Was it not that he wanted to instil loyalty and unity amongst his followers?\(^2\)

Ārāslī believes that there is a sense of emotional excitement running through the Dah-nāma. The hero of the story seems to be ready to sacrifice his everything to achieve what he wants and avoids no struggle to obtain it. He does not give in to sorrows and adversity. He tells the reader about the truthfulness of a lover, the inconvenience caused by separation and about his delight in succeeding in being united with his sweetheart.\(^3\)

In his ghazals for instance, he describes his sweetheart using many beautiful images, as in the following:

---

1. Bihrangi, op. cit., pp. 177-8; see also Shāh Ismā'īl's Diwān, presented by گزینه نامی کرده از آثار شاه اسماعیل از سبزوار بالر 1946، نشر نامداری. Ārāslī on page 61 states that one of Shāh Ismā'īl's titles was "صاحب النامه والعلم" "the lord of the sword and of the pen."

2. For instance, see his advice during his last days to his people, in chapter V, p. 336, infra.

3. Ārāslī, op. cit., pp. 50-51. It should be added here that there is an opera performed by an Āzarbāyjānī orchestra in Baku entitled: "The Opera of Shāh Ismā'īl," of which a record exists.
God saw your lips and created laughing flowers,
But in his kindness he made them even finer.
The gardener traced your figure's shadow,
And to its pattern he shaped the beautiful
cypress in the garden." 1

Or, again, in another *ghazal*, he writes:

"Nobody has become famous except me through your love,
0 my beloved.
Nobody has become proud of her beauty except you (?)
It is said that the garden and the virgin of Paradise are alike,
But I believe that neither the garden nor the virgin can match your house or your beauty...." 2

Shāh Ismā'īl is said to have loved the classic writings of ʿAzarbāyjān, and more especially the literary style of ʿĪmād al-Dīn Nasīmī, the poet of the Ḥurūfī

op. cit., p. 77, no. 114 where he gives
instead of "asjon al-marīn" which is correct.
Gandjei, op. cit., gives "ma mīrūn ʿalā ʿalā tā which seems incorrect.

2. Bihrangi, op. cit., pp. 177-181. Cf. also
According to Ārāsī, Shāh Ismā'īl not only in

1. The founder of the Ḥurūfī sect was Fadl Allāh Astarābādī (murdered in 804/1401) who was born in 704/1339 in Astarābād in Māzandarān. Because of his religious activities he was killed by the order of Mīrān Shāh. Nasīmī is said to have been one of his students and, according to Gibb, he was "the first true poet of the Western Turks, the only true poet of this far-off period." See E. J. W. Gibb, A History of Ottoman Poetry, vol. III (London 1904), p. 88. According to Browne, (op. cit., III, p. 572):

Nasīmī was executed in Aleppo in 820/1417.

There are several works written by Fadl Allāh which have been published recently under the title of Majmū'a -yi Rasā'il-i Ḥurūfī. This publication contains various works, namely: 

- Hīdāyat-nāma,
- Muḥarram-nāma,
- Nihāyat-nāma,
- Rasā'il-i Mukhtala'īfa-yi Iskandar-nāma.

For more details see R. Tawfīq, Majmū'a-yi Rasā'il Ḥurūfī (London, 1909). Cf. also Minorsky, "Jiḥān Shāh"

p. 273; Browne, op. cit., III, pp. 365-75; Gibb, op. cit., III, pp. 336-88;

Mazzaoui, op. cit., pp. 66 and 84, where he calls him "Faḍl Allāh of Astarābād (put to death in 796/1393-94)"
This literary style, but also in his ideology, modelled himself on Nasimī.¹

The love poetry of Shāh Ismā'īl forms a striking contrast with the religious poetry commonly attributed to him. This very contrast has caused critics to doubt whether he composed these poems at all.

There are differences of approach even within the corpus of religious poetry commonly attributed to him. Sometimes he opposes the enemies of the Prophet's family and the Immaculate Imāms.² On other occasions he introduces himself as a relative or messenger or representative of the promised Mahdi, the lord of the age or Shāhib al-Zamān as he is known to Twelver Shi'ism.³ He even calls himself the god of the earth and wishes to be praised and to be the object of prostration.⁴

It seems likely that political motives were behind these progressively more grandiose claims and that they were used to help to achieve the long-desired establishment of the Safavid dynasty, a task his father and grandfather had left unfinished.

The culmination of his claims is epitomised in the

2. See for instance Minorsky, "The poetry of Shāh Ismā'īl", p. 1027a, where he calls them "Munāfiq".
following verses:

"It is I who have come now for this epoch (var. "to this world").
I have set myself in motion and have entered a soul (manifested myself in a soul?)."

"By the Shāh's (By 'Alī's command I came) in pre-Eternity.
Do not be troubled, (for) now I have come (again)."

"Like Soloman's ring and the staff of Moses I have come to the world as Noah (during) the Flood."¹

"Know for certain that Khatāl is of divine nature,
That he is related to Muḥammad Muṣṭafā;
He is issued from Ṣafī, he is the scion of Ḥaydar
He is related to 'Alī Murtadā...."²

"Today I have come to the world as a Master,
Know truly that I am Ḥaydar's son..."³

¹ Minorsky, "The poetry of Shāh Ismā'īl", pp. 1036a and 1046a; cf. also Gandjei, op. cit., p. 109, no. 171 where the same poems appear.
"My name is Shāh Ismā‘īl. I am God's mystery. I am the leader of all these ghāzīs. My mother is Fātima, my father is 'Ali; and I am the pir of the Twelve Imāms...."

1. Minorsky, op. cit., p. 1042a and 1031a, no. 15; cf. Gandjei, op. cit., p. 18, no. 16.

However, an opposing view is offered by Manṣūrī, who claims that in 905/1499 Šafawīd progress made the Ottoman Empire extremely worried about the future. Therefore, the rulers decided to do something about it before it became too late. By imitating the system which the Šafawīds used for their Qizil-Bāsh orders, the Ottomans established a kind of mosque (Takkiya) of which the Janissaries were also members. In order to hold back the progress of Šafawīd darwīshes the Ottomans proselytized widely so that they could gather many adherents who would all work against the Qizil-Bāsh. In their writings, amongst which Manṣūrī places the so-called Diwan of Shāh Ismā‘īl, the name of 'Ali stands for Ḥājj Baktāsh Wallī, but not for 'Ali, the son-in-law of Prophet Muḥammad. Haydar, in the same Diwan, stands for the son of Ahmad Yasawi (died in 562/1166-7), who was freed from prison by Ḥājj Baktāsh. The Persian text bearing this claim runs as follows:

It should be added that Hasluck in his statements...
II. Shah Isma’Il's Interest in Poets and Outstanding People.

According to contemporary and later histories, Shah Isma’Il respected the great poets and scholars of Iran, provided that they did not insult Twelver Shi’ism. He treated respectfully both ancient and contemporary literary works and honoured Firdausi, the author of the Shah-nama. The Shah was fond of the heroes of this work and admired them to such an extent that he chose the names of his three sons, Tahmasb, Sam and Bahrām, from it. He himself used to read the Shah-nama on the battlefield. An idea was current that he and Kur Üghlu, an Azarbâyjânî hero, were to some extent alike. Both actually writes:

"The real Haidar is probably a local hero or tribal ancestor of a Shia clan and elsewhere unknown to fame. Whoever the buried Haidar may be, he is locally identified with the Sheikh Khoja Ahmed of Yasi in Turkestan. In local legend Khoja Ahmed is regarded as one of Haji Bektash’s disciples,...."

Unfortunately, Manṣūrî ignored the statement given by Hasluck who says:

"But, in fact, this Haidar neither was, as Crowfoot was told, son of the King of Persia, nor did he die in Asia Minor. The real Haidar is probably a local hero...."

were men of war and both were men who enjoyed banqueting. Even on the battlefield Shah Isma'īl encouraged the reading of this or some similar epic to invite his adherents to perform great feats of bravery.¹

The Shah-nāma and other epics used also to be read aloud to entertain the Qızıl-Başh in all parts of the camp. This pleased the tribesmen and created in them great feelings of pride. Shah Isma'īl's commanders, such as Khan Muḥammad Üstājlū, recited the Shah-nāma aloud to entertain the Qızıl-Başh in such a manner that the blood used to boil in their veins, so that they could easily contemplate martyrdom. Sometimes the Qızıl-Başh willingly accompanied Khan Muḥammad in singing.²

At the Battle of Chāldīrān,³ the most important parts of the epic stories, on the subject of the battles between Iran and Turān, were chosen purposely to excite

¹ See Jahān Gushā, f. 305a; Shāh Jang, p. 230 and 256; Bihrangi, op. cit., p. 177.
³ See Shujāʿ al-Dīn Shafā, Jahān-i Irān Shināsī, vol. I (Teh. 1970), p. 80, where Shafā states that there was a newspaper published in 1514 A.D. in Nuremberg in Germany (in the city's public library) which carried a picture of the Battle of Chāldīrān.
the Qizil-Bash against the Ottomans who were also Turks. This agitation used to lead to furious battles between the Qizil-Bash and the Ottoman forces. ¹

E.G. Browne speaks of ʿAbd al-Rahmān Jāmī (born in 817/1414 and died in 898/1492)² as the last great Persian poet, and considers that during the four centuries which elapsed after Jāmī's death Persia produced no poet of eminence. ³ On the authority of Mīrzā Muḥammad Khān Qazvīnī who sent a letter to Browne (dated May 24, 1911), the latter remarks:

"There is at any rate no doubt that during the Safawī period literature and poetry in Persia had sunk to a very low ebb, and that not one single poet of the first rank can be reckoned as representing this epoch."⁴

1. Shāh Jang, pp. 230–6, where the author's text runs as follows:


3. Ibid. This is a letter sent to Browne in reply to a request by Browne to Mīrzā Muḥammad Khān Qazvīnī, dated May 24, 1911, to give him his view.

4. Cf. Mansūrī, op. cit., p. 14 where he gives Īldūz-Beg and Suhrāb Hamadānī as two of the Shāh-nāma readers of Shāh Taḥmāsb's period; and Bosworth, op. cit., p. 293 ("manāqib-Khwāns... and faqāʾ ed il-Khwāns" during the period of the Saljūqs).
Browne further suggests that the chief cause of this literary decline was because of the Şafawīd kings' strong antagonism to their rivals, the Ottoman Empire in the west and the Öz-Begs in the east. These kings therefore devoted most of their efforts to the propagation of Twelver Şī'ism and "the encouragement of divines learned in its principles and laws" which led to the religious unification of Persia.¹

These remarks are mostly true, but Browne's generalisation, based as it was on the authority of only one scholar, should not be taken so much for granted that we forget the second and third ranks of poets who flourished during this period, but who for many causes were neglected.²

---

1. Browne, op. cit., iv, 26; cf. Rypka, op. cit., p. 293, where he says:

"In the field of poetry we even find an endless number of names. The works of these poets have unfortunately not yet been thoroughly studied so that for the present the names remain practically without significance..."

'Aziz-Ahmad, "Şafawīd Poets and India",


2. For instance see Sām Mirzā, Tuḥfa-yi Sāmil, ed. by V. Dastgirdī (Tehran, 1314 sh.); Qāḍī Nūr allāh-Shūshtarī, Majālis al-Mū'minīn, (Edinburgh U. Library, Ms. no. 244), Majlis-i Shīshum, where the author speaks of more than twenty-two Persian Şī'ī poets, and Tarbiyat, Dānishmandān, passim.
Shāh Ismā'īl's son, Sām Mirzā, in his Tuḥfa-yi Sāmī, speaks of nearly 700 poets who flourished during the reign of his father and elder brother Ṭahmāsb Mirzā (from 907-984/1501-1576). In this work he indicates that such poets were skilled and deserved comparison with former poets such as Saʿdī and Firdausī. Therefore, as far as our subject allows us, we shall examine the life of those poets who were active during the life of Shāh Ismā'īl I, and during the reign of his son to some extent too. These are poets who have hitherto been neglected by scholars.

1. See for instance Rypka, op. cit., p. 293, who states:

"One must not ignore the fact that at any rate the members of this polycephalous dynasty [Safawīd] if not rulers themselves, gave support to literary activities, and in some cases were themselves actively engaged as poets, as for instance Ismā'īl I ... and Sām Mirzā ...."

Cf. Mansūrī, op. cit., p. 15 who writes about Shāh Ismā'īl's concern for poets and poetry:

"... در سالیانه ۳, ۴ یا ۵ مبارزه بین دو فرد که شخصیت خاصی داشتند، پدر و پسر شاهان، سبز و سبز، و همچنین ...

..."
III. The Poets who were at Shāh Ismā'īl's Court or Praised Him.

1. Hātīfī and Shāh Ismā'īl.

Maulānā 'Abd Allāh Hātīfī was the nephew of Maulānā 'Abd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (born in 817/1414, died in 898/1492).¹ He was from Khurjird in Khurasan. According to a well-known story, Jāmī tested his nephew's poetical talent before allowing him to write by bidding him compose a "parallel" to the following verses in Firdausī's celebrated satire on Sultān Maḥmūd of Ghazna:

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


Hātifī produced the following "parallel", which his uncle Jāmī approved, except that he jocularly observed that the neophyte had "laid a great many eggs on the way.": ¹

"If thou should'st place an egg of the crow compounded of darkness under the peacock of the Garden of Pardisise. And if at the time of nourishing that egg thou should'st give it grain from the Fig-tree of the Celestial Gardens, and should'st water it from the Fountain of Salsabil, and Gabriel should breathe his breath into that egg, in the end the crow's egg will become a crow, and vain will be the trouble of the peacock of Paradise." ²

Browne believes that "Hātifī was one of the innumerable poets who strove to compose a "Quintet" (Khamsa) rivalling that of Nizāmī of Ganja. Two of his five subjects were the same, the romances of Laylá

---

2. Atashkada, pp. 375-83; Tuhfa, pp. 94-97.
and Majnūn

and of Shīrīn and Khusraw; the Haft Manzār formed the parallel to the 'Haft Paykar'; while the Timūr-nāma formed the counterpart of the 'Sīkandar-nāma' except that, as Hātīfī boasts, his poem was based on historical truth instead of on fables and legends.¹

Hātīfī was from a village called Kharjīrd-i Jām where he bought a garden and settled down. There he began a life of retirement. It was there that, after capturing Khurāsān on his way to Persian 'Irāq in 917/1511-12, Shāh Ismā'īl paid him a surprise visit. Shāh Ismā'īl intended to visit the tomb of Qāsim Anvār,² one of the Safawīd adherents, and on his way he arrived at the door of Hātīfī's garden. Shāh Ismā'īl found the door locked, but seeing the branch of a tree hanging over the wall, he sent some Qızıl-Bāsh to climb into the garden to open the door.³

---

² Qāsim Anvār was one of the disciples of Shaikh Sadr al-Dīn Mūsā. For more details about him, see Falsafī, Kulliyāt-i Qāsim Anvār (Teh. 1337), passim; Ḥabīb, vol. IV, pp. 6-7 and 10-11; Rawdat al-Safawīyya, f. 15a; Browne, op. cit., iv, pp. 473-487 where he states "Qāsim Anvār died in 837/1433-4"; Rieu, op. cit., I, pp. 635-7; Savory, Ph.D. Thesis, pp. 112-114 and G.M. Meredith-Owens "The Turkish verses of Qāsim al-Anvār" in B.S.O.A.S., vol. 25, 1962, pp. 155-161.
³ Ataškada, p. 378; cf. Tuhfā, pp. 94-5.
Hātifī was informed of what had happened. He stood up respectfully and warmly welcomed the King. Having asked after his health, Shāh Ismai'īl went into his house, sat on his humble carpet and ate the food that was to hand, quite informally. Shāh Ismai'īl asked him to read a poem, which he did. After praising him, Shāh Ismai'īl ordered him to versify his conquest. Hātifī accepted and produced about 1,000 lines in verse, but did not finish.

The opening lines read as follows:

1. "From the blood of the brave and dust of the army, the earth became red and the sky became black."

Hātifī had also composed a mathnavī praising Shāh Ismai'īl of which the opening lines run as follows:

2. "Leadership ended with him as prophecy ended with his ancestor."

---


2. See Maykhāna, pp. 112-118.
According to the story, Shah Isma'īl spent his time enjoyably in that garden talking to Hātifi from morning till night. Shah Isma'īl with his own hand cooked bughrā (بُغْرَاء).\(^1\) It is said that on that occasion, Hātifi asked for several royal pardons, which were all given. Among those who received the Shah's forgiveness were several Shaikhs of Jām who were the sons of Shaikh Aḥmad Jām (Shaikh al-Islām Aḥmad b. 'Abū-Ḥusain al-Nāmiqī al-Jāmī). Because of their Sunnī activities, the lives of these Shaikhs had been in danger and they were afraid. Before leaving, Shah Isma'īl pardoned more offenders than can be imagined.\(^2\)

It is not clear why Hātifi did not finish his work of glorifying Shah Isma'īl. He had more than ten years in which to complete the task, which was time enough. Probably his delay with the work sprang from his annoyance with Shah Isma'īl on the matter of the tomb of his uncle, the great Jāmī.

It is said that when Shah Isma'īl captured Herāt in 916/1510 (or 919/1513) he ordered the exhumation of Jāmī's corpse and that in every single book he transferred the dot of the letter ژ to the top, so that it read ژ. So, instead of reading "Jāmī" it read

---

1. Bughrā (Khānī) or Ash-i Bughrā a certain dish of which Bughrā-Khān, King of Khāvarazm, was the inventor. See F. Steingass, Persian English Dictionary, 6th ed., p. 192.

"Khāmī"\(^1\) which means "stupid."

The reason for Shāh Ismā'īl's annoyance with Jāmī was because the Shāh felt affronted by the poet's quatrain that indicated his contempt for the two opposite

\[\text{---} \]

1. Dickson says that: the author of Afḍal al-Tavāriḥkh, f. 60a-b, has a very curious anecdote relating to the visit of Shāh Ṭahmāsb to Herāt:

"It seems that the Shāh ʿṬahmāsb\(\) was told by a certain official that Jāmī had been "an extreme Sunnī and his works were detrimental (khalal) to the faith of society \(\).\) The Shāh ʿṬahmāsb\(\) immediately ordered the banning of Jāmī's works and anyone found reading them was made subject to the death penalty. The Harāts were then ordered to demolish Jāmī's tomb and when this had been done the Shāh himself came to the site in order to burn the very bones of the poet.\!

On the next page Dickson rejects this story. For more details, see Dickson, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 190-1. Cf. Bustān al-Siyāḥa, p. 166, where the author tells us that it was Shāh Ismā'īl.
Islamic factions, Shīʿa and Sunnī:  

"Oh cup-bearer of the time, give me a glass of wine,  
I am sick of the quarrel between Sunnī and Shīʿa.  
They ask me: 'Oh, Jāmī, what is your religion?'  
I thank God a hundred times that I am not a dog  
like Sunnī or an ass like Shīʿa."

It seems that Hātifī was very annoyed with Shāh  
Ismāʿīl, because of his treatment of the tomb and  
reputation of Jāmī,2 but since he was afraid of the

1. See Jāmī, Diwān, (ed. Ḥ. Raḍī),  
p. 89; cf. Yar-Shatīr, Shiʿr-i Fārsī dar ʿAhd-i  
Shāhrukh, p. 17. Cf. Qāṣī Ṭāhir Ghaffārī, Ṭārīkh-i  
Nigāristān, ed. by M. Mudarrīs Gilānī, (Teh. 1340 Sh.)  
p. 362.

Jāmī was said to have been at first Sunnī, then  
Shīʿa, and at the end a member of the Naqshbandī  
sect. One possible reason for the hostility between  
Shāh Ismāʿīl and Jāmī was because Jāmī had dedicated  
his Silsilat al-Dhahab to Bayazīd II, and  
had also praised Bayazīd in that book for his  
justice. This panegyric appears in Haft Iqlīm.

For more details see Amin Ahmad Rāzī, Haft Iqlīm,  
ed. by Ṣ. Fāḍīl, (Teh. n.d.), vol. iii, p. 507.

2. It is said that Jāmī was not alone in his attitude.  
Mīrzā Ṭāhir Hājar, the Ṭāhirī poet, was  
another who was tired of this quarrel in his own  
period. In his Ḥūdb-Ḥūdb-nāma he states:

"Once, we charmed Shāh Ismāʿīl and Sultān  
Salīm, and we divided Islam into two parts.  
We gave to this single religion two separate  
names: this Shīʿa, that Sunnī, which put
future, and the cruelty of the Qizil-Bash, he despatched a respectful complaint as follows:

"I am very surprised at the judgement of the conquering King, that fortune has made me the servant of his court. For the sake of some naughty men, He has replaced the dot of Jamal and made it Khâmil."

According to his poetry, Hâtifî was a devotee of Twelver Shi'ism. In praise of this religion he says:

"God, when you make me blessed in the religion of my 12 Imâms, Please, give a mouthful of water from the Kauthar; I swear to you by the family of 'Ali, As long as my tongue moves, I'll praise 'Ali and his household."

According to different stories, Hâtifî lived for 105 years and passed away in Kharjird-i Jâm in 927/1520 or 1521. His corpse was buried in the same garden in which

—

fear between us. Now in our separation we deserve only regret. We are like parasites upon our religion."

See Hûb-Hûb-nâma, "Fakhriyya", first edition, ed. by H. Muhammadd Zâda and V. Sattârî, (Baku 1962), pp. 76-78. Hûb-Hûb was the author's pen-name; it means Stop-Stop (do not talk too much).

2. Šâkhkada, p. 381.
3. Maykhâna, P. 117.
he had lived. The chronogram of his death was:

"What happened to Jami II?"

It was said that he was a follower of the Kubrawiyya family who were related to Abu'l-Janab Najm ad-Din Ahmad b. 'Umar al-Khayyumi, known as "Kubra" (died in 1221 A.D.)

Browne believes that "Hatifī belongs essentially, like so many other representatives of Art and Letters in the early Safawi period, to the circle of Herat formed under the liberal patronage of the later Timurids."

Hasan Rûmî in Āhsan al-Tawārîkh states:

"Maulāna 'AbdAllāh Hatifī, the son of Maulānā Jami's sister, died in the month of Muḥarram 927 A.H. Among his poems are: Khusrau wa Shīrīn; Laylā wa Majnūn; Haft Manzar; Timur-nāmā; Shāh-nāmā of Ḥaḍrat-i Shāh Ismā'īl."


2. Maykhāna, p. 112.

3. See Bosworth, op. cit., p. 298, who says:

"In Khwārazm the greatest Sūfī of this epoch was Abu'l-Janāb Najm al-Dīn al-Khwāqī, known as Kubra, who was... known as Šaikh-i Valī-Tarāsh (" the Creator of Saints") .

Browne, op. cit., iv, p. 299.

4. Āhsan, vol. I, p. 174, where Rûmî says:

"Maulāna Šīrāzī, the son of Maulānā Jāmī. Darvūz Sīnā'ī-nām (952 A.H.)"
2. **Fudūl.**

His full name was Maulānā Qurāb al-Dīn Baghdādī, usually known as Fudūl.¹ He was skilled in the rational and traditional sciences and outshone all competitors. In religious studies he was the authority of the day, and in writing essays and making speeches he had no equal. His teacher was Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Mašūr. Shāh Ismāʿīl respected him a great deal for his knowledge.²

Among his poetical works, the short mathnāvī Bang-ū Bāda (Nepenthe and Wine), is well known. It is written in Turkish and according to Gibb "must have been one of its author's earliest works, for although the year of composition is not given, its dedication to Shah Ismāʿīl fixes it as being somewhere between 907/1501-2, when the Persians took Baghdad [sic] and 930/1524 when Ismāʿīl was succeeded by his son Ṭahmāsb."³

1. On him the author of Inqlāb-Īlām states: [p. 601?]


3. See Gibb, op. cit., vol. III, p. 88. Gibb is wrong about this date. It should be 914/1508/
As discussed later in this thesis, Fuḍūlī composed a maqta (place of slaughter or execution related to Karbalā), so that the Turks and Qızıl-Bāsh should understand the events of Karbalā.

Fuḍūlī praised Shāh Ismā'īl in one of his poetical works. Gibb gives a specimen of Fuḍūlī's praise of Shāh Ismā'īl, his patron, which runs as follows:

"The feast-brightener of the banquet-hall of the intimate,
The 'Jam' of the age, Shah Ismā'īl
At rest through him are rich and poor,
God perpetuate his kingdom to eternity!"

Fuḍūlī died in 970/1562-3, in Qazvīn. Of him Ḥasan

1. See chapter VI, p. 391.
2. See Inqilāb-İslām, p. 601.
3. Gibb, op. cit., p. 88. Cf. Inqilāb-İslām, p. 601 where the author states that the mathnawi-yi Bangū Bāda implies that Shāh Ismā'īl I and Sultān Salīm I were both accustomed to drinking and Cannabis. See also Browne, op. cit., IV, p. 237; and Rieu, op. cit., vol. I, p. 659.
Rūmlū states:

"Mawlānā Qūṭb u'd- din Baghdādī, a man of great acquirements in scientific and historical learning and theological matters. He was a pupil of Amīr Ghiyāṣu'd- (<Ghiyāṣ al-) dīn Mansūr, and a favourite courtier of the Shāh. He died at Qazwīn this year." 1


For more details see Aḥsan, vol. I, p. 420; cf. vol. II, a summarized translation of the above statement, by Seddon, p. 183; Gibb, op. cit., p. 73; Jahan-ara, p. 308, under the year 970 A.H.;

"Dr. Rūmlū ʿAbd al-Malik Naṣrī, a person of great learning and knowledge of Arabic language and various sciences. He was a pupil of the eminent scientist and theologian Ahmad al-Shāhī. He died at Qazwīn this year."

summer and winter quarters

and Browne, op. cit., iv, p. 236.
3. Maulānā Umiddī

Umiddī Rāzī¹ (or Tehranī) was born in one of the districts of Ray where his father was the village chief (لرضا). His patron was Amīr Yār Aḥmad Khūzānī Ḥisfahānī the "Wakīl-i Nafs-i Nafs-i Shāh Ismā‘īl" after the death of Amīr Najm Zargar Gīlānī (Rashtī) in 915/1509.² His proper name was Arjāsp³ and he was a pupil of the celebrated philosopher Jalāl al-Dīn Dawwānī (died in 908/1502).

Umiddī had great ability as a composer of elegies, but his skill in ḍhazals was poorer than in qaṣīdas. Early in life, he went to Shīrāz, where he became a pupil of Maulānā Jalāl al-Dīn Dawwānī. He studied widely and finally became interested in medicine. Dawwānī changed his name to Mas‘ūd, because of his new occupation and interests.⁴ Umiddī was on friendly


3. See Tadhkira-yi Nigarīstān, p. 14, where the author states:

terms with Shah Ismail's courtiers. At the end of his life he bought a garden in his township, and settled there. It is said that "he was on bad terms with his fellow townsmen, against whom he wrote many satires."¹

Because of a difference with Qiwam al-Din Nurbakhsh over a piece of garden, Umid was killed at the instigation of the former in 925/1519.² A certain poet of that time, called Afdal (Af'dul)³ composed this chronogram to commemorate his death:


3. Unfortunately Browne states:

"Nam, one of Umid's pupils, composed the following verses (the above mentioned chronogram) and chronogram on his death." Op. cit., IV, p. 231. However, Browne did not notice the words: "اُعْضَرَ أَنَّ نَاهُي إِرْسَالَهُمْ آنِ عِيْدَةٍ إنّ يَقْطِعُنَّ نَاهُي أَعْضَرَمُ" which mean "a certain poet named Afdal has composed these verses on his death."

"The much-wronged Umídí, wonder of the age,
Who suddenly and unjustly became a martyr,
Appeared to me at night in a dream and said,
'O thou who are aware of my inward state,
Write for the date of my murder: Alas for my blood unjustly shed, alas!" ² (A.H. 925)

1. Tuhfa, p. 101; Ahsan, vol. I, p. 177, where the same verses appear. If this chronogram was written by one of Umídí's students or one of the poets who lived at that time, it may be taken at its face value, because according to the abjad calculation, the words: آدرزرین ناکهمن ۳۶ stand for 925 A.H.
Although Khwáid Amír and Hasan Rümí's statements should be more accurate, since they both were contemporary historians, Sám Mirzá's statement seems more correct, since Hasan Rümí copied the above verses without considering the chronogram Ah Az Khûn-i Nâhaq-i Man Ah (925 A.H.). Cf. Savory, Ph.D. Thesis, pp. 149-150, who agrees with 929/1522-3 and states that Shâh Qiwâm was killed by the order of Shâh Tâhmâsp I, for this murder. See Muntazam, vol. II, p. 101 where the author states:

2. Browne, op. cit., IV, p. 231. Browne in his above translation gives "contrary to right" which sounds very awkward; I therefore ventured to change it, and placed my own version in brackets, since "unjustly" or "unlawfully" makes better sense.
Finally, most of Umūdī's poems consist of panegyrics, but he also wrote a Sāqī-nāma (book of the cup-bearer) in a stereotyped form.

Browne presents two of Umūdī's poems. The first line of the following poem quoted by Browne is mentioned also in Ḥabīb al-Siyar as follows:

"Thou art a half-drunk Turk, I am a half-slain bird; thy affair with me is easy, my desire of thee is difficult."

Moreover, the author of Tadhkira-yi Nigaristān Sukhān gives a line of one of Umūdī's poems as an example

1. For each ḡaṣīda he composed for Amīr Najm Thānī, he used to get 30 Tabrīzī ṭūmānsa a reward. On one occasion the author of Rawdat al-Ṣafā (vol. viii, p. 13) states:


of his work:

"So as not to forget my covenant, you who break your promise,
You must tie round your finger the string of my life."

4. Baba Fighânî Shirāzī.

He was born in Shiraz and also settled there. According to Browne, he "was of humble origin, the son of a cutler or a vintner according to different accounts, and seems to have lived the life of a somewhat antinomian dervish."

At first Fighânî had another occupation. In Sultan Ya'qūb's time, he went to Tabrīz in the service of the Prince of the Āq-qoyūnlū Turkomān where he was so highly honoured that he was called "the father of the poets of the time." He had a huge appetite for

1. Nigaristân-i Sukhan, p. 14. Cf. Majma' al-Fuṣahā, vol. IV, pp. 1-12, where Hidayat records several examples of Umlī's poetical works, for instance his panegyrics on p. 10-11, his ghazal on p. 12 and a qīta'h on p. 12 which runs as follows:

"مَرَّهُمْ فَلَتَّينَيْنِي زَيْلًا فِي نِّمَبُوْنِ وَشَخْوَرُ مَلِيْنِ "

4. Tuḥfa, p. 102.
wine and was frequently so drunk that he could not control himself. He was constantly in the tavern. After the death of Sultan Ya'qub, (895-6/1490) Fighâni went into the service of Shah Isma'il and settled in Abâvard. On the orders of Shah Isma'il, the governor of Abâvard used to give him a daily allowance of a serving of meat and a serving of wine (sufficient for one person). In the last years of his life he had reached such a pitiful condition that people used to give him his needs but in return made fun of him indecently. Because of his craving for wine, Baba did not retaliate. 1

Finally, the poet went to Mashhad and died there in 925/1519. 2 The following verse is an example of his poems:

"Stained with wine Fighâni sank into the earth: alas if the Angels should sniff at his fresh shroud." 3

1. Tuhfa, p. 103 where Sâm Mirzâ states:

"درآوانی عرصٰ کارش بیانی ریوید که مردم درمانیان روز ورزی می‌کنند تا مینفستادند و رعوض بالر هزلاً ی رلیک سردن. بابا نفان با سه‌ست مری مراد سرک‌سالگر خود نزدیک‌رست." 2

2. Ibid., p. 103. Browne states: (p. 230)

"In Khurásán, whither he went from Shíráz, he was unappreciated, even by the great Jámí, with whom he forgathered; but at Tabríz he subsequently found a more appreciative patron in Sultan Ya'qúb the Prince of the "White Sheep" Turkmán." 3

3. For more details see Browne, op. cit., IV, pp. 229-30.
5. Nārinjī Sultan.

This poet was the son of Yārī Sultan from Shahrazur of Zūr. At the start of his career he was in the service of Kapak Sultan, one of Shāh Ismā‘īl’s amīrs. Then he left him for Bahram Mirzā, the son of Shāh Ismā‘īl I (died in 956/1549). Nārinjī stayed with Bahram Mirzā for 20 years. He made great claims to bravery but did nothing to justify them. He was the commander of the Namad Pūshan, who were a group of partisans in the service of Shāh Ismā‘īl. They claimed to be an army.²

Nārinjī Sultan, apart from his activity in Shāh Ismā‘īl’s army, composed works in both Persian and Turkish. He gave himself the pen-name "Nārinjī". Here is an example of his poetry:

"I am full of kindness, courtesy and generosity. All of these virtues were given to me by ʻAlī."

1. Namad Pūshan means the people who wore felt cloth. Even nowadays this cloth is in fashion in some parts of Māzandarān or Tawālish. In Māzandarān these people are called (کلیم پوش). Killama Pūsh.

2. Tuhfa, p. 184.

3. Ibid.
6. Šūdaq Beg.

He was the son of Hisār Beg the "Mir Ākhrūr" of Shāh Ismā'īl (Master of the King's stable). Although he was a Turk, Šūdaq Beg used to compose in both languages, Persian and Turkish. Unfortunately Sām Mirzā does not record any of his poetry.

7. Susání.

Susání rose to prominence during the Āq-qoyūnlū dynasty. In his youth he was an army man, in the pay of Shāh Ismā'īl, but because of an action which displeased the Shāh he was later dismissed from the court. He claimed others' poems as his own, but also sometimes composed poetry of his own in both Persian and Turkish.

8. Shihāb al-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh Bayānī.

Bayānī was known as the pearl, a title given to him because once he brought a pearl from Baḥrāin for one of the Timūrid Sultāns.

He was the son of Muḥammad Kirmānī (Khwāja Muḥammad). In his youth he was at the court of Sultān Ḥusain Mirzā Bayqara and served him as chancellor. He then became one

1. Tuhfa, p. 186.
3. Tuhfa, p. 63.
of the amirs in his army. 1

After the death of Sultan Husain Mirza, he withdrew from society and began to write tafsir on the Qur'an. After the capture of Khurasan by Shah Isma'il I (in 916/1510), he gave up his seclusion and became a member of Shah Isma'il's court. However, after an attack of smallpox he shut himself away again and resigned from his post. 2

This great poet and scholar of Shah Isma'N's court was one of those who versified the exploits of Shah Isma'il's reign and in fact he wrote well, as the following line of his indicates:

"Your prose and verse are wonderful, oh beautiful one.
Anyone who sees them will say: 'how excellent is the poet.'"

Sam Mirza states that the sudden death of this poet left his last work incomplete. The date of his death is given as 932/1525. 4

Among his works may be listed elegies, ḥazals and quatrains (رباعيات), which are entitled:

Munis al-Aḥbāb, Tarikh-i Shāh (unfinished),
Munshāfat and the poetic history of Shirin wa Khusrau,
(unfinished). 5

1. Tuhfa, p.63.
2. Ibid., pp. 64–66. On these pages Sam Mirza gives some examples of his poetry.
3. Ibid., p. 64.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.

He was the elder son of Shaikh Muḥammad Lāhijī and was one of the powerful "Khulafā" of the Nūrbakhshī sect. He was born and grew up in Shirāz. He entered Shāh Ismāʿīl's service with the assistance of Najm Thānī. He attended many parties, and was always drinking wine, "to such an extent that day and night did not matter to him." He was also an active poet. According to Ḥabīb al-Siyar this poet and scholar was sent on several occasions to Shaibak Khān as Shāh Ismāʿīl's envoy.

1. Shaikh Muḥammad Lāhijī's full name was: Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā b. 'Alī Gilānī Lāhijī, one of the pupils of Sayyid Muḥammad Nūrbakhsh, whom he served according to his own admission from 849 A.H. till 869 A.H. For more details see his book Sharḥ-i Gulshan-i-Rāz, (ed. by K. Sāmī), p. 82.

2. Tuhfa, p. 67.

Qâdi Nur Allāh

Qâdi Diya‘ al-Dīn Nurallāh was the son of Qâdi Darwīsh Muḥammad b. Khwāja Shukr Allāh Vizier, and the nephew of Qâdi ‘Isā. During the lifetime of Amīr Khān Mūsīlū, the tutor of Shāh Ṭahmāsb I (before 928/1522), he was the Qâdi of Herāt and a distinguished and learned man.¹

According to Sām Mīrzā, Shāh Ismā‘īl honoured him so much that he was sent to Shaibak Khān as his envoy sometime before 916/1510.² As a satire, he composed this quatrain on his way to Khurāsān and sent it to Shāh Ismā‘īl:

"Oh my king, do not send one like me to Khurāsān, do not send a lady to the battlefield of heroes. To the place of the cautious, do not send an opium-eater and dreamer."³

Qâdi Nūr Allāh’s pen-name was Amlīn.⁴ He died in 927/1521.⁵

2. Tuhfa, p. 73.
3. ̄Ibid. On this poet Khwānd Amīr in ̄Habīb states:

4. ̄Tuhfa, p. 73.
5. ̄Habīb, vol. IV, p. 610
11. Qad'āl Muḥammad.

He was praised for his pleasant and brilliant conversation and was without peer in composing verse, prose and satires. According to Šām Mīrzā, 1 when Qad'āl Muḥammad was in Ray as a judge, his pen-name was "Visālī." He was the friend and partner in conversation of all the great and powerful amīrs in Shāh Ismā'īl's court. He was more sincerely attached to Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain, the minister of Shāh Ismā'īl I (killed in 929/1523), than the others.

Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain composed this poem to show his concern about the departure of his friend, Qad'āl Muḥammad:

"Oh Visālī, it is impossible to be separated from you,
Unfaithfulness is not our custom.
You have been my friend for a long time,
My intimate friend, a shield, and a companion.
It is your fault that you are going away,
Out of my presence you will be patient."

1. Tuhfa, p. 73.
2. Ibid.; cf. Jahān-ārā, (p. 20-21 introduction), where the rest of this "parallel" appears as follows:

It is also believed that this maṭla' belongs to Visālī:

---

pp. 20-21
It is said that when Qâdi Muḥammad (Vişâlî) was young, he fell in love with a boy called ʿSâdiq (صادق). Once when he was proclaiming his love to the boy, he was thrown into a pool by the angry boy and his arm was broken. He composed this poem for the boy to show his faithfulness to him.

"I do not care if my arm has been broken for the sake of ʿSâdiq's love. It could happen to anyone who is a true lover. No one is needed to prove my love. The proof of my love is in my sleeve."

Vişâlî died in 932/1526.

1. Here, in this quatrain ʿSâdiq means both a name and a "true lover" or "who speaks truly".
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid. See Tuḥfa, p. 74; Jahân-ārā, p. 63, introduction.

The Qa'î was one of the composers of elegies at Shâh Ismâ'îl's court.¹ He composed couplets in praise of Shâh Ismâ'îl of which the following is one:

"Shâh Ismâ'îl, whose wisdom resembles that of Alexander,
The king with the judgement of the Khusrâw and the throne of Jamshîd (the ancient king).
No one performed actions that he performed in his firm resolve,
Neither the seal of Solomon in his banquet, nor Rustam in his fight."²


This man was a scholar and poet of Shâh Ismâ'îl's period who lived in Marâgheh where he had a wide following. He was one of the murîds of Shaikh Ibrâhîm Mujâhid b. Shaikh Muṣṭâfâ 'Azîz Kandi.³

According to Tarbiyat, he died in Tabrîz in 930/1524, the same year in which Shâh Ismâ'îl died, and was buried

---

¹ Mir Sayyid Sharîf (Râqim), Tawârîkh-i Mir Sayyid Sharîf (see Dickson, op. cit., p. LVII, Tarîkh-nâmeh-yi Râqim), Edinburgh U.L. Ms. no. 246, f. 80.
² Ibid.
³ Danishmandân, pp. 84-5, quoted from Hadîqat al-Shu'arâ'.
in Charandāb cemetery in the tomb of Shaikh Ibrāhīm-Jūniyānī, opposite the Mosque of Sayyīd Ḥasan Maftūl Band.¹

Tarbiyat states that he was a good calligrapher and poet.²

14. Ḥāfīẓ Chargar.

He was from Tabrīz and was a painter and satirist. One of his satires attacks Maulānā Zinātī³ for his extremely black face and huge body. In this way, he found his death chronogram "بَسْرَاء سِبَايَا" or "Black bear" which stands for 936/1529.⁴ This poet was a singer too. His pen-name was Faraqī.⁵

---

1. Dānīshmandān, pp. 84-5. 
2. Ibid. Tarbiyat also presents the following verses as an example of his poetry:

```
لم يعلم من ذكرى مسجدنا ساءت
وليس من غيره من ناسين ساءت

وَفِي عَالمِ الْعَلَمِ وَفِي ذُرْعَىِ الدَّارِ
```

3. Maulānā Zinātī seems to have been another poet of this period.
4. Dānīshmandān, p. 103, on the authority of Tuhfa-yi Samī. 
5. Ibid. Tarbiyat records an example of his poetry as follows:

```
دمين بِنِيَام مَرْضَى قِبْلي لِلْيَلِّي تَوْسِيَت
```

15. **Maulāna Ḥabīb.**

He was an Āzarbāyjānī poet born in a village called گرگی چای (گرگی چای) in "Gúychāy" (Gúychāy). In his early life he was a shepherd but later on he became a courtier of Sultan Ya‘qūb Āq-qoyūnlū. In the reign of Shāh Ismā‘īl he became the Malik al-Shu‘arā of his court and since Shāh Ismā‘īl was devoted to him, he called him "Gurz al-Dīn" which was a satirical pen-name.²

Tarbiyat states that Ḥasan Chalabi in his Tadhkira states that the above poet went to Bāyazīd II and died in Ottoman territory in the time of Sultan Sallūm I (918-926/1512/1520).³

16. **Faḍlī Shabistārī.**

He was among the poets and learned men who flourished during the reign of Shāh Ismā‘īl I. In 926/1521,⁴ when Abu’l-Muẓaffar Shaikh Shāh b. Shīrvān Shāh came to Iran,

---

1. I could not trace this place in *F.J.I.*, vol. IV. See *Danishmandān*, p. 112.
2. Ibid., where Tarbiyat presents an example of his Turkish poems.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p. 299. Tarbiyat gives 927/1521, but according to the poet himself it was the end of 926 A.H. as the author says "لَوْمَهُ وَبِرَيْتُ وَهُنَفَتَ كَرْسَيْهَا نُبْدَ."
he composed a poem in his praise.

Tarbiyat indicates that a volume of his *risāla* is available in the private library of Sayyid 'Abdal-Rahīm Khalkhālī copied by a certain writer called Mullā Allāh virdī b. 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad Tabrīzī.¹

17. Shauqī Tabrīzī.

He was a relative of the vizier Rashīd al-Dīn and was a poet, calligrapher (especially in nastā'īq) and a member of Sām Mīrzā's court. At the end of his life he went to Kabul where he died in 954/1549.²

Tarbiyat states that Shauqī had a *diwān* containing qāṣidas, ghazals and rubā'īyāt of which about 400 verses are said to be extant.³ Tarbiyat also says that Shauqī was the first person before Maibūdī who composed Ḥadrat 'Allī's *diwān* in Persian in 885/1480 and dedicated it to Sūlṭān Ya'qūb ʿAq-qūyūnli. He adds that a volume of that *diwān* is in his private library.⁴

¹ *Dānishmandān*, p. 299 where Tarbiyat presents the following example of his poem:

```
"...  "

...  "
```

² *Dānishmandān*, p. 208.


⁴ *Ibid.* where Tarbiyat records two of Shauqī's Persian quatrains, one of which runs as follows:

```
*...  "

...  "
```

*...  "

...  "
```
18. 'Arif Hamadānī and Shaikh Junaid Yaqi'nī.

According to the author of Jahān Gus̱hā, these two poets praised Shāh Ismā'īl in their qaṣīdas. The same author does not quote the qaṣīda of the former but only records the latter's.¹

1. Jahān Gus̱hā, f. 305a where the author presents 9 lines of the above-mentioned qaṣīda beginning:

```
[...] نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا نیا ن
```

Another poet of this period was Mirzā Qāsim Gūnābādī who composed a Shāh-nāma for Shāh Ismā'īl, and died in 929/1522. On Mirzā Qāsim Gūnābādī see Ray, op. cit., p.100, where the author mentions that "Shāh-nāma-i Qāsimī of Mirzā Qāsim Gūnābādī, composed after 971/1563-4 " Cf. Muntāzam, vol. II, p. 101 where the author states:

```
وفا ست میرزا قاسم بن بادی شاه نامه شاه اسمی ایست اسلم دراو ورده

بود 29/1522 "
```

Cf. B.M. Ms. Or. 339. Ray states that the first draft of the work dealing with the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl was printed at Lucknow and is available in Ms. at the R.A.S. of Bengal; Browne, op. cit., IV, p. 83, where Browne states that the above Shāh-nāma was completed ten years after the death of Shāh Ismā'īl I.

There was also Ahlī Shīrāzī who died in 942/1535-6. On him see Habīb, IV, p. 606 where Khwānd Amīr says: "His life and death were not known.

But contrary to Habīb, the author of Ahsan states:

```
ما مال مال و سال و سال میانقری سالم تکنیت
```

See Ahsan, vol. I, p. 274, see also Browne, op. cit., IV, pp. 233-4; Muntazam, p. 111, year 942/1535; Fārs-nāma, p. 103, year 942 A.H.
1. He Paid a Salary to a Poet for His Sense of Humour.

Alif Abdāl was a poet of Balkhī origin whose first pen-name was Muṭṭīʿ. Later on he changed it to Alīf (ا لِی ف). His speech was cheerful and his phrases well-turned. Sām Mīrzā says that his jokes with Sūltān Yaʿqūb Āq-qoyūnlū were very famous in Āzarbāyjān. One day, he asked Sūltān Yaʿqūb for a white goat-fur cloak. The King said:

"I will give it to you on the condition that you make the sound of the sheep [or goat]"  

He did it and won the fur. After Yaʿqūb's death, he went to Isfahān and settled there. When Shāh Ismāʿīl captured Isfahān in 909/1503, a man called Ḥabashī who was known as Gurz al-Dīn (گرژالدین) arrested him. Ḥabashī suggested to Abdāl that he should give some gold in exchange for his freedom, but Abdāl had nothing to give, repeatedly answering him:

"Alīf has nothing ( ني ناش )"  

1. Tuhfa, p. 111.
2. Ibid.
3. Aḥsan gives the above date. See vol. I, p. 72.
4. Tuhfa, p. 111.
Abashī became tired of beating him, and he took Abdal to Shāh Ismā'īl. The above joke was explained to Shāh Ismā'īl, who summoned him to his presence and asked him:

"What have you said about me?"

Abdal composed this line at once:

"The crown of the King has more respect than the head of the Qāiser; Anyone who has not this crown, has a headless body."

Shāh Ismā'īl said to him:

"You have composed this poem to please me because of your fear."

Abdal composed this further couplet forthwith:

"I have a story which is not flattery, A King like you never has come to the world."

Shāh Ismā'īl was very excited, and ordered that a stipend should be provided for him for the rest of his life. Sām Mīrzā states that:

1. Tuhfa, p. 111.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
2. Shah Isma'il Expelled a Poet from his Court, because of his provocative poems

One of the poets who fell into disfavour with Shah Isma'il was Muhibb 'Ali Na'n (مُحِبّ مَعْلُوْعَان) who was a good piper (nay-nawaz). He was excellent at calligraphy, and a fine writer of nastaliq. He was, however, a very rude, impudent man, but good-natured and a jester. He used to regard anything as an excuse for a joke. He lived with Sâm Mirzâ at the court, but since he was very rude to people, and his pranks caused them to complain about him, Shah Isma'il sent him out of Sâm Mirzâ's service. He sent him to Sayyid Beg, known generally as Sayyid Manşûr.¹

Sâm Mirzâ, who had been delighted to have him with him, writes enviously:

"He made up a great many jokes with the above-mentioned Sayyid. For instance, one day Sayyid was sitting in his tent, reading and interpreting Arabic poems. Suddenly, his mule, which was tied outside, farted and the sound reached the tent. 'Oh, my lord, your mule is also composing poems!' Muhibb 'Ali said to his master. Sayyid Beg, his master, was not amused by this joke and said irritably, 'If you repeat this kind of talk I will punish you.' Muhibb 'Ali said: 'You should give me a prize for the joke that I have told you!' Sayyid Beg thought a while, then accepted his argument, and replied that he was right."²

2. Ibid.
3. Shāh Ismā'īl Accepted Even the Hollowest Panegyrics of Himself.

The Shi'ite poets wrote laudatory works, which Shāh Ismā'īl apparently accepted, however extreme the flattery contained in them. One such poet was Ḥāj j Āqā Lur of the Lurī Atābak dynasty.¹ According to Sām Mirzā, he was a man who meddled in everything but knew nothing. At first he was Shāh Ismā'īl's chief entertainer of visitors, then he was appointed to the position of Yūz Bashi (the head of a hundred soldiers) and Khalīfa qurchīyān² which was a great position in Shāh Ismā'īl's court. He used to compose this kind of poem for instance:

"I saw the Shāh's face from a distance, (And because of that) I reached to the seventh heaven. The face of the Shāh and moon are alike; anyone who saw the Shāh's face is honoured."³

Sām Mirzā writes of this poet:

"It would have been better if he had not composed any poems."⁴

He adds:

"I asked him how -poem  rhymed with each other. He replied that he could not find better rhymes than that"⁵

---

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
Baḥrām Mīrzā, the other son of Shāh Ismā'īl I, writes in condemnation of this poet's writing:

"Your father is a Lur and your mother a Kurd, The neck of a poet like you would be better broken, Being a poet is a job for afflicted ones, Being a poet is a job for libertines." 1

4. Shāh Ismā'īl Once Ordered a Poet to be Skinned Alive.

One Khurāsānī poet who incurred the disfavour of Shāh Ismā'īl was Qādī Mūsāfīr. After capturing Tabrīz and coming to the throne Shāh Ismā'īl made Twelver Shīʿism the only state religion. For this proclamation historians have discovered the chronogram 2

It is said that Qādī Mūsāfīr3 changed this chronogram

2. See Jahān-āra, p. 265 where the author gives two chronograms which both stand for 906 A.H.
3. Mīrzā Muhammad Ṭāhir Naṣrābādī, Tadhkīra-yi Naṣrābādī, (Tehran, n.d.), p. 471. It is believed that the following poets and scholars also took part in the corruption of the same text. First, the poet Shahīdī (cf. Ḥabīb, vol. IV, p. 617); on him Mir Sayyid Ṣafī (Rāqīm) states: Edinburgh Ms. no. 246, f. 78a-b
to (دهسناعشی) which means "the untrue or unlawful religion". When this alteration came to the notice of Shāh Ismā'īl, he ordered his qūchās to arrest the poet and skin him, as soon as they found him. When they did find him the Shāh was informed of his arrest and asked him, "Why did you invert that chronogram?" "I got the idea from your Majesty, my lord," Qāfī replied. Then he explained: "Your Majesty has announced that 'Our religion is the true religion' (مذهبنا حق), but it is not the way that self-interested people have perverted it." Shāh Ismā'īl was pleased with him and forgave him.¹

On him Khwānd Amīr states:

"He is a learned man and is working as a judge in Tabrīz."²

In contrast with "Raqīm" the author of Inqilāb-Islām indicates that it was Bidlīsī, the author of the Salīm-nāma, who found the above chronogram. See Inqilāb-Islām, p. 57. Khwānd Amīr on Shahīdī (Qumī) states:

"مولا نفری درسلک شیری بلده قم احاظدام داشت و مراحت بعزال و مرتعی بیان می‌کرد. این مطلورن تاکنون آمروست " بیا ای عقیق آ نشی زن دل اسرد؟ ما را مورزندی و کردن که برافر مرده با را " See Ḥabīb, IV, p. 611.

1. See above sources. All agree on the Shāh's forgiveness.
2. Ḥabīb, vol. IV, p. 609.
5. Once, Shâh Ismâ‘īl Ordered a Poet to be Hanged from a Minaret.

Malik Khânî was a poet who was executed at Shâh Ismâ‘īl's orders. He was one of the princes of the Khalkhâl province; he was well known for his bravery, cruelty and overbearing nature. Šâm Mîrzâ states that although he was unpleasant in his habits, he used to compose good poems. He was also a very skilful archer. ¹

Because of some mistakes and misdemeanours he fell out of favour with Shâh Ismâ‘īl and, afraid of punishment, he left the King's court, taking refuge in the castle of Istâ‘in Khâf (عستای خان). ² He was arrested on Shâh Ismâ‘īl's orders who ordered him to be hanged on top of the Naşîriyya minaret in Tâbrîz. He was suspended there by one foot until he died. ³

---

1. Tuhfa, p. 79.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
PART FOUR

Shāh Ismā'īl's Poetically Gifted Ministers

Among Shāh Ismā'īl's ministers, three were said to have possessed poetic gifts. These three ministers are discussed below:

1. Māhmūd Khān Dailamī.

He was a Dailamī who claimed to be descended from Mālik Ashtar, the governor of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭalib in Egypt. He became Shāh Ismā'īl's minister in 909/1503 when the Shāh camped at Qum. He was an even-tempered and pleasant man. Māhmūd Khān showed manliness with those he knew to be powerful people, and fatherliness with ordinary subjects. His virtues were too exalted to be mentioned. He composed both prose and poetry.

---

1. See Lubā, p. 243.
2. Tuhfa, pp. 56-7.
3. Ibid. Sām Mīrzā presents the following line as an example of his poems:

\[\text{sic}\]

"After my death they should make wine jars out of my dust; If the stone they throw to her (my beloved's) dog would strike and break me." (?)

See also "Safāl" (v.n. of ستفل) in Steingass, P.E.D., p. 684.
2. Mirzá Sháh Husain Isfahání.

According to Sám Mirzá, this man used to waste his time at first\(^1\) and was a house builder in Isfahán but since he had good handwriting he became employed by a judge in Isfahán. Then, because he was quick-witted, he became the minister of Dúrmish Khán in Isfahán. He treated the people in a sensitive and admirable way.\(^2\) He possessed a good sense of humour which is apparent in his extant poems and satires. The parallel (نمرولوي) which he composed in answer to Mauláná Kámí is a good instance of his poetic skill. He is said to have followed the style of Amir ‘Alí Shír Na vá.\(^3\)

Sám Mirzá records the following as an example of his poems:

"Lovers get used to your detachment,  
As long as they cannot reach you, they are satisfied with that."

Mirzá Sháh Husain was assassinated by Mihtar Sháh Qúll Rikábdr in 929/1523 in Tabríz.\(^5\)

---

1. Tuhfa, pp. 55-6.
2. Ibid., p. 56.
3. Ibid., p. 56 where Sám Mirzá states: 

\[ \text{عاشقان هر میزی می‌دانند} \]

"For more details on Mirzá Sháh Husain's life and activities, see chapter IV, pp. 305-7."


This man was the last minister to serve Shāh Ismā'īl I and he was also in the service of his son, later Shāh Ṭahmāsb I.

He had "no competitor in jocularity" and was an excellent essayist. He was appointed as Minister at Shāh Ismā'īl's court after the death of Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain Ḩosainī, but six months after Shāh Ismā'īl's death Jalāl al-Dīn was burned alive because of the calumny of Dīw Sūltān Rūmlū. ¹ It is said that on the day that people were plaiting the reeds with which to burn him, he quoted a line of Ḥayrānī Ḥamadānī which runs as follows:

"I settled in the alley of calamity, where I caught fire,
Anyone who stays in such a place deserves this fire." ²

¹. Tuḥfa, p. 56; Aḥsan, vol. I, p. 184, cf. vol. II, p. 91; Ḥabīb, p. 598. Ḥasan Rūmlū records the following quatrain as an example of his poetry:

"I praise you, O eminence! I am the slave of your feet.
You are the best of mankind, who forgives the sins of others.
May your number be counted among the righteous!"


². Aḥsan, vol. I, p. 184; cf. vol. II, p. 90 where the above line is omitted. Cf. Dānishmandān, pp. 97-98 where the author on the authority of Sām Mirzā attributes the following line to Jalāl al-Dīn:

"If I were to praise you, my tongue would not suffice to
"mention you properly, O lord of the world!"

Tarbiyat believes that Jalāl al-Dīn was a learned man of Āzarbāyjān.
I. The Scientists and Great Scholars of Distinction of this Period.

During the long period of their sovereignty (907-1150/1500-1722) Šafawīd rulers gave every support to Shī'ite theologians:

"Theological colleges were founded and shrines in the cities of pilgrimage were restored throughout Persia and Mesopotamia. Every encouragement was given to writers who endeavoured to lead the people back from the teaching of numerous sects to a sincere following of the Twelve Imams."¹

In this atmosphere of full encouragement, and also because of a widespread campaign of Shī'ite education, many writers and scholars flourished during the reign of Šah Ismā'īl I and his son Tahmāsb I. The wealth of scholars mentioned below testifies to great intellectual activity in the reign of Šah Ismā'īl I, both amongst the indigenous population and those encouraged to come to Iran from Herāt and elsewhere. This is an aspect of the reign of Šah Ismā'īl that has been neglected, even by modern scholars of the Šafawīds.

One of the great theologians of this period was Maulānā Ḥusain Wā'īz (died in 910/1504). He was the author of Jawāhir al-Tafsīr, Rawdat al-Shuhadā', Akhlāq-i Muḥsinī, Maṣābīḥ al-Qulūb, Ikhtiyārat and Makhzan al-`

Inshā.¹ Maulānā ʿAbd al-Rahmān Astarābādī, the author of the
Bilqīs wa-Sulaimān and Diwān-i qaṣāyīd, died in 922/1516,
the same year in which Maulānā Rīyāzī Savājī died. The
latter was the author of Tārīḵ-i Sultān Ḥusain Mīrzā.²
Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Astarābādī (died in 931 A.H.)
was a student of Maulānā Jalāl al-Dīn Dāwānī (died in
908/1502)³ and Maulānā Shaikh Ḥasan Muḥtāsib. Because
of a disagreement with Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain Isfahānī he
went to Shirāz.⁴
Shaikh ʿAll b. ʿAbd al-ʿAll Muṭtaghī was another Shīʿite
scholar; he died in 944 A.H. He was the author of Sharḥ
Lāma, ʿAḥṣiya, Sharāyat, Sharḥ Irshād, Risāla-yi
Jaʿfariyya and ʿAḥṣiya-yi Alīyya. His students included
Amīr Niʿmat Allāh Ḥillī from the Sayyids of Ḥilla.
Because he was denounced by Qāḍī Nūsāfī⁵ and Maulānā
Ḥusain Ardabīlī and others to Shāh Ṭahmāsb I, he was

---

2. Ibid.
   Cf. also chapter VI, p. 420.
4. Aḥsan, vol. I, pp. 189-190 where the author quotes:
   "اِنْ مِّمْ بِكَالْءِ مَعْتَمِرُ فَرْقِي
   نَوَسْتَنَّ تَرْفِيَةَ فُرْقِي
   اَحْمَسْ كُنْتَ مُرَائِدًا وَرَفْقِي"
5. According to Ḥabīb, vol. IV, p. 609, Qāḍī Nūsāfī became a judge in Shāh Ṭahmāsb I's period.
sent to Baghdad from his home in Dar al-Saltana of Sahl Abad, Tabriz, near the zuwa of Nasiriya in Tabriz. He died in Baghdad in 940/1533.1

Another influential scientist and theologian of this period was Amir Ghiyath al-Din Mansur b. Amir Sadr al-Din Muhammad Shirazi (died in 942/1535) whose title of honour was "Mu'allim-i thani", "the second teacher". About his high rank and knowledge it is enough to say that he was appointed by Shah Isma'il I to repair and rebuild the Rasad-Khana of Maragheh, built by Khwaja Nasir al-Din Tus (born in 597/1201, died in 672/1274 in Baghdad).2 This building had gone completely to rack and ruin because of negligence on the part of earlier rulers. But this plan was not practicable because of the high expense and the long time involved (about 30 years).3

Another eminent scholar was Shaikh Zayn al-Din Jabal 'Amili (died in 965/1557). He was killed by Rustam Pasha and other Sunnis in Istanbul, because of his Shi'ite activities.4

Maulana Abu'l-Hasan b. Maulana Ahamd Bavar was another scholar of this period and Hasan Rumli, the author of Ahsan al-Tawarikh, was his student.5 He passed

away in 967/1559. He was the author of Ithbāt-i Wajib-i Rawdat al-Jīnān Dar Ḥikmat-i Risāla-yi Manṭiq.¹

1. Ahsan, vol. I, pp. 410-411. For more details on Qādī Ṣhaikhūm, Qādī Naṣrallāh Baghdadī, Mālānā Abū al-Ṣamād, Mālānā Ṣārāk Kīyānī, poet and learned man of Tabrīz, Shaikh 'Alā al-Dīn 'Alī b. 'Abd Allāh, the most learned theologian of the Shī'ite sect of Tabrīz, the author of Ḥāshiya-yi Alfiyya and Risāla-yi Ja'fariyya and other scholars or theologians see Habib, vol. IV, pp. 609-618. See also Shaikh Shams al-Dīn b. Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā b. 'All Gilānī Lāhījī (died in 912/1506), Mafātīḥ al-ʿIjāz Fī Sharḥ-i Gulshan-i Rāz, p. 87. According to the above work this chronogram seems to be his death year, which according to jamāl calculation becomes 912/1506 in Shīrāz. See pp. 82-88 for more details.

Another scholar and poet of Shâh Ismâʿîl's period was Maulâna Husain Ilâhî. He was also a Sūfî. According to Tarbiyât, this scholar wrote mystical poems which

1. Ilâhî was the author of Sharḥ Risâla yi-Ithbât al-Wâjib of Dawwânî, Sharḥ Taḥdîb al-Uṣûl of Allâma Hillî, Sharḥ Ashkâl al-Taṣāsîs of Samarqandî, the ʿHavâshî, Taʿlîqât on Sharḥ Ḥidâya, Mawâqîf, Sharḥ Shamsîyya, Matâli, Sharḥ Tâdhkîra. He was the translator of Nahj al-Dîrât by Sayyid b. ʿAbd al-ʿUsîr in Persian. He was the author of Risâla yi-ʿIlm Qiyâfa and Risâla of ʿImamat in Turkish.

His best works were Taj al-Manâqib fi-Faṣâḥih al-ʿAʿimma and Munhîj al-Faṣâḥa fi-Sharḥ Nahj al-Balâgha (available in the library of Asʿad Pâshâ in İstanbûl) which both were dedicated to Shâh Ismâʿîl I.

Ilâhî was a translator of the Qurâna into Persian and also interpreted it in Arabic.

For more details see Danishmandân, pp. 47-8.
amounted to 2,000 couplets. He died in 950/1543 in Ardabil and is buried there.¹

Danishmandan, pp. 47-8, where Tarbiyat records two examples of his poems in Persian:

- دکت برای تو پدر حسین نمی‌هر
  کلم تو روزانه نزدما می‌خور

- ملکت بی‌ایا تو باز هم رفته
  بم زاین ما هم جان پا‌ش - یم رفته

PART SIX

Some of Those Celebrated Scholars and Poets who Left Iran because of Their Sunnī Activities.

1. Shaikh Ibrāhīm Gulshanī.

His full name was Shaikh Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. Ḥājī Ibrāhīm b. Shihāb al-Dīn Barda'yī. He was born in Barda'in 830/1426, educated by his uncle, Sayyid 'Alī, and then settled in Tabrīz. He was a pupil of Dada 'Umar and through his recommendation changed his pen-name Ḥaybatī to Gulsanī. Ibrāhīm Gulsanī became the Khalīfa of Dada 'Umar after his death.

After Shāh Ismā'īl captured Tabrīz, Maulānā Gulsanī went to Cairo, settled in "Qubbat al-Musta'fā" and established the Gulsanī order in Cairo and Turkey. In 922/1516 when Sultān Sa‘īd captured Egypt, he respected Gulsanī to such an extent that the latter could gather many darwīshes and build a khānqāh. When his fame reached Sultān Sulaimān II, he summoned him to Turkey. This summons he obeyed respectfully in 935/1528. He was

2. stärkmandān, p. 318; cf. Asāmī, p. 266.
110 years old when he died in Cairo in 940/1533-4. 1

According to Tarbiyat, Gulšanī was well known in tafsīr and ḥadīth interpretation and in taṣawwuf. He wrote a Qaṣīda in Arabic analogous with the Qaṣīda of Ibn al-Farīd. He composed a dīwān in Persian and in Turkish, and several mathnāvis. Tarbiyat adds that one of his dīwāns (440 pages) is in the National Library in Egypt. 2

1. Dānīshmandān, p. 319, where Tarbiyat on the authority of ‘Arifi Istanbulī gives this chronogram:

\[ \text{كَذَّبَتْ إِنْ شَيْءٌ إِمَّا نَعْمَةٍ أَمْ بِإِرَادَةٍ} \]

\[ \text{مَا أَسْتَقْطَبَ الْزَّمَانِ اِبْرَاهِيمٌ} \]

Cf. Gibb, op. cit., p. 374; and Āsāmī, p. 266, where the author has this to say:

"سلطان سلما بيف دمتعي (وزريه 936) ده استامبول كليه."

2. Dānīshmandān, p. 319 presents the following mathnāvi beginning:

\[ 
\text{بَاَللهِ رضي ورحيم} \\
\text{كُلُّ حِبِّ اَللَّهِ مَفَاتِحُ اَللَّهِ} \\
\text{كُلُّ حِبِّ اَللَّهِ مَفَاتِحُ اَللَّهِ} \\
\text{كُلُّ حِبِّ اَللَّهِ مَفَاتِحُ اَللَّهِ} \\

Tarbiyat states that Shaikh Aḥmad Gulšanī (died in 977 A.H.) and Sayyid ‘Alī Šafwattī (died in 1005 A.H.) were his sons.

Rūzbihān's full name appears in Mihmān-nāma-yi Bukhārā as:


Rūzbihān was a well-known scholar who travelled widely. His Sunni activities among Shi'a scholars were well known, but continued to be ignored in ultra-Shī‘ite Șafawīd Persia.²

Two letters of his have survived, recorded in the Salīm-nāma³ and Munshāat-i Fardūn Beg. These show the author's strong hatred of Shāh Ismā‘īl and of his proclamation of Twelver Shi‘ism.⁴

---


4.  See the sources cited in n. 3.
We are told that in Sha'bān 892/1486, which was the year of Shāh Ismā'īl's birth, Rūzbihān presented the Āq-qoyūnlū prince, Ya'qūb Mīrza, with his book entitled Badī' al-Zamān Mīrza. He wrote his essay entitled Ibtāl-i Nahj al-Bāṭil, which was a refutation of the Nahj al-Ṣidq wa Ḵaṣb al-Ṣidq of 'Allāma Ḥillī, in Kāshān in 909/1502-3; this he finished on the third of Jamādā II of that year. This took place about the time that Shāh Ismā'īl's Qızıl-Bāșh conquered 'Irāq-i 'Ajam.

It seems that after writing pejorative words about Shāh Ismā'īl's father and his grandfather, in his history called 'Alam-ārā yi-ʿAmlī, the author had no alternative but to leave his fatherland. Nor were the successors of Timūr who were allies of the Šafawīds at that time able to give him asylum. Without hope, he was forced to go to Transoxiana. Ḥasan Rūmlū states that Rūzbihān died in Bukhārā on the 5th of Jamādā I, 927/1521.3

1. Rūzbihān/Minorsky, p. 4; cf. Browne, op. cit., p. 78; Rūzbihān/Minorsky, p. 4.
2. Rūzbihān/Suttuīda, p. 18; cf. Rūzbihān/Minorsky, p. 3. "Amlī" or "Amlīni" was Rūzbihān's pen-name; see Salīm-nāma, f. 69b, line 26.
Among his works we can list:

Tārīkh-i 'Alam-ārā yi-Amīnī, Badī' al-Zamān fi Qīṣa

Ḥayy ibn-i Yaqażān, Ibtāl-i Nahj al-Bāṭil, Mihmān-
nāma-yi Bukhārā, Sulūk al-Mulūk, Nasab-nāma-yi Muḥammad

Khan 'Shaibānī, Risāla-yi Ḩāshiyā,1 and Sharḥ Qaṣīda

Burda (completed in 921/1515).2

The Morals and Religion of Fadl Allāh b. Rūzbihān

(Amīnī).

Sutūda, the editor of Mihmān-nāma-yi Bukhārā, when
discussing the religious attitude of Rūzbihān, states
that Sakha'vi, his teacher, regarded him as a Shāfi'ī,
and a Sufi who was a follower of Pir Jamāl Ardīstānī.
At 'Shaibānī's court, Rūzbihān was an adherent of the
Shāfi'ī sect, and perhaps retained a partiality towards
the Shāfi'ī doctrine until his death.3 The author of
Rawḍāt al-Jannāt believes him to be Ḥanafī in furū' and
Ash'arī in ʿusūl. "ضني النزعة وأصول الأمر".4

1. Aḥsan, p. 174; cf. Rūzbihān/Sutūda, p. 18, and
   Rūzbihān/Minorsky, pp. 5-8.
2. Rūzbihān/Minorsky, p. 8.
3. Rūzbihān/Sutūda, p. 28.
4. Ibid.
Certainly, he tended towards fanaticism in his works and vigorously attacked the ancestors of Shāh Ismā'īl and the pioneers of Twelver Shi'ism whose sect he considered worthless and whom he roundly condemned. Whenever he speaks of the Ṣafawīd shaikhs, he displays his hostility towards them; he especially singles out for his attacks Shaikh Haydar, his father Junaid and Shāh Ismā'īl. In Rūzbihān's view, the Shi'ite supporters of the Ṣafawīds were infidels, and shedding their blood would be lawful. In his great hatred, he requested Shaibak Khan to invade Iran after concluding his war against the Cossacks.

1. Ḥabīb, p. 607; Aḥsan, p. 174. Cf. vol. II, p. 183. It seems that Rumlū copied Khwānd Amīr's statement almost word for word. Khwānd Amīr states:

2. Rūzbihān/Minorsky, pp. 64-81.


4. Ibid.; cf. Inqīlāb-Īslām, p. 58 where the author states that Qādī 'Umar was another Sunnī scholar who went to Khurasān, caused many Shi'ite subjects to be killed and encouraged Muḥammad Khan Shaibānī to attack Kirmān and Iranian territories.
A written description of Rûzbihân has come down to us from the work of two scholars who saw him during the last years of his life. One of them, Zain al-Dîn Muḥammad Wâṣifî, narrates two anecdotes. The first mentions his speaking in Samarqand, in the name of ʿUbaid Allâh Khân Üz-Beg, in a Friday khūṭba (sermon); there then follows a funny story about his playing chess with Maulâna Bânaî, the celebrated poet killed in the Qarshî massacre in 918/1512.¹

According to Sutûda, Rûzbihân's teacher mentions his good characteristics:

"He was mild-mannered and spent most of his time in ْتِفْسِير و تَوْاَمُّ, living frugally and doing kind deeds. He was clever in business and in organizing things. He had a quiet elegance and a habitual contentment."

¹ Navâî, Shâh Ismâ'îl Ṣafawi, p. 200

The author says that they were joking with each other during the chess game and sometimes their jokes changed into irony and satire. They were speaking so viciously that nobody could bear to hear it. Their laughter was sometimes so great that both of them became hysterical.

The second story was mentioned by Khwând Amîr, the author of Habîb al-Siyar, who had seen Rûzbihân in Herât. For more details see Habîb, p. 607.

² Rûzbihân/Sutûda, p. 28.
The Poetry of Rūzbihān.

As well as Rūzbihān's two polemic poems, he apparently wrote a ghazal of which a quatrain exists in Ḫūrāṣṭān al-Ālamārā yi-Abbāsī. Ḫikandar Munshi talks about a certain Rūzbihān Isfahānī and records the following ghazal:

"Who is it that out of shame and modesty is sitting behind the purdāh, (and) Seeing me presumptuous has a frown on her forehead. I had sought after a merciless one like this from God, The one to give the punishment of my heart would be this one."2

As mentioned before, Rūzbihān left two polemical poems full of complaints and regrets, urging Sultan Salīm I to fulfil his final victory over Shāh Ismā'īl I.

1. Ṭāḥṣib, p. 133 where Ḫikandar Munshi indicates:

2. Ibid.
The Persian poem (twenty six lines) appears in *Salīm-nāma-yi Bidlīsī*, in which Rūzbihān's hatred is very marked. These poems run as follows:

2. The above Arabic line appears in the *Salīm-nāma* of Bidlīsī (completed in 974 A.H.) f. 67b; *Salīm-nāma* of Muṣṭafā Celebī, op. cit., p. 34a; *Munshaāt*, I, p. 367. This is omitted by Browne, op. cit., IV, p. 78.

3. *Salīm-nāma* gives f. 67b: "carry a greeting from this inferior to the Qaṣīr." Cf. the same text in Muṣṭafā Celebī, op. cit., p. 34a, and *Munshaāt*, p. 367, where the author gives ْنيا زم بر سوی ساه مغز، so does Browne, op. cit., p. 78.

1. The *Salīm-nāma* records 26 lines in Persian and 43 lines in Turkish of which the Persian lines (only 16) have been translated by Browne (op. cit., IV, pp. 78-80). The same lines, including the whole Persian and Turkish verses, have been translated into English by Celia J. Kerslake, *A Critical Edition and Translation of the Introductory Sections and the First Thirteen Chapters of the "Selim namä" of Celalzāde Muṣṭafā Celebī*, unpublished D. phil. degree, Oxford 1975. Cf. *Munshaāt*, I, pp. 367-9; Rūzbihān/ Minorsky, pp. 4-5. Minorsky states that it was Browne who discovered among them two poems which an unpatriotic Persian addressed to Sultān Selīm to hail his victory over Shāh Ismā'īl (920/1514).
1. Salīm-nāma, f. 67b and Salīm-nāma of Muṣṭafā Celebi, p. 34a; both agree with the above line but cf. Munsha at, p. 368 where the author gives, so does Browne, op. cit., p. 78.

2. Salīm-nāma, f. 67b. Salīm-nāma of Muṣṭafā Celebi op. cit. But Munsha at, p. 368 and Browne, op. cit., p. 78 give a negative version, which carries a negative meaning. For instance for "شکلی" Browne gives: "If thou dost not break him......" but Kerslake translates: "Do you defeat him out of manliness...." The latter seems more accurate than Browne.

3. Salīm-nāma, f. 67b. Cf. Kerslake who gives "If, at some time, he recovers......." Browne does not appear to be accurate here since he gives: "If he obtains amnesty in safety......."
1. Browne finishes his quotation here by giving only sixteen lines, and gives no details of other lines. But Bidīsī and Farīdūn Beg present more text here. See Sālim-nāma, f. 68a, and Sālim-nāma of Muṣṭafā Celebī, op. cit., p. 35b. Since the rest of the above poems, both Persian and Turkish, have been translated by Kerslake (op. cit., pp. 34a-35b) I see no necessity to translate them again.

Cf. Browne, op. cit., pp. 79-80 "Come, break the idol by the aid of the faith......." ; Kerslake: "Come, O help of the Faith...."; the latter seems to make better sense since Rūzbihān calls Sālim I "the aid of the faith" "ای نصر دین".

2. Sālim-nāma, f. 68a, Sālim-nāma of Muṣṭafā Celebī, op. cit., p. 35b gives "باز دوالرتن" Cf. Munshanāt, p. 368 where the author gives

"باز دوالرتن راز در کلمت کام گردد بانی دوالرتن اسماء"

Bidīsī's line would appear more accurate than the others since he refers to "a new Dhu'l Qarnain who is Muslim" rather than "the Zu'l-Karneyn of Islam may be taken again" (the latter version is Munshanāt's).
1. Munshaamat does not give in and uses the past tense.

2. Salīm-nāma, f. 68a; cf. Muṣṭafā Celebī, op. cit., p. 35b and Munshaamat, p. 368 where both agree with rather than بیرار. Once again Bidlīsī seems more accurate, since in this line the poet talks about a new creation and uprising or rebirth.

3. Salīm-nāma, p. 68a; cf. Muṣṭafā Celebī, op. cit., p. 35b and Munshaamat, p. 368 where both give توان دین بیرار غلیب ستی. But Bidlīsī seems correct, since the poet says: "If the (first) Dhul-Qarnain was remembered for only two centuries, you will be remembered for a hundred centuries."
Lārī was another scholar who fled from Iran after Shāh Ismā‘īl I captured Tabrīz. He was a pupil of Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Maḥṣūrī Shīrāzī. In India Lārī became Hūmāyūn’s chief minister. 4 Lārī set out for the Holy places (Mecca) after the death of Hūmāyūn, but was shipwrecked, and nearly 400 of his books were lost. 5 With much difficulty, Lārī himself

1. Salīm-nāma, f. 68a; cf. Munṣhaṣāt, p. 368 where the author gives

2. "Amīn" or "Amīnī" was Rūzbihān’s usual pen-name. For another pen-name (Ṣabrī) (?) cf. ‘Ā.‘Ā. ‘Abbāsī, p. 133.

3. All these lines have been quoted from Bidlīsī’s Salīm-nāma (B.M. Ms. Add. 24,960, ff. 67b-68b). It seems that the other sources discussed here probably used this Ms. as their main source.


5. Aḥsan, p. 454. It seems that Lārī was moving from India for good.
managed to reach the shore and went to Istanbul.

Sultan Salim I showed him considerable favour and finally sent him to Ṭūṣ, the capital of Diyar Bakr.

He died there in 980/1572 at the age of ninety.¹

Lārī was the author of the following works:


See B.M. Ms. no. Add. 7650 explained by Rieu, vol. I, p. 116 where Rieu states:

"He went to Diyar Bakr, where Iskandar Pasha appointed him tutor to his children and master of the Madrasah. He died there in 979 A.H. upwards of sixty years old...."

Aḥsan, under the deaths: ۷۳۸۰A.H. ۳۳۷۱ H. vol. I, p. 454 gives:

"هم در سال میزان عصریان لاکی از عالم ما؛ لیکن بعد از یکم هیاتی تربیت را سال بود.."

See also vol. II, p. 197 (English translation).


4. Fārs-nāma, p. 112. Cf. Asāmī, p. 269 where the author indicates that
An example of the handwriting of Şah İsmā‘īl I.
The original manuscript of this piece of calligraphy can be seen at the University of Istanbul.


Ḥarrarahū İsmā‘īl b. Ḥaydar al-Ḥusainī, Ghafara Allāhū Lahū."
PART SEVEN

Shāh Ismā'īl's Patronage of the Arts.

His Love for and Interest in the Arts.

The Calligraphers and Calligraphy of his Court.

Falsafī illustrates a few lines of handwriting which he attributes to Shāh Ismā'īl himself. Whether or not this is a correct attribution is a matter for speculation.

One of the most well-known calligraphers at the court of Shāh Ismā'īl was Shāh Māhūd Nīshāpūrī, who was the royal calligrapher of the court and its library. Shāh Māhūd lived with Sām Mīrzā for a long time and taught him calligraphy. In his biography of poets and scholars, Sām Mīrzā puts Shāh Māhūd's name on the


Rūmī in these pages records many scholars and calligraphers, and presents the following lines which are omitted in volume II:

"خواجہ مہمود نیشابوری
بے تھوڑے کوئی تعریف
تا فطلہ بنت میر طریب
هو ہے دیس میں قیامت و نجیر
کر ہوں روہم سیدن تفصر
جلد یا سیدن نبی نفییر"
first page of his Tuḥfa. This priority gives us an idea of how dear he was to Šām Mirzā. He was the comrade and companion of the princes of the Ṣafawīd family from the beginning of their reign and he taught Shāh Ismā‘īl’s children too.

There are a few examples of his handwriting in Gulistān-i Hunar. This great calligrapher was known as "Golden-pen" (or نَزْرَة، ژر) and his penmanship was on a par with contemporary calligraphers, such as Ṣultān ‘Alī Mashḥadī and Mīr ‘Alī Herātī, about whom the ‘Ālam-ārā yi-‘Abbāsī speaks only very briefly. Mīr Sayyid ‘Aḥmad Mashḥadī and Maulānā Maḥmūd Isḥāq were his students.

Maulānā ‘Abdī was another of the calligraphers of the court of Shāh Ismā‘īl. He was one of the students of Maulānā Sultan ‘Alī Mashḥadī who was a very close friend of Shāh Ismā‘īl. Maulānā Sultan ‘Alī (died in 919/1513) was so expert in calligraphy that according

2. ‘A. ‘Abbāsī, p. 124, where the author writes:
3. See the above sources.
to Hasan Rūmlū and Iskandar Munshī, "not one of the past or contemporary calligraphers could be compared with him." ¹

¹ Ahsan, p. 140; Ḍā.ʿAbbasī, p. 124.
PART EIGHT

Shāh Ismā‘īl’s Interest in Painting and Painters

1. Ustād Bihzād

It is said that most of the Ṣafawīd kings and princes were particularly interested in painting and Shāh Ismā‘īl I was no exception. He honoured the painters of his court and gave respect to them. His son, Shāh Tahmāsb I, was also interested in this art and he himself was a painter from early youth onwards.1

Shāh Tahmāsb I was trained in the arts with great master painters and calligraphers such as Ustād Kamāl al-Dīn Bihzād and Sulṭān Muḥammad and ʿAqā Mīrak Naqqāṣ Isfahānī.2 Even his cousin, Ibrāhīm Mīrzā (the son of Bahram Mīrzā) was also a good painter, besides being skilled in calligraphy and music. Many great painters, such as Shaikh Muḥammad Sabzavārī, ‘Alī Aṯghar Kāshī, ‘Abd Allāh Shīrāzī and others worked for Ibrāhīm Mīrzā and lived with him.3

3. ‘A.ʿA. ‘Abbasī, p.127 where Iskandar Munkhī states: 

(مناه قُصْمِي) درآ غاًزروانی نمکت و فوف با ری کار که داده و نزدیک نکا نه کار که داده و درنکا N

-1235-
Bihzād, who was the most famous artist from the Herāt school of painting, appeared at the court of Shāh Ismāʿīl I in Tabrīz after the Battle of Marv in 916/1510. ¹ He was contemporary with Sulṭān Muḥammad Naqqāsh and ʿAqā Mirak Naqqāsh Iṣfahānī.

Bihzād studied at a school which was established through the continued efforts of a talented prince who was a calligraphic artist and a poet himself, Bāysunghur b. Shāhrūkh Mīrzā b. Timūr. ² Bihzād reached his high standard in art through the patronage of a ruler, like Sulṭān Ḥusain Bāyqarā and a minister, poet, musician and artist like Amīr ‘Āli Shīr Navāʾī. ³

Unfortunately there is no satisfactory biography of Kamāl al-Dīn Bihzād written by his contemporaries; even his date of birth is not known. But it is certain that he was born and brought up in Herāt which was the ideal city for the arts at the beginning of the Ṣafawī dynasty.

Some time before 893/1487, Ustād Kamāl al-Dīn Bihzād was admitted to the court of Sulṭān Ḥusain Bāyqarā who admired him very much. ⁴ When the Öz-Begs

³. Ibid.; cf. Dāʿīrat al-Maʿārif-i Fārsī, p. 478 where the date 893 A.H. is given.
conquered Khurasan in 912/1506, Muḥammad Khān Shābānī summoned Bihzād to his presence and gave him the title of the "Second Mānī" (مانی نات ای). 1

The only evidence of Bihzād's joining Shāh Ismā'īl's court is found in a document that shows his appointment in 928/1522 as the head of the library of the "Magistracy" (کتاب‌خانه حاکم) 2. Bihzād held this high position until his death in 942/1535. 3 He was buried in the garden of Shaikh Kamāl Khujandī near his tomb in Tabrīz. The date of his death according to this chronogram "the soil of Bihzād's grave" (خاک قبر بیزادر) was found inscribed in couplets on his grave-stone. 4

Navāl expresses surprise that Bihzād with his extreme Sunnī views could enter the Shāh's court and reach such a height. 5

---
2. Ibid.; cf. Ḥabīb, vol. IV, p. 362, where Khwānd Amīr states:
4. Navāl, p. 355; Ahsan and Muntazam do not mention anything under the year 942/1535.
1. Apart from the above information, we possess little information about Shāh Ismā'īl's royal library. On the other hand, we have a statement left by Sultān Muḥammad Taqī Khān (pen-name "Hakīm") in 1305 A.H. who describes the famous Safawīd library in Ardabil. He states:

See his work called Ganj-i Dānish (Tehran, 1305 Sh.) pp. 13-15.

2. Nava m, p. 361. The author states that the above manuscript is available for consultation in the National Library of Paris. He further on introduces Qādī Ṭahmāb Dīn ʿAbd Allāh b. Sādiq al-Dīn Ḥusaini's work entitled Gulistān-i Ḥunār which I believe has been edited by Suhail Khvānsārī. Khvānsārī has an article on Bihzād in...
Translation:

"We hereby command that the position of the management and magistracy of the staff of the Royal Library, writers, painters, illuminators, draughtsmen, colour grinders, gold-blockers, lapis-washers and the others who are connected in any way with these jobs and occupations, in the fortified states of Iran, shall be entrusted and consigned to him. All the enlightened authorities and incomparable ministers... and the supervisors of the King's affairs, the authorities of the court in general, the employers of the Royal Library and the above-mentioned group in particular should regard him as state accountant and in charge of the magistracy. They must hand over the control and management of the library affairs to him and they should consider as valid whatever orders he may give and they should not deviate from his instructions and written orders for the management of the Royal Library."

2. Shāh Ismā'īl's Treatment of Mānī Shirāzī.

Mānī was one of the talented and famous painters of Shirāz who lived at Shāh Ismā'īl's court in Tabrīz. He sometimes composed poems for his own pleasure. He served Shāh Ismā'īl during his concealment in Lāhījān when he was about thirteen years old. This famous artist respected and liked Shāh Ismā'īl very much. One day the king summoned him into his presence and treated him very kindly, while allowing him to kiss his feet, a gesture he had always wanted to make. The courtiers and Sūfīs of Shāh Ismā'īl, who had already felt jealousy towards Mānī because of his high position at the court, became even more envious of Shāh Ismā'īl's
favour and kindness towards Manī.  

The courtiers spread a rumour that Manī had kissed the Shāh's foreleg out of a presumptuous desire and for an evil purpose. They forced the king to punish Manī. The next day, the king was encouraged by them to murder Manī, and he ordered the execution of the poor love-sick painter. After a short time, the king forgave him owing to the intervention of some friends. But unfortunately the order reached the executioner when Manī had already been executed.

Sām Mirzā is the only person who comments on the main cause of Manī's death, and the giving of such an order. According to him it was at the instigation of Amir Najm Zargar who was jealous. This man had influenced the King by spreading slander about him.

Sām Mirzā adds:

"His poetry was of high quality and well known and he composed this emotional poem at his place of execution:

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Sām Mirzā states: ۱۱۲/۱۱۵۳

The above name should be Amir Najm Mas'ūd Zargar, not Najm Thānī Zargar, known as Amir Yar Ahmad Khūzānī Isfahānī.
"You killed me by your oppression, was this your justice?  
Do you punish me for praising your kingly beauty?  
On the day of resurrection I will lay a complaint to you,  
I will say (to God) that the king is the person whose sadness has cast my ashes to the winds of ruin.  
A head was cut off from its body and thrown into the dust, this was the fate of your lovers, wherever you went. (or your horse stepped)  
You have listened to others slandering me;  
How could I have believed this of my beloved friend in whom I trusted?"

1. Since Sâm Mirzâ did not leave us his complete poems, I have used Falsafî's quotation which seems more accurate.  
The lines Sâm Mirzâ mention are as follows:

PART NINE

Shāh Ismā'īl's Interest in Music.

Although the sources often describe Shāh Ismā'īl's feasting and drinking with beautiful singers, they give no details about the musicians themselves.

Our information in this field is limited to two notable manuscripts, namely Tuhfa-yi Sāmī and Tarīkh-ī Jahān Gushā-yi Khāqān.

1. Ustād Dūst Muḥammad.

Sām Mirzā merely mentions a musician called Ustād Dūst Muḥammad and states that he was in Shāh Ismā'īl's service from the days of the king's childhood in Lahijān. Later on, he went to Herāt and finally died on a pilgrimage to Mecca in 949/1542.1

2. The Üzānchīyān Shāh.

The author of Tarīkh-ī Jahān Gushā-yi Khāqān states:

"Khāqān Ṣahlb Qirān (Shāh Ismā'īl) did not like the musicians and dancers who were sent by Sultan Ḥusain Mirzā to Tabas during his invasion of that city."2

2. Jahān Gushā, f. 111a. Sultan Ḥusain Mirzā died on 11 Dhu'l-Ḥijja 911/5 May 1506.
The author goes on to say that Shāh Ismā'īl had a group of musicians in his camp who used to sing Varsāqī and Turkish songs, so that the Qīzil-Bāsh were aroused to attack the very heart of the enemy army. When Shāh Ismā'īl had completed the general massacre of Ṭabas and murdered about 7,000 Sunnis of the place, who had been sacrificed "to satisfy the king's passions," he began to travel about and hunt around the Ṭabas area. Meantime Sultan Ḥusain Bayqara sent him some presents and also a few musicians, harp-players and others who were unusually sweet-singing and unsurpassed for charm and for their elegance in dancing. However, the king did not accept them and sent a message to Sultan Ḥusain saying that "only he (the Sultan) deserved musicians and dancers like these. And since he himself (i.e. Shāh Ismā'īl) was a warlike man who rode on horseback all around the country and put down bandits and insurrectionists himself, he preferred his musicians to

1. See F. Sūmer, op. cit., pp. 49-50; "Varsak".
2. See chapter IV, p. 256. Cf. Ḥabīb, vol. IV, p. 480 where Khwand Amir wrongly or deliberately states "4,000."
be able to excite and encourage his troops to attack the centre of the enemy forces. Then he chose some of his own players and sent them to Sultan Ḥusain Mīrzā at Herāt.1

When Sultan Husain became aware that his expert musicians and dancers had been sent back, he thought that Shāh Ismā'īl's artists must be better and more beautiful than his. So, he admitted Shāh Ismā'īl's musicians into his presence.

The author of the Tarikh-i Jahān Gushā-yi Khāqān continues as follows:

"Sultan Ḥusain was horrified when he saw their fierce and frightening appearance and his heart began to palpitate out of fear. For all of them had shaved their heads while their moustaches had been allowed to droop below their lips; and they wore plumed head-dresses with tufts of feathers in them and had strips of tiger-skin draped around their shoulders.

1. Jahān Gushā, f. lila-b. We have some information left to us by Iskandar Munshi about the musicians' life in the reign of Shāh Ẓahmāsb I. The author states that: 

See A.A. Abbasi, p.135.
They carried their swords at an angle and their large Chukūrs ¹ were slung from their necks. Following a social custom, they began to play on the Chukūr and to sing Varsāqī songs as soon as they entered the Sultan's palace. The Sultan and other members of the audience were so frightened that their hair stood on end when the awful sounds reached their ears. But Sultan Husain told the musicians that he admired their warlike spirit and their boldness. 'You are worthy of your noble king' he said, and he went on, 'Who would dare to be equal with him!' ........ 'I can't bear to hear these sounds and see these figures' he said, and presented each of them with a horse and money and robes of honour and then let them go back to their king's camp.'²

1. Chukūr or qupur, was one of the musical instruments that used to be played in former times by 'āshiqs (عاشق) . It had five strings and was played in some parts of Azarbāyjān.

2. Jahan Gushā, ff. 11a-112a. The whole passage is so curious that I have transcribed it completely:

... وچون آنان با طلب شرود و اوپریلا ان دا خلل حمله سلطان میرنار آز همبست و همان روا ب اینان دل دربیان سلطان میرنار درآمد و میکر گی نازن. رآ تریکه و شا رسی ان از هم سریزه نزه، ما نا با جدال بی‌بار که رسته و بومیت بلغ مانند سپهر و شمشیرها از آن که بودند. چکرکه زیرکک
از گورون آتشه با رسین اینان بیملا سلطان به همیشه انجام یآ گا مان پور کرپور نازن و ورسیت فرا نازن کرژن دیلدا، از همبست آن اندراها مهیب مروار
اناآه سلطان و عضا پریمل راست ایند. سلطان صین لیاقت و شجاعت کبیلی نان را پوری دیده و چکن بی نفر
شدنا می‌کر و دو کابان صن میری و ولای‌تبار دراهی و همکسی را هدیت است. لکه توامان نفل روبا نفر ... ما تا بیلی شنیدن این همراه و همایی و همایی کهیمه مشن نردن...
CHAPTER IV

SHĀH ISMĀ'ĪL’S NATURE
1. **He Possessed a Nature of Opposing Qualities.**

As can be discerned from the different sources, Šāh Ismā'īl was possessed of both virtuous and immoral traits of character. Studies of his private and political life have proved that he was made up of conflicting characteristics. Selfishness and generosity, obstinacy and mildness, cruelty and gentleness, ingratitude and gratitude, brutality and kindness, relentlessness and clemency were so frighteningly combined together in his character that none of his relatives, governors and amīrs dared to betray him.

One of the historians of his own day says of him:

"His majesty treated the nation, his subjects and inferiors with sympathy and justice, and nobody dared to oppress the people or to treat them unjustly, because he was so stern. He was an expert swordsman on the battlefield and an eloquent champion in hand-to-hand fighting. In the banqueting hall he was like a rain-cloud in his liberality.

In his opinion, gold and stone were the same, and when he was feeling extremely generous, all the products of the sea and of the mines were not sufficient for the daily presents he made. Most of the time his royal treasury was empty. He was very interested in hunting and honoured scientists."¹

Another contemporary historian states:

"He treated all creatures, including inferiors, with justice and in a kindly manner. Because of his authoritative manner, none of his Qīzīl-

---

¹ Jahān Gushā, f. 304b.
Bāsh dared to act unjustly to oppress or deceive the poor. It was he who founded the Qizil-Bāsh regiment which took part in all his battles. He was not wounded in any battles for he had the protection of God's mercy.¹

The author of Lubb al-Tawārīkh in a similar way states:

"His majesty was a great and noble gentleman, very brave and self-controlled. He was very courageous and daring, so much so that he could conquer an army of 100,000 troops with only a small army. He went to hunt lions and tigers alone. He was so severe that his government officials and his relatives did not dare to enter his presence without his special permission. The other great kings did not dare to express their opinions in his presence. On the other hand, he was so liberal with his wealth that whenever the treasures were delivered from his suburbs and territories to the royal treasury, he would give them away at once, in his generosity."²

In contrast to these sources, the author of Tārīkh-i Inqilāb- Islām has a more balanced and dispassionate assessment:

"He was literate. His pen-name was 'Khatāb'. He sometimes composed poems. Most of his poems were simple, without rhetorical figures of speech and in Turkomān language. Since he was brought up in Gīlānāt, he had learned the 'Gīlakī' language very well, but he almost always talked in Turkomān language. He was unique in combat as a swordsman and lancer,

2. Lubb, Edinburgh U.L. Ms. no. 239, f. 101a, or Lubb, p. 259; cf. also another similar panegyric account given by the author of Ḥabīb, vol. IV, p. 602.
and he was also skilled in the arts. He was of exemplary bravery. He was interested in hunting particularly lions, tigers and leopards, and had announced that anyone who reported any news about the whereabouts of a lion would be presented with a horse with a saddle. And any news about a tiger or leopard would be rewarded by the present of a horse without a saddle.

He went alone to hunt these animals and used to hunt them with the bow and the sword. It is said that he used to kill both his human and animal enemies with a single shot or with one thrust of his sword. Even in the Battle of Chaldiran (920/1514), he cut off the Malqūch Úghlī's head and his right hand with one blow, thus earning the admiration of Sultan Salīm."

The same historian goes on to say:

"Alas, he was also very bloodthirsty and cruel, like Chingiz Khān and Tīmūr. He instituted many brutal forms of torture: for example he grilled a human being alive over the fire or joined two trees by the strength of a few men like a spring and then fastened their hands and feet into these two trees and then released them in such a way that the human body was cleft in length and each part of the body went to one side. Or he boiled his victims alive in a pot, or hanged a person upside-down from a height with a large stone hung from his neck to pull off his head. Or he hanged people from their testicles. He murdered about 250,000 human beings in the fighting against the Aq-qoyūnlu, the Ottomans, Shīrvānis, Úz-Begs, and other tribes and in the general massacre he carried out with changing the previous religion to the new one.

Although he was a great leader of Imāmī Shi'ism, he drank wine instead of water and his comrades were always beautiful women and handsome boys."
To sum up, the Italian merchant believes that:

"From the time of Nero to the present, I doubt whether so bloodthirsty a tyrant has ever existed."

2. **Shāh Ismā'īl's Despotism and Wilfulness.**

In view of the range of conflicting opinions in the sources about Shāh Ismā'īl's character, we shall examine it more carefully.

First we shall consider his despotism and wilfulness. Shāh Ismā'īl's despotic rule is not a subject which can be summarized in one or two pages. He removed anyone who was accused or even suspected of opposing his absolute rule or of preventing his succession, or anyone who committed an offence against his despotic regime.

After he had passed from adolescence to manhood he snatched authority out of his Turkmān amīrs' hands. Using the expertise of his Persian supporters and in

Cf. *Ilchī*, f. 47b for Shāh Ṭahmāsb's curse upon Dūrmish Khan who made his father Shāh Ismā'īl addicted to drinking wine.

See also Browne, *op. cit.*, IV, pp. 81-2.
particular officials who had administrative experience, he himself ruled personally with their assistance. Nobody else dared to express an opinion or to give an order in Shāh Ismā'īl's presence, not even his tutor, when he really insisted on doing something.¹

He roasted alive those who tried to act independently and let them be eaten by his Qızıl-Başh. He punished independent provincial rulers and destroyed the feudal system and centralized Iran by giving the country one religion under one flag (only Twelver Shī'ism). He did not fail to punish criminals, most of whom were his political and religious opponents. He murdered them by the cruellest and severest tortures without any mercy. He deposed officials on the slightest suspicion of crime, removing them from office whenever he heard the least hint of gossip about them, even coming from an enemy. The order for arrest or dismissal always came fast on the heels of gossip. In this way many people lost their lives.²

From a political point of view, Shāh Ismā'īl's suspicion was the result of his circumstances. Although he was a great leader and his Sūfīs loved him, he was


constantly afraid of losing his throne. It was for this reason that even when his own brother rebelled, Shāh Ismā'īl gave him no quarter, but favoured his brother's murderer with appointment to a higher position. 

The author of Ilchī-yi Niẓām Shāh states:

"He \(\text{Shāh Ismā'īl}\) was extremely bloodthirsty. As a judge he would hand out a death sentence for only a slight sin. He was also very interested in pleasures and in playing jokes. However, he seemed exalted and awesome to his amirs. None of them dared to disobey \(\text{or violate}\) his orders or to offend him. The leopard-natured Turkomāns were reduced to obedience and complied with his

2. There are two different accounts. According to the author of Jahan Gushā \(\text{cited in Ahsan, vol. I, p. 139-140}\) Shāh Ismā'īl favoured his brother's murderer, Muntish Sultān, and gave him the governorship of Tabrīz \(\text{See f. 235b}\). But according to the author of \(\text{A.A. Shāh Ismā'īl}\), before entering Tabrīz he ordered Muntish to be arrested and put in prison; as the author says:

3. On one occasion, Amīr Najm Thānī rejected his order. See \(\text{A.A. Shāh Ismā'īl}\), p. 411, where Amīr Najm refuses to give Samarqand to Bābur.
wishes so readily that Kūr Sulaymān Qurčī went alone to Shirāz at Shāh Ismā'īl's instructions and cut off the head of Sūltān Khalīl Dhu'l-Qadar, the governor of Shirāz, who had about three to four thousand war-like troops. The head was brought to Tabrīz, and nobody dared to do anything to prevent this."

Shāh Ismā'īl was so despotic and sure of himself that most of the time he did not take advice and acted according to his own inclinations, pride and sense of destiny. During the Battle of Chāldirān, Khān Muḥammad Ustājlū suggested to him: "The best strategy for you is to send the regiments to the summit of Chāldirān in order to attack them unawares and destroy their munitions before the enemy can mount a guard to protect their army with gun-carriages and Yenicheris." Dūrmlīsh Khān, an amīr of Shāh Ismā'īl, refused this suggestion and replied: "You are the head-man in the territory of Diyar Bakr. It is not your job to interfere in this matter or to speak with Ashraf-i Āfālī's attendants in this way in our presence. The best thing for us to do is to wait until they make it clear what their strategy is. Then we will enter the fray with courage and spirit on the battlefield." Shāh Ismā'īl became angry and said anxiously: "I am no desert bandit, the outcome

1. Ilchā, f. 32b.
2. For instance see Ḥabīb, pp. 453-4.
of the battle will be according to the providence of God."

Thereafter, Khan Muhammad obeyed him and followed his order. 1


Especially in his treatment of the Sunnite population of Iran, Shāh Ismā‘īl showed no mercy. Before proceeding any further with a discussion of the character of Shāh Ismā‘īl, it is necessary to consider for a moment his cruel and ruthless attitude to human life.

Some modern scholars have justified his cruelty by stressing that circumstances necessitated such an attitude, in view of the constant changes of regime which had beset Iran since Mongol times. 2 Perhaps Shāh Ismā‘īl and his Qızıl-Başh genuinely believed that their ruthless methods were the best way to check corruption, disorder and sedition. As Maulānā Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī says:

"A small mischief for the sake of the general good,
Is acceptable under religious law; do it." 3

1. See Jahān Gushā, f. 246b, cited in Aḥsan, vol. I, p. 145; cf. ‘Ā.K. ‘Abbāsī, p. 31. According to Khwānd Amīr, Shāh Ismā‘īl was so sure of himself that he did not try to gather the rest of his troops and attacked Sultan Salīm with only 12,000 of his personal troops. See Ḥabīb, IV, p. 545.
3. See Na‘īm, op. cit., p. 318, where he quotes the following line:

"شعر رضعت سیره، بل امامکم"
There remains, however, an important unanswered question, which other scholars have ignored. To what extent were Shāh Ismā'īl and his followers more brutal and "barbaric" than their predecessors, such as the Mongols and Timūr, or than their contemporaries? As will be demonstrated in this chapter and in chapter VI, it would appear that Shāh Ismā'īl and his immediate advisers actually relished some of the barbaric practices to which they submitted their unfortunate victims. Perhaps in this respect they may be considered to have transgressed even the norms of their own time.

4. The Simplicity and Gentleness of Shāh Ismā'īl

It is noteworthy that in spite of Shāh Ismā'īl's severity, brutality and stubbornness, he was unassuming and humble in his daily life. He seldom chose to live in glorious palaces in Tabrīz and Khūy, but preferred to live in the countryside in rural surroundings. It is true that he sometimes stayed in the Hasht Bihisht palace—but only occasionally, and after a short time he would go back to the simpler life of the countryside and stay there in his military camp. If he stayed in his palace of Khūy, it was for the sake of hunting only, as it was a convenient place during the hunting season.¹

¹ He further quotes G. Bernard Shaw:

"When a man wants to murder a tiger he calls it sport: when the tiger wants to murder him he calls it ferocity."

See G.B. Shaw, Maxims for Revolutionists.

¹ See M. Āqāsī, Tārīkh-i Khūy, (Tabrīz, 1350 Sh), p. 90.
Because of his gentle behaviour, the Sūfīs loved him and would risk their lives to save him from dangers. They worshipped him as a god on earth, as already mentioned. It was said of him that on the first day of the Battle of Chāldirān, after finishing his prayers, he asked his slave boy named Anūsh to bring him cheese and bread, while his soldiers (Qızıl-Baş) were eating a better breakfast like bread and eggs.  

The same historian states:

"The king of the Shi'ites sometimes walked about the Qızıl-Başh tents dressed like his amīrs so that it was difficult to distinguish the king from his amīrs."

The author then goes on to say:

"In that battlefield, when his troops were eating their provisions, he used to walk among them and share in their provisions. At one stage, one of the great commanders of his army was captured in that battle by mistake instead of the king himself, because of the resemblance in their dress."  

5. The Bravery and Manliness of Shāh Ismā'īl.

According to the sources, Shāh Ismā'īl was a brave and fearless king, with experience in using these qualities. Because of his bravery, strength and

2. Ibid., p. 417.
3. Inqilāb- Islām calls him Mīrzā Sulṭān 'Alī, and states that Sulṭān Salīm admired him very much and set him free, but the poor amīr was killed by thieves on his way because of his horse and clothes (p. 196). Cf. Falsafī, Jang-i Chāldirān, pp. 61-63.
endurance he was famous among his amirs and lords. He was an excellent rider and a well-trained swordsman. He was also a crack shot. In battle he was sometimes unassuming, sometimes rough. He was tireless on horseback, fighting the enemy and destroying his opponents. His horse could not be seen for dust when he was angry, he would ride at such a pace.¹

According to contemporary historians, when he wished to kill his enemy on the battlefield, he used only one stroke and that was enough to kill his enemy or cut him in two. It was said that in the Battle of Chaldiran, because of his fierce speed in taking control of the battlefield and in attacking the Yenichiris, he had to change horses seven times. No horse had stamina sufficient to maintain the pace he wanted on the battlefield. In spite of injuries to his hands, legs and shoulder, the king was in the attack at every corner of the battlefield and is said to have broken the line of the guns and killed 300 gunmen.² He used both axe and sword

---

1. For instance in 910/1504 before Wednesday 2nd Sha'ban when he attacked Tabas. On this occasion Rūmī writes:

2. Inqilāb- Islām, p. 196.

It should be remembered that the author of the above-mentioned work was an Ottoman subject working in Iran and therefore biased against Shāh Ismā'īl. The author states:
with the combined weight of himself and his horse to bear in upon his enemies.1

6. **Shāh Ismā'īl and Mālqūch Īghlī.**

Of **Shāh Ismā'īl's** bravery and his skill as a swordsman, much has already been said. It is noteworthy that both sympathetic and hostile historians and chroniclers are agreed in their respect for his courage in battle. Here we shall examine another instance of these qualities in action, when the **Shāh** pitted his human strength against the guns of his enemy.2 Under heavy attack by **Ottoman guns** he once attacked the gunmen with his sword, breaking the chains of the **Ottoman** "Huwālīch" (gun-carriage) and killing the guards.3 **Mālqūch Īghlī**, one of **Sulṭān Salām's governors** (in **Sofia**)4 was very proud of his bravery and used to boast at every opportunity that he was the only person who could capture the "Shaikh Īghlī" and kill him. He was appointed as the head of the "charkhchī" or Front Line, in that battle, and was proud of his position. In the battle he challenged **Shāh Ismā'īl** to a duel, and in spite of strong opposition

---


1. See **Shāh Jang**, pp. 343-5.


from his advisors the Shah accepted his proposal.\footnote{1}
Mālquč, along with his brother Nūr 'All Beg, attacked him at once and injured Shah Ismā'īl's hand, but before he could strike a second time, he was cut in two pieces.

Of this incident the author of Jahān Gushā-yi Khāqān writes:

"Shāh Ismā'īl with his first and only strike on Mālquč's shield under which Mālquč had hidden, cut the shield through, pierced Mālquč's helmeted head and passed through the body right to the waist. With this one strike the King had cut his enemy into two - just as if he had chopped a rock and made two stones. It is said that Shāh Ismā'īl's power and strength in wielding the sword was admired even by Sullān Sallūm."\footnote{2}

7. His Methods of Handling Difficulties.

Shāh Ismā'īl's bravery sometimes caused him to risk his life in such extreme ways that no one believed he could possibly survive. As he was a powerful, courageous and alert man, he never allowed any difficulty to daunt his courage or lower his dignity. He was never afraid of danger. Fate decreed that on many occasions he fought to within an inch of his life and had narrow escapes from perilous situations.

The sources say that he always took the initiative

\footnote{1} Ḥābīb, p. 547; Inqīlāb- Islām, pp. 200-1; cf. Jahān- Ārā, p. 277 and Aḥsān, p. 146.
in difficult situations. If the assignment was to capture a castle, he would shoot the first arrow.\(^1\) If it was to fill in a moat he would dismount and throw in the first stone.\(^2\) If the course of a river had to be changed, he himself would take up a spade and begin the task and then his Qizil-Bashes would follow his example, rushing at their work like a storm-cloud rolling in behind the first drops of rain.\(^3\)

Once when he was no more than a young man, and a novice in the art of war, he risked his life to cross the River Kur and reach the area of Shirvān.

In 906/1499-1500, Shāh Ismā'īl decided to invade Shirvān to avenge his father's death which had taken place at the hands of the Shirvān Shāh.\(^4\) The only possible route into Shirvān involved crossing the River Kur. So Shāh Ismā'īl sent Bāyra'īm Beg Qaramānī, along with a group of Takkallū tribesmen and a group of Dhūl-Qadars, to find a shallow place in the river at which they might ford the stream. They failed to find a suitable crossing-point and waited on the bank till Shāh Ismā'īl arrived.\(^5\)

---

1. Habīb, p. 455. See 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 117 where the author states:


3. Habīb, p. 475, 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 130, Lubb, p. 244, Ilchī, f. 10b, Aḥsan, p. 79.


5. Habīb, p. 455, Jahān Gushā, ff. 56a, Ilchī, f. 5b, Rawḍat al-Ṣafawiyya, f. 33a.
When the Şhâh was informed of Bâyram Beg's failure, he backed away from the river a few paces on his elegant fish-figured horse, turned up-stream a little, then galloped into the water and crossed the river without assistance. The Şüfîs followed him at once and crossed the river without loss of life.¹

8. The Şhâh's Kindness Towards his Qûzîl-Bâsh and his Ways of Caring for them.

Şhâh Ismâ'îl believed victory was to be won, not just for the king but for his soldiers too. A commander of an army must choose the most dangerous area of the battlefield for himself, and must use his sword to protect his soldiers' lives. He must be willing to fight to the death and must never baulk at entering dangerous parts of the battlefield. One source² tells us that in the Battle of Châldiran, Dîw Sultân Rûmîn was chosen as the commander of the Qûzîl-Bâsh cavalry. After giving Dîw Sultân the necessary orders, Şhâh Ismâ'îl made a gesture of respect to him, and to the Qûzîl-Bâsh, by declaring, "I will fight in the battle myself and will take part in the attack along with the

¹ Hâfib, p.455. Cf. İlchî, f.5b, where the author seems to have copied Khâwand Amîr's work.

² Şhâh Jang, p.317.
soldiers under your command. From the moment that I enter the battlefield, Rustam Kulāh Charmīna¹ will be the commander-in-chief, and you and the other generals must obey him. But since I will fight under your command, I will obey your orders."²

If the above story is true, it means that Shāh Ismā'īl knew how to value his officers and men and to instil great loyalty in them. There is also another instance of his self-effacing style of bravery which demonstrates his belief in equality between himself and his soldiers. He said: "I will refuse only one order you may make, that is if you tell me to move to a safe place, because I am your king and therefore should be safe. I must fight against the enemy in the most dangerous part of the battlefield side by side with your soldiers."³

It is said of Shāh Ismā'īl that he always enjoyed living with his Qīzīl-Bāsh and sharing their joys and sorrows. He encouraged them to fight bravely just as their Imāms did, and described to them the fates of those martyred for Islamic ideology.⁴

1. He is not known to me and unfortunately the translator does not give any clue to his identity. See above work, p. 317.
2. Shāh Jang,p.317.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.

It should be stressed, however, that the information here is mentioned with due caution, since it is of rather dubious origin.
9. Shāh Ismā'īl's Keenness to Kill the Enemy by his own Hand.

It has been mentioned that Shāh Ismā'īl sometimes killed his enemies (or anyone who incurred his displeasure) with his own hands or had the execution carried out in front of him to satisfy his lust for revenge. An extreme example of the harsh actions of Shāh Ismā'īl was the murder of his kinsman, Alwand Mīrzā Āq-qoyūnlū. About this man the Venetian merchant, who saw Alwand at that time, states:

"During my stay in Malacia [Malatia], a city belonging to the Soldan [Sultan] of Cairo, on my return journey from Chimish Gazak and Arsingan to Aleppo, I met Amirbec [Amīr Beg Mūsīllū], the governor of Mosulminiato, a great adherent of Ismael's....To do a favour to Sultan Ismael, he had put a number of Lords to death, and while I was in Malacia, I found that he had captured the young Sultan Alumut [Ālward], who had been defeated by Sciech Ismael..... Leaving a governor in the city, he put him in chains and took him with him to meet Ismael at Malacia (where I then was), being the nearest place on the road to the country of Aliduli where Ismael was engaged in war..... I myself saw the young Alumut bound in chains in a tent. Amirbec leaving took him as a grateful gift to Ismael, who had him brought into his presence and cut off his head with his own hands...."

Alwand Mīrzā's death must have happened after 29th July, 1507.3

1. For Chimish Gazak or Tchimish Gazak, the birthplace of Zimisces, see the Persian translation of "The Travels of a Merchant in Persia" by M. Amīrī, under the title of Safar-nāma-yi Venizīyan dar Iran, (Tehran, 1354) p. 352.  
10. The Political Acumen of Shāh Ismā'īl.

A selection of examples will suffice to demonstrate the great political acumen of Shāh Ismā'īl. Whenever ambassadors entered his country, he let them see his military force to its best advantage and entertained them by a show of strength, just in case they had aggressive intentions towards his territory. ¹

He took a cautious interest in the ambassadors of the Ottoman Empire and when they left his court to return home he gave them extravagant presents that made them think that he always treated others in the same way.

In other ways Shāh Ismā'īl's policy towards the representatives of the Ottoman Sultan was astute and crafty. Even if we now believe that these subtle and well-planned moves were made by the Shāh's top Sūfīs and advisers, we must admire them for developing such a successful policy at that period.

While he was in Iṣfahān in 910/1504, Shāh Ismā'īl was informed that ambassadors from Sultan Bāyazīd II wished to meet him. Since he realized why they were sent to Iran, Shāh Ismā'īl ordered Dūrmīsh Khān, the

¹ For instance see Munsha'āt for the text of the letters sent to his Sunnite neighbours of East and West, (p. 339) to Bāyazīd II on his way to Albistān, pp. 355-7 from Shāh Ismā'īl to Sultan Salīm and (pp. 351-3) from Sultan Salīm to Shāh Ismā'īl. His skill and good policy towards his strong and powerful enemies are clearly shown.
son of ‘Abd1 Beg Tawâch1 Shâmlû, the governor of Isfahân, to conduct the envoys to his court. When they had been settled there for a few days, Shâh Ismâ’îl allowed them an audience. After showing them the extravagant buildings of Naqsh-i Jahân and Iwân-i Jahân, which had a stream flowing beneath it and which had been built for him not very long before (in the same year, in fact), Shâh Ismâ’îl sat on his throne. Dûrmîsh Khân Ishik Âqâsî (Master of the Threshold)2 stood in front of him with his golden staff and his men were lined up in a tight formation on both sides of the stream. The axe-bearers with their axes along with Talish tribesmen carrying their bow and arrows stood on the other side of the line. Learned and religious scholars such as Qâdi Muhammad Kâší, Qâdi Shams al-Dîn Ardabîlî, Sayyid Sharîf al-Dîn Shîrzâ’, Shaikh ‘Alî Jabal ‘Amîlî and others were presented in that celebration in which the messengers of the Ottoman Sultan along with

1. "Tawâchî" according to the author of Inqilâb-Islâm, p. 37, means a person who took the message to the governors to gather troops for the Shah’s camp.

2. Ishik Âqâsî (ابنک تاچی) or Master of Ceremonies. Cf. Minorsky, review of Ghulâm Sarwar’s History of Shâh Ismâ’îl Safawî, p. 1027: "Eshik-aqâsî". Cf. also Ghulâm Sarwar, op.cit., p. 102, who writes "Ishak Aqâsî Bashî". Since "Ishak" means "donkey" this is not correct but as Minorsky says Ishik Aqâsî is the correct form.
two great scholars of their country presented a letter and worthy presents to the king along with the Sultan's expressions of devotion and sincerity. 1

Shah Ismai'il then demonstrated to his Ottoman visitors his gruesome treatment of traitors. This involved placing the body of Husain Kil'ay Chalavi and Rafis Muhammad Karahi and his family along with some other criminals in a cage. Then they poured gunpowder into the cage and set fire to it. The cage was lifted into the air by the force of the exploding gunpowder, and after a short interval came down empty of corpses. 2

The author of Tarikh-Jahani Gusha-yi Khwajan states that his action caused such terror in the hearts of the Ottoman envoys that for a while they could not understand what had happened in front of them. Then Shah Ismai'il ordered food to be served, and after it was over he presented gifts to the envoys with great pomp and honour.

By these actions they were really being given to understand that they should inform their government of the loyalty of the Sufis to their king, of the king's

1. Jahani Gusha, f. 113a.
2. Ibid., f. 112b-13a where the Persian text runs as follows:

remorselessness towards rebels and of the king 's extraordinary munificence to his allies. 1

11. Shāh Ismā'īl's Nicknames and Titles.

In the many sources which have been consulted, numerous titles come after or before Shāh Ismā'īl's proper name. It may be assumed that for the most part these serve no purpose other than to exaggerate the king's importance. The laudatory titles were applied to the Shāh by effusive panegyrists who were forced to invent such elaborate appellations in order to earn their livelihood by his patronage. Similarly, pejorative titles were given to him by his political opponents.

However, to introduce these titles we present here the most important and frequently used examples which have come to light thus far:

The Qızıl-Baş called him Shāh, Shaikh, Pir and

1. Jahān Gushā, f. 113a where the author states:

Cf. Inqilāb- Islām, pp. 66-69 for the letter sent to Shāh Ismā'īl from Sulṭān Bayāzīd II about Shāh Ismā'īl's bad treatment towards the Sunnites of Iran. See also p. 113 of the same work where the author believes that Shāh Ismā'īl never respected the Ottoman envoys:
Murshid-i Kāmil, and his panegyrists named him Abu ʿI-
Muzaffar Sultān Shāh Ismāʿīl Bahādur or Khāqān-i
Iskandar Shān-i Şāhīb Qirān or Nawwāb-i Ashraf,
Ḥaḍrat-i Aʿlā, Padishāh-i 'Ādil-i bī 'Adīl (the just
and peerless king), Shāh-i Nūshīrwān, Padishāh-i
ʿAllāh and Shāh-i Dinpanāh. 1

The Ottomans and Öz-Begs and his other Sunnite enemies
called him: Shāh Ismāʿīl Qızīl-Bāš, Rāfīq, Daḥāk
Zamān, Shaikh Ügli, Ardābīl Ügli, Qızīl-Būrk and
Ismāʿīl Darūgha 2

The European travellers used to call him The Shāh,
King, Sophī, Ismael, and Padishāh-i Shiʿa 3

1. For instance see Jahān Gūshā, ff. 1a and 68b,
Add 200, f. 68b, 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismāʿīl, p. 665,
Aḥwāl-i Shāh Ismāʿīl, (Mic., of the John Rylands library, Manchester,
Persian Ms. No. 424; unpaginated).
Cf. also Rabino, op. cit., pp. 1-4; Mushīrī,
op. cit., pp. 11-31; Ḥabīb, vol. IV, pp. 446,
453-71; Aḥsān, vol. I, p. 3; Jahān-ʿara,
p. 263; Rawdat al-Ṣafiyya, f. 3a, Rawdat
al-Ṣafā, vol. VIII, p. 11, and Ilchī, f. 32b.
2. See Munṣ̄ḥāt, vol. I, pp. 367-395; cf. Ḥabīb,
vol. IV, p. 510; Aḥsān, vol. I, p. 112, and
Inqilāb- Islām, p. 547.
3. See "Travels of a Merchant in Persia", p. 190,
cf. Angiol ello, op. cit., p. 111; Zeno, op. cit. p. 5;
Shāh Jang, p. 171; "Padishāh-i Şūfi" and
p. 196: "Padishāh-i Shiʿa."
As well as all these titles that have been mentioned, Shāh Ismā'īl I was also given the following designation on his coinage:

Al-Sultān al-ʿĀdil al-Kāmil al-Wālī al-Muẓaffar Ismāʿīl Sultān al-Ṣafawī.¹

In reality he usually liked to call himself (The slave of the king of men, Ismāʿīl b. Ḥaydar) or as Kasrawī states: gulām-i Āl-i Ḥaydar and Murīd wa Chākīr wa Lālā-yi Qanbar.² Kasrawī adds that the title of Shaikh ʿUghlī was the one right title for Shāh Ismāʿīl and that the rest of them were only ceremonial.³

It is obvious that Shāh Ismāʿīl was interested in the kind of title which would show his faithfulness to the Prophet's household, but he always hated disparaging appellations and never failed to respond with vengeance to the pejorative titles which were used by his enemies. For certain, these kinds of titles originated in feelings of rancour and enmity and were also rather ironic designations. Shāh Ismāʿīl usually bided his time when confronted with such rude names but on one occasion, in order to quench his thirst for revenge, he carried out a

---

¹ See Mushīrī, op. cit., pp. 11-13, where more than 22 titles are recorded.
² See Fārs Nāma, p. 91.
³ Kasrawī, Shaikh Ṣafī, pp. 29 and 33.
⁴ Ibid.
general massacre of innocent people whose ruler had
called him "Ismā'īl Mirzā" instead of a proper title.¹

1. This general massacre of the inhabitants of Tabas
happened at the beginning of Sha'bān of the
year 910/1504; 7,000 people were killed
because of Sultān Ḥusain Mirzā (who died on the
11th Dhul Hijja 911/5th May 1506. See Ḥabīb, IV,
p. 319). The full information could be obtained
from these sources: Ḥabīb, vol. IV, p. 480,
Jahān Gushā, ff. 109a-110b, Ilchā, f. 13b, Aḥsan,
vol. I, p. 84, Jahān-ārā, p. 269 (where the author
states: "در صحبت روشن درم شیخان، حسن حسین میرزای
rageh، حسن حسین میرزای دوم، اعلل و حسن حسین
میرزای دوم روز میرزای واحد humorous
Lubb, p. 246; Tārīkh-Sultānī, f. 30b; 'A.A. Shāh
Ismā'īl, p. 140; 'A.A. 'Abbāṣī
p. 23; Ahwāl-i Shāh Ismā'īl, under the year
"سناریو توسطه"; Muntazam, p. 88 under the year
910/1504. To the contrary of all the above-mentioned
sources which give 7,000, Khwand Amīr gives three
to four thousands (see Ḥabīb, p. 480).
Šah Ismāʽil's Severe Punishment of Traitors and Opponents.

1. The Murder of Julbān Beg.

In 911/1505, when Šah Ismāʽil was staying in his winter quarters of Ṭarūm (of Qazvin), he was informed about the misdemeanours of Julbān Beg, the governor of Ṭarūm.¹

The subjects of Ṭarūm and the surrounding area reported that they had been driven to extremities by the action of this governor and his attendants. Šah Ismāʽil presided over his trial in person, and when the complaints were proved justified that Julbān Beg had behaved unfairly towards the inhabitants of Ṭarūm, the king ordered his qūrchīs to kill the governor. Those qūrchīs who were present at the time at once cut him to pieces.²

2. The Murder of Mir Sayyid Sharif 'Allāma and Muḥammad Mir Mīrān.

It has been said before that Šah Ismāʽil acted with hostility towards the traitors and opponents, especially

the Sunnites, and would listen to anyone's slander to find an excuse to murder them. One of these murders was carried out on Mūr Sayyid Sharīf, the grandson of Ustād al-Muḥaqiqīn Sayyid Sharīf 'Allāma.

In 909/1503, Shāh Ismā'īl went to Shīrāz. The lords and learned people of Shīrāz went out to meet him. Amīr Najm Zargar, who was an extreme Shi'ite, spoke libellous words against the Sawā'id (مراجع) and their pedigree which went back to Sa'd Waqqās (sic).

Shāh Ismā'īl accordingly ordered the arrest of the tribesmen, put Mūr Sayyid Sharīf in chains and plundered all their property. He also killed Khwāja Nizām al-Dīn Aḥmad and his brother, but one of the members of the tribe escaped. The Shāh went to Kirmān and on from there to Isfahān, where he ordered the killing of Sayyid Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammād Mūr Mīrān, one of the most learned men in that city, for his part in the plot against Shāh Ismā'īl and his government. His wealth and property were looted by the Qizil-Bāsh. His three sons were killed with their father on the same day.

1. Ilchī, ff. 9b-10a; cf. also Jahān-āra, p. 268.
2. Ilchī, ff. 9b-10a; cf. also Jahān-āra, p. 268.
3. Ilchī, ff. 10a, where the author indicates: "... در شیروان م م نا کردن توراوتی الدین میر میرزا ل تلیب و عیده ای دارود، ب مانند و زنگ داده به قباد میرزا پس میرزا پسر میرزا در قباد میرزا در این سوی میرزا به قباد"... و سبب که ب پسر این میرزا پسر میرزا در این سوی میرزا به قباد...
3. **Shāh Ismā'īl and Khalîl Sulṭān Dhul-Qadar, the Governor of Shirāz.**

As already mentioned, the amīrs of the Qizil-Bāš were very much in awe of the authority over them. No one could speak against the king and stay alive. And a single person was often enough to carry out Shāh Ismā'īl's order to kill the traitors. As evidence of this fear we cite the murder of Khalīl Sulṭān Dhul-Qadar. This is just one example of the obedience of the Qizil-Bāš and their willingness to please their overlord and protector.¹

At the Battle of Chāldirān, Khalīl Sulṭān Dhul-Qadar would not fight against Sulṭān Salīm's army who were his overlord's enemies. The battlefield was coloured with the blood of the Qizil-Bāsh, and Shāh Ismā'īl himself received several injuries. Khalīl Sulṭān believed that Shāh Ismā'īl would not be able to survive, so he stayed to one side out of the line of battle and watched the action. Shāh Ismā'īl was riding on his horse to every corner of the field of battle and was helping and encouraging the Qizil-Bāsh, when he noticed

---

1. See Ilchī, f. 32b.

2. Ḥabīb, p. 551; see also Jahān Gushā, ff. 255a-b; Ilchī, f. 32b; Rawdat al-Ṣafawiyya, f. 99b; Aḥsan, vol. I, p. 152, vol. II, pp. 72-3, and A. A. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 530-32.
that Khalil Sultan was standing to one side with his army and was not fighting against the enemy. The Shāh sent one of his personal qūrchī, called Kūr Sulaimān, to him and told Khalil Sultan that, whether they won or lost, he must take part in the action. Khalil Sultan took no notice of his message and decided to flee.

After the battle was over, in favour of Sultan Salīm, Shāh Ismā'īl had in mind to punish Khalil Sultan by some means, and when the enemy had left the capital for their own territories, and Shāh Ismā'īl had returned to his own capital, he sent Kūr Sulaimān qūrchī his special executioner to Shīrāz with a death-warrant for the traitor. He was given the task of killing Khalil Sultan and bringing his head to Shāh Ismā'īl. Kūr Sulaimān took the king's warrant to Shīrāz and arrived there on a day when Khalil Sultan was feasting and drinking with his lords and amīrs, listening to harp players as they entertained. Kūr Sulaimān walked in on the party, saw a number of lords there and thought that if he announced his business perhaps Khalil Sultan's relatives would kill him, so he went to him and said quietly:

"The king ordered me to punish you for what you did at the Battle of Chāldirān, so I am here to whip you twelve

1. A.A. Shāh Ismā'īl, op. cit., p. 83, where he gives "Gūr Sulaimān" instead of "Kūr" which means "blind".
2. 'A.A. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 531-2.
times, and return immediately. But I do not wish to shame you in front of your amirs and relatives; so, if you wish to keep your self-respect in front of them, take me to a private place, so that I may fulfil the Lord's order."¹

Khalîl Sulṭan was deceived and went to his private room. Kur Sulaimân followed him and showed him the king's farman. When Khalîl Sulṭan saw the king's seal he said:

"What can I do but obey the order of my Lord?"²

Then he sat in front of the executioner and had his head cut off.³ After fulfilling the order, Kur Sulaimân took the head to the party and explained the reason for the execution. He returned at once to the king's camp, bringing with him the head of the traitor.

Shâh Ismâ'îl gave the governorship of Shîrâz to Khalîl Sulṭan's children before his death since Khalîl Sulṭan had asked that his death should have no adverse effect on his children's fortune. And Kur Sulaimân had assured him that the king had promised to give the governorship to them after his death.

---

1. Ḥabīb, p. 551, Jahān Gushā, f. 225b.
2. Ḥabīb, p. 551, gives the following text: "بُنِيَ الْعَرَبِ لِلرَّحْمَةِ فَرِی الْقَبْلَاءِ".
3. Ḥabīb, p. 551.
4. See 'A. A. Shâh Ismâ'îl, p. 533. Cf. Jahān-ārâ, p. 279, where Ghaffârî records the following chronogram: جیاح رزطوان شیل which stands for A.H. 926.
4. Sometimes his Opponent Died from Fear of his Threatening Messages.

Aqā Rustam Rūzafzūn, who was a descendant of the family of the Marʿaššī Sayyids of Mazandaran, was the self-appointed governor and King of Mazandaran, and did not admit the overlordship of anyone other than himself. The chief of his family was Iskandar from Rūdbār. He lived with Sayyid Ghiyāth al-Dīn Sayyid Qiwām al-Dīn Marʿaššī. Then he went to Sayyid Murtazā, the son of Sayyid ‘Alī, his cousin. He was a very influential person in his government and "everything to everybody". He was entitled: "Jumlat al-Malik".¹

Aqā Rustam was the fourth member of this family to rule in Mazandaran.² He worked with Qiwāmī Marʿaššī's Sayyids, as his family had done previously. Eventually, he revolted against his master, killed him and usurped his estates. When Shaibak Khān Öz-Beg assumed power in Khūrāsān and added Astarābād to his territories, Aqā Rustam, who could not withstand Shāh Ismāʿīl by himself, joined forces with Shaibak Khān, with his support

---


² He reigned from 897-917/1491-1511; see A. Shāyān, Mazandaran, p.229.
rejected Shāh Ismā'īl's offers and announced: "My hand is on Shaibak Khan's skirt,"\(^1\) which meant "Shaibak will support me." Shāh Ismā'īl, who was affronted by this answer, according to his usual policy, waited for a proper chance, and in 916/1510 when he had defeated Shaibak Khan and put him to death in a savage manner, he sent Shaibak Khan's right hand along with his ring, to Āqā Rustam in Sarī, his capital, to show what his initial action was likely to be against an enemy.\(^2\)

Darwīsh Muḥammad Yasāwul, one of the Shāh's supporters, was to take the right hand to Sarī to tell the rebel: although your hand could not reach the skirt of Shaibak Khan, his unfortunate hand is at your hand, seeking your support.\(^3\) When Darwīsh Yasāwul arrived in Astarābād, Khwāja Muẓaffar Butakchī rejected his plan and said it would not be wise if he went to Mazandarān on the very day when they were preparing their new year's feast (Ayyām-i Khamsa) \(^\sqrt{}\) because there was a custom among the people of Mazandarān to have a big festival on the first day of \(^\sqrt{}\)  \(^\sqrt{}\) Saratān or Sarātān.

---


2. See the sources mentioned above.

3. Ḥabīb, p. 520, Jahan Gusha, f. 191b-2a, 'Ā.A. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 375; cf. Browne, op. cit., IV, p. 65, and Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 64 where the author only mentions: "Rustam Rūz-afzūn, the ruler of eastern Mazandarān, died." He does not mention how, in spite of using the same source (B.M. Or. 3248 ff. 192a-193a).
"Tirmāḥ" — the fourth month of the solar year. During this festival, they went bathing in the river, splashing the water on other members of their families. They feasted for five days, and the lords and amirs surrounded their king. Khwāja Muḥaffar was afraid for Darwīsh Yasāwul's life; but Darwīsh Yasāwul, like other loyal servants of the Shāh, said that he would not delay in carrying out his master's orders and that he knew his duty if he wanted to obtain eternal life; he would prefer to die for his master's sake.

When Darwīsh Yasāwul went to Sārī on the day of the festival, generals were assembled there with a large crowd of people on the seashore, dressed in their newest clothes. Darwīsh shouted across from the other side of the River Tajin for someone to bring a boat so that he could cross the river. The people announced Darwīsh's arrival, but waited to receive permission to bring him to their side of the river. Darwīsh, without bothering them, rode his horse into the river and crossed it. He went to Āqā Rustam's tent and said:

"My Lord Khāqān-i Sulaimān Shāh-i Șāhib Qirān,


at whose feet thousands of his slaves are sacrificed, said:

'You said that your hand would be at Shaibak Khan's skirt. Since your hand could not reach him, his unfortunate hand is at your skirt seeking your support.'

Then Darwish Yasawul tossed the hand down at his feet and this audacious act so shocked Aqa Rustam that he fell flat on his back and never recovered again. Meanwhile Darwish Yasawul went back to Shah Isma'il's camp in Herat where he was received with honours.

2. Ibid. Cf. Habîb, vol. IV, p. 520; Browne, op. cit., IV, p. 65; 'Â.Â. Shah Ismâ'il, pp. 377-381; Ghulâm Sarwar, op. cit., p. 64 on the authority of the same Ms. (B.M. Ms. no. Or. 3248), f. 201b.
PART THREE

Shāh Ismā'īl's Method of Dealing with Uprisings

1. Shāh Ismā'īl Sometimes Pardoned Rebels and Re-appointed them to their Posts.

In 914/1508 Shāh Ismā'īl invaded ʿIrāq-ī Arab and on his way back to Dizfūl, he sent Ḥusain Beg Lala, Bayrām Beg Qaramānī and Amīr Najm Zargar with a thousand of his Qizil-Ḥašh to suppress Malik Rustam, the governor and king of Luristān.¹

The governors of Lur-i Kūchak (or Lesser Luristān) were from the family of Atābakān-i Lur, and unlike the governors of Ardalān, they were forced to submit to Shāh Ismā'īl's sovereignty at the end of that year 914/1508-9.²

Malik Rustam knew that he could not resist Shāh Ismā'īl and his army, and left his headquarters to take refuge on a nearby mountain side. In that year, Malik Rustam eventually decided to capitulate. When Malik Rustam was taken in Shāh Ismā'īl's camp in Shūshtar, he on his arrival kissed the Shāh's feet and bowed down in


front of him declaring his apologies and shame. He praised the Šāh in his Luristanī accent, charming the Šāh by his sweet words. Šāh Ismāʿīl was full of admiration for Malik Rustam's long beard, so much so that the king ordered a frame studded with jewels and pearls to be made for the beard. Malik Rustam attended the king for a while and then returned to Luristan with a renewed contract as governor.¹

It is said that the tribes of Lur Kūchak that lived in Khurramābād, Khāwa and Ṣadmarra, were traditionally Shīʿite. According to the author of Jahān Gushā-yi Khāqān, they were settled in the south of Persian ‘Īraq in an area about 100 farsakhs long. They were called ‘Abbāsī, because of their connection with ‘Abbās b. ‘All b. ‘Abī Ṭālib, the son-in-law of the Prophet Muḥammad.(sic)

It seems mostly that the great favour shown by Šāh Ismāʿīl to this governor was expressed because of the connection between these tribes and the Prophet's family, which prompted him to give this man the governorship of Ṣadmarra, Hārūnābād (Shahābād) and Siḥkhūr.²

1. Jahān Gushā, ff. 149a-150a.
3. Ibid. Situated in the north of Khurramābād. The area covered a hundred farsakhs from north-east to north-west; that is, it ran from Būjird to the frontier of ‘Īraq-i‘Arab and Baghdaḍ.
2. **Shāh Ismā'īl's Massacre of the People of Balkh, Andkhūd and Shuburqān.**

In 919/1513, Shāh Ismā'īl heard that Būpay Sultān had left Balkh and fled to Mesopotamia. ¹ At the end of ⁲ Rajab 919/May 1513 the Shāh learned that his opponents in Andkhūd had organized a rebellion and had chosen a man named Qara Baqqāl as their leader. Shāh Ismā'īl appointed Diw Sultān Rūmlū to go along with Amir Sultān to Andkhūd to put down the revolt. After six days of sustained effort to break the siege, involving much bloodshed, the king's forces captured the fort of Andkhūd and carried out a general slaughter of all who resisted them.³ Qara Baqqāl himself was arrested, brought to Shāh Ismā'īl and placed in the pillory. The Shāh ordered his men to kill him, so that the rebellion would be entirely extinguished.⁴ The author of Ḥabīb al-Siyar states that Shāh Ismā'īl's general massacre was carried out in Balkh, Shuburqān, over those who were against his government.⁵

---

² See the sources mentioned above.
³ Ḥabīb, p. 540:
⁴ Ḥabīb, p. 540; cf. Jahān Gushā, f. 227a-b.
⁵ Ḥabīb, p. 540; cf. Jahān Gushā, f. 227a-b.
3. **Shāh Ismā'īl's Treatment of Captives.**

It was seldom that the Shāh or his amīrs refused to make a general slaughter of the troops taken in battle, or showed them any mercy. This same merciless attitude was often extended to the inhabitants of the cities which he captured.

On one occasion, for instance, in Fīrūzkūh, he had three general massacres. The author of Lubb al-Tawārīkh who was present at that siege gives 1,000 only for Istāl fort.\(^1\) On the other hand, the author of Jahān Gushā-yi Khāqān records 10,000,\(^2\) and finally, the author of Ilcī-yi Niẓām Shāh states 30,000\(^3\) for the number of people killed by the Qīzīl-Ḥāsh. He was, however, capable of acts of public magnanimity, as the following story reveals. Angiolello writes that after defeating the Öz-Begs, Shāh Ismā'īl "was about to set out on his return journey when he

---

1. Qazvīnī in Lubb (p. 245) states:

   \[\text{"دیدیم شریعت نازگی از عرفان به‌نلقت آمدن. تولعاب ای تکررده دربس کسب‌کردن انساب بوده و مشاهده‌ای وقایع مینوردن..."}\]

2. Jahān Gushā in f. 104 b. indicates:

   \[\text{"امیری کیا و ماردی بیش از شاهان و مسلمانان نزار شده اهل عرب و از‌به‌ای سران کُرتب... بده خوارگی بودن جهت پر اهل عرب و همی‌گذر... نفیص سنّ فی آن بکاررود اهل‌آمر فیر و شفتگرودن..."}\]

3. The author of Ilcī quotes Lubb and says: (f. 105b)

   The author of Lubb speaks of 30,000 people being killed which is not correct since Qazvīnī himself gave 1,000.

   Cf. also Ḥabīb, IV, p. 478; Aḥsan, I, p. 80.
caused the sons of Jesilbas\textsuperscript{1} to be brought before him, and said to them:

'You are the sons of a great monarch, who having broken his faith, and ravaged my territories, forced me to attack him; I have conquered him, and put him to death; but I will spare your lives, and allow you to return to your country on condition that you wear the red caftan, and that this river (Jaihūn) be your boundary.'

The young men replied,

'Sire, we are content with what pleases your majesty, and will give in \textit{yield} our submission.'

Thus they were released."\textsuperscript{2}

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{enumerate}
\item This certainly should be Shaibak Khān.
\item Angiolello, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 117.
\end{enumerate}
\end{flushleft}
PART FOUR

The Šāh's Punishment of Highwaymen, Thieves and Profiteers.

1. His Attitude to Highway Robbers.

Šāh Ismā'īl was a vigorous opponent of highwaymen and thieves. One account of this treatment of them will serve as a good example of his typical punishment of brigands.

At the beginning of his reign after the previous anarchy and instability which had prevailed, brigands and thieves robbed and plundered everyone who passed. In 911/1505, when he was in his summer-quarters in Sūrluq in Isfahān, Šāh Ismā'īl was informed that Shir Šārīm the Kurd had gathered a group of Yazīdī Kurds and brigands of the Kurdistan province and camped in a place called Šārū Qūzghān (Sārī Qūzghān ?).¹ He was robbing the people coming and going through the area, especially the camel drivers and caravans. He had no respect for anyone's life and caused great panic among the people of Āzarbāyjān.²

Šāh Ismā'īl decided to set out for Šārū Qūzghān to

1. Since the name is Turkish, Sārī Qūzghān is more accurate. See Ḥabīb, p. 483 (Sārū Qūzghān); Jahan Gūšā, f. 117b (Šārū Qūzghān); cf. also Aḥsan, I, p. 90; Jahan-ārā, p. 270; and 'A.Ā. Šāh Ismā'īl, pp. 151-160, for the above story.

2. See the above-mentioned sources.
get rid of this evil man and his followers, in order to return his provinces to security. After Şarim heard of Şâh Ismâ'îl's advance, he had no option but to escape in fear, and since Şâh Ismâ'îl caught him unawares, he left his equipment and valuables and fled to take refuge in one of the wild mountain regions.¹

After entering the Sarû Qûzgâhân area, Şâh Ismâ'îl massacred many Kurds who had not succeeded in leaving. Having rid the area temporarily of Şarim, the King went back towards Qızîl_Uzûn (or Uzan) and camped there.²

Finally, in 912/1506, Şâh Ismâ'îl sent Hayrâm Beg Qarámânî, his Amîr Dîwân, Kâdîm Beg (Khalîfat al-Khulafâ), 'Abdî Beg Şâmlû, his son-in-law, along with Sarî Âli Takkalû Muhr Dâr (seal-keeper), to do everything in their power to exterminate Şarim. This time Şarim managed to escape again, but his son and brother, along with many other Kurds, were arrested and brought back.

¹. Ḥâbib, p.485.
². Ḥâbib, p. 485; cf. also Jahân Gushâ, f. 120a-b, Jahân-ārâ, p. 270, Ahsan, p. 90, & 'A.A. Şâh Ismâ'îl, pp. 159-160, where the author also states that Şâh Ismâ'îl's brother Ibrâhîm Mirza was injured in the first battle and for this reason the Şâh could not go to the second war, and therefore, he went back to Tabriz while Ḥusain Beg Lala and the others pursued Şarim Kurd.
to the Shāh's camp. Shāh Ismā'īl ordered them all to be taken to his camp's Bazaar and to be hanged, so that a lesson might be taught to others.1

1. Jahān Gushā, f. 121b-122a, Ḥabīb, p. 485. The Persian text in both sources appears thus:

A similar incident briefly occurred in ‘Irāq-i Arab in 914/1508. In that year Shāh Ismā'īl went to visit Najaf. On his way, he was informed that near Hilla a group of Arabs living in that area had settled in the desert to the inconvenience of travellers and pilgrims. They robbed the pilgrims and then vanished into the desert. They supported themselves by this "profession". Shāh Ismā'īl immediately went to that desert and unexpectedly massacred all of the robbers, plundered their wealth and continued his journey towards Najaf.

For more details see Ḥabīb, p. 495; Jahān Gushā, f. 144a; Jahān-āra, p. 272.
2. *Sometimes the Shah Forgave Brigands.*

In 905/1499, when Shah Isma'il was going to invade Shīrvān, some of his adherents such as Qaraja Ilyas Rūmlū came to his camp in Dughghūz Alam and complained against Muntish Sulṭān who had plundered their property and killed Sūfīs. Shah Isma'il appointed Ilyas Beg Ùglū to overcome Muntish Sulṭān and capture his fort, which was called "the fort of Muntish" - the centre of his rebel activities and of his marauding forays against the caravans. Ilyas Beg moved in that direction, but since Muntish had discovered that he was coming, he left the fort in the charge of his relatives and escaped to the mountains. Ilyas Beg captured the fort, murdered some of the inhabitants and plundered their wealth. When he saw how the rest of the people submitted and how they mourned the loss of their comrades, he had pity on them and brought them to the Shah with their swords hanging from their necks and a shroud as their clothes. The Shah considered their plight, had mercy on them and showered them with gifts including the fashionable clothing and hat of the Qizil-Bāsh. Then he gave the governorship of that fort to them and dismissed them on

the condition that they give up robbery.¹

This action caused Muntish to come to the Shāh's camp to ask for forgiveness, since he was informed by his relatives that the Shāh had forgiven them all. Muntish personally came into Shāh Ismā'īl's presence and asked for forgiveness. The Shāh forgave him and presented him with a Qīzīl-Bāsh hat, an Arab horse and other presents including the new governorship of that fort.²

3. His Attitude Towards Profiteers.

In 910/1505 Shāh Ismā'īl celebrated New Year's Day in Īlang Kahīz in Isfahān. In that year he received the Ottoman ambassador and envoys there and entertained them by parading his army in front of them. It was in Isfahān that he was informed that because of his long stay in his winter-quarters in Isfahān and because of the excess expenditure incurred by his army and by the Qīzīl-Bāsh summoned to display his power to the Ottoman spies and ambassador, Isfahān was now faced with such a shortage of provisions that most of the people were likely to die through famine.³ Since most of the grain


2. Ḥabīb, p. 454.

3. Jahan Gushā, f. 113a; cf. ‘Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 97-98 where the author gives a different story. Cf., too, Ḥabīb, p. 478, Aḥsan, pp. 83-4, and Jahan-ārā, p. 269, where there is no mention of the above event.
and provisions of Isfahān belonged to the Ḥusainī Sayyids, Shāh Ismā'īl summoned their leader and said:

"I will stay in Isfahān this winter along with my troops. What is the reason why you will not give us provisions? You should sell your grain cheap to our troops and feed the poor."¹

The man, who was called Ghiyāth al-Dīn, swore by the king's head that he had hardly any grain in storage and that it was not even sufficient for his relatives. Shāh Ismā'īl appointed some Qizil-Bāsh to search the large store-houses. When it became known that Ghiyāth al-Dīn was lying and that he had a large stock of corn, grain and other provisions, the king upbraided and reproved him, saying:

"Taking a false oath by the king's head and by the soul of Amīr al-Mū'mīnīn 'Alī shows nothing except enmity against the family of God's messenger."²

Then he ordered the execution of the man. His Qizil-Bāsh at once cut him into pieces, and his grain was sold to the poor at a low price.³

2. Ibid.  
3. Ibid., f. 114a. The above statement is unique. Cf. Ghulām Sarwar who speaks of the same event:

"Civil and military reasons were responsible for the violent death of Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn and Shāh Taqī al-Dīn Isfahānī by the Shāh's orders. The former had violated his oath to the Shāh by not supplying the royal army with the grain from his large stores of wheat."

PART FIVE

Shāh Ismā'īl's Habit of Torturing his Enemies to Death.

In this part, we examine several examples of Shāh Ismā'īl's efforts on behalf of the general good, or, to employ the words of Maulānā Rūmī: "Small mischief according to the laws of religion!"

1. Shāh Ismā'īl and Ḥusain Kiya Chalāvī.

Amīr Ḥusain Kiya Chalāvī, was one of the descendants of the Iskandar Shaikhī's who was the Amīr of the Māzandarān provinces at the time of Timūr. It was at that time that these provinces were transferred to the authority of the sons of Mir Buzurg of the Mar' aşhīs family. These men stayed in Fīrūzkūh and the Damāwand (or Demāvend) mountains where Iskandar had built his castles on the high slopes of these mountains. Amīr Ḥusain Kiya was one of the generals who inherited this region. At the beginning of Shāh Ismā'īl's rise to power, Amīr Ḥusain invaded the provinces of Persian

'Irāq, (Ray, Khwar, Sīmnān) and killed Shāh Isma'il's amīr, Ilyās Beg b. Ya'qūb Āqā known as Ighūt Ūghil by a trick in the Gunbad-i Kabūd of Ray. After the defeat of Sultān Murād, Ḥusain Kiya gathered many Qara-qoyūnlū Turkomāns around him for protection. Ḥusain Kiya was a Shī'ite who boasted of his devotion to the house of the Prophet and his Immaculate Imāms; this made him a dangerous rival to Shāh Isma'il. The Shāh knew that sooner or later he would attack Mazandarān because after he (the Shāh) had defeated Sultān Murād in 908/1503, most of his enemies had been given sanctuary by Amīr Ḥusain Kiya. Both this fact and religious rivalry prompted Shāh Isma'il to set out from his winter-quarters of Qum on 12th Ramaḍān 909/28th February 1504. The Shāh was successful in his attempts to capture Kiya and other Qara-qoyūnlū who opposed him.

2. See Lubb, pp. 243-4, Ilchī, f. 10b, Jahan Gusha f. 97a-b, Rawdat al-Ṣafawiyya, f. 51b, 'A.A. Shāh Isma'il, pp. 111-112.
3. Ibid. In fact Qādī Ahmad Ghaffarī (on page 268) states:
   "On 12th Ramaḍān the Shāh attacked Gulkhandān, and on 14th Ramaḍān he conquered it."
   So says the author of Lubb, p. 244; f. Savory, "Consolidation", p. 73.
4. See Lubb p. 244 where Qazvīnī states:
Two of these captives, Murad Beg Turkoman and Sātilmış Beg were tied to a spit and roasted alive.² Shāh Ismā'īl

Cf. Ilchī, f. 10a; Jahān-ārā, p. 268:

Hābh, IV, p. 478; Aḥsan, vol. I, p. 79; and 'A.A. 'Abbāsī, p. 22 where Iskandar Munshi gives:

"It lasted 33 days, and the inhabitants, guilty or not guilty, were killed."

However, the above sources more or less agree that the inhabitants were surrounded, but as the author of Lubb and Ilchī say:

"Seven hundred of his Turkoman refugees and soldiers came down from the fort a few days later where Shāh Ismā'īl was, showing his obedience and also his lack of faith in his own powers, besides his praise of the Shāh. This humble obedience and praise was of no avail and finally he (the Shāh) killed all the soldiers."

1. Ilchī, f. 10a. Sātilmış means a person who betrayed or sold himself. This is a Turkish word. Sāt stands for "sold" and Ilmīsh acts as past participle. "Sāylātmış", as Ghulām Sarwar and Savory give, is wrong. For the correct form see Aḥsan, vol. I, p. 80:


2. Jahān Gushā, f. 104b. Cf. Ilchī, f. 10b, where the author states:

Cf. also Jahān Gushā, f. 104b.
then ordered all his Qizil-Bash to eat the roasted flesh declaring:

"Anyone who is our true follower must eat a piece of this meat." ¹

Accordingly, they stormed towards the roasted flesh and ate with such gusto that there was not a scrap of flesh left, nor even his bones. ²

We are told that Shāh Ismā'īl then ordered that Husain Kiyā should be confined in the cage which the latter himself had made for any of the Sultāns of Iran who might be taken prisoner by him in battle. ³ According to Ilchī he once boasted:

"I will soon capture the son of Shaikh (Shaikh Ughlī) who has just appeared strutting in the world, and will confine him in this iron cage." ⁴

This came to the ears of Shāh Ismā'īl and he carried out on Kiyā the punishment that he had intended for the Shāh. Husain Kiyā committed suicide in that cage after a few days because of the unbearable torture which the Qizil-Bash had inflicted on him. ⁵ His corpse was burned with

---

1. Ilchī, f. 10b, Jahān Gushā, f. 104b, Lubb, p. 255.
2. See the above-mentioned sources.
3. Lubb, p. 255, Ilchī, f. 10b, Jahān Gushā, f. 104b.
4. See the above-mentioned sources.
5. Yaḥyā Qazvīnī who was in Shāh Ismā'īl's camp at that time states that they tortured him, and that he killed himself. The Persian text runs as follows:

"وْحِينَ كَيْمَا رَأَيْتُ فِي عُقْدَةِ عَذَابٍ يَندُرُنَّ وَأَذُوْنَ رَأَيْتُ فِي مَسْتَمَةٍ..."

Lubb, p. 244; cf. also Jahān-ārā, p. 268.
gunpowder in Isfahān along with those of Raḥs Muḥammad Karahl and his family.¹

A poet composed this elegy on that occasion:

"In a cage made of split wood, he with his breast cut, died in it abused."²

Shāh Ismā'īl's Different Forms of Torture:

2. The Torture and Murder of Raḥs Muḥammad Karahl

Before any consideration about the incident involving the murder and torture of Raḥs Muḥammad Karahl³ and his

"After much torture he killed himself and his corpse was burned in Qūmā-yi Raẏ."

Cf. Ḥabīb, p. 478, where Khwānd Amīr indicates that Kiyā and Kara were burned in Isfahān after Shāh Ismā'īl returned from his Ṭabas excursion. The same version appears in Jahān Gushā, 105a. For the above suicide see Ilchā, f. 10b, Aḥsan, I, p. 80, ‘Ā.Ā. ‘Abbāsī, pp. 22-23, ‘Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 131-132, Browne, op. cit., IV, p. 56, Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 48, Savory, "Consolidation", pp. 73-4, Inqilāb-Islām, p. 60.


2. Jahān Gushā, f. 105a, Aḥsan, I, p. 80, ‘Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 132, Rawdat al-Ṣafā', vol. VIII, p. 7—where the author states that it was a wooden cage.

3. The author of Jahān Gushā (f. 77b) says that "Kara is one of the districts of Luristān."
wife and family, we have to make clear that this single example of torture which follows is just one example of many types of torture which used to be carried out during the reign of Shāh Ismā’īl I. Judgement is not our duty; precision and accuracy are our main concerns.

Rafīs Muḥammad Kara was the governor of Abarqūh in the time of the Āq-qoyūnlū dynasty. Before 910/1504, he hastened from Abarqūh, and entered the city of Yazd at night, and killed Sultan Ahmad, the governor of Shāh Ismā’īl, who had recently accepted Shāh Ismā’īl’s sovereignty over himself. 2

Shāh Ismā’īl was in his summer-quarters at Sūrluq near Isfahān when he was informed about the Yazd events. 3 Although Kara had already sent his obedience to Shāh Ismā’īl, the latter wanted him to come personally to his court; this Kara refused. 4 The Shāh set out immediately at the beginning of 910/the middle of 1504. 5 After

---

1. For later periodsssee Ilchā, ff. 52a, 57a, under the year 945/1538, where the author states that Shāh Ṭahmāsb in that year created a kind of new torturing.

2. See the above -mentioned sources in foot -note 3.


4. See Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 49.
besieging both the city of Yazd and its fort one after another, in which Muḥammad Karahī had taken refuge, Shāh Ismāʿīl finally set fire to the fort and captured its inmate. The Shāh ordered his men to put Kara in a cage like Ḥusain Kiya. They rubbed Kara's body with honey and put some bees into the cage to sting him. Before he reached Iṣfahan he died of bee stings and the pain caused by them.¹

3. Shāh Ismāʿīl and his Cannibals.

We are told that Shāh 'Abbās I had a group of executioners called "Chī yīyan"² or "flesh-eaters". Their job was to eat the people who fell from the Shāh's favour. They used to eat the victims alive from top to toe.³ This was probably a type of torture used during the time of the Mongols and Timūrids and from them passed on


² Rawdat al-Ṣafawiyya, f. 296b. But as this word is Turkish the exact pronunciation is "Chī yīyan" in which "Chī" stands for flesh and "Yīyan" stands for eater. Falsafi (Zindigāni, vol. II, p. 129) quotes the same story but does not correct the word or give the folio number.

³ Rawdat al-Ṣafawiyya, f. 296b.
to Shāh Ismā'īl and from him in turn to Shāh 'Abbās I. 1

The author of Tārikh-ī Inqilāb- Islām says Shāh Ismā'īl himself was the inventor of this variety of torture. 2

The author of Rawdat al-Safawiyya states:

"There were other groups like them [the executioner] that were under the command of the chief herald /of the court/, called Chiqīyīyan /Chī yīyān is correct/, which means "flesh-eater". These people were also subject to the politics and anger /of the king/. They snatched the victims' flesh from one another by force, cutting their nose and ears with their teeth and swallowing their flesh as they did with other parts of the human body, until the victim died. These groups had their own special uniform in order to be distinctive; namely they wore a hat without a turban round it, very thick and long, about one zar /half a metre or one arm/ in length. The hat was decorated with crane and owl feathers. Most of these people chosen to punish criminals were particularly strong, huge, tall and very ugly." 3

4. Shāh Ismā'īl's Treatment of Shaibak Khan's Corpse.

It has already been mentioned that Shāh Ismā'īl treated the corpses of his enemies harshly. His treatment of the corpse of Shaibak Khan was no exception.

---

2. See chapter IV, p. 249.
3. Rawdat al-Safawiyya, ff. 296a-296b. The above Persian text runs as follows:

"... دیگری از کسانی که در دستور خانه بودند، یکی با نام شیبک خان بود که از رومیان بود. در سال جدید سال پس از مرگ سلطان قریشی، این خانواده به سرزمین رومیان برگشت. اما در زمان شیبک خان، گروهی از رومیان که در سرزمین بودند، به روزگار این خانواده برگشتند..."

The author tells us that Shāikh Ahmad Āqā was the head of this group. Cf. Zindigānī, vol. II, p. 129.
After defeating the Öz-Begs on Friday 30 Sha'ban, 916/December 2, 1510, Shāh Ismā'īl sent for Shaibak Khān's corpse, insisting on its being found among the tens of thousands of dead bodies scattered on the battlefield. When they heard this order, the Qizil-Baš warriors did their best to find the body. After an exhausting search they found the corpse of Shaibak Khān, undamaged, under the many corpses of the Öz-Begs within the circle of the

1. Ḥabīb, p. 510–11 gives:

Cf. "Tarikh-i Rashidi" (ed. by Denison Ross), pp. 233–4: "At the hour of afternoon prayers, on the Ruz-i Shah of Ramazan in the year 916 (1510 A.D.) they marched out"; Lübb, 252: "On Friday, 26th Sha'bān (sic)"; Jahan-ārā, p. 273: "On Friday 30th of Sha'bān 916"; Jahan Gusā, ff. 191b–192a, where the whole story appears in full detail, and the author gives the following chronogram:

On f. 192a the author presents the following chronogram:

which according to Persian poets became

Cf. Ilchi, f. 20a, where the author follows Ḥabīb nearly word for word, stating that the Battle of Marv happened in the early morning of Friday Shāh Ismā'īl staying one day and two nights in the village of Maḥmūdī and then on Friday the battle occurred. Then the author on f. 21b states:

which is not correct. Cf. Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 62, 30 Sha'bān 916/Dec. 2, 1510; cf. also Savory, "Consolidation", p. 79.
walls. A certain Qizil-Bash, named 'Aziz Aqā, known as 'Adl Bahādur, discovered the body and immediately cut off the head. This was brought to Shāh Ismā'īl along with the body. The revengeful king struck his belly three times with his sword and said:

"Anyone who loves me, will eat a piece of this enemy's flesh."2

The author of Rawdat al-Safawiyya continues:

"Trustworthy people, and in particular Khwāja Mahmūd Sāgharchi claimed that as soon as the Qizil-Bash heard this order, the crowd jostling each other to eat the flesh of the body became so tightly packed that the Sūfīs pulled their swords out and fought with each other. They seized and ate that putrid flesh which was mixed with blood and dust more eagerly than a bird of prey at the point of starvation and with a delight never shown by such birds. Then the order was given to remove the skull and encase it in red gold for the king's drinking cups. After that success, Shāh Ismā'īl sat down with Bādī' al-Zamān Mīrzā b. Sūlān Ḥusayn Bāyqarā (died in 911/1505) and together they drank their wine out of that golden skull."3

1. Rawdat al-Safawiyya, ff. 77b-78a; cited in Jahan Gushā, f. 189a-b.
2. Rawdat al-Safawiyya, ff. 77b-78a.
3. Ibid. This statement is invaluable and its Persian text runs as follows:

"And a trustworthy Khwāja, Mahmūd Sāgharchā, claims that after the Qizil-Bash heard the king's order, the crowd jostling each other to eat the flesh of the body became so tightly packed that the Sufis pulled their swords out and fought with each other. They seized and ate the putrid flesh which was mixed with blood and dust more eagerly than a bird of prey at the point of starvation and with great delight never shown by such birds. Then the order was given to remove the skull and encase it in red gold for the king's drinking cups. After that success, Shāh Ismā'īl Sat down with Bādī' al-Zamān Mīrzā b. Sūlān Ḥusayn Bāyqarā (died in 911/1505) and together they drank their wine out of that golden skull..."
Then the Shah ordered that Shaibak Khan's two hands be cut off and that one be sent to Muhammad Zahir al-Din Habur with a message reading:

"If Shaibak Khan cut your hand from ruling Samarqand, we instead, cut off his hand from the world."

It is also recorded that Shah Isma'il after making the skull into a drinking cup, had Shaibak's head stuffed with straw and sent to Bayazid II with a message reading:

"We have heard that it used to be said in your assembly: Strange is the sovereignty we see displayed in the head of Shaibani Khan; lo, we are now sending you the same head stuffed with straw."

Another source reports that Shah Isma'il at his victory feast asked Khwaja Mahmud Sagharchi, the minister and adviser of Shaibak Khan (who had been pardoned on Amir Najm Thanl's recommendation);

"Do you recognize this cup?"
"Yes, glory be to God," answered Khwaja Mahmud, "How favoured by fortune was he, nay, fortune still abides with him, so that even now he rests

Cf. also Jahan Gusha, f. 190a-b, and 'A. A. Shah Isma'il, pp. 368-9 where the author states that Shah Isma'il was proud of himself:

"و اَسْمَاَىْلَ بِتِإِنَّ ْمَا َ نَ للْمَيْنِ ْبِنْمِنْ ِلاَيْنِ َ بِكَنْثَ بِ ْأَرْبَعَ ْلَيْلَ َرَأَيْنِ ""


1. Jahan Gusha, f. 190b. This is a unique statement. The Persian text runs:

2. Ghulam Sarwar, op. cit., p. 63; cf. also Savory, "Consolidation", p. 79.
in the hands of so auspicious a being as thyself who continually drinks the wine of Delight."


However, an authorized translation of Voyage autourdemonde, Tome II. De la Perse, by Gemelli Careri, which was published in 1719 in Paris, states that the above cup existed at the time of Shāh Sulaimān Ṣafawī, and was used as his drinking cup. When the author who was invited to one of his parties asked him the story of this cup, Shāh Sulaimān answered that this was the skull of the Öz-Beg King. See the Persian translation of the above work by 'A. Nakhchīwānī and 'A. 'A. Kārang, (Tehran, 1348 Sh.) under its Persian title: Safarnāma-yi Gemelli Careri, p. 74.
PART SIX

The Loyalty Shown by Shāh Ismā'īl to his Faithful Followers.

1. Shāh Ismā'īl Never Betrayed his Loyal Amīrs for the Sake of Money.

Historians tell us that in the summer of 915/1509, when Shāh Ismā'īl was camping in Shīrāz and spending his time in drinking and feasting, Qāḍī Muḥammad Kāshī the Šadr, who dealt with the religious affairs of the kingdom and was also the governor of Yazd, Kāshān and Shīrāz, was removed from his very high position because he had been corrupted by pride. He spoke slanderously to the king about Amīr Najm Zargar, for instance, suggesting that Amīr Najm had embezzled 20,000 tumāns of government money and that if the king requisitioned this sum he (Qāḍī) would contribute it to the government treasury. Considering the good service record of Amīr Najm, Shāh Ismā'īl took no notice of this nonsense and he reported the allegation of Qāḍī Muḥammad to Amīr Najm. Qāḍī Muḥammad later was found guilty of committing obscene acts and using obscene language and because of this the king was forced to execute him.¹

¹ Habīb, IV, pp. 499-500, cited also in Jahān-ārā, p. 272 where Ghaffārī states:

[Cited in Ḥabīb, f. 16a; Aḥsan, I, p. 110; Rawdat al-Šafawiyya, f. 70b. The version of Ḥabīb on this matter]
On the committing of obscene acts by Qâdî Muḥammad, 
the author of Ilchî-yi Niẓâm Shâh states:

"Qâdî Muhammad, who centralized the executive 
powers of the government, also began to oppress 
the people—killing and plundering the Muslims 
and behaving with all kinds of vicious and 
immoral conduct (under pretence of carrying out 
his duties for the king) and as governor of 
Yazd, Kâshân and Shīrāz."1

2. Shâh Ismâ’îl's Strong Inclination and High Regard 
for Amîr Najm Zargar.

Amîr Najm Zargar was born in Gîlân and was a gold-
smith as his name suggests. According to contemporary 
historians his shop was located beside the White Mosque 
where Shâh Ismâ’îl and his Sûfîs had spent some time during 
their concealment, around the year 900/1494-5, before they 
moved to Lâhijân.2 As a reward for his kindness and 
hospitality towards Shâh Ismâ’îl and his Sûfîs, the gold-
smith was very highly favoured by the Shâh, to the extent 
that he was appointed "Wâkil-i Nafṣ-i Nafaṣ-i Humâyûn".3

Amîr Najm was in Gîlân up to the time that Shâh

runs as follows:

1. Ilchî, f. 16a; cf. Ḥabîb, p. 500; Lubb, p. 250, 
and Ahsan, I, p. 110. It seems to me that Rûmîn 
copied Lubb word for word.

2. Ḥabîb, IV, pp. 490-1; cf. also Rawdat al-Ṣâfawiyya, 
f. 63a.

3. Ḥabîb, p. 491.
Ismā'īl invaded Shirvān in 906/1500. During that year, Kūsa 'Abbās, the chief official of the ruler of Rasht, Amīr Ḫāqān, resolved to kill Amīr Najm because of his connections with Shāh Ismā'īl, and he persuaded Amīr Ḫāqān to murder him. Amīr Najm found out about the plot and escaped to the camp of Shāh Ismā'īl in the area of Shirvān. This was in 906/1500. Because of Shāh Ismā'īl's kindness and his liking for Amīr Najm, the goldsmith's situation improved considerably after his arrival in the Shāh's camp. His intelligence won him a great deal of support. Finally he obtained the position mentioned above and excelled in his post as auditor. His seal was put before the other seals at the head of official forms. He limited the power of murderers, thieves and other law-breakers during his time of office and he took good care of law-abiding subjects, in proportion to their financial status.1

Eventually Najm Zargar died of a severe illness in 915/1509 in Khānānā in the province of Shabistar. Shāh Ismā'īl was so upset about the death of his worthy adviser that his grief was visible from his expression. He stopped doing government business or taking part in worldly enjoyments. He mourned and read the Qurān "to the extent that all his amīrs and attendants wished that they had been Amīr Najm instead."2

1. Ḫān-āra, p. 491.
Finally, he sent Amir Najm's corpse to Najaf. ¹

3. The Shāh's Loyalty Towards Mīrzā Shāh Husain Iṣfahānī.

As has been mentioned before, Mīrzā Shāh Husain was the minister of Durūmīsh Khān in Iṣfahān,² and then after the Battle of Chaldīrān in 920/1514, as a reward for the assistance he gave to Tājlu Baygum in her escape, he became Shāh Ismā'īl's chief minister and was given the title "Wakīl al-Saltana" and "I'timād al-Daula".³

On this man the author of Ḥabīb al-Siyar states:

"He held the highest government office ever awarded and was so highly favoured that he would give away 1,000 tūmāns daily in gifts to loyal subjects. He was so confident of the high regard of the King that he had no consideration for other officials. This enraged the other civil servants and they plotted to murder him."⁴

Mīrzā managed government affairs efficiently, but allowed absolutely no criticism, another cause for complaint by other crown officials. On one occasion Mīrzā demanded the settlement of the accounts of Mihtar Shāh Quli Rikābdār Arabgīrī. Mihtar had risen to the position of Imārat after promotion from his first post as Master of

¹ Ḥabīb, pp.500-1.
³ Ḥabīb, p. 595.
⁴ Ibid.
the Shāh's Stable. He was spending a great deal of money on expenses and was in debt by about 7,000 tumāns. The order to settle his accounts infuriated Mihtar who decided to kill Mirzā. Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain sent him his bills and asked him to pay his debts as soon as possible. Mihtar Shāh Quli Arabgirlū did not pay any attention to his demands, being confident of the king's protection.

Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain was forced to write a letter to Shāh Ismā'īl and complain about Mihtar Shāh Quli's carelessness and debt. Because of his respect for Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain and his honesty, Shāh Ismā'īl allowed him a severe judgement on Mihtar. But instead of punishing the other official, Mirzā treated him kindly and did not take advantage of the power which was given to him by Shāh Ismā'īl. There is even an idea that he paid Mihtar's debt out of his personal expenses. Mihtar, on the other hand, was full of resentment against Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain and waited for a suitable chance to kill him.

Mihtar Shāh Quli one day took the opportunity of complaining in front of Shāh Ismā'īl saying that Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain had misused 50,000 tumāns out of the government account, and incited the other Turkomāns to

1. Rawdat al-Ṣafawiyya, f. 122a-b. Cf. 'Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 618-19 where the author gives "18,000 tumāns"; F. Şümər, op. cit., pp. 50-51 (the tribe of Arabgirlū) and Jahān-ārā, p. 280.
2. Rawdat al-Ṣafawiyya, f. 122a-b.
3. 'Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 619.
4. Ibid.
make the same complaint. But since he had no proof of
his allegation he could do nothing.¹ Thereafter, he waited
for the right opportunity to kill Mirza Shah Husain.
This came in 929/1523 when he knifed him in the back while
the other Turkomans helped him to cut his victim into
pieces.²

The author of 'A. A. Shah Ismail states that Shah
Ismail sent the servants of Mirza Shah Husain to capture
Mihtar Shah Quli and also he sent for the wife and
children of Mihtar Shah Quli. The Shah ordered that
Mihtar's wife and children be stripped naked and sent
into the streets. Later on the servants of Mirza Shah
Husain brought Shah Quli to Tabriz and Shah Ismail gave
them the privilege of doing the same to Mihtar as Mihtar
had done to Shah Husain. He respected the widow and
children of Mirza Shah Husain and sent his corpse to be

1. 'A. A. Shah Ismail, p. 618.
2. Habib, p. 595, Rawdat al-Safawiyya, f. 122b, Ahsan,
p. 177, Jahan-ara, p. 280, 'A. A. Shah Ismail,
pp. 618-20. Since I have spoken about Mirza Shah
Husain's death in chapter VIII, the
statement given by an eye-witness (Shah Tahmasb I)
on that occasion appears on p. 471 in chapter VIII.
Cf. IIchii, f.28a-b.
buried in Najaf

4. The Shāh and Amīr Yār Aḥmad Khuzānī Ḩāfīzānī, Known as Najm Thānī.

Since Amīr Najm Zargar had no son to succeed him, the king chose Yār Aḥmad Khuzānī to succeed this loyal Shīʿa supporter. On this Khwānd Amīr states:

"After the mourning was finished, Shāh Ismāʿīl chose Amīr Yār Aḥmad Ḩāfīzānī as his chancellor (Wakil), and nicknamed him Najm al-Dīn Thānī, and gave the high responsibility of the post to him. Then the Shāh ordered all the Ministers

1. Iltī, f. 28b; cf. the above-mentioned sources, for instance Habīb, IV, pp. 598-60, Ḥajān Gusba, f. 301b, Aḥsan, I, p. 177, Rawdat al-Ṣafawīyya, f. 122b where the following chronogram is given:

A. H. 926/28 Jummā al-Akhir, 929

or Ḥajān-ārā, p. 280, where Ghaffārī states: "At the end of Tuesday, 28th Jumādā al-Akhir, 929 which contradicts Habīb's given date: p. 560/.

Another occasion of Shāh Ismāʿīl's favour towards Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain (in 925/1519 at Isfahān) is given by several contemporary historians, such as the authors of Habīb, pp. 565-6, Rawdat al-Ṣafawīyya, f. 105b, & A. A. Shāh Ismāʿīl, p. 618.

2. 'Ā. A. Shāh Ismāʿīl, p. 315.
and amirs and official staff to obey him, and put the management of all affairs under his responsibility and judgement. Najm Beg Thānī was also a well-organized amir with high ambition. He gave good treatment to both rich and poor in terms of justice during his ministry.\(^1\)

Khwānīd Amīr was, however, habitually biased in favour of Amīr Najm Thānī, and there is evidence in other sources which presents a different picture of this official. According to one source, he was more overbearing in his job than anyone else had been before. He was very ambitious and conceited. When lords and nobles came to visit him, he would not grant them an audience and he did not even bother to rise from the cushion on which he was seated.\(^2\) He even acted in the same way towards Shāh Ismā'īl, his king and father-in-law.\(^3\)

It is said that for the sake of Bābur Gūrakān, Shāh Ismā'īl sent him to Transoxiana to suppress the Öz-Begs and to assist Mūhammad Zahrīr al-Dīn Bābur towards a favourable solution. But it appears that Najm Thānī quarrelled with the king over and over again and told Shāh Ismā'īl he would do whatever he (Amīr Najm Thānī) considered best.\(^4\)

Shāh Ismā'īl was aware of Najm Thānī's pride and vanity, and because of Bābur's loyalty and devoutness

---

2. Ilchī, f. 22b.
3. 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 411-412; cf. also Inqilāb-Islām, pp. 237-240.
4. 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 412, where the author states:
towards himself and his new religion, advised Amir Najm to act moderately with Babur and give him those territories that he had conquered in Transoxiana. But Amir Najm, who hated Babur because of his disrespect towards his servant Muḥammad Jān, was willing to give preference to Khān Mirzā, the governor of Ḵīsār-i Shādīmān, Khatlān and Bādakhsān. Shāh Isma’īl repeated several times that he wished to give those territories to Babur, but Najm Thānī stubbornly replied that he would decide what should be done, not him (Shāh Isma’īl), and we are told that the Shāh accepted his idea.¹

Najm Thānī moved into Transoxiana with a large army and Babur found out that he was coming and went to meet him. They opened an attack on the Ūz-Begs together.² As is well known, Najm Thānī was killed in this campaign.

The author of Inqilāb-ī Islām is the only source to provide certain facts about the relationship between Shāh Isma’īl and Najm Thānī. Firstly, the author states that:

"Najm Thānī's wife was Shāh Isma’īl's daughter."

Secondly, he relates that she was taken prisoner after her husband's death and was sent back to Tabrīz along with several camel-drivers who abused and ill-treated

¹. 'Ā.A. Shāh Isma’īl, pp. 411-412.
². Ibid. Cf. Ḥabīb, p. 527, where Khwānd Amir states that Najm Thānī set out for Khurāsān without Shāh Isma’īl's permission:

"بي آئنا واردا ندادنگ نمانته شعیب ایام خانگ نشینام، خانگ نشینام..."
her en route. The author goes on to say:

"This secret information was hidden in a letter sent by 'Ubaid Allāh Khān to Sulṭān Salīm I after Najm Thāni's death. In this letter he calls Shāh Ismā'īl Kalb Akbar (big dog) and Najm Thāni as Kalb Aṣghar (small dog) and his son-in-law."

Finally, contemporary sources say of Amīr Najm that as well as having exalted ambitions, he had such a pride that:

"His private servants and bodyguards numbered nearly 5,000 well-armed cavalrmen. And his personal wealth was beyond the calculation of accountants. Every day at his feast-table he used to have a hundred roasted (cooked) sheep. There would be chickens, geese and materials for soup in the same quantities on his campaign to Mesoopotamia. Despite the difficulty of having to leave many supplies on this side of the River Jaihūn, every day Amīr Najm Thāni's cooks used to set in front of the Qīzīl-Bāsh thirteen pots of pure silver in which rice had been cooked over the fire. They would serve the rice on golden trays or on china dishes. One of my (Khwānd Amīr's) trusted friends said that a person who was present at Amīr Najm Thāni's feast-table (sufra) reported his surprise on asking the head cook how he could manage to serve such a splendid and expensive entertainment, and where they obtained the materials in such a hostile place. The chief cook answered: 'By God's help we have sheep, chickens, sugar, sweatmeats, flour, rice and other materials in ready supply; but we have trouble finding herbs and spices such as ten mans of cinnamon, saffron, asafoetida root (zanjabīl), cumin seed, fennel, fennel-flour, coriander seed and some other herbs and condiments.'"

---

1. Inqilāb- Islām, pp. 237-240. This letter may be found in Munshārat, vol.I,p.350. See chapter V, p.354.


For more details on Najm Thāni's death and Shāh Ismā'īl's second invasion of Khurāsān see Habīb, IV, pp. 529-39, Jahān Gushā, f. 225a-b, Aḥsan, I, pp. 138-9, Ilchi, f. 23a, & Jahān-āra, pp. 276-7 under
5. **Shāh Ismā'īl's Sincere Respect for Dūrmīsh Khān Shāmlū.**

Dūrmīsh Khān Shāmlū, known as "Anīs al-Ḥādra" was a close friend and companion of Shāh Ismā'īl his brother-in-law, especially after the Battle of Chāldirān (920/1514). He was so highly respected by the Shāh that, after the above-mentioned battle, he was placed in charge of most subsequent military expeditions. On 3rd Ramadān 928/27 July 1522, Sām Mīrzā under his tutorship reached Khorasān. And on Sunday the 17th, Dūrmīsh Khān received Sām Mīrzā in Herāt,† of which city and surrounding territories he was the new governor. In that year, he was given the responsibility of returning Shāh Tāhmāsb and Amir Khān Muṣillū, his tutor, to the court of Shāh Ismā'īl and also of undertaking Sām Mīrzā's special education. His position among other amīrs at Shāh Ismā'īl's court was especially high; when he was sent to Herāt, the

the year 919/1513 which was the author's birth year. For Shāh Ismā'īl's treatment of Chirkin Ḥasan Takkallū (Ḥasan the dirty) for his indecent action in violating a married Georgian woman in 927/1521-22 in Georgia, and of Amir Khān Muṣillū, another amīr of Shāh Ismā'īl, see Jahān Gushā, ff. 271b-2a, Jahān-āra, p. 279, Aḥsan, p. 163, and Ḥabīb, iv, pp. 558-9 and 571-2, where Khwānd Amīr does not mention the cause of this murder. For Amir Khān Muṣillū see Ḥabīb, p. 588-94, Jahān Gushā, ff. 296a-7b, & Rawdat al-Ṣafawīyya, f. 118b.

† Where Khwānd Amir does not mention the cause of this murder. For Amir Khān Muṣillū see Ḥabīb, p. 588-94, Jahān Gushā, ff. 296a-7b, & Rawdat al-Ṣafawīyya, f. 118b.

1. Ḥabīb, IV, p. 592; cf. Jahān Gushā, ff. 296b-7a, Rawdat al-Ṣafawīyya, f. 120a, & Jahān-āra, p. 280.
Shāh made the following proclamation to the people of Khurāsān:

"Dūrmīsh Khān has a high position in our imperishable government and the King gives the government of Khurāsān to him, and permits him to destroy anyone who does not obey him." ¹

Most contemporary sources speak only favourably about Dūrmīsh Khān but there were also less favourable aspects to his rule in Khurāsān, especially his treatment of the predominantly Sunni population there. ²

On Dūrmīsh Khān's policies the author of Rawḍat al-Šafawīyya states in favour of him that when he arrived in Khurāsān he began to improve conditions in that devastated area. He divided other regions and small towns among the generals of the army and tried to improve the country very greatly. He introduced moral and honest people into jobs dealing with finance and held all insurgents in disrespect.

---

1. Habīb, IV, p. 588; cf. also Rawḍat al-Šafawīyya, f. 120a, for the above decree.

2. For instance, it was possible to find out about his treatment of the Sunni inhabitants of Khurāsān from a letter sent to Shāh Ṭahmāsb I in 936/1529-30 by Ḥabīb Allah Khān Özbeg, cited in Takmala-yi ʿĀlam ʿarā-ʿyī ʿAbbāsī (Takmilahā here in after = B.M. Ms. no. Add. 7654) ff. 128a-129b; Aḥsan, vol. I, pp. 226-233 (probably copied from Takmala ); Munṭaṣām, pp. 104-7; and mentioned by Brown, op.cit., iv, pp. 43-4;

and by Kasrawī, Shaikh Ṣafī, p. 36. For the Persian text see next page.
Then, he paid attention to the well-being of the citizens of Herat and reduced in number the villages and other places which had burdened the people of Herat by depending on them for aid during Amir Khan's administration. He developed those areas of land which were not cultivated and in so doing helped the poor and made them happy. Then he began to honour the learned and scholars, poets and other inhabitants. He gave them support and encouraged them.

1. However, there are some contrary statements about Dürmish Khan's dealings in Herat and destroying mosques and Sunnite buildings and schools or khānaqāhs by using them as stables and toilets for his troops, as Ubaid Allāh Khan Öz-Beg states in his letter sent to Shāh Tahmāsb I:

This letter was translated by Seddon in his English translation of Ahsan (vol. II, p. 107) but only in part: see vol. I, pp. 226-233. Cf. Takmīla, f. 128a where the above Persian text appears.

2. Rawdat al-Safawiyya, f. 120a-b.
The same author goes on to say:

"One of the books written and dedicated to the name of Dūrmīsh Khān was the history of Ḥabīb al-Siyar, which was compiled by Khwānd Amīr, the grandson of Mir Khwānd, the author of Rawḍat al-Ṣafā."¹

¹ Rawḍat al-Ṣafawīyya, f. 120²-

See also Ilchī, f. 29a, for another reason why Dūrmīsh Khān was sent to Khurāsan. The author believes that Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain wanted to get rid of him.
CHAPTER V

KINGSHIP AND KINSHIP
I. The Cause of Hostility Between Shāh Ismā'īl and his Kinsmen.

One of Shāh Ismā'īl's good policies was to appoint his relatives, including his sons-in-law and influential tribal chiefs, as his army commanders and governors.

However, as we have shown in previous chapters, it sometimes proved to be a mistaken policy, for the Shāh would become irritated by his kinsmen or amirs who relied on them very much and would remove them from their positions, even giving their wealth and property to the newly appointed officer.¹

In his childhood Shāh Ismā'īl had been forcibly separated from his parents and had grown up far from the influence of the moral traditions of his family, and more important, deprived of his mother's love and supervision. He grew up under the protection of the so-called lion-hearted Turkomāns and rigid Shī'ite authorities such as Ḥusain Beg Lala, his tutor, Khulafā Beg, Gūg 'Alī

¹. For instance the murder of Chulbān Beg the governor of Ẓārūm in 911/1505 (see Jahān-āra, p. 270); his decision over Dūrmīsh Khān Shāmlū to send him out of his capital or camps (see IICHI f. 29a); and Dada Beg Tālīsh and his punishment. For more details see HABIT, iv, p. 538. Cf. Rawdāt al-Şafawiyya, f. 42b; and R. Savory, "The Principal Offices of the Safavid state during the reign of Ismā'īl I (907-30/1501-24) in B.S.O.A.S. vol. XXIII, (1960), p. 93.
Beg, Chulbān Beg and Mullā Zain al-ʿĀbidīn Rashtī, his teacher along with Shams al-Dīn Lāhījī, his teacher of Qurān, Persian and Arabic. Most of them were his companions before he was old enough to understand how to run the country. Shāh Ismāʿīl ruled under the direction and supervision of these Sūfīs and religious authorities who were, in fact, the real governors of the country and who included men who later became his great Ministers.

Because of his early difficulties, the privations of his childhood and youth, the dangerous and terrible things that happened to him, and the harsh life he led while he was in hiding, Shāh Ismāʿīl grew up fearless, and possessed of a ruthless interest in revenge.

From his early youth he had witnessed the deaths of his close relatives at the hands of his mother's kinsmen, and as a result he was always watching for an opportunity to avenge the injuries done to the Ṣafawīd family by members of his mother's clan.

On the other hand, as soon as he understood the moral principles of his Qīzīl-Baṣhāmīrs, Shāh Ismāʿīl used his own sober intelligence in deciding to reduce their power gradually, and eventually he did take away

2. "A.A. Shāh Ismāʿīl", p. 37. He is believed to be the princes' teacher too.
4. Jahān Gushā, f. 32a; Add. 200 f.32a.
the authority of some of them. His anger towards his mother's family produced such harsh and unbending treatment of them that a Venetian merchant commented:

"From the time of Nero to the present, I doubt whether so bloodthirsty a tyrant has ever existed."¹

II. Šah Ismā'īl and Sultan Murād Āq-qoyūnlū.

As has been mentioned before, Šah Ismā'īl was a good diplomat. Influenced by several experienced Sūfīs, he used to try to win his enemies over by his polite and even friendly manner, and then destroy them unexpectedly. The use of this ingenious policy is illustrated by his behaviour towards Sultan Murād.

Before 24 Dhu'l-Hijja 908/June 21, 1503, the date of the Battle of Hamadān, Šah Ismā'īl is said to have sent messengers to Sultan Murād, and to have opened negotiations with him.² He wrote to Murād:

"Since we are relatives, you would do better not to quarrel and fight but to accept my position of superiority and strike your coinage and head your proclamations with my name, and in return I will make over to you several provinces of Iraq. And if you even think the words corruption or disorder, or talk of conquering and conquests or of despotism, I and my warriors will march towards that spot."³

¹ "The Travels of a Merchant in Persia", p. 191.
² This negotiation is confirmed in several sources: Jahān Gushā, f. 83b, Ilchī, f. 9a-b, Šāh Ismā'īl, pp. 67-68; cf. Savory, "Consolidation", p. 71.
³ Šāh Ismā'īl, pp. 67-8; Ilchī, f. 9a-b.
Upon receipt of this message, Sultan Murad gathered his Turkoman amirs including his best-informed advisers and consulted with them. They told him that his best move would be to remain at peace with Shâh Ismâ'îl because, as they said, "a wise man does not crack a whip when he is able to accomplish the same ends by talking; nor does he use swords and arrows when he could achieve the same results with a whip. But since the curtain of adversity had been pulled in front of Murâd's eyes, so that he could not see wisdom or tell the difference between right and wrong, he chose to do battle with Shâh Ismâ'îl" and the encounter took place on Monday 24th Dhu'l-Hijja 908/June 21, 1503.

It seems that Sultan Murad knew of Shâh Ismâ'îl's hatred of his kinsmen on his mother's side, and so he could not trust the Shâh. He had no intention of giving in to him easily, since he had learned the fate of his brother, Alwand Mirzâ, who was defeated by him. The version of this story told by the author of 'Ālam-ārâ-yi Shâh Ismâ'îl is worth quoting, since it gives much circumstantial detail.

The author says that Sultan Murad asked the envoy named Qanbar Āqā why he was sent as a messenger rather than someone else. Qanbar Āqā replied:

"Since I am now the Shâh's old tutor and his close friend who knows his secrets, he sent me to you to give you his exact message and

also to advise you."¹

After reading the letter Sultan Murād remarked:

"The Šāh wanted a suitable chance to destroy me and since he was not sure of Alwand Mirzā, he did not attack me and thought that it would be better not to make any move against me till he had first killed Alwand Mirzā. On the other hand he was sure of my weakness and therefore called me "Nāmurād"—"Murād the Unfortunate". I obeyed him because it seemed right and proper for the occasion, expedient at the time. However, now that I have received news from my brother Alwand that Khwânggār (Bayazîd II) has given my brother 120,000 soldiers that are like fierce lions, why should I miss this promising opportunity to withstand Šāh Ismā'îl? I myself am a king and it will be best for me not to be subservient to another ruler. You tell me Qanbar Āqā (Murād said) — I take an oath by Shaikh Šafī's family — which one is wiser?"²

Qanbar Āqā answered:

"Your majesty, I have listened to what you have said, now listen to what I want to say to you. Think of what the all-conquering king has written to you and do not think of your brother. Certainly the Šāh knew your goodness of heart better than you. Because although he is capable of capturing and imprisoning you at this very moment, he has not done it; instead he has called you "Nāmurād". On the other hand, the Nawwâb Ashraf (Shaikh Ismā'îl) does not need any help and has rebelled with God's support, so that he can further the spread of the Ithnâ 'Asharī sect. Anyone who is upheld by God need never fear, though the whole world be his enemy. Since he was kind to you and did not want you to be burned by your brother's fire and Hasan Beg's children to be thus completely wiped out, the Nawwâb Ashraf sent you his letter, with its announcement. And the will of our victorious king for you is simply for your welfare."³

¹ 'A.A. Shâh Ismā'îl, p. 68. For the fate of Alwand Mirzā see chapter IV, p. 264.
² 'A.A. Shâh Ismā'îl, p. 68.
³ Ibid., p. 69; cf. Jahân Gushây, f. 82b, where the author states that Qanbar Āqā was sent back to Šâh Ismā'îl alive.
⁴ 'A.A. Shâh Ismā'îl, p. 69.
After Qanbar Āqā had spoken, Sultan Murād replied:

"Tell your master to speak the truth. I am his enemy and nobody in the world wishes his enemy to be alive. Now I and my brother will attack him from both sides and will destroy him. We will deal out to the wives and children of the Qizil-Başheş the same kind of treatment that they give to their enemies."¹

Since Qanbar Āqā spoke harshly to him, Sultan Murād ordered that he be trampled to death.²

This was therefore the last hostile action perpetrated by Sultan Murād and of course the result rebounded against himself. This final act of hostility forced him to go into exile. After his defeat in Allâh Qulâghî³ he moved from one place to another till he settled in 'Alâ' al-Daula Dhul-Qadar's territory in Albistân. Finally, in 920/1514 he was killed by Qarâcha Sultan, who was given the title "Gûdûrmîsh Sultan"⁴ "the Rabid Sultan", in return for this success. With his death, Shâh Ismâ'îl put to an end the White Sheep (Āq-qoyûnî) dynasty.

1. "A.A. Shâh Ismâ'îl, p. 69.
2. Ibid.
3. See Jahân-ārā, p. 267, Aḥsān, p. 65, ابلیّة قؤونی, vol. 4; Jahan Gushâ, f. 84b; Aḥsān, p. 65, ابلیّة قؤونی, vol. 4; Jahan Gushâ, f. 84b (Alma Qulâghî); Ḥabîb, pp. 471-2; Rawdat al-Ṣafawīyya, f. 46b; Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 44:

"Ulma Qulâghî"; Savory. "Consolidation" ; "Ulma Qulâghî".

4. See Inqilâb- Islâm, p. 241; Ḥabîb, pp. 471-2; Jahan Gushâ, f. 84b; Aḥsān, pp. 150-1; "Travels of a Merchant in Persia", p. 199; and "A. A. Shâh Ismâ'îl, p. 572, where the author states in connection with this event that Sultan Murâd's son was arrested.
III. Shāh Ismā'īl and his Stepmother.

The historians have had nothing to tell us about Shāh Ismā'īl's attitude towards his stepmother. The only information that we could learn about his improper treatment of, or indecent behaviour towards, his stepmother appears in the work of a Venetian merchant who was in Tabrīz which was Shāh Ismā'īl's capital in those days. Unfortunately, when this merchant speaks of Shāh Ismā'īl's mother he does not indicate whether he is referring to the King's real mother or to his stepmother. Since the Shāh is said to have had two mothers, it seems likely that Shāh Ismā'īl murdered his stepmother out of his great love for his real mother who stayed faithful to her husband. In any case, if Shāh Ismā'īl did murder one of these women, it must have been his stepmother, not his real mother, Marta.

The Venetian merchant on this event has this to say:

In 907/1501, when Shāh Ismā'īl captured Tabrīz "all the kinsmen of Jacob Sultan (Sultān Ya'qūb Aq-qoyūnlu) were put to the edge of the sword, and even pregnant women were slaughtered with their unborn offspring. The tomb of Jacob Sultan, and those of many Lords who had been present at the Battle of Derbant (Darband) where Ismael's father was killed, were opened, and their bones

1. To specify the woman see Zeno, "Travels in Persia", p. 52 where he says: ".... he had his stepmother brought before him, who after the death of his father had married a certain great Lord..... abused her to her face, insulted her in every possible way, and at last commanded that she should be decapitated as the vile and worthless woman she was, in revenge for the slight estimation she had held his fatherin."

2. Ibid. See "Travels of a Merchant in Persia", pp. 190-191.
burnt. Three hundred public courtesans were then arranged in line, and their bodies divided in two. Then eight hundred avaricious Blasi who had been brought up under Alumut Alwand Mirzā Aq-qoyūnlu were beheaded. They even slaughtered all the dogs in Tauris, and committed many other atrocities. After this, Ismael sent for his own mother, who was in some way related to Jacob Sultan (in what manner I have not been able to discover), and finding that she had married one of the Lords who had been present at the Battle of Darbant, after reviling her, caused her head to be cut off before him. From the time of Nero to the present, I doubt whether so bloodthirsty a tyrant has ever existed.'

IV. The Rebellion of Sulaimān Mirzā against his Brother, Shāh Ismā'īl I.

According to Hasan Rumlu, Sulaimān Mirzā, the brother of Shāh Ismā'īl, gathered a large number of supporters and rebelled against the king during the Shāh's absence in 919/1513. According to the chronicler:

"Since the Shāh had gone to Khurāsān and was afar off; and seizing this occasion, Tabriz should be taken. Sayyid Sulaymān, being beguiled by these fools, and having acquired the means of rebellion, marched quickly on Tabriz with a number of seditious persons. And when the governor heard of this he strengthened the ways along with the citizens, and let water run in the roads, so that it froze and horsemen could hardly pass.

1. In order to show his step-mother that she was a worthless woman.
3. As is generally known, Sulaimān Mirzā was Shāh Ismā'īl's brother, but the author of 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl on the contrary calls him Sultan 'Alī's son. Sultan 'Alī was the elder son of Sultan Haydar who was killed by
Then Sulaymān entered the Avenue with a host of men, but the Tabrīzīs pierced the walls of the Avenue and fired on those unfortunates and overthrew them. So Sulaymān, in mighty chagrin, set out for Ab-Ī Shūr."

The knaves (chāpānis) of Tabrīz fell upon like lightning (Bālā-ī Āsimānī) at Šaṁb-ī Ghāzān. Sulaimān's troops also made ready for the fight, as busily as ants and as cunningly as snakes; but the Tabrīzī orphans plied their swords and forced Sulaimān to dismount. Although on foot, he managed to kill sixteen of them but was himself killed


1. Ahsan, vol. II, p. 66. It should be noticed here that C. N. Seddon, the editor and translator of vol. I of Ahsan al-Tawarikh, makes his usual practice of omitting some words and makes mistakes in several places on these pages. For instance, he adds "iyyas" to Sulaimān and translated: "at Shumb-ī Ghazān (which should read Šaṁb-ī Ghāzān) the Sulaymāniyyas (which must be Sulaimān's people or followers) too, made ready for battle...." And he also omits the words "like ants and snakes" (see vol. I, p. 140). Further on he translates (orphan) as "cut-throats". However, Hasan Rūmū refers to Shāh Ismā'īl as the father of these people of Tabrīz, since they were left alone, as he writes: (see p. 140). Seddon also omits the words ("cosmic catastrophe"). For more details see Ahsan, vol. I, p. 140, vol. II, p. 66; cf. Jahān Gushā, f. 235a-b and 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 478-9.

by Muntashā Sultan Ustāji. The story as told up to this point is recorded by Hasan Rūmī, but, as usual, Khwānd Amīr is silent. Fortunately it is possible to discover the exact motive of this unexpected rebellion in Sultan Sulaimān; in the ‘Alam-‘arā-yi Shāh Ismā‘īl we are told that when Shāh Ismā‘īl (in 919/1513) went to Herāt, he went into Ḥiṣar-i Shādman, where he was told about the fantastic sights to be seen. The author goes on to say he was told that there was a place near the fort carpeted with beautiful flowers and other things worth seeing. Naturally he wanted to go to see this beauty spot. He was accompanied by Bābur Pādishāh, Khān Mīrzā, Dīw Sultan, Dūrāsh Khān, Ḥusain Beg Lala and Mīr Sayyid Sharaf al-Dīn Ṣadr. When they reached the tulip garden, Shāh Ismā‘īl galloped his horse onto some rocks where the beast put a hoof in the wrong place and slipped on a rock, throwing the Shāh to the ground, unconscious. The amīrs surrounded him and tried their best to bring him round, but could not do any good. Seeing the king’s condition, Dīw Sultan instructed everyone to keep the incident a secret. After the accident they allowed no-one to return to the camp ahead of themselves and so they managed to take Shāh Ismā‘īl back to his tent without anyone else realizing what had happened, except those few companions. Once inside the Shāh’s tent they bled him, but this was

3. ‘Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā‘īl, p. 479.
of no use in bringing him round. They held a mirror in front of his nose, but this produced only a slight mist. The great amirs became worried about their master and did not know what to do. For three days the Shāh lay unconscious, but suddenly, on the fourth day, he sat up in bed saying: "Yā 'All madad" ("Oh 'Ali help me") and sat on his bed. 1

At the other end of the country, his brother Sulaimān Mirzā who was in Dār al-Irshād, Ardabil, had gathered a following around himself. He had become intoxicated by power and wondered why he should not be called Shaikh and the absolute Murshid. He was continually thinking of that position and discussed his ambition in secret with some of his ignorant friends. They encouraged him to rebel against Shāh Ismā'īl. Sulaimān Mirzā said to them: "After my brother (lit., "uncle") 2 dies Shāh Ṭahmāsb will succeed him and when he becomes king, it is not certain what our position will be."

Sulaimān Mirzā's little band of ignorant friends declared: "Once you have promised to be sympathetic to our wishes when you have obtained a position of power, we will give you the support needed to put you on the throne." 3

1. 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 479.
2. The author calls him Shāh Ismā'īl's cousin. Cf. Ahsan, p. 7 where the author states:

Cf. vol. II, p. 3 for English translation.
3. 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 480.
Sulaimān Mīrzā gave his word to them and said: "I promise that any posts you want will be yours, and I will always consider your needs personally."¹ Therefore those men promised Sulaimān Mīrzā their obedience and loyalty, and they all waited for a good chance to carry out a coup.² Since Shāh Ismā'īl's campaign was taking him towards Khurāsān from the court at Isfahān, Sulaimān Mīrzā sent Manūchīhr Bēg, the former slave of Qīzīl Muḥammad Turkomān, who had by this time become Sulaimān Mīrzā's slave, to spy on Shāh Ismā'īl. When Shāh Ismā'īl fell from his horse near Shādīmān,³ Manūchīhr informed Sulaimān Mīrzā that the conquering king was dead. After Manūchīhr had told his master about the accident, Sulaimān Mīrzā went to the Dār al-Irshād at Ardabīl and said to the head of the Šafawīds' shrine and his followers: "Since the fates were against the Shāh and have brought him that accident, may God bless me and keep me in health." But the grey-bearded men did not believe him at all, only those who were ignorant or who were traitors. In three days he was able to gather around him eighteen thousand rebels, and Sulaimān Mīrzā destroyed all the gold treasures belonging to the Shrine of Shaikh Šāfī, minted coins in his own name, and distributed them among his followers. Then he moved towards Tabriz in order to capture the throne, as was

1. 'Ā. A. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 479.
2. Ibid., p. 479.
3. Ibid., p. 479.
When Shāh Ismā'īl heard the news of his brother's death he distributed substantial gifts of land and goods to his brother's murderer. He entitled his brother's killer "Muntūsā Sultan" and appointed him governor of Tabrīz.¹

1. 'Ā. Shāh Ismāʿīl, p. 482.
2. Ibid., p. 500. The author tells us that on his return to Tabrīz Shāh Ismāʿīl had Muntūsā Sultan arrested with all the other people who were responsible for Sulaimān Mīrzā's death, and then entered the city of Tabrīz. The author of the Jahān Gushā gives the opposite information quoted above; see Jahān Gushā, f. 235b.

However, in reference to the rebellion just discussed, the Venetian merchant gives a slightly different account which seems to be worth mentioning, since he speaks of dissatisfaction amongst the Shāh's brothers who were sent into exile in Ardabil by Shāh Ismāʿīl's order. The merchant says that Shāh Ismāʿīl, after defeating 'Alī al-Daula's son "Becarbec in Karport" and cutting off his head with his own hands, then proceeded in great haste on his way to Tabrīz in 913/1508;... returning to Tauris he found that his two brothers whom he had left in charge of the city had not thoroughly observed his commands, so he was very nearly putting them to death; but in accordance with the entreaties of many of his lords the young men escaped, but were banished to their native province of Ardouil which they were not allowed to leave, being granted a train of only 200 horsemen each." See "Travels of a Merchant", p. 198. The above statement is unique; cf. Savory, "Consolidation", p. 81; Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 71.
V. **Shāh Ismā'īl's Love of his Brother, ʿAbbād Mīrzā.**

We learn that in 914/1508, when Shāh Ismā'īl was camping at Darābjird in Fārs, he erected a mausoleum at ʿUjān in memory of his brother, ʿAbbād Mīrzā, who had died near there. To give permanence to his brother’s name in the minds of the people the Shāh built a splendid dome with a courtyard attached to it and he ordered flags to be flown and drums beaten, and money to be given regularly to the poor of the neighbourhood and salaries arranged for the guards and custodians and those who served his grave and mausoleum. He appointed several Qurān readers to

---


"Qaṣr-i Zar" which seems to be the summer quarters of Kushk-i Zar".

For more details see Jahān Gushā, f. 235b. See also Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam, translated and explained by V. Minorsky, (London 1937) p.497, where Minorsky indicates that:

"Kūsh III [In the H.ʿĀ., Persian Kūshk usually stands for Arabic Qaṣr]."

Minorsky seems to have been to identify "Kushk-ajān"? (read ʿUjān, since he put a question mark in front of it.

However, the above ʿUjān also appears in ʿAzarbāyjān, for example in the Tabrīz area (see Nuzhat al-Qulūb, vol. II, (London 1919), p. 320.

It should be noted here that the above Sultan ʿAbbād Mīrzā does not appear in any other work consulted by me, except that the author of Tarīkh-i Ṣūlṭānī (f. 307a) under the year 912/1504 mentions ʿAbbād Mīrzā's name as Shaikh Nīṣām al-ʿĀin Amīr ʿAbbād
stay there permanently. He also appointed a custodian for the tomb and allotted several sums of money from the income of lands in order to cover its expenses.

and says that he was Shāh Ismā'īl's brother and died in Ūjān, Fars, in that year. For more details on Shāh Ismā'īl's sons see pp. 330-52 below.
PART TWO

Fatherhood and Sovereignty

Shâh Ismâ'îl is believed not to have loved children very much before Tahmâsb's birth. As the author of Ilchâl-yi Nizâm Shâh states:

"Although Ḥadrat-i Shâh Dînpanâh [the refuge of religion] was not fond of children, he devoted his full care to the prince of the world."

This statement, which is the only source of this information, shows that it was after Shâh Tahmâsb's birth that Shâh Ismâ'îl changed his mind about having more children. It is said that he had fifteen daughters and more than six sons.²

It would appear that none of his sons or daughters were disfavoured by the Shâh while he lived, and no historian has mentioned the Shâh's ever doing any harm to his children. We shall try to give full consideration to the lives of the Shâh's children, and their fates, by discussing them one by one, beginning with the King's son and successor, Shâh Tahmâsb I.

I. Tahmâsb Mîrzâ was born at the end of 918/beginning

1. Ilchâl, f. 24b.
2. Târîkh-i Sultânî, f. 303a; Aḥsan, I, p. 183.
of 1513 in Shâhâbâd in Iṣfahan. His mother was called Tâjlû Baygum. He was the eldest son of Shâh Ismâ‘îl and was appointed Crown prince. In order to restore the ruined province of Khurâsân, Shâh Ismâ‘îl appointed Tahmâsb as nominal governor of Khurâsân in 921/1515, under the regency of his tutor Amîr Khân Mušillû. He went to Herât in 922/1516 and remained at his post there till 928/1522 when Shâh Ismâ‘îl summoned Amîr Khân Mušillû to the capital for reasons which have been mentioned in a previous chapter. His teacher was called Amîr Muḥammad Tâbâsî. In his own writings Shâh Tahmâsb

1. Ḥâlib, p. 531. Tadhkira-yi Shâh Tahmâsb, p. 8, ed. by Abd al-Shukûr, gives 26 Dhul-Hijja 920/1514; Atishkada, p. 74 "918/1513". Jahân Gushâ, f. 218b, where the author states: Lubb, p. 255: 26 Dhul-Hijja 919;

2. 'A.A. Šafawî, ed. by Y. Shukri, (Teh. 1350) p. 17, where the author says that at the time of Shâh Tahmâsb's birth Shâh Ismâ‘îl was twenty years old; 'A.A. Shâh Ismâ‘îl, p. 82; Jahân-tarâ, p. 281; and Ilch1, ff. 24b-25a.

gave his name and title as ۳۰اماسب b. یاسمٗیل b. ٔهدار al-مُساوی al-حسائینٗ۳۰.

By his own account, ٔهھ ٔ medically succeeded his father in ۳۰/۳۰۱ on Monday ۰۰th راب, at the age of ten years.۳ His father loved him very much and according to the directive he gave to میل سلمٗن on the last day of his life, he very much wanted his son یه ٔ medically to succeed him. In his last hours, the ٔهھ appointed میل سلمٗن as his tutor and legal adviser, telling میل سلمٗن:

"I grant you custody of my son, یه ٔ medically. You must be his full guardian for seven years and because you will have that authority, all the chiefs and امیر, شمس and قیزیل-بِاش, must obey you and your orders on condition that you are kind to the قیزیل-بِاش and do not annoy them. When the worthy life of my son reaches its eighteenth year do not interfere with his affairs at all and leave him to rule the country according to his own will and personal judgement."۴

یه ٔ medically is believed to have ruled his country for ۵۳ years, one month and ۲۶ days—longer than any

---

1. Tadhkira-yi یه ٔ medically, p. ۸. However, if we accept the statement of the author of ی.آ. یافوٗی that at the time of یه ٔ medically's birth یه یاسمٗیل was twenty years old, we may conclude that یه ٔ medically's own statement is not correct.

2. Tadhkira-yi یه ٔ medically, pp. ۸-۹. Cf. Ilchi, f. ۳۳a where the author states he was ۱۲ years old, and

3. Ilchi, p. ۷۴: "ten and a half years and ۲۰ days." See also p.۳۳۸ below.

4. ی.آ. یه یاسمٗیل, p. ۶۴. For the same statement cf. Ilchi, f. ۳۱a.
Muslim Caliph, King or Sultan except the Fatimid Caliph Al-Mustansir bi'llah (427-487/1035-1094), the eighth Caliph of Egypt. In his youth, Tahmasb learned several styles of calligraphy and loved painting. He is said to have learned naskh, thuluth and nastalq, and is believed to have had wonderful tastes in these arts. He has left his thirty years history in his Tadhkira.

Browne says that Shah Tahmasb loved riding on Egyptian asses, which became fashionable in his time and used to be ready in front of his court with golden trappings and gold-embroidered saddle-cloths. According to Atashkada-yi Azar, a certain poet called Buq al-'Aysh (بوق العيش) "the trumpet of pleasure" lampooned him in

1. Atashkada, p. 74. Cf. Browne, op. cit., iv, p. 84 where he gives the number of years of the reign as "fifty two years and a half" whereas in a later statement on p. 98 he calculates "a reign of fifty three years and a half."

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.


5. Atashkada, p. 74; Ahsan, I, p. 488 (بوق السعد); cf. Browne, op. cit., iv, p. 97 "Buq' l-Ishq (the Trumpet of Love)"). It seems "Buq al-'Aysh" is correct since this title is more convenient for pleasure.
has poem, as he says:

"The scribe, the painter, the Qazvinian and the ass, obtained easy promotion without trouble."2

Of Shāh Ṭahmāsb's character and personality Ḥasan Rūmī states:

"... And in his old age, from morning till evening he would set his account-book in front of him and go over the government finances. He paid attention to every little detail, so much so that none of his lawyers or ministers could pay a penny to anyone without his permission. At other times he used to spend one day grooming his nails, and the next day soaking in his bath from morning till night. He regarded most things as unclean, and used to spit out his half-eaten food into the water or fire. He would not eat anything at a party or in front of company, insisted on not drinking a drop and he destroyed nearly five hundred tumans of opium by dissolving it in water. He had left off all his amusements, and had not ridden (any horse or ass).... During his reign his subjects lived in a well-ordered and comfortable condition." His

3. On Shāh Ṭahmāsb's life and character see "Narrative of the Most Noble Vincentio D'Alessandri Ambassador to the King of Persia (Shāh Ṭahmāsb) for the most illustrious republic of Venice", p. 211, ed. and translated by Charles Grey. On pages 215-16 the ambassador is quoted as stating:

"The King is in the sixty-fourth year of his age, and the fifty-first of his reign, is of middling stature, well formed in person and features, although dark, of thick lips (p.216) and a grisly beard; he is more of a melancholy disposition than anything else, which is known by many signs, but principally by his not having come out of his palace for the space of eleven years, nor having gone once to the chase nor any other kind of amusement, to the great dis-
Majesty refused to send any of his superintendents (to a city) and for this reason the subjects used to have to settle their disputes among themselves. The Qizil-Bagh loved him so much that although he paid them no salary for fourteen years, not one of them complained, but continued to work hard.  

The Persian text on Shâh  Taḥmāsb's character appears in Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh as follows:

For more details see pp. 211-229 of the above-mentioned source.

1. See Ahsan, vol. I, p. 489, which unfortunately Seddon omitted in his second volume, p. 294. Instead of translating the above text, he translated nothing more than the use of Tīryāq-i Farūq and indicates: "تریاق قریشیون انسنت رکب ازحتیاداد ادیویه واین را تریاق قریشیون می‌باد."  

1. In contradiction to the statement in Aḥsan, the author of *Tarikh-i Niẓâristân* (p. 378) indicates that there was a famine throughout Iran so severe that people were forced to eat human flesh. On the same page the author also discusses Shāh Ṭahmāsb's attitude to religion as it was described to the English envoy who went to see him at his court. According to D'Alessandri's statement, which totally contradicts that of Ḥasan Rūmlū, "day and night they cry aloud before the palace for justice.... And the King, hearing the voice, usually orders them to be sent away, saying that there are judges deputed in the country, with whom rests the administration of justice, not taking into consideration that these things are against the tyrannical judges and Sultans, who usually wait in the street to assassinate the people, seen by me as well as by many other people. I have been told as a fact, that in the book of lawsuits there are written more than ten thousand persons who have been killed during the last eight years. This evil comes principally from the Cuzzl (judges or ṣāḥibs) who, as they do not receive pay, are forced to take bribes...."

For more details see pp. 215-218 of the above-mentioned source.

On his giving up drinking, Aḥsan (vol. I, p. 246) has detailed information of which some is translated by Browne, *(op. cit.,* *iv*, p. 87). It is given in shortened form by Seddon in his translation (vol. II, p. 113); see also *Ilchī*, ff. 46a-b under the year 940 A.H.
Shāh Ţahmāsb lived sixty four years and one month and twenty five days and died in 984/1576. He reigned for fifty-three years and six months and twenty six days. According to various opinions he had reigned eight years in Khurāsān and had twelve sons and several daughters.

1. See Ahsan,I,464, where the above Persian text appears. It seems that the above repentance occurred probably between 939-40/1533-4; cf. Ilchi, ff. 46a-b.

2. See Ahsan, vol. I, p. 464. The Haft Iqlīm (Calcutta 1927) p. 177, gives his chronogram as "The Twelfth Imām" as the author on the authority of Shāh Ghīyāth al-Dīn ʿAbd al-ʿAll. states:

"تازی گفت نام امام با دلدرد امام با پنجم امام هشتاد و دوازده هشتاد و روز از ملعب که زیاد و هشتاد و پنجم روز فر بر می‌همد،"

Cf. B.M. Ms. Or. 1649, f. 616a cited in the B.M. Catalogue of the Coins of the Shahs of Persia, introduction, p. xxx; Shāh Ţahmāsb's chronogram is:

"بای نازدم شریعت تابی‌است.

The Persian text runs:

"بپای‌رقطع صیحه با نازدم شریعت سی.then پنجم و نهم و این غیر بر رو... شبل شاه... و نازدم نیاز ندارد با نازدم شریعت تابی‌است،"


4. For the full names of his sons and daughters see 'Ā.Ā. 'Abbāsī, pp. 95-104; Falsafi,
According to the Ātashkada-yi Ādhar, the following verses are attributed to Shāh Tahmāsb:

"We have come with the help of God to fight against the enemy of religion, Oh, my enemy, come forward even one step and see how far we have come."¹

"Iṣfahān is like a paradise of affluence, But in it, Iṣfahānis should not live."

"A dog is better than a citizen of Kāshān, But a Kāshānī (dog) is better than a chieftain of Qum."

"In the men of Tabrīz you will see only womanisers, It is best not to see anyone from Tabrīz."²

II. Ilqāš Mīrza /or Alqāsb Mīrzā, the son of "Khān Bāji Khānum", was born in the winter of 921/1515 at the winter quarters in Tabrīz. His birth gave the Shāh an excuse to spend several days feasting and drinking. The author of Ḥabīb al-Siyar states that "the music of pipes and the sounds of drinking wafted through the heaven of this earth" because of his birthday.


1. Ātashkada, p. 74.

2. Ibid.


It should be noted here that the above lady's name does not appear in any Persian sources consulted by me. Cf. Ilchī, f. 61b where the author states that she was alive when Ilqāś Mīrzā rebelled against his brother Tahmāsb.
In 943/1536 he was granted the governorship of Shirvan by his brother Shah Tahmāsb. According to D'Al essandri, "Ilias Mirza (Ilqāṣ Mirzā) was a man of great valour and daring, who during a peace with the King, Barcan (Bahram), King of Sirvan took both his city and country, which is very large and of great importance on the shores of the Caspian Sea."¹

However, at the instigation of some discontented chiefs, and with their help, he rebelled against his brother, Tahmāsb Mirzā, in 953/1546–7 and issued proclamations and minted coins in his own name. Finally Shirvan was captured by Shah Tahmāsb in 954/1547 and was handed over to Isma'īl II the son of Shah Tahmāsb. Ilqāṣ Mirzā took refuge in Istanbul at the court of Sulaimān II, who helped him to attack Iran in 955/1548.² In this military expedition it is believed that more than 7,600 Ottoman soldiers died because of snow.³

2. Ahsan, p. 327; cf. Walsh, op. cit., p. 75; D'Alessandri, op. cit., p. 212 where Grey on the authority of Knolles gives 1549 and Jahān-ārā, p. 298 where the author states, under the year 955/1548, "بهرانك انها مراجعه در مرکز شیران لارا نبوده بعد بهرمان آ دو هردو نبایم میرا و جوان سلیمان یارادیو، تعداد آنها است ملتی که یاده شده‌اند رضایت داشته‌اند اذار و فریال، مهربان اهل ایران تخریب شده...

Cf. also Ilchī, f. 64b under the year 955 A.H.
Ilqāṣ Mīrzā withdrew towards Bāghdād, but came back to Hamadān in 955/1548 and plundered the house of his brother, Sām Mīrzā, taking captive his wife and family.1 He further attacked Qum and Kāshān, the suburbs of Iṣfahān, and Fārs. At last an envoy called Sayyid Naʿīm al-Ǧīn Niʿmat Allāh-Ṭāhāl b. Amīr Nīzām al-Ǧīn ʿAbd al-Baqī went to him from Shāh Tāhmāsb in 12 Ramaḍān 955/15 October 1548 along with Bahram Mīrzā to bring him back to Shāh Tāhmāsb. "On Tuesday, the 9th of Ramaḍān, Alqāṣ left the fort and his rebellion came to an end."2

According to Ilchī, Shāh Tāhmāsb refused to shed Ilqāṣ Mīrzā's blood and instead imprisoned him in the fort of Qahqaha.

Shāh Tāhmāsb himself writes of Ilqāṣ Mīrzā:

"I loved him more than any of my other brothers or my children, so I ordered 250 tūmāns to be lent to the Sayyids and holy men of Mashhad. This sum was to be retained by them as long as Alqāṣb was alive, to provide for prayers (to be said) for his health. Like a

1. Ilchī, f. 63; Jahān-ārā, f. 299; Aḥsan, vol. I, p. 334. See also more generally, pp. 327-335.
2. Walsh, op. it., p. 74;
   cf. also Ilchī, f. 68b; Atashkada, p. 44; Browne, op. cit., vol. IV, p. 89 and Jahān-ārā, p. 299 under the year 956 A.H.
3. Ilchī, f. 68; Jahān-ārā, p. 299; cf. Tadhkira-yi Shāh Tāhmāsb, p. 62 where Shāh Tāhmāsb gives "Alamūt"—so does the author of Atashkada, p. 44.
fool he rebelled with no cause. I can think of only two reasons for his rebellion. First that he had a love affair with a boy called Mâghûrîlû who is at present in Rûm (Turkey). Because he was afraid that I might punish him and some of his other companions who used to drink with him (and deceive him too), he rebelled against me. Secondly, before the news of his rebellion had become common knowledge I had sent 'Ali Āqā Āqcha Saqqal to him to try to make him see sense, but he could make no impression on him, and Alqâsb escaped to Rûm."

However, after bringing him back and forgiving him for his wrong-doings, 2 Tahmâsb Mirzâ states:

"In short, after a few days, I realized that he was afraid of me and always caught up by his troubles (preoccupied). Therefore, I sent him in the custody of Ibrâhîm Khân and Ḥasan Beg Uz-Bâshî to the fort of Alamût. They escorted him there and came back to me. Six days later, due to the negligence of the guards, a group of prisoners who were serving sentences in the same prison killed Alqâsb to avenge their father's blood (Alqâsb having put their father to death some time previously). They carried out their revenge by throwing Alqâsb down from the walls of the fort. After his death the world became a safer place." 4

2. Ilchî, f. 68b; Jahân-āra, p. 299; Ahsan, I, pp. 339-40.
3. Ilchî, f. 68b, "Qahqâha"; the Jahân-āra on p. 299 "Qahqâha"; Ahsan, I, pp. 339-40 "Qahqâha".
His death occurred in 956/1549. 1

1. *Ilchī* : after five or six months being in that prison. (باعر تُلَوَّنُ حَسْنَ مَتَّا). On the matter of Ilqāṣ Mirzā's death the sources differ from each other. The *Jahan-ārā*, p. 299 gives 956/1549 and the chronogram: "اٍ" which in abjad stands for 956/1549. The *Ilchī* on f. 68b gives 956; the *Majmaʿ al-Khawās* (p. 23) gives 984/1577 which is wrong; the *Atashkada* (p. 43) gives 987/1577 which is also wrong; *Aḥsanrū*, pp. 339-40 dates his death a week after his imprisonment began; while *Majmaʿ al-Fuşāhā* (vol. I, p. 8) gives 948/1577 and locates the place of his grave at Mashhad. Cf. D’Alessandrī, *op. cit.* , p. 213, who says Ilqāṣ Mirzā was killed by Tahmāsb his brother.

The author of *Majmaʿ al-Khawās* attributes the following quatrain to Ilqāṣ, while the author of *Rawdat al-Salāṭīn* claims it as Sām Mirzā's poem:

"We are all hunting like fierce lions,  
In our passion and desire, we are friends, and  
If they remove the curtain from our deeds  
Then it will be clear what these doings really are."

According to the Tārīkh-Jahān Gushā-yi Khāqān, Sām Mirzā was born in the summer-quarters of Diz Award, Surluq, on Tuesday 21 Sha'bān 923/September 8, 1517.¹

According to his own book, Tuḥfa, Sām Mirzā was the son of the same mother as Ilqāṣ Mirzā.² Of Sām Mirzā it is reported that his father was delighted by his birth and ordered a feast of several days' duration. Of this feast and celebration the authors of Ḥabīb al-Siyar and Rawdat al-Ṣafawīyya both state that at that celebration Shāh Ismā'īl ascended to his throne of dignity and pleasure with happiness and delight while the amīrs and chiefs and attendants of his court observed ceremonies of congratulation and thanksgiving and drank red wine and ate rich food in a splendidly luxurious atmosphere. Jewels and gold were presented to the child in plenty.³

1. Jahān Gushā, f. 262a; Ḥabīb, p. 555; Lubb, p. 260; Rawdat al-Ṣafawīyya, f. 101b. Khwānd Amīr on the authority of Maulānā Shihāb al-Dīn gives "Kawkab-i Burj Shāhanshāhī" (کوکب برج شاهنشاهی) which stands for 923/1517 in abjad calculation. But the author of Tārīkh-Sultānī gives "کوکب برج شاهنشاهی" as his birth chronogram, which stands for 924/1518 and is not correct. See Ḥabīb, p. 556 for several verses quoted by Khwānd Amīr, and Tārīkh-Sultānī, f. 303a. Cf. too, Majma' al-Fushā, vol. I, p. 58 where unfortunately Sām Mirzā is introduced as Shāh Tahmāsb's son rather than his brother and the editor has not noticed the mistake. Cf. also Rawdat al-Ṣafā, vol. VIII, p. 15 under the year 923 A.H.

2. Tuḥfa, p. 2; 'A.A. 'Abbāsī, Atashkada, p. 62.

3. Ḥabīb, p. 556; Rawdat al-Ṣafawīyya, f. 101b.
Shāh Ismā‘īl loved Sām Mīrzā very much. On the day that the ceremony of cutting his hair (‘Aqlqa) was observed, the King showed great enthusiasm. On this little episode the author of the Rawdat al-Ṣafawīyya has left the following comment (which does not appear in other histories):

However, Sām Mīrzā, still in the tutelage of his tutor Dūrmīsh Khān (who died six months after Shāh Ismā‘īl in 930/1524), was appointed as the new governor of

1. For ‘Aqlqa or “Akika”, or “the cutting of the hair” in the world of Islam, see Donaldson, op. cit., p. 3 where the author says:

"In 8 A.H. one of his [Muḥammad the Prophet] concubines, Mary the Copt, who had been sent to him by the Governor of Egypt, bore him a son. The boy was called Ibrāhīm. Muḥammad was delighted at the birth of his son, and the seventh day afterwards he observed the ceremony of the Akika, or the cutting of the hair with which the child came into the world. It is related that on this occasion he sacrificed a sheep, as is still customary, and when the baby's head had been shaved, he gave the equal weight of the hair in silver as alms to the poor, and commanded that the hair should be buried. The ceremony of the Akika had to do with the shaving of the hair of the child."

2. Rawdat al-Ṣafawīyya, p. 104a. For its translation see chapter II, the Coins of Shāh Ismā‘īl, p. 140.

Khorāsān in 928/1522, after Amir Khān was summoned back to Tabrīz. He arrived in Herāt on Wednesday 19 Dhu-l-Ḥijja of the same year.

We are told that Sām Mīrzā because of the people's instigation rebelled against Shāh Ṭahmāsb at the end of 936/1529. Sām Mīrzā rebelled again in 939/1532 and again in 941/1534, at which time he went to Qandahār, but later on asked for Shāh Ṭahmāsb's pardon. He is said to have risen against Shāh Ṭahmāsb for the last time in 969/1561, but to have been arrested. According to one report he was imprisoned in the fort of Qahqaha, but some other chronicles state the opinion that he retired to Shaikh Šafī's resting-place and began a new life.

The sources are full of information about his personality. The author of Majma' al-Khawāṣṣ states:

"He loved feasting and drinking wine. He was of a witty and relaxed nature as expressed in all kinds of verse and prose. He composed a poetic biography called Sāmi, and at the end of his life retired to Shaikh Šafī's retreat and began writing poetry. His Tuhfa is a

1. Ḥabīb, p. 588.
3. Ibid.; Ilch1, f. 42a.
   Cf. Dickson, op. cit., p.293 where he gives the date as in Sha'bān 942/January 1536. For more details on this rebellion see also ibid. pp. 289-295.
6. Ilch1, f.77b; cf. Tuhfa, p. 2.
7. Majma' al-Khawāṣṣ p. 23; Ilch1, f.77b, and Dānishmandān, p. 117.
valuable relic because in it are preserved imitations of Jamīl's Bahārīstān, Mīr 'Alī Shīr Naqī's Majālis al-Nafa'ūs and the Tadhkīrat al-Shuʿarā of Daulatshāh of Samarqand. In his Tuḥfa, Sām Mīrzā mentioned nearly 6,664 poets of his period. The late Muḥammad 'Alī Tarbiyat claimed to have seen about 6,000 couplets of poetry in a Diwān attributed to Sām Mīrzā. The final word on the subject comes from the author of Khulasat al-Akhbār, in which the author states:

"The Mathnawi of Yūsuf wa Zulaykhā by Sām Mīrzā is well known in most parts of Ṭrāq and in most of the cities of Azarbāyjān. Its charming couplets are very widely read and are on the tip of everyone's tongue. His poems run to more than eight thousand verses. He also composed a Shāh-nāma for Shāh Ṭahmāsb."

Sām Mīrzā is believed to have been killed in 974/1566.

2. See Dānishmandān, pp. 176-8 where he gives the verses quoted below as an example of Sām Mīrzā's poetry:

   "ای هر بحری لر دواد روز کرده 
   ای هر بیان عاطفه را نگری
   آ زندگی را در زندگی جهان بیه
   درد که کف کرای همه رسوه
   درد شاد و زیبایی جهان گرده..."

   Cf. Rawdat al-Salāṭīn, p. 71 where the author gives the following example:

   "یمایی مزیتی کاری که پیامگزاری نماید"
   and Majmāʿ al-Khwās, p. 23 for the following example:

   "وزگان که مستعفی آن کنار خود کرد
   با آدم کسانی در دکتر شد
   " بنام شیفید کسی که را تست
   Dānishmandān, p. 177 where the author states:

   "The chronogram "Daulat-i Ṭahmāsb Shud Baz" according to abjad calculation stands for 974/1566; cf. Tuḥfa, where the editor on p. 2 gives 984 A.H."
But according to D'Alessandri, he was killed by Shah Tahmasb himself. 1

IV. Rustam Mirza:

According to Habib al-Siyar, Rustam Mirza was born four days before the birth of Bahram Mirza, on Friday 26 Shaban 923/13 Sept. 1517. 2 Unfortunately this is all that we could draw from the sources on Rustam Mirza. 3

V. Bahram Mirza:

Bahram Mirza was the fifth son of Shah Isma'il and he was born on Thursday 1 Ramadan 923/17 Sept. 1517 in the summer-quarters of Surluq between Tabriz and Maragheh. 4 It is

1. However, D'Alessandri on p. 213 states:

"...For this reason the King caused him (Ilqas Mirza) to be killed, as he had already done to Saine Mirisce, his second brother, fearing lest he also should rise against him...."

Unfortunately Ghaffari finishes his Jahan-ara in 972/1564 and Ahsan does not mention anything on Sam Mirza either in vol. I, p. 433, or on pp. 476-490 under the years 984-985 A.H. On the other hand the author of Ilchi-yi Nizam Shah notes Shah Tahmasb's hate towards Sam Mirza, states that his amirs advised him not to leave Sam Mirza in Herat; but he answered:

See Ilchi, f. 52b under the year 942 A.H.

2. Habib, p. 556; Jahann Gusha, f. 263b; Rawdat al-Safawiyya, f. 101a.


4. Habib, p. 556; Atashkada, p. 49.
said that he was appointed to rule Khurāsān after Sām Mirzā's dismissal in 936/1529.\(^1\) His relationship with his full brother Ṭahmāsb Mirzā and with his other brothers was particularly good. It is worth noting that Shāh Ṭahmāsb's daughter Gauhar Sultān Khānum was the wife of Bahrām Mirzā's son Ibrāhīm Mirzā.\(^2\) We have seen that Bahrām was the man who brought Ilqās Mirzā to Ṭahmāsb. Bahrām Mirzā died on Friday 4 Ramaḍān 956/1549.\(^3\) By Shāh

\(^1\) Tārīkh-i Sultānī, f. 303a; Ātashkada, p. 49; cf. Dānishmandī, p. 51 where Tarbiyat states that Bahrām's tutor was called Ghāzī Khān Takallū Muhrdār (the seal keeper) who was the Governor of Baghdad (for several years) and Herāt (936-939).


"..."See Ilchī, f. 68b-69a.

\(^3\) Ahsan, p. 342. Jahān-āra, p. 299 under the year 956/1549 has this to say:

"..."See Ilchī, f. 68b-69a.


Hidāyat gives 955/1548; cf. Ilchī, f. 68b under 956 A.H. The author of Tārīkh-i Sultānī gives the year 926 A.H. for the birth of Bahrām Mirzā; he is wrong. The author on f. 303a has this to say:
Tahmāsb's order he was buried in Mashhad. Bahram Mirzā was thirty-three years old when he died. He left three sons: Sultan Ḥusain Mirzā who died in 981/1576 in Qandahār, Sultan Ibrāhīm Mirzā and Badiʿ al-Zamān Mirzā. Sultan Ibrāhīm Mirzā, the son-in-law of Shāh Tahmāsb I, his full uncle, like his father was a poet. The following poems are attributed to Bahram Mirzā:

"Oh Bahram, in this passionate world, How long will you be proud of being you? In this desert, the hunter of life has at each step cast a thousand Bahrams into the grave."

The second example:

"Oh King of the earth, the age would not be without you, In the world of this era, your sign (shadow) should not be omitted. The ultimate desire of the world is you, so the world should not be without you. The happiness of all existence emanates from you; so this mortal existence should not be without you."

1. Ahsan, I, p. 342; Ātashkada, pp. 50-51; Tārīkh-i Sultānī, f. 303a; Majmaʿ al-Fuṣāhā, I, p. 30. Cf. Muntazam, p. 148 where the author states that Sultan Ḥusain Mirzā died in Qandahār in 984/1576; Dānishmandān, pp. 18-21 for a discussion of Ibrāhīm Mirzā's admirable personality and of his writings, including poetry.
"Although the prayers of my heart have been for successes in life, I do not know what I have gained except heartbreak."

"Alas! We are all dreamy idealists.
Behind a dark curtain of error,
We pass our time in sinful fantasies,
And because of our soul-sickness we are all in pain."

VI. Sultan Husain Mirza:

The only source which mentions him is the Tarikh-i Sultanî. The author states that Sultan Husain Mirza was

2. Tuhfa, pp. 9-10. Of Bahrâm Mirza, his brother Sâm Mirza states: "ئھروت نتختہ ضمینہ سام پیل 37 ہلائی و ان کے میں خیال ضمینے 52 اسے پیل ہے۔

For more details on Bahrâm Mirza see Habib, p. 556; Ahsan, p. 342; Tarikh-Sultanî, f. 303a; Jahan-ara, p. 299. On Shâh Tamâsb's attitude towards Bahrâm Mirza see Ray, op.cit., p.33; Ilchâ, ff. 68b-69a.
born in 925/1519, but there is no further information about him.¹

---

¹ Tarikh-i-Sultānī, f. 303a where the author indicates:

"دولت سلطان صين مرزا، سبب پرند انتظار و یک پرند مثل شده و از آن سرگذشت؟"

Cf. D'Alessandri's statement on the sons of Shāh Ismā'īl:

"There only remained one brother, who had a principality in India. And the King (Ṭahmāsb), wishing to marry him to one of his daughters, sent to summon him, but the people would never consent to tell him go to Casmen (Qazvin), fearing lest he should do him some harm."


It should be noted here that D'Alessandri's statement is not correct since according to Islamic law, a brother could not marry a member of his immediate family. As we have learned, it was Sultān Ibrāhīm Mīrzā b. Bahrām Mīrzā who married Gauhar Sultān Khanum, daughter of Shāh Ṭahmāsb.

For more details see Tarbiyat, Dānishmandān, p. 18 where the author states that the prince was given the governorship of Khurāsān after this marriage. For more accurate details see A.A. 'Abbāsī, p. 102 where Iskandar Munshi states:

"ولو جدیده کرده، نیازی ندارد که بیشترین نفع سلطان ابراهیم میرزا، ولد مرحوم بیژن میرزا یاده عزیز بنویست، که در هر زمان و هر زمانی دختر فرنشیزی دختر نداشت."

For the prohibition of marriages of close relatives see A. Fyzee, Outlines of Muhammadan Law, (London 1964), pp. 100-1.
PART THREE

Shāh Ismā'īl's Daughters.

There are varying statements about the number of Shāh Ismā'īl's daughters, the number ranging from five to fifteen. Only six can be identified by name and have biographical information available from the histories of the time.

According to contemporary sources, these daughters were:

1. Pari Khān Khānum
2. Shāh Zainab Khānum
3. Mahīn Bānū Khānum
4. Khānish Khānum
5. Khair al-Nisā Baygum

Except in the case of Mahīn Bānū Khānum, Khānish Khānum, Khair al-Nisā Baygum and Pari Khān Khānum, there seems to be no information about exactly who married Shāh Ismā'īl's other daughters. But we know that Amīr Najm Thānī, Sultān Khalīl, the King of Shīrvān, 'Abd Allāh Khān b. Qarā Khān Üstājlū, Muẓaffar Sultān & Sayyid Na'īm al-Dīn Ni'mat Allāh Thānī were all Shāh Ismā'īl's sons-in-law.

1. See Aḥsan, I, p. 183; Tārīkh Sultānī, f. 303a where the author says:

"...ذمزمان شاه اسماعیل بانزده فرزند دن. لیل میهن با نز سلطان کم ستیب رک و نیمه تیر یاراد."...and...

فانی خانم کم نماز گرفت و نازه عربانم کم احتیال ابیدین حمل نشست و

و کلگه خانم وده فرز دختر ابیدین حمل نشست.

After Amir Najm Thānī was murdered in Ghūjduwān in 918/1512, Shāh Ismā'īl's daughter who was Amir Najm's wife was brought to Tabrīz by way of Samarqand and on a camel, while the camel-drivers feasted and drank with her. This was done, (it is suggested) in order to insult and humiliate Shāh Ismā'īl, and damage his reputation which was mentioned before. 1

Parī Khān Khānum was one of Shāh Ismā'īl's daughters who married Sultān Khalīl the King of Shīrvān in 926/1520-1 at Bunāb near Marāgheh. 2 She stayed in Shīrvān till 943/1536 and it was in this year that she had a quarrel with Shāhrukh Sultān (the new ruler) and left Shīrvān to go to her brother Tāhmāsb Mīrzā and incited him to attack Shīrvān. Of her life there is nothing much known but a few words. 3

---

2. The contemporary sources generally differ from each other. Ḥabīb gives the date of his marriage as 926 A.H. (see p. 570); Jahan-ārā, 927 A.H. (p. 280); Lubāb gives between 925 and 926 A.H. (pp. 257-8); Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 91, gives 927-28/1521-22 and locates it in "Nabāb (sic) by Marāgheh." In the Inqilāb- Islām the author believes the reason for Shāh Ismā'īl giving his daughter to Sultān Khalīl was to break off the relationship between Sultān Salīm and Sultān Khalīl after the Battle of Chaldirān (pp. 480-1).
3. ʿĀĀ. ʿAbbāsī, p. 135. Cf. also
As 'Azīz Āḥmad states in his article:

"According to the Tārīkh-i 'Ālam-ārā-yi 'Abbāsī ... Tahmāsp (1524-76) was not pleased with the two panegyrics sent by Muḥtasham Kāshāi from Kāshān in praise of the Šāfawīd monarch and the Princess Pārī Khan Khānum...."¹

Mahīn Bānū Sulṭānum: (born in 925/1519; died in 969/1561.)²

Very little information about Mahīn Bānū Sulṭānum has come to light. However, it is said that she was very wise as she took pity on the fugitive monarch, Humāyūn b. Bābur, who visited Iran on his way to Mecca in 950/1543.³ Shah Ṭahmāsp sent a message to Humāyūn that if he would accept the Shiʿa formula, he would give Humāyūn all necessary help; otherwise he would be burned alive. According to Sukumar's statement, Mahīn Bānū Sulṭānum pleaded with her royal brother pointing out that "he was already surrounded on all sides by enemies - Turks, [Öz-Beks,] Circassians and Europeans and (that if he were to do injury at this point to Humāyūn he would create more enemies, for his sons and brothers would one day take

---

¹ Ilchī, f. 52a.
2 'Azīz Āḥmad, op. cit., p. 117. Cf. 'Ā.Ā. 'Abbāsī, p. 135 where Iskandar Munshī records the above story rather differently.
3 See Jahān-ārā, p. 307; Muntāzam, p. 140.
4 See Ray, op.cit., p.29.
revenge and that it was advisable to let Humāyūn go if he could not help him. The Shāh was convinced of the justice of his sister's arguments and changed his mind.  1

It is also said that Sulṭānum showed a verse by Humāyūn to Shāh Tahmāsb which proved that Humāyūn already loved the Prophet's son-in-law. The verse reads as follows:

We are told that "in Aq-Ziyārat which is the last stage before the summer-quarter (of Jūrūq)," 3 Sulṭānum was beside Shāh Tahmāsb on horseback which proves her influence over her brother who prohibited all women from riding horses. 4

Mahīn Bānū Sulṭānum died in 969/1561 and was buried in Qum. 5 Hasan Rūmlū says of her:

"Mahīn Bānū Khanīnum or Sulṭānum, the full sister (of Shāh Tahmāsb), was born in 925/(1519) and died on Wednesday 14 Jumādā I 969/(1561)." 6

The author of the Jahān-ārā indicates that her death was at midnight on Wednesday 14 Jumādā I 969/(1561) after Shāh Tahmāsb's return from fishing in Tārum. 7

1. Ray, op.cit., p.341
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Jahān-ārā, p. 307; Ahsan, I, p. 418; Tārīkh Sulṭānī, f. 303a; Muntāzam, p. 140.
7. See Jahān-ārā, p. 307.
Khānish Khānum:

There seems to be considerable confusion about the details of the life of this person. Ghulām Sarwar states:

Amīra Dūbbāj, who had succeeded his father, Ḥusāmuddīn, in the governorship of Rasht and Fūman, was suppressed by Durmīsh Khān Shamlū without resorting to arms.1 He was brought to Hamadān at the Shāh's camp, where he celebrated the marriage of the Shāh's daughter, Khānish Khānum, with himself and gained the title of 'Muẓaffar Sulṭān'.

This statement seems to be incorrect as we have evidence that his wife was named Khair al-Nisā Baygum.3 However, Savory's statement on Khānish Khānum seems correct. He notes that "after the Safawīd conquest of Persia, the Ni'mat Allāhs were held in the highest respect. Shāh Nūr al-Ḍīn Ni'mat Allāh Baql, the son of Amīr 'Abd al-Ḍāqī the Sadr, married Khānish Begum, the sister (hamshīra) of Shāh Ṭahmāsp....."4

The date of Khānish Khānum's birth was 912/15075 and, according to Ḥasan Rūmī, she died in 971/1563, and was buried at Karbala' in Imam Ḥusain's tomb according to her wish.6 Her husband, Sayyid Na'im al-Ḍīn (or Nūr al-Ḍīn) Ni'mat Allāh Thānī, became sick and died during the same

2. Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 91. Unfortunately the author of the Fārs-nāma under the year 925/1519 (p. 98) agrees with Ghulām Sarwar.
Khair al-Nisā Baygum:

It is not known when Khair al-Nisā Baygum was born. However, it is known that she was the wife of Amīra Dūbbāj (اَمْیراء دُربِج) who was the ruler of Gilān and Fūman. She must have been some years older than Shāh Ṭahmāsb as she was of marriageable age in 925/1519.²

The author of Tārīkh-i Gilān, in substantial agreement with other chroniclers, gives the following account of the marriage:

"When Shāh Ismā’īl Ṣafawī captured Iraq, Āzarbāyjān, Fārs and several provinces of Kurdistan and Arabistān (‘Irāq-i ‘Arab), he settled down in Sultāniyya and began feasting and drinking, enjoying life and having a relaxing holiday. His dignitaries of state gave him an account of the capture of Gilān. Although the amīrs and rulers of the Lāhījān provinces had given a warm reception to the Ṣafawīd government’s envoys, and had accorded them the same kind of hospitality as had been extended previously to Shāh Ismā’īl during his exile, Amīra Dūbbāj, son of Amīra Ḥāfiz, the ruler of Rasht and the provinces of Gilān (the Biyeh Pas) made the mistake of choosing a different policy from that of the other rulers.

---

1. ʿAḥsan, p. 422; cf. also Jahan-āra, p. 309 (under the year 971 (1563)); Haft Iqlīm, Fasc. 2, p. 176 and Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 91.

2. Lubb, p. 257 (under the year 925 A.H.) and Jahan-āra, p. 279 (under the year 925 A.H.) both give 925/1519 as the date of this marriage, but the author of Tārīkh-i Gilān on the contrary gives 923/1517. See op. cit., p. 11; Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 91; and Nava, op. cit., pp. 308-9 (who also agrees with Ghulām Sarwar).
He rebelliously declared himself to be an independent governor. As a result Shāh Ismā'īl had sent Ḥusain Beg Lala to Gilān to bring him to a more sensible way of thinking. Meanwhile, Amīra Dūbbāj realized his mistake and sent Maulānā 'Abdullāh Tūlī ( '\ \ ) and Khālīfa Sayyid 'Ali Fūmanī to the Shāh's camp in Qazvīn with generous presents. After accepting his homage, Shāh Ismā'īl gave Amīra Dūbbāj his daughter, Khair al-Nīsā Baygum to be his bride. To show his respect for his bride and for the King, Amīra Dūbbāj (who was in Rasht) ordered all his ministers, amīrs, army commanders and provincial rulers (the lords of the provinces of Fūman, Rasht, Tūlīm, Māsūleḥ and Kūchīsfahān) to go out from Rasht to welcome the princess. A huge crowd of people formed this welcoming party. So large was the crowd that it stretched from the banks of the Qizil-Uzūn at the border of the province of Puštḵūn right to the village of Māsūleḥ and up to Amīra Ḥusain al-Dīn's state. Further along the route of the princess's journey Amīra Dūbbāj ordered the chiefs and the well-to-do citizens, the ministers and amīrs of Rasht and Kūchīsfahān to go to Tūlsara-ī Mākulwān(?) to welcome the bride. Everyone was to bring a suitable present for the princess, according to his means. The wedding procession travelled from Qazvīn, moving at the relaxed pace of about three farsakhs per day. As they travelled the people sacrificed 150 sheep and cows at every stopping-place. Thousands of people set out to welcome her. When the bride and her party reached the Shanba Bāzar of Lūlmān (Qūz), they stayed there for a day and a night and on the following morning they were met by thousands of dancers and sightseers who were lining the roadside. Men and women danced ahead of the bride till the procession reached Fūman.

1. Tārīkh-i Gilān, p. 11; Ghulām Sarwar, (op. cit., p. 91) rejects this statement and states that it was Khānīsh Khānum who married Muẓaffar Sulṭān in Bunāb, Marāğhehāra (not Nabāb as he states).
2. Tārīkh-i Gilān, p. 11.
3. Ibid., pp. 11-16.
Amīra Dūbbāj arrived in Fūman on Thursday 17 Shaʿbān 923/5 Sept. 1517, celebrated the consummation of the marriage there and then feasted for several days and nights consecutively. Then he set out for Rasht.\(^2\)

The author of the *Tārīkh-i Gilān* goes on to say:

"Khair al-Nisāʾ's death occurred on 5th Shaʿbān 938/1531\(^3\) in the summer-quarters at Māsūleḥ and her corpse was transported to Ardabil and buried in Shaikh Safī's tomb. To pay respect to her memory Amīra Dūbbāj made a bequest to one of the villages of Fūman in her name."\(^4\)

---

3. Ibid. *Jahan-āra* and *Lubb* do not confirm her death, neither does the author of Aḥsan. On the other hand, the author of *Ilchī* states that in 943/1536 Shāh Ẓahlāb on his way to Khurāsān intended giving his sister (the wife of Muẓaffar Sultaṅ as the author indicates) to Shāh Qiwām al-Dīn Nūrbakhsh but he refused to marry her. Shāh Ẓahlāb became angry and left his house. Later on, on his way back from Khurāsān, Shāh Ẓahlāb ordered his arrest and sent him to the Port of Alinjiq and from then on no one saw him. For more detail see *Ilchī*, ff. 55b-56a. Cf. Savory, Ph.D. thesis, p. 149.
4. Ibid, p. 16. On the death of Muẓaffar al-Sultaṅ the author of Aḥsan gives full details under the year 942/1535 but Seddon omits some parts of the Persian text in his English translation. Seddon did not want to describe the way in which Shāh Ẓahlāb ordered the city to be decorated or who these singers were, though the Aḥsan makes it clear (in vol. I, pp. 273-274) and has this to say: \(^9\) A.H. 942
The same version more or less cited in Ilchî, ff. 51a-51b under the year 941/1534.

All these entertainments were intended as insults to the Shâh's ex-brother-in-law. The Shâh, because Muẓaffar Sulṭân had betrayed him and had taken refuge with Sulṭân Sulaimân II, burned the body of Muẓaffar Sulṭân in an iron cage, while at the same time he hanged Amîr Sa'd al-Dîn 'Inâyat Allâh Kühânî Vizier below the cage, by his testicles, and both men were burned together. (The second prisoner was executed because of his involvement with a certain boy called 'Iṣâ, son of Bâsîliq Beg, who was reported to have approached Amîr 'Inâyat with the intention of tempting him into sedition.) I find it puzzling that Seddon omitted such passages from his translation even though they contain many remarkable facts. See Ahsan, vol. I, p. 274 and Vol. II, p. 125:

However, the statement given by the author of Ilchî-yi Nîzân Shâh on Muẓaffar Sulṭân's wife differs from that given above. The author states that:

For more details see Ilchî, f. 87a.
PART Four

Shāh Ismā'īl and Women.

There is almost nothing said about Shāh Ismā'īl's wives, or about his dealings with other women, in the Ḥabīb al-Siyar, Jahān-ārā, Lubb al-Tawārīkh, Aḥsan al-Tawārīkh and 'Ālam-ārā-yi 'Abbāsī. On the other hand some anonymous contemporary historians did mention the names of some of the Shāh's women in passing, and these brief references deserve consideration.

The general condition of women changed little between the period after the Mongol invasion and the Ṣafawīd period. A woman was, it seems, valued for her beauty and for giving birth to male children.¹ Even nowadays these same criteria are applied to women in the villages of Azarbāyjān. It has already been mentioned that Shāh Ismā'īl had daughters before Shāh Ṭahmāsb's birth but these were not considered to be of value to his family and, according to the Ilchī-yi Niẓām Shāh, Shāh Ismā'īl was not pleased about being a father because he had no son.² It was only after the birth of his first son, Ṭahmāsb, that he became excited.³ We also know that before Shāh Ismā'īl's death there was no mention made

---

1. For more details see chapter V, p.331 and Shāh Ṭahmāsb. Cf. also Ilchī, f. 24b.
2. Ibid.
(in contemporary records) of the birth dates of his daughters.\(^1\)

It seems then, that, women in Iran in \(\text{Shāh Ismā'īl}'s\) day were considered inferior to men. They had no legal rights or personal liberty, and no say in using their private wealth. In view of this it is perhaps surprising that during \(\text{Shāh Ismā'īl}'s\) reign some women actually went into battle along with their husbands so that they could share their sorrows and joys.\(^2\) Moreover, \(\text{Shāh Ismā'īl}'s\) two wives were given the highest respect by his subjects because of their goodness.

Although one must not neglect to mention the life and status of those women who were sacrificed to the sensuality of the rich and the corrupt, one cannot accept the claim made by the Venetian merchant who declared of the women of Tabrīz, as a whole, at that period (10th/16th century):

"All the Persian women, and particularly in Tabrīz are wanton."\(^3\)

---

1. Except in \(\text{Tārīkh-i Sultānī}, \text{f. 303a} \) (Mahin Bānū Sultānum who was born in 905/1499) and \(\text{Jahān-nārā} \) (p. 309) for the second daughter, \(\text{Khānīsh Baygum} \), who was born in 912/1506.

2. For more details about women's activities before and after \(\text{Shāh Ismā'īl I} \), see "The Travels of a Merchant in Persia" p. 172; D'Alessandri, op. cit., p. 219; Falsafī, \(\text{Zindigānī} \), vol. II, pp. 198-248; Jāmī, \(\text{Diwān} \), ed. by H. Ṭagī, (Tehran, 1341), p. 44.

For the purpose of analysing the status of women in Iran during or around Shāh Ismā'īl's reign, we may identify four groups: those who were not referred to by the historians of that time; prostitutes; women who lived at court; and women praised for their courage and manliness.

Since little can be said by definition about the first group we may now discuss prostitutes (including male prostitutes and catamites).

As has been mentioned in previous pages,\(^1\) active or passive sodomy was a common practice in 10th/16th century Iran and was often not punished. The kings even made political capital out of such people in certain circumstances. For instance, from the Aḥsan, "The Travels of a Merchant in Persia" and Ilči, we learn that on two occasions Shāh Ismā'īl and Shāh Ṭahmāsb respectively wanted to insult their opponents, the ʿAq-qoyūnlū relatives in 908/1502 and Muẓaffar Sultān, the Shāh's one-time brother-in-law, in 942/1535. On the first occasion the Shāh killed 300 such women\(^2\) and on the second occasion Shāh Ṭahmāsb ordered that both sodomites and catamites should be gathered together to welcome Muẓaffar Sultān who was then burned, along with his personal vizier, Ḵhwāja Saʿd al-Dīn ʿInāyat Allāh Ḵūzānī.\(^3\) The latter was hung by

\(^{1.}\) See p.360.
\(^{2.}\) See "The Travels of a Merchant in Persia", pp. 190-1.
\(^{3.}\) See Aḥsan, vol. I, p. 274 where Rūmlū quotes:

\[940 + ب = 942/1535\]

See also Ilči, f. 52a.
his testicles beneath the cage which contained Muẓaffar Sultān.¹

Italian visitors to Iran during the period 913-983/1508-1575 recorded quite different observations on the position of women in Iranian society. The author of "The Travels of a Merchant in Persia" admired the beauty of the Persian women and their traditional costumes but condemned all the women, especially those of Tabrīz, as being shameless and loose-living. Prostitutes were prominent in public places and paid tax rated according to the beauty (and resultant business success) of each woman. What most shocked the merchant, however, was his discovery, in Tabrīz, of a school of sodomy.²

The narrative of the Most Noble Vincentio D'Alessandri concentrates on various kinds of women connected with the court of Shāh Ẓahmāsb. Georgian and Circassian noble-women brought to the royal harem as slaves formed the first class of women. Next came slaves who did not actually live in the palace, but worked elsewhere as servants of the Shāh. D'Alessandri thought most Persian women "ugly" though "of fine features and noble dispositions." He noticed their silk robes and the fact that they did not cover their faces in public.³

¹ Ahsan, I, p. 274; cf. also Ilchī, ff. 51a-52a.
³ D'Alessandri, op. cit., pp. 219 and 223. According to Ahsan (vol. I, p. 246) prostitution and sodomy were made illegal after the year 939/1532 during
There is a fourth group of women, some of whom deserve admiration for their bravery and "manliness". To introduce this group we may examine the part they played in the Battle of Chaldiran in 920/1514. After defeating Shah Isma'\'il's army and destroying most of it, Sultan Salim was at first afraid to order his soldiers to go in pursuit of the retreating men, or to plunder the camp that had been left behind. However, after he was sure that the Shah's army really had escaped from the battlefield, he ordered his soldiers to plunder their tents. After plundering the area of the camp and accumulating a great deal of booty, including gold, silver, and weaponry, the soldiers found the bodies of many women who had been killed or wounded on the battlefield. They wore men's clothes, including armour, their faces covered by the "Niq\'ab" veil.

By the account of Turkish, or even Persian historians, there were many women who had come along with their husbands to the battlefield in Qizil-Bash uniform to share the harshness of martyrdom with their husbands, and many were captured alive by Sultan Salim's army. Among the captives were two ladies from Shah Isma'\'il's harem.

the reign of Shah Tahm\'asb I. However these practices continued reaching the highest level of activity of the entire Safaw\'id period in the reign of Shah 'Abb\'as I (1587-1629). For more details see Falsafi, Zindigan, vol. III, pp. 54-63. For female slaves see Ilchi, f. 44a in Shah Tahm\'asb's court.

These were called Bihrūza Khānum and Tājlū Khānum. ¹

Falsafi quotes the Sahāyif al-Akbār to the effect

¹. However, Navāḥ in his work (op. cit., pp. 138-40) disagrees with the statement by the author of Jang-i Chāldirān or other sources cited above. It seems to me that he did not consult the above works except Jang-i Chāldirān, nor does he agree with the opinion of Falsafi, expressed in the latter's Jang-i Chāldirān, pp. 65-66. Navāḥ believes that there was no mention of this captive lady (Bihrūza Khānum) in any letters sent to Sulṭān Salīm (see Munšaʾāt, I, p. 418) by Shāh Ismāʿīl after this battle was over and Shāh Ismāʿīl regained the throne. Secondly, in the histories of the Ottoman historians, there exist many names of the ladies who were taken captive by the Ottoman troops, but no mention of Bihrūza Khānum. Thirdly, Shāh Ismāʿīl would not have wanted his wife (who had recently given birth to Tahmāsb, born in 919/1513, just seven months before the battle) to take part in the battle. However, in order to excuse his taking these women prisoners, Sulṭān Salīm made it known to everyone that this lady was Shāh Ismāʿīl's mistress, a false accusation. It might be true that, to save her own life, the lady had pretended to be Shāh Ismāʿīl's lady or his Mutʿah (concubine).

It seems that Navāḥ (and Falsafi) both did not notice the statements in A. A. Shāh Ismāʿīl (see Falsafi, Zindigānī, Appendix, vol. I, p. 240, "A. A. Shāh Ismāʿīl"), p. 527; Angioletto, op. cit., pp. 106-7; Inqilāb- Islām, pp. 225; Munšaʾāt, I, p. 418 - especially the following Turkish statements in Munšaʾāt, ibid.
that the Iranians used to take their wives with them into most of their battles so that they would be urged on by their ardour and zeal.¹ As mentioned already, in addition to the women who were taken prisoner alive there were also many women among the dead on the battlefield of Chădirăn. They were buried with full respect and military ceremonies, at the order of Sultan Salîm. These brave women, as the Turkish historians and others have mentioned, had participated in the battle fully armed. After that, many exaggerated stories developed on the theme of Shâh Ismâ‘îl's cavalry of 10,000 expert swordswomen.²

² Falsafi, Jang-i Chădirăn, p. 66.

However, according to the author of the Inqilâb- Islâm (p. 200), many women were taken as prisoners and parcelled out for the pleasure of the Ottoman soldiers. The Persian text runs as follows:

Evidence will be presented to show that the author of the Inqilâb- Islâm as well as many European scholars who followed the Turkish source was certainly in error when he introduced Tâjlu Khânûm as Shâh Ismâ‘îl's concubine. She was undoubtedly the mother of Shâh ûahmâsb I and had married Shâh Ismâ‘îl a few years after the conquest of Fîrûz Kûh
it is claimed, who had the type of bravery associated with Tājlū Baygum, could lead a troop of several hundred women followers, but numbers like these cannot be taken very seriously.

and the death of Ḫusain Kiyyā Chalavī in 909/1504. For more details see the section on Tājlū Baygum on p.374-82 of the present chapter.
PART Five

The Wives of Şâh Ismâ‘îl.

I. Bihrūza Khanum:

Unfortunately there seems to be no information about this lady's early years. However, historians say that she was among those ladies who were taken captive by Sultan Salîm I in 920/1514. It is said that after Şâh Ismâ‘îl's withdrawal, the ladies who were among the Qızıl-Bâsh were captured by Sultan Salîm’s troops and kept captive.

According to the author of the Târîkh-i Inqilâb- Islâm, many beautiful women were taken captive. Among them were two wives of Şâh Ismâ‘îl; one of them was Bihrūza Khanum. By the judicial decree pronounced by the muftî, Sultan Salîm married Bihrūza Khanum to Ja‘far Chalâbî Qâdî‘Askar, otherwise known as "Tâjzâda". But since Ja‘far Chalâbî acted against his promise, Sultan Salîm, who was waiting for an opportunity to punish him for taking sides against him at the Battle of Châldirân with the rebel Yenicheris, used this excuse to put him to death.¹

However, some historians believe that the reason for Tâjzâda's murder was not as simple as the Yenicheris' revolution. Şâh Ismâ‘îl's wife, Bihrūza Khanum, had become pregnant by Ja‘far, even though he was supposed to

¹. For more details see Inqilâb- Islâm, pp. 263-264 and Falsafî, Jang-i Châldirân, pp. 65-66 and 77-78.
be her husband only in name. When Sultan Salim gave
Bihruza Khânûm to Ja'far Chalabi in a ceremony of marriage
he gave this order to his Qâdî 'Askar: "I know that you
are an honourable man. This woman is already married;
she has not been divorced from her husband. I have given
her to you for safe keeping, not to be seduced by you,
or raped. I took this lady captive to break the heart of
Ardabîl Üghîlî (shâh Ismâ'îl), and the wife of anyone
who has made the pronouncement 'There is no God, but Him,'
is immune from sexual assault."¹ But when he discovered
that she was pregnant, Sultan Salim did not wish to
reveal this and thus damage his own reputation, so he
used the pretext of previous hostility towards himself
to order the death of Ja'far Chalabi. By committing this
murder, Salim was able to keep the secret of Bihruza
Khânûm until 926/1520 when he died and his son Sulaimân II
succeeded him.²

It is also remarkable that Sultan Salim did not want
to harm Bihruza Khânûm but simply to insult shâh Ismâ'îl.
Since a Shaikh's wife merits a Shaikh as a husband, he
gave Bihruza Khânûm to his Qâdî 'Askar, who was a Shaikh,
thus showing shâh Ismâ'îl that he knew that his wife
deserved Ja'far Chalabi, rather than one of his amîrs or

¹. Inqîlîb-ī Islâm , pp.263-4.
². Ibid.
Salīm himself, who was a Sultan. 1

Salīm may have had another reason for marrying Bihrūza Khānum to his Qādī 'Askar Ja'far Chalabī. He realised that if he did not send the lady back to Iran but kept her in his camp he might cause ill feeling among the Yeniçerî officers and soldiers or religious scholars. He managed to solve his dilemma by means of a religious act, and at the same time achieve his dishonourable aims. Since Qādī Tajzāda himself gave that fatwā he was, accordingly, given custody of the lady at the command of Sultan

1. Falsafī, Jang-i Chaldīrān, pp. 77-78 based on the Inqilāb- Islām, pp. 200, 263 and 264. This is in contrast to the statement by Nayā, op. cit., pp. 138-9 and 140, who does not believe that any of Shah Ismā'īl's wives were captured. This story does have some foundation and it will be discussed later in this chapter. See Habīb, p. 609 where Khwānd Amīr says:

However, Khwānd Amīr did not want to mention that the above envoy was in prison as the author of Munša'at in vol. I, p. 419 states that:

(Cited in Inqilāb- Islām, pp. 283, 289, 292; cf. Falsafī, Jang-i Chaldīrān, pp. 77-78).
Salim. This happened two months before the revolt of the Yenicheris.  

The Fate of Bihruza Khanum.

Although Shah Isma‘il requested a peace treaty with Sultan Salim several times he was unsuccessful. According to the author of Tārīkh-Inqilāb- Islām, in Shawwal 920/Sept.-Oct. 1514 Shah Isma‘il sent Amir ‘Abd al-Wahhab as an envoy to Sultan Salim and asked for the return of his wife. However, in order to insult Shah Isma‘il, with his highly developed sense of honour, Sultan Salim ordered his clerk to write an answer to Shah Isma‘il which read:

"Write to the Sufi Ughli that the Khwāndigār says: 'We married his wife according to the fatwā given by the learned Sunnite judges, to make Shah Isma‘il understand from his own experience the full import of the act of marrying the wives of Muslims to his Qızıl-Bash in the very presence of their real husbands. In those days Shah Isma‘il had acted by the fatwā of his heretic Mullās, who were lovers of this world, murdering the learned chiefs and amirs among the Sunnites of Iran and burning them alive. He took captive Muslim virgins and treated them as they would have treated their unbelieving (non-Muslim) captives, and made presents of them to his amirs or took them himself to make love to them. He also forced

1. Jang-i Chaldiran, pp. 77-78.
2. Ḥabīb, p. 609; Inqilāb- Islām, pp. 283, 289 and 292. Munsha Ṣar, vol. I, p. 419, where the author states that these envoys (namely Kamāl al-Dīn Husain Beg and Mir ‘Abd al-Wahhab, as the author of the Inqilāb-Islām, p. 225 and Ḥabīb, p. 609 say) were imprisoned by Salim in the "Demotica" prison in the fort of "Gallipoli".
youths into sodomy or gave them to people to use them as cup-bearers or to make love to - all this without understanding the vengeance of the Mighty God....

Beyond the information given by the author of the Tārīkh-i Inqilāb- Islam, there seems to be no information about the fate of Bihruza Khānum apart from the fact that the same author as well as the author of the Munsha’āt adds that Bihruza Khānum remained in Salīm’s custody till 15th Ramaḍān 921/23Sept. 1515 while he was out hunting, Sulṭān Salīm ordered her to be sent a horse-drawn coach with nine attendants and slaves, besides 5,000 "Āqcha" (money equal to 83 tumān of Qājār currency), to take her from the Qādī’s house to Edirne. Later on Sulṭān Salīm ordered that this entourage should remain in her service for her lifetime. And this was the last information given by the above authors about Bihruza. Khānum. 2

II. Tājlū Baygum (Khānum):

Contrary to the view of many historians that she was


The Persian text according to the Inqilāb- Islam runs as follows:

... روز یا نذردم سال ای شما در مراسم سلطان سلیم در شما که بوده، نیز دستگاه کاملک ... اما و روز خام، سرا و گذشت شی غلام و بینن زرآ چنینی مینشاد و سرانه تیمی در درخواست را که در خانه همیلی گذاشته که فاس ، مک کر متقن بود ، از مسلمانان دارد راز که یا بیاوریز ، وزارت ها که اکنون هم مال نو دری نیا باید یک
Shāh Ismā'īl's concubine,1 Tājlu Baygum was his wife and the mother of Shāh Ṭahmāsb I, Bahram Mirzā and Princess Mahīn Bānū Sultānum.2 On the downfall of the Āq-qoyūnlū dynasty, she took refuge with her relatives in Ḥusain Kiyā Chalāvī's fortress in Firūzkūh. They remained there till Shāh Ismā'īl invaded the fort in 909/1503 and captured the Āq-qoyūnlū tribes-people there, among whom he discovered this lady.

According to the history Ilchī-yi Niẓām Shāh, the king went into the fort out of mere curiosity, but caught sight of this lady among the captives. And according to this verse:

"I saw you and lost the option of my heart,
Yes, because of eyes, the function of the heart is not in order."3

1. See Inqilāb- Islām, p. 200; cf. also Falsafī, Jang-i Chāldirān, pp. 77-8 and many other modern works who erroneously call her concubine rather than wife.

2. See Ḥabīb, p. 531; Ahsan, pp. 183 and 418; Ilchī, f. 12b; ‘A.A. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 80; Angiolello, op. cit., pp. 106-107; ‘A.A. ‘Abbāsī, p. 33.

3. Ilchī, f. 12b where the unique Persian text runs:

However, Angiolello has a different version of the
Shāh Ismā'īl fell in love with her and ordered her to be kept under house-arrest in the tent of one of his amīrs till she reached marriageable age. After the marriage the king called his wife Tajlū Khānum.¹

Angiolello has discussed the circumstances of Shāh Ismā'īl's getting acquainted with Tajlū Baygum, and his choosing her as his wife. Obviously this could not have been the king's first marriage, because according to the Tarīkh-i Sulṭānī (f. 303a), Mahīn Baynū Sulṭānūm was born in 905/1499. But it is very surprising that a similar statement also appears in the 'Ālam-ārā-yi Shāh Ismā'īl.

story which goes as follows:
"After the victory over Murād Khān Āq-qoyūnlū, before returning to Tauris, all his friends counselled him to marry; but while he was considering this step, they could find no lady worthy of such a match. At length, after many discussions, they said that a certain lord had a lady in his house, a granddaughter of Sultan Jacob (Yaʿqūb), the son of Ussun Cassano, who was beautiful and named Taslucanūm (Tajlū Khānum)."

It seems that Angiolello and the author of 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl both used the same source. See Angiolello, op. cit., p. 106. Cf. also 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 80.

1. Ilchi, f. 12².
The author states:

"When Šāh Ismāʿīl overcame Sulṭān Murād, he stayed in Hamadān for a while, and it was there that his commanders advised him about the daughter of 'Abidīn Beg Shāmlū, that 'she is unique in her beauty and bravery, and has no competitor whatsoever. She is in the habit of wrestling with her brother Dūrmīsh Kāhn, but defeats him every time.' 1 After Šāh Ismāʿīl heard about her beauty and bravery, he sent a proposal to her father but her father replied:

'Since we are your humblest slaves and my daughter is utterly at your mercy, you could give her to anyone you choose. However, my daughter makes one condition: anyone who can defeat her by strength or by sword, or in wrestling, will win the right to be her husband. I will ask her to confirm this.' 2

So the father applied directly to the girl and was given the same story that was given to the envoys, except that she told her father:

'If another envoy comes, tell him that you have spoken to me and had my answer, that I am the Šāh's slave. I am not pretty enough to wed with a king, but I want him to promise me that he will not forbid me to take up weapons in time of war, or to be free to take part with him in battle at any time that he goes to war.' 3

'Abidīn Beg informed Ḫusain Beg Lāla of the conditions she had set, and Lāla conveyed the information to Šāh Ismāʿīl. The Šāh accepted these conditions and made the further promise that Tājīlū Baygūm would be at the head of his harem. So, with the assistance of Mullā ʿAḥmad Ardaβīlī, Tājīlū Baygūm was married to Šāh Ismāʿīl at an appropriate time. Then the Šāh gave her the title Tājīlū Khānum and held a feast in the winter-quarters of Hamadān. Later on this lady became the mother of Ṭahmāsb Mīrzā the Crown Prince." 4

1. 'Ā.Ā. Šāh Ismāʿīl, p. 80.
2. Ibid. p. 81.
3. Ibid.
4. 'Ā.Ā. Šāh Ismāʿīl, pp. 81-82; cf. 'Ā.Ā. 'Abbāsī, p. 33.
Iranian historians refer to her captivity following the Battle of Châldirân with irony and only briefly. For instance Şâm Mirzâ states:

"He [Mirzâ Shâh ʻHusain], because of the excellent service he gave to [Shâh Ismâ‘îl] during the Battle of Châldirân, was appointed as the Minister of Khâqân Šâhib Qirân Maghûr... (the late Shâh Ismâ‘îl)."

Because of Tâjû Khanûm's love, Shâh Ismâ‘îl apparently honoured Mirzâ Shâh Ḥusain by appointing him one of his powerful ministers and granted the head of his court to this exceptional human being. Mirzâ Shâh Ḥusain Mu‘mâr who had rescued two women from the harem of Shâh Ismâ‘îl and had brought them to Shâh Ismâ‘îl at Dargazâin. The Shâh commanded all his āmirâs and governors to obey Mirzâ Shâh Ḥusain and not to interfere in any of his undertakings. He was to be an independent minister, responsible for every aspect of the government of the kingdom. 2


However, it seems unlikely that Abû Bakr Tehrânî could have written any such history as the Tarikh Jahan-ûrâ, as he was a contemporary of Hasan Beg Aq-qoyûnlû, who died in 882-3/1478. Falsafi certainly seems to have been misled by the Tarikh Jahan Gushâ-yi Khâqân, since the same quotation appears in the above-
The real reason for Mirzâ being given such honour was, as is mentioned, that after Tajlû Khanum was captured by Sultan Salîm, she was sent to the tent of Masîh Pasha Zâda, and after staying two nights there, mentioned manuscript, word for word, as follows:

"...Bâbâ, va sahîh, wa asanâh, man a-ma'âm ilâ bi'lîbît, jîn nasab, tâmâm wa ta'a-nûfî mawâfî qa'd. Man asemb, asemb ra-z, bi jâhân is salâm, asebabil mu'âkîn dar adâm. Nûfuq wa 2-wad, hizâ, wa 3-dawîn, 4-riyâk, dar shâb i, sa-râk. Dar adâm'i, râz dar zâmân, fî håshâya, laqîn, wa 4-wad, 5-a'sâh, 6-muzâm, 7-5-darbi, 8-2-dârbi, 9-bahsh, 10-lu'ayn, 11-nâwâl, 12-dorînîn, 13-dar adâm'i, 14-mu'zî, 15-3-3, 16-4-4, 17-lu'ayn. Dar adâm'i, fî håshâya, laqîn, wa 4-wad, 5-a'sâh, 6-muzâm, 7-5-darbi, 8-2-dârbi, 9-bahsh, 10-lu'ayn, 11-nâwâl, 12-dorînîn, 13-dar adâm'i, 14-mu'zî, 15-3-3, 16-4-4, 17-lu'ayn. Dar adâm'i, fî håshâya, laqîn, wa 4-wad, 5-a'sâh, 6-muzâm, 7-5-darbi, 8-2-dârbi, 9-bahsh, 10-lu'ayn, 11-nâwâl, 12-dorînîn, 13-dar adâm'i, 14-mu'zî, 15-3-3, 16-4-4, 17-lu'ayn.


However, the Ilchî, contrary to the above-mentioned statement, gives the following version on fol. 27b:

"When Shâh Ismâ'îl withdrew from Châldîrân and went towards Sulînâniyya, Tajlû Khânûm, who had escaped to Khûy (the winter palace), stayed in the house of the Governor of Khûy, and when the king came to Tabrîz, she came to Tabrîz too. Shâh Ismâ'îl was very happy to see her safe and the Governor of Khûy was promoted as one of his amîrs for having looked after Tajlû Khânûm."

1. Unlike all the other historians who deal with the Battle of Châldîrân, the author of the Inqîlâb-Islâm says that Tajlû Khânûm:
gave him as tribute a pair of her earrings one of which was broken by Shāh Ismā'īl when he was drunk one night. According to the Tarikh-İnqilâb-ı İslâm, she put on men's clothes and escaped on horseback from Salîm's camp without anyone else seeing her.\(^1\) She was tired and injured when Mirzâ Shâh Ḥusain found her by the wayside and took her straight to Dargazîn (north of Hamadân).\(^2\) It was after this that he became the Shâh's chief minister.\(^3\)

Tâjî Khanûm was loved by Shâh Ismâ'īl beyond all measure. According to the unique version of İlçâh, Shâh Ismâ'īl placed her at the head of his harem and as she was his favourite wife he was always happy and pleasantly disposed in her company, and always tried to keep her happy and satisfied.

It is also said in support of the accounts of Shâh Ismâ'īl's affection for this lady, that if any of Shâh Ismâ'īl's ministers, amîrs or court attendants who were

\[\text{'A.ā. Shâh Ismâ'īl (p. 530) who says:}\]

... در مض خان بانگئی میزآ شاه‌خین ... اصل خرم‌ را بردارسته بم زرفست وراز اشرف بدیران کتابیت راهنابی طرف ورفت میزآ شاه خین را عرض بردن ... زرفت کتابیت قبیشان آن طرف درده ... ربار خنابان خان لقب زردند و طرف طالا بم زرفبت اوسامه و ربار فیطکی طوه کشان ربار خنابان خان سفیت زرماند ...

For more details see 'A.ā. Shâh Ismâ'īl, p. 530.

1. \text{İnqilâb- Islâm, p. 200.}

2. \text{F.J.I.,Vol.III,p.212.}

in difficulties or had fallen from the king's favour came to this lady for protection, she would solve their problems through her influence. This beautiful lady was an excellent influence both morally and socially. She was generous and tried to spread good all around her, setting an example of clean habits and of charity towards others. She acted as an adviser to the Shāh concerning the affairs of the people and improvements to the city and the provinces. She shared the Shāh's life for twenty years, and after the death of Shāh Ismā'īl in 930/1524, she lived for fifteen years under the protection and care of Shāh Ṭahmāsb and finally died in Iṣṭakhr-i Fārs in 945/1538.¹

¹ It is surprising that Tajlū Khānum's death is not mentioned by any of the historians of her day, except by the author of Ilchā who was in Iran after 952/1545. This historian was at pains to report the truth about why she died in Iṣṭakhr. It is odd that the year of her death is completely omitted in Aḥsan, vol. I, pp. 279-293. Ḥasan Rūmālū does not make the appropriate entry under the year 945/1538, but Seddon in his translation (vol. II, p. 129) mentions 945 A.H. even though Rūmālū for some reason preferred not to chronicle the year 945/1538. Ḥasan Rūmālū deals with 944 A.H. and then jumps to the middle of 946. Thus the year 945 A.H., which is the year of Tajlū Khānum's death, is missing.

It seems to me that the very facts of Tajlū Khānum's fame and the people's respect for her graciousness and dignity might have brought about Shāh Ṭahmāsb's anger. After the death of her husband, Tajlū Khānum was forced to leave the court for the fort at Iṣṭakhr, which had been the prison of her husband and his family in past days; she certainly
III. The Last Wife of Shāh Ismā'īl I:

History it seems has left no information about the life or even the name of Shāh Ismā'īl's last wife. We only know that she was the daughter of Shaikh Shāh b. Farrūkh Yasār, the murderer of Shāh Ismā'īl's father and grandfather Sulṭān Junaid who married his daughter to Shāh Ismā'īl in 929/1523.¹

Khwānd Amīr states that:

"On Tuesday 20th Shawwāl 929, Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn and Damūrī Beg Tawwāghī, the commander, set out for Shīrūn from their lodging at Shānī Gūzan (the place where Shāh Ismā'īl had his residence). They took with them lapfuls of jewels, limitless amounts of money in coins of red and white gold, besides many camels worthy of the dowry, and cloth from Egypt, Rum and European countries, along with a large number of Arab horses - all to fulfil the marriage contract."²

had no reason to go there.

Perhaps, then, the author of Aḥsān omitted the events of 945/1538 because he knew the immediate cause of her death. However, according to the author of the Muntāzam p. 1147 Sulṭān Tahmāsb's court left Tabrīz in 946/1539 because of an outbreak of disease in the city. But we cannot accept that Tājlū Baygum left Tabrīz for this reason since the epidemic broke out a year after her death. Clearly there must have been some other reason for her secret death in that fort.

1. Ḥabīb, p. 599; cf. Inqilāb- Islām, pp. 480 and 563-8 where the author gives as the reason for this marriage the ruin of the relationship between Sulṭān Salīm, Sulṭān Sulaimān and Shaikh Shāh after the Battle of Chāldirān. Shāh Ismā'īl's daughter's marriage appears to have been celebrated for the same reason.

2. Ḥabīb, pp. 599-600.
"On being informed of the high rank of the Shāh's messengers, Shaikh Shāh laid the finger of acceptance on his eyes and the marriage was legalized by Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn Mūḥammad Nāhīd, acting as proxy for Shāh Ismā'īl. After the contract had been signed they brought the bride to the king. When the news of Mahd 'Ulyā's arrival reached the king, Shāh Ismā'īl sent his chief amīrs and other officers to Wāsīmenj (or Bāsming), two farsakhs distant (20 km.) from Tabrīz, on Wednesday 25th Dhu'l-Ḥijja, 929/November 4th, 1523, to welcome the bride, while in Tabrīz the people celebrated in anticipation of her arrival. The sounds of harps and lyres and lutes ascended heavenward. Musicians took up harp or lute, congratulating the royal couple with music all the while. Singers sent up prayers of praise for the existence of pleasure and sovereignty, making pleasant, sweet songs."

Then the amīrs and chiefs of government (came forward and) presented the Shāh with an appropriate gift in congratulation, thankful for the fact that till now that is, Rabī' al-Ī 930 this gracious king had enjoyed independence on his sovereign throne, through

1. 1Rābī', p. 600; 2Tārikh-i-Sultānī, f. 314a where it is stated that Shaikh Shāh himself handed the bride over to Shāh Ismā'īl on Thursday, 24th Rabī' al-Thānī, 929/12 March 1523, at his winter-quarters of Tūmān Nakhchivān, this being the 24th year of Shāh Ismā'īl's reign, and himself went back to Shīrvān; cf. Jahān Gūshā, f. 303a where the author states that in 930/924 Shāh Ismā'īl was in Nakhchivān. After the celebration of the new year he went to Shakkī for hunting. The author does not mention his last marriage. See also 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 610-11, where the author gives a different version, but confirms this marriage. Cf. too 'Ā.Ā. 'Abbāsī, p. 33, where Iskandar Munšhī indicates:
the agency of God the merciful.\(^1\)

The above mistake by Iskandar Munshî should be corrected to read Shâh Ismā'îl married the Shîrvân-Shâh's daughter in 929/1523, since the text quoted clearly indicates that a girl from the Shîrvân-Shâh's family married Shâh Ismâ'îl and joined his harem. Therefore the above-given date is wrong.

1. See Ḥabīb, p. 600 where Khwâнд Amîr calls her "Mahd 'Ulyā" which is only her title. Cf. also p. 602 where Khwâнд Amîr indicates:
CHAPTER VI

شاه اسماعیل's Religious Policy and His Harsh Methods of Establishing Twelver Shi'ism as the State Religion of Iran
His Religious Policy

It could be argued that neither Shāh Ismā'īl nor his courtiers were true Muslims, but merely made a show of zeal by persecuting the Sunnīs among other groups of Iranians. When the Turkomāns conquered Iranian territory, those who did not accept the new religion had to leave their native land or give up resistance.¹

To hold the attention of the people, and to carry out his own plans and those of his Turkomān Ṣūfīs, Shāh Ismā'īl never undertook any important campaign without first having recourse to Qur'ānic divination, or even consulting astrologers or fortune-tellers' advice.² Judging by such actions, and by those described in previous chapters, he only pretended that he believed in God, His Prophet Muḥammad and the Shī'īte Imāms. It is even said that he used to participate in veneration of the martyrs of Karbalā on the days of mourning in Muharram, especially on Ṭaḥīr, when he sent a Qur'ān reader to read from a public pulpit the mourning book of Ḥusain Kashīfī called Rawdat al-Shuhada.³ In order to make a show of his sincerity towards the Shī'īte Imāms, and to receive Shī'īte support, he used to go on pilgrimage

1. See Ilchī, f. 7b, where the author states:

2. See chapter VII, p. 435.

3. See Inqilāb-Islām, pp. 600-1. See also Sharḥ-i Gulshan-i Rāz, p. 87 (introduction).
to their shrines on foot, and sleep there overnight. He even claimed to speak to them in total devotion until he was granted his request, beseeching and crying out in such a loud voice that he could be heard outside by the attendants. He was full of respect for their tombs in Mashhad, Najaf, Karbalā', Kazimayn, Medina and so on, going to the extent of making many gifts to them. He was so vengeful towards those people who offered any kind of insult to the Shi'ite spiritual leaders or Imāms that he could not rest until he had insulted their religious leaders in a similar way.

On the battlefield he used the force of religion to stimulate his soldiers' hatred of the enemy and their sense of pride. He did this in accordance with guidance given to him in visions by the Immaculate Imāms. Religious practices were part of his normal tactics on the battlefield. It is even recorded that at the Battle of Marv, when he saw the withdrawal of his cavalry before the powerful attack of Jānvāfā Mirzā and Qanbar Bay (or Beg), two of the great amīrs of Shaibak Khān, he immediately

1. See chapter VII, p. 399.
2. See chapter VII, p. 401.
4. See Abū Ḥanīfā and Jāmī in pages 417-20 below.
5. Kh. B. Bayānī, Tarīkh-i Nizāmī-yi Iran (Teh., 1353), p. 378; cf. Shāh Jang, pp. 327-8, for a similar prayer on the battlefield, but one which unfortunately did not prove effective on that occasion, namely in 920/1514 at the Battle of Chāldirān.
stood and prayed to almighty God in the middle of the battlefield and after finishing praying, personally joined in the battle in which he was—consequently—victorious.¹

It can be generally accepted that most of Shāh Ismā'īl's actions, in pretending to be a good and true Shī'ite king as well as a spiritual leader (Murshid-i Kāmil), proved to be of great help in keeping him in power before the Battle of Chāldirān. But after he had lost most of his great amīrs and the spiritual leaders on whom he had relied for advice, and according to whose guidance he had based his actions, he lost his rigidity and became so calm and tolerant that he actually issued an order to his governors to the effect that people were not to be harassed on account of their beliefs.²

1. The author of the Jahān Gushā even believes that if he had not been defeated, the people would have thought that he was a god. The Persian text on this matter runs as follows:

See f. 252a of the above-mentioned Ms.

2. See Inqilāb-Islām, pp.320-1.
On the other hand, one can see quite clearly that he was not a good Muslim, considering his actions throughout his life, especially after the Battle of Chāldirān. His only motive for the massacre of many Sunnis in Iran and elsewhere appears to have been the great hostility of the Şüfis and other religious notables around him towards Sunnism. Another potent factor was the ambition of the Şüfis, before they were decimated at the Battle of Chāldirān, to ensure the continuity of their control. It was claimed when the new regime was introduced, that it was the only true protector of Iran as well as of the Imāmī sect. Only the Şafawīd dynasty - so it was argued - could bring back a time of peace and stability, and the splendour of ancient Iran, so long eclipsed.

1. **Shāh Ismā'īl's Interest in Participating in the Mourning for Martyrs.**

Contemporary historians recorded Shāh Ismā'īl's particular interest in participating in the mourning for the martyrs of Karbala', and in showing respect by performing the mourning ceremonies during the months of

1. The accounts given by the authors of Ḥabīb, IV, p. 497; Jahān-ārā, p. 253; Lubb, p. 250; Aḥsan, l, p. 104; 'Ā.A. 'Abbāsī, p. 26; Rawdat al-Şafawiyya, f. 67b are a proof of the instability and terror during his reign, even for those Shī'ite rulers who did not want to obey him.
Ramaḍān and Muḥarram. It seems that Shāh Ismā'īl was deeply interested in the Prophet Muḥammad and also in his son-in-law's family, particularly the third Imām of the Shi'a sect, Imām Ḥusain.  

1. According to Ḍaqī Mūr Allāh Shushtarī, the author of Majalīs al-Mū'minīn, when Shāh Ismā'īl captured Fārs and Shīrāz, he went to visit Shaikh Muḥammad Lāhījī, the great thinker and Ṣūfī. During his visit the King asked the Shaikh: "Why are you in black clothes?" "Because of the mourning for the Imām Ḥusain," the Shaikh answered. Shāh Ismā'īl asked him: "Was it not settled that his mourning should be performed for ten days of each month of Muḥarram?" The Shaikh replied: "The people should eat their words - (Mardūm Ghalat Kardeh and) mourning for him will last till the day of resurrection."

For more details see Majalīs al-Mū'minīn, "Majlis-i Shishum", Edinburgh University Ms. Add. 244. Cf. also Shāh-i Gulshan-i Rāz, (introduction), p. 84.

2. The author of Inqilāb-Īslām (on the authority of Jalāl al-Dīn Mīrzā Qājār, the author of Nāma-yī Khusrūvān, vol. III), states that on one occasion when the mourning ceremony for Imām Ḥusain was held by Shāh Ismā'īl, a great amīr from the Shamlū tribe was present. He was among those who wept during that mourning ceremony. Shāh Ismā'īl asked him why he was crying. He answered: "I am not weeping for your Ḥusain's martyrdom, but for those brave soldiers who were killed by Ḥusain and his supporters in Karbala." Shāh Ismā'īl laughed at his reply and said nothing.

The above story gives the impression that some of Shāh Ismā'īl's amīrs were not pure Shi'a at heart; indeed, Dickson (op. cit., pp. 192-3) states that there were 700 Sunnīs at the court of Shāh
Shāh Ismā'īl knew himself to be a Sayyid by descent, of 'Alī's family (through Imām Musā al-Kāzim, the seventh Imām). To publicize his claim and show that he was religious, he paid a great deal of respect to the family of the Prophet and of his son-in-law. As indicated by the poetical works attributed to him, he composed poems praising this family in a manner that shows his great concern and love for them. To show his affection and love, he visited their shrines on several occasions, spending generously at the holy places. The Shāh's respect for the Prophet's family and his desire to be known as one of them made him act very reverently when he was among his fanatical Shi'ite supporters, who were employed by him to destroy their Sunnite enemies.

During the month of Muharram, particularly on the day of 'Ashūra' (the tenth of Muharram), Shāh Ismā'īl used

1. Tahmāsb I. Shāh Tahmāsb's "grand vizier" as Dickson states "was a Sunnī." It should be noted here that the above Shāikh Muhammad Lāhījī was a follower of the Nūrbakhshī sect.

2. See Minorsky, "The Poetry of Shāh Ismā'īl" nos. 101, 15, 237, 168, 211, 249 and so on, on page 1026a. See also Gandjei, op. cit., nos. 9, 10, 11, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 103, where in all these poems he praises 'Alī as his king and superior. Cf. also Salīm-nāma, ffs. 83b and 104a; Zindigānī, vol. I, p. (Z).introduction, Kasrawī, Shāikh Saffī, p. 33 (he believes that Shāh Ismā'īl was not proud of being a Sayyid).

3. See Minorsky, "the poetry of Shāh Ismā'īl I" pp. 1026a-27a.
to perform ceremonies personally to show his respect for the martyrs.\footnote{1} As already mentioned, the Shāh used to send a Qur'ān reader or a Ta'ziyeh Khwān to the public pulpit in the Jāmi' mosque on this particular day to carry out the ritual of the mourning day by reading the Rawdat al-Shuhadā',\footnote{2} and the general populace used to weep and mourn on that day. Since this book was written in Persian and most of the amīrs and Qizil-Bāsh were uninstructed in Persian they could not understand the mourning ceremony. Therefore, Mullā Muḥammad Baghdadī, who had the pen-name "Fuṭūlī", and who was one of the great men of learning among the Turks, was ordered by Shāh Ismā'īl to translate the book of Maqtal (Martyrs) into Turkish which he did very well and which he entitled Ḥadīqat al-Su'da'.\footnote{3}

The author of Inqilāb-Islām himself has left us this account of the project:

"Since no mourning book had been prepared in Turkish, the great Turks, 'Arabs and 'Ajam could not appreciate the mourning ceremonies, especially the part of those which dealt with the martyrs of Karbala'. Books written in Persian were treated like waste paper and were not used in their mourning ceremonies. Therefore, I (Fuṭūlī) was ordered to write a book on martyrdom. At that time the celebrated and well-read books on martyrdom were the Maqtal-i Abū Ḥanīfa and Miṣra'-i Tūsī, which Sayyid Riḍā al-Dīn Abu 'l-Qasim 'Alī b. Mūsā b. Ja'far b.

1. Inqilāb-Islām, pp. 600-1; cf. also Dānishmandān, p. 300.
2. Composed by Ḥusain Wā'īz Kāshifī during the reign of Ōljeitū.
3. Inqilāb-Islām, p. 600.
Muḥammad al-Ṭūsī had collected with great care and caution and which he had edited, using many important and reliable sources. The one which is now common is Kitāb-i Rawḍat al-Shūhada', written by the great preacher and scholar, Maulānā Ḥusain Wā'īz Kāshīfī, also composed with great care. I, the abject servant (bandeh-yi khāksār) followed his example, drawing on his work and other materials available to me, and entitling my book Ḥadīqat al-Su'dā."

The author goes on to say that "the reason for giving titles like "Rawḍa" and "Rawḍa Khvān" is that the book of "Maqtal" is used for the mourning ceremony and the person who performs it is called Rawḍa Khvān. As a result the book became known as Rawḍat al-Shuhada'."2

The Institution of Mourning and of the Passion Play, (Ta'ziyeh Khvānī).

Among historians since Shāh Ismā'īl's day there has been a tradition that after the establishment of Twelver Shi'ism in Iran by Shāh Ismā'īl I, the re-establishment of the mourning and passion plays also took place. It was he who ordered his supporters to impose the mourning celebration for the chief of the martyrs in Karbalā', which had been instituted by Mu'izz al-Daula in 352/963 but which had been interrupted by Sunnite governments.3

According to the author of Inqilāb-Islām, the mourning

2. Inqilāb-Islām, p. 601.
day of ḍhūr had been an institution of long standing among the Umayyads. According to Abū ʿAmm b. Thābit Kūfī, the founder of the Ḥanafī madhhhab,

"For Umayyads to celebrate the day of ḍhūr, or to mourn like the Shi'ites on that particular day, would be a type of heretical innovation. The follower of the Sunni religion should avoid both of these practices. However, if a Sunni should chance to be present at a Shi'ite mourning ceremony and to join in the wailing during that ceremony, he would receive God's blessings."¹

The same author then goes on to state that

"Shi'ites were not allowed to carry out the mourning ceremony for the principal martyr till the year 352/963; till then Shi'ites dared not mourn in public. In all the cities where Shi'ites lived, they had to gather in secret places from which their voices could not be heard outside, and there perform their mourning ceremonies. However, in that year Mu'izz al-Daula the Buwayhid gave orders to all the Shi'ites that throughout Iraq they should mourn during the ten days of Muharram. During this time all shops should be closed and the women would need to disorder their hair, and stain their faces black when they came out of their house. They should beat themselves on the breast and head and tear their clothes."²

According to the author of Inqilāb-Islām, it was the same ruler who ordered that the 'Īd-i Ghadīr Khum³ should

---

1. See Inqilāb-Islām, p. 602; Browne, op. cit., IV, pp. 30-1. For the
2. Inqilāb-Islām, p. 602, Saljuq and later Ṣafawīd periods see Bosworth, op. cit., p. 294; Zindigānī, vol. III, pp. 6-10; Chelkowski, op. cit., p. 3 onwards;
   Tapper, Pasture and Politics, p. 159; Donaldson, op. cit., p. 277 and W. Litten, Das Drama in Persien, (Berlin, 1929).
3. See Donaldson, op. cit., pp. 4-5, "Ghadir Khum".
be an official religious festival thereafter.¹

It is said that Ta‘ziyeh Khwānī was based on a Roman theatrical tradition. The Romans used to have a type of theatre set up for the performance of plays about the lives of their heroes and about Roman campaigns in various places - all this before the Christianization of Italy.² According to the author of Inqilāb-Islām, the passion play or Ta‘ziyeh Khwānī is said to have been inspired also by European passion plays. In Europe passion plays and miracle plays continued to be enacted until the Protestant reformation, after which there was a break in production. Later the plays were revived and have evolved into the form seen nowadays (Qājār period) in both Iran and Europe.³ The Wahhābīs imitated these two kinds of plays from the people mentioned above, and in their theatres they used the stories of the Old Testament about the lives of the prophets, expressing them in the simple language of ordinary people. The passion play had a great success in Iran because the Safawīd kings were very anxious to establish Twelver Shi‘ism and its doctrines firmly throughout Iran as the sole state religion. As the people of the period, including the immediate supporters of the Safawīds were largely illiterate, this kind of propaganda, (which even nowadays is still practised) was very effective in spreading the doctrines of Twelver Shi‘ism among the people.⁴

¹. See, Donaldson, op. cit., pp. 4-5, "Ghadir-Khum"; and also Inqilāb-Islām, p. 602.
². Ibid. pp. 602-3.
⁴. Ibid.
One historian relates that "during the reign of Karim Khan Zand [died in 1193/1772] an ambassador was sent to Europe, who on his return brought stories then being presented in the European theatres, and recounted them to Karim Khan. The King told the ambassador that in the first play to be produced by him in Iran, he should present the story of the 72 martyrs of Karbala. The ambassador carried out the orders his master gave him, and afterwards the play circulated gradually among the Iranian cities. Later on many more stories from Iran's history were dramatized, accumulating until they reached the numbers we know today" (Qajar period). ¹

1. Inqilāb-Īslām, pp. 604-5. Cf. also Falsafi, Zindigānī, vol. III, p. 10, where Falsafi makes an error of interpretation, in spite of following his source closely throughout his study. The author of Inqilāb-Īslām gives the above text as follows:

"... در نام او سلست که خان زند ستی و فرستاده شد، سنگر از فرسته کرد..."

Falsafi himself interprets the above Persian text as follows:

"... نوشته آن که در این که خان زند ستی و فرسته کن به مولانا آن..."

Whether the original text is correct or not, Falsafi does not give any explanation, but presents the same Ms. as the main source.

The validity of the above statement is obscure.
3. **Shāh Ismā'īl's Genuine Regard for the Shi'ite Imāms and the Family of the Prophet.**

It has already been mentioned that Shāh Ismā'īl claimed to be of Sayyid descent from the Imām Mūsā al-Kāzim, the seventh Shi'ite Imām, and that he was also said to be the envoy of the last Shi'ite Imām, the promised Mahdi.¹

Shāh Ismā'īl believed with certainty that the foundation of his dynasty would be firm and long-lasting only if he propagated Twelver Shi'ism and its doctrines throughout Iran and destroyed those who were against it. He had, therefore, to show himself a faithful admirer of the Prophet's household, especially his son-in-law, 'All b. Abī Talib, and his children.²

In this way he and his Turkomān supporters were able to win the full support of the Shi'ite inhabitants of Iran and it appears that, for the reasons given above, Shāh Ismā'īl claimed that he was the only being in the entire kingdom putting his faith in the guidance of Ḥaḍrat 'All and the other Immaculate Imāms, whose words of wisdom he would receive in his dreams.³

According to the Persian historians, in most of his political moves Shāh Ismā'īl was helped mainly by Ḥaḍrat

---

1. See Jahān Gushā, f. 41b-44a. Add. 200, 41b-44a; 'A.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 41-43.
2. See below, p. 398.
'Ali and the Immaculate Imams who saved his life in many dangerous situations through their advice. For instance, twice in Lāhījān and once each in Ardabīl, Arzinjān, Gokcedeniz (or tankir), Shīrvān, Tabrīz, Yazd, Isfahān, Khurāsān, a few times in 'Iraq-i 'Arab, and on many other occasions, he saw 'Ali b. Abī Ṭālib in his dreams, and was guided by him towards a solution of his problems.¹

As a result, Shāh Ismā'īl claimed that every action he carried out, every prosecution he made during his reign, was not something he himself chose to do, but the will of Ḥaḍrat 'Ali and the Immaculate Imams, who commanded him to suppress those infidels who were not willing to follow his new doctrine.²

It is said that because of Shāh Ismā'īl's deep reverence for 'Ali b. Abī Ṭālib, he called himself "Ghulām-i Shāh-i Mardān Ismā'īl b. Ḥaydar"³ "the slave of the king of mankind, Shāh Ismā'īl b. Ḥaydar," or, according to another story, "Murīd wa Chākir wa Lālā-yi Qanbar" "the devotee and slave and the chief servant of 'Ali" and "Ghulām-i Al-i Ḥaydar" "the slave of the household of 'Ali."⁴ And we have seen that later on,

---

1. Jahān Qushī, f. 36²; Add. 200, f. 36²; Ḥabīb, pp. 447-62; Afsān, I, p. 47.
2. See Abwāb al-Jīnān, vol. I, p. 200, where the author states that Shāh Ismā'īl used to say:

   "..."


3. See Fārs-nāma, p. 91.
4. See Kasrawī, Shaikh Ṣafī, p. 33.
these titles were perpetuated by his family throughout their rule as a dynasty.¹

Historians tell us that because of his devotion to 'All and his family, Shāh Ismā'īl used to boast of his proud lineage and on many occasions he looked scornfully at the boast of strength made by his enemies and their religious leaders. At these times he was fond of saying:

"From the east to the west, if there is an Imam, 'All and his household are enough for us."²

His official letters show us that he very often used the words "Ya 'Ali Madad," "Oh 'Ali help (me)."³ He mostly used to say with pride that if anyone fought against 'All's family of which he himself was a member, that person would be defeated and destroyed by God's will; and he would quote the following verses on the death of his great foes


3. See Falsafī, Zindīgānī, vol. IV, pp. 307-9 where Falsafī also records a letter sent to Shaibak Khān by Shāh Ismā'īl from which he quotes:

Or see Salīm-nāma [f. 83b] where Bidlīsī states that Shāh Ismā'īl claimed:

To reject Kasrawī's statement in Shaikh Saft, p. 32 that Shāh Ismā'īl was never proud of being a Sayyid by descent we quote Falsafī's statement written in Zindīgānī, vol. I, p. 2, introduction that:
such as Sultan Salim and ‘Ala’ al-Daula Dhul-Qadar:

"We have experienced, in this treacherous world, the consolation, That anyone who fought against ‘Ali’s family was destroyed in the end."¹

To illustrate Shāh Ismā‘īl’s devotion to ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, the following story may be included here. In 914/1508 he invaded ‘Irāq-i‘Arab, and after driving Sultan Murād out of Iraq, the Shāh dismounted from his horse when he was still a few farsang̣s away from the shrine of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, and bowed in the direction of the shrine. Then he knelt and wept joyfully in the emotion of that happy and momentous instant. All his amīrs and attendants did likewise.² After paying homage, they thanked almighty God for his greatness and then set out on pilgrimage for the shrine of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, bare-headed and barefoot.³ According to the author of ‘Alam-ārā-yi Shāh Ismā‘īl, when they reached a place two farsakṣḥs away from the shrine, the Sayyid of Iraq brought the flags of the shrine which belonged to ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, and presented them to Shāh Ismā‘īl. When the Shāh saw the flags, he saluted them and bowed his head. He carried one of those flags himself, and also bared his head and removed his shoes, announcing "Yā ‘Alī Yā ‘Alī" "Oh ‘Alī, oh ‘Alī." In this way he set out for the shrine.

¹. Ḥabīb, p. 495; ‘Ā.A. Shāh-Ismā‘īl, p. 166.
². ‘Ā.A. Shāh Ismā‘īl, p. 166.
³. Ibid., p. 167.
When he reached the wall of the city of Najaf, he first touched the gate with his head and made his secret petition to it. Then he lost consciousness.¹

The same author goes on to say that after an hour he recovered, by which time the road to the shrine was jammed with many people; it was a very hot day. He then set out to visit the shrine. When he reached it, he summoned Dūrmīsh Khān and gave him this order:

"Do not allow anyone to enter the shrine; and guard the entrance till my return. I will permit the people to visit the shrine after I come out."²

The author says that Dūrmīsh Khān took his golden staff and obeyed these orders.³ The same author states that Shāh Ismā'īl stayed in the shrine about three hours and because he stayed in the building so long, his great amīrs became anxious about him. They were also worried that he might have been hurt by an enemy who could be hidden inside the shrine. Those fears and worries, and

¹. 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 166.

Khwând Amīr in Ḥabīb al-Siyar gives 25th Jamādā al-Ākhir 914/October 1508 as the date of his arrival in Baghdad, but does not mention this story (see Ḥabīb, pp. 494-5); cf. Ahsan, vol. I, p. 103. Ṣūlūq gives the same date but again does not mention the above event.

For a similar visit, to the shrine of Imām Riḍā, see 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 346-49.

². 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 167.

³. Ibid.
their restlessness in the extreme heat of the day, soon vanished as Sayyid Muhammad Kamuna and Dūrmīsh Khān assured them not to have any fear whatsoever for the Shāh's safety as he was the descendant of 'Alī. Dūrmīsh Khān said to them that when he had listened by placing his ear against the door of the shrine, he had heard them (Ḥaḍrat 'Alī and Shāh Ismā'īl) talking to each other, questioning and answering. When he tried to open the door to see who the king was in conversation with, Shāh Ismā'īl told him not to panic, as he would soon come out.¹

Finally, after waiting for eight hours outside the main door of the shrine, Dūrmīsh Khān saw Shāh Ismā'īl come out with his face shining. They realized that their king had received a blessing (بِرَاءَةَ شَرِهِ قُسَامَتُهُ, ² or a favourable attitude shown to someone by a religious leader), from Ḥaḍrat 'Alī. We are told by the same author that if one had been able to measure the king's dignity, and the respect accorded him, it would have moved up the scale from one, before this interview, to a hundred after it.³

"On that occasion," the same author says "Bābā 'Ishqī Tabarrān who had composed a qaṣīda read his qaṣīda in

1. Ẓāhīr al-Snān Ismā'īl, pp. 167-8.
2. Ibid., p. 168.
3. Ibid. The same author states on page 457 that Bābā 'Ishqī Tabarrān's death occurred in 928/1522, when during the siege of Herāt he went out of the fort to procure provisions, but was captured by 'Ubaid Allāh Khān Üz-Beg and murdered.
praise of Shāh Ismā'īl, who gave the composer a robe of honour and one hundred Tūmān in gold coins.  

In addition to Shāh Ismā'īl's anxiety to show the relationship between the family of 'Alī and his own dynasty he claimed that he, personally, was a reincarnation of the Mahdi, the Twelfth Imam, and made public his fondness for the Shi'ite shrines in Iraq. When he conquered Iraq and its capital, Baghdad, he made the pilgrimage to the tombs of the martyrs of Karbalā', and offered many gifts at the shrines. He made a particular point of visiting the shrine of the principal Karbalā' martyr, the Imam Ḥusain. He also made gifts to the custodians of the shrines and ordered the replacement of the wooden covers of the tombs by gold caskets. He also offered gifts of several golden lamp-stands to these shrines; and he personally cleaned the shrine of the Imam Ḥusain. He sat for an entire night beside his tomb and prayed till dawn. Then he moved towards Kāzīmâyn and it was there that he ordered the restoration of the dome of the

1. 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 168.
2. The above account appears in most contemporary histories such as: Ḥabībī, p. 494-6; Jahān-ārā, p. 271 (briefly); Lubb, p. 249 (briefly); Jahān Gushā, f. 140a-b; Ilchā, f. 15b; 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 167-8; 'Ā.Ā. 'Abbāsī, p. 26 and Rawdat al-Ṣafawiyya, f. 65a-b.
3. 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 168.
4. Ibid.
mausoleum of the Imam Musa al-Kazim, from whom he claimed to be descended. The Shah had a plaque placed at the top of the main door of the shrine, bearing his name and the date of the restoration. \(^1\) After that he set out on pilgrimage to the shrines of Imam al-Taqi \(^2\) and Imam al-Hasan al-'Askari \(^3\) in Samarra.

The most important thing which Shah Isma'il did in 914/1508 for the city of Najaf was to make arrangements for bringing a water supply to the city from the Euphrates. This job was entrusted to Qadi Jahán for execution with the help of skilled engineers. \(^4\)

The reason behind this order has been explained in several Persian histories of the Safavid dynasty. According to these sources, Shah Isma'il wanted to give substance to the rumours or hadith about his personal claim to be the rightful representative of the promised Mahdî. \(^5\) The author

---

2. He was the ninth Imam called "Jawâd" born in 195/809 in Medina and killed in 220/835. For more details see Shi'ite Islam, p. 207. Cf. 'A. 'Abbâsi, p. 26. and Habîb, p. 495, "Al-Naqî".
3. He was the son of the tenth Imam who was born in 232/845 and killed in 260/872. See Shi'ite Islam, p. 209.
4. Ilchi, f. 15b.
5. It should be mentioned here that the real reason for Shah Isma'il's bringing the water of the Euphrates to Najaf was not the one claimed by some historians who considered that he was acting purely for the sake of the citizens of Najaf and the welfare of the city itself as the author of Ilchi-yi Nizâm Shah indicates:
of Ilǩhā-ye Niẓām Shāh, who went to Persia in 952/1545, states that Shāh Ismā’īl completed the construction of the canal in Najaf as he says:

"و الواحنا هذا نور دلوردن آن لرگن میرنس جابر است." 

"At this moment (sometime between 952/1545 and 971/1562) the water runs through that canal in that holy land."1

The dark side of the history of the matter was that Shāh Ismā’īl wanted to prove the rumours appearing in the hadith referring to the belief that:

"When the River Euphrates reached the city of Najaf, the time had come for the appearance of the Twelfth Imām."

The above Persian text appears in Mi’raj al-Tawḥīd or Zuhūriyya-yi Šafawiyya as follows:

This statement clearly indicates that the main aim was to prove the rumours. To legitimize the other historians' claims, the same author gives his view as follows:

This, however, is contradicted by Iskandar Munshi who says that Shāh Ismā’īl did complete the construction of the canal in Najaf and Shāh ‘Abbās I in 1032/1623 dredged it. For more details see Abū Ṭālib Hindī al-Īsfahānī, Zuhūriyya-yi Šafawiyya, Edinburgh U.L. Ms. no. 87, not paginated; Ilǩhā, f. 15b; Jāhān Gushā, f. 140a-b; Rawdat al-Šafawiyya, f. 65a-b; ‘A.ʿ.ʿ Abbāsī, p. 757; Muntazam, under the year 1032/1623.

1. Ilǩhā, f. 15b.
4. **The Claim of Shāh Ismā'īl that Ḥadrat 'Alī Saved his Life.**

It has already been mentioned that in 919/1513, when Shāh Ismā'īl was in Herāt for the second time, he fell from his horse and was unconscious for three days. On the fourth day he recovered and sat on his bed, saying happily: "Ya 'Alī madad," "Oh 'Alī help me." His great amīrs who had gathered around his bed said to him: "What we did for your recovery was useless, you must tell us how you recovered your health." The king replied: "When I was unconscious, Amīr al-Mū'mīnīn ('Alī) visited me and touched my body with his blessed hands, and I was healed. He told me to show myself to my Sūfis before more time went past. Then, in the joy that had come to me at his visit, I opened my eyes."

5. **The Claim of the Šafawīd Family to be Representatives of the Mahdī.**

Most Persian histories written during the reigns of Shāh Ismā'īl I and his son and successor, Shāh Ẓahmāsīb I, clearly state - quite apart from showing the Šafawīd family as the descendants of 'Alī - that Shāh Ismā'īl's rise to

---

2. 'A.A. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 479.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
power was in accordance with the will of Ḥadrat 'All and the last Shi'ite Imām, Mahdī Ṣāhib al-Zamān.¹

This claim was circulated widely and was so readily accepted among the Shi'ite minorities² that even educated historians like Qādī Aḥmad Ghaffārī, the author of Tārīkh-i Jahān-ārā, believed that there was a connection between Shāh Ismā'īl's rise to power and the promised Mahdī.

On this subject Qādī Aḥmad states:

"The prophecy of this connection appears in Ḥadrat 'All's Diwān and the lines referring to this connection run as follows:

'Jāmī' fī ʿrā'ī ʿrā'ī ʿrā'ī ʿrā'ī ʿrā'ī ʿrā'ī ʿrā'ī ʿrā'ī

'What is the condition of one who does not know or understand?"

"A boy among other boys who is not able to give an opinion,
There is no seriousness in him, and he cannot solve any problem either."³

Qādī Aḥmad points out that there is a secret hint of Shāh Ismā'īl's connection with the rise of Ṣāhib al-Zamān in the above-quoted lines and he noticed that these prophetic words are equal in number to the words:

'Maḥbrū ʾilā ʿlā ʿlā ʿlā ʿlā ʿlā ʿlā ʿlā ʿlā ʿlā

"He is no one but the Shāh Ismā'īl b. Ḥaydar b. al-Junaid al-Mūsawī."⁴

2. Falsafī believes that the only reason for Shi'ites to support the founder of the Safawīd dynasty was because these minorities were tired of previous rulers' tyranny. See Falsafī, Zindīgānī, vol. I, p. 26 introduction.
4. Jahān-ārā, p. 266.
It thus becomes obvious that Qaḍī ʿAbd Allāh Ahmad and other historians before and after him\(^1\) were obliged to write such stories in order to have a peaceful life under this dynasty. On the other hand they misled the Shi'ites of Iran into giving support to their protector, whom they believed to be the chosen one.\(^2\)

However, one can easily see the differences between these histories and those written later on, after the downfall of the Safawī dynasty, or those prepared by chroniclers outside Iranian territory.

On the other hand, after Shāh Ismā'īl’s unexpected death in 930/1524, Qaḍī ʿAbd Allāh Ahmad, like other opportunists, began spreading propaganda to the effect that it was Shāh Tahmāsb I who was the sign of the rising of the promised Mahdī. Qaḍī ʿAbd Allāh Ahmad had by now concluded that there was a secret hint between the words of Shāh Tahmāsb I and the words Akhīr al-Zaʿmān. According to abjad calculation the words Akhīr al-Zaʿmān stand for the year 930 A.H. (1524), which was the year that Shāh Tahmāsb I ascended the throne, and

---

1. For instance, see Salīm-nāma, Miḥmān-nāma, Inqilāb-Islām, Bustān al-Siyāha and compare them with Ilchī, Habīb, Jahān-ārā, Jahān Gushā, Aḥsan, ‘Ā.ʿĀ. ‘Abbāsī, ‘Ā.ʿĀ. Shāh Ismā'īl and Bahār al-Anwār, which contain a considerable amount of information on both the positive and the negative aspects of the situation. However, one cannot ignore the strongest criticism made by the author of Bustān al-Siyāha on pp. 65-66 against Maulānā Majlisī and the other previous historians.

the same year yields "Zilhāj" which stands for 930 A.H. and was also the death chronogram of Šāh Ismā'īl I, his father. The author adds that since the word "руḥ" Allah stands for 66, in abjad, he anticipated that the year 930 + 66 = 996, which is very near to the year 1,000 A.H., would be the time for the rise of the promised Mahdi, the Lord of the Age; and Ghaffārī believed that the above explanation shows clearly that there was a connection between the appearance of the promised Mahdi and the family of the Šafawīd dynasty, especially Šāh Tahmāsb I.

1. For the year 1,000 A.H. see Šī'ite Islam, (ed. and translated by H. Naşr, p. 212) where Tabātabā'i presents hadith referring to the 1,000 year period and the rise of the Mahdi; see also Mağūrī, op. cit., p. 87, discussed in chapter III.

2. ḽāḥān-ārā, pp. 281-2.

Šāh Ismā'īl's son, Tahmāsb, appears to have been unwilling to continue to encourage the belief that he was the promised Mahdi or his envoy. It should be added that the belief of the Šafawīd darvishes during his reign that he was the promised Mahdi was so strong that 40 of them lost their lives in front of Šāh Tahmāsb who asked them to recant. When they refused to renounce their belief in the holiness of Šāh Tahmāsb I they were killed. This story appears in Ḥāfiz al-Dīn, p. 90, where Iskandar Munāshi states that this event occurred in the winter-quarters of Sūrluq in Sūfānīya. The above story is also cited in Žuhūriyya-yi Šafawīyya, f. 20a onwards. Cf. also Ḥaft Iqlim, (Fasc. I, p. 177) under Šāh Ghiyāth al-Dīn who found Šāh Tahmāsb's death chronogram: "The Twelfth Imam " Homework 13 " which shows clearly the thought of
6. **Shāh Ismā'īl's Efforts Towards Establishing Twelver Shi'ism in Iran.**

Many historians have mentioned that Shāh Ismā'īl was not the first ruler who established or tried to establish Twelver Shi'ism as the only state religion and to replace the Sunnite slogans, preaching and ceremonies by Shi'ite liturgies in the name of the Twelve Imāms. But he was the last ruler to make an all-out effort to establish Twelver Shi'ism, and in the process he shed a great deal of blood, resorting to much cruelty and harsh expedients to achieve his purpose.¹

There is some evidence to show that the following kings and rulers tried, to a certain extent, to achieve the same ends, but their success could not last for any length of time. These rulers were:

I. Mu'izz al-Daula Dailamī, in 352/963.

II. Al-Mu'taḍīd the 'Abbāsid caliph in 408 A.H.

III. Sultan Muhammad Khudā Banda (öljeitū) in 709/1309.²

those times, and the author of Ilchī was no exception, as he says:

```
...وَإِلَّا أَنَّمَ سَلَّمَتْ هُوَ رَخَّص

...مَنْ إِجَازَ هِمْا...```

"And his reign will last till the rise of Mahdī the Lord of the Age...."

1. See Ḥabīb, pp. 467-8; Jahan-ārā, pp. 266-7; Jahan Gushā, ff. 75b-6a; Aḥsan, vol. I, p. 61; Rawdat al-Šafawīyya, f. 3b; Inqilāb-Islām, p. 598 and Browne, op. cit., IV, pp. 30-1.

2. Jahan Gushā, ff. 75b-6a; Aḥsan, p. 61; Jahan-ārā, pp. 266-7; Mazzaoui, op. cit., p. 3.
IV. Jahan Shah Qara-qoyunlu (died in 872/1467).

V. Sultan Husain Mirza Bahqara in 893/1487.1

According to the author of Habib al-Siyar and Rawdat al-Safawiyya, Sultan Husain Mirza (died in 911/1506) was the last king before Shah Isma'il whose attempt failed.2 The latter states that his attempt failed because 'Abd al-Rahman Jam'i and 'Ali Shir Navai did not agree to Sultan Husain's proposal.3 The same author states:

"Among other rulers who attempted to establish Twelver Shi'ism in their countries was Sultan Husain Mirza. In 893/1487 he tried to pronounce the Khutba in the name of the Twelve Imams at prayers one Friday. This offended the Sunnites and made them very angry. They dragged Mr. Sayyid 'Ali Qa'im down from the public pulpit and humiliated him. From that year till 907 (1501), no one could celebrate the Twelver Khutba and its liturgy from any public pulpit."4

According to both Persian and non-Persian historians (i.e. Turkish ones), after Shah Isma'il had captured Tabriz on the first Friday of the beginning of 907/middle of 1501,5 he went personally to the Friday mosque

1. Jahan Gusla, f. 75b-6a Rawdat al-Safawiyya, f. 3b.
3. Rawdat al-Safawiyya, ff. 3b-4a.
4. Rawdat al-Safawiyya, ff. 3b-4a.
5. See Lubb, p. 242; Jahan-ara, p. 266; Jahan Gusla, f. 69a; Ilchli, f. 7b; 'A.A. 'Abbasi, p. 25; Ahsan I., p. 61; Inqilab-Islam, pp. 55-6; Minorsky, A History of Sharvan and Darband in the 10th-11th Centuries, p. 30 (Arabic text) and Browne, op. cit., IV, p. 52. Cf. also Habib, IV, p. 467 and Rawdat al-Safawiyya, f. 42a where both authors agree with 906 A.H.
in Tabrīz and read the Shī'a khūṭba in the name of the Twelve Imāms. He ordered that the current Sunnite liturgy should be replaced by that of Twelver Shī'ism. Contemporary historians state that after taking the throne of Āzarbāyjān, Shāh Ismā'īl immediately ordered that Twelver Shī'ism should be the only official religion of Iran. He then ordered that the khaṭībs should alter the khūṭba to include the new chants. They would have to add the words ḥaṣhadū anna 'Alīyan wālī Allāh, and after saying Ḥayya 'Alā al-Ṣalāt and Ḥayya 'Alā al-Filāḥ the words Ḥayya 'Alā Khair al-‘Amal and Muḥammad wa 'All Khair al-Bashar should be added to the Friday khūṭba.\(^1\)

The Shāh further ordered his Qizil-Bāsh and ābdādārān (axe-bearers) to cut off the heads of those who would not agree to the new chants and Shi'ite slogans and promised them that they would not be prosecuted for carrying out these murders. Those Sunnis who were ignorant or bigoted and who, during the previous government, had been in the habit of annoying and insulting the Shi'ite minorities, were burned and the same fate befell the Jews and Magis (fire worshippers).\(^2\)

On the other hand, the author of Inqilāb-Islām has a new and different light to shed on this situation. He states that in 907/1501, after capturing Tabrīz, Shāh Ismā'īl devoted much discussion and consideration to the

---

1. Rawdat al-Ṣafawīyya, ff. 3b-4a.
kind of official religion he would proclaim, and to its ceremonies. The King was told through his Ṣūfī advisers that he should establish his father's ṭariqa which is said to have been the Jalālī sect, but their proposal was rejected by several scholars (probably Lāhījānī Shi'ites) who presented counter-arguments at that meeting, and whose reasons were also supported by some of the Shāh's amīrs. Shāh Ismā'īl therefore rejected the Ṣūfīs' proposal.

Finally, the same author says that the King and his counsellors chose Twelver Shi'ism as the only state religion and used force in their attempt to convert the people of Iran to Twelver Shi'ism. They made Twelver Shi'ism the dominant religion for the whole of Āzarbāyjān and decided to convert the rest of the inhabitants of Iran. In order to unite all Shi'ite sects under one single banner, they added the rituals mentioned above, and apart from all this, the Shāh ordered that the following Aya should not be read at the end of each khutba:

"God commands justice, the doing of good, and liberality to kith and kin, and He forbids all shameful deeds, and injustice and rebellion: He instructs you, That ye may receive admonition."

Qur'ān, Sura Al-Nāhāl, XVI/90.

1. See Inqilāb-Islām, pp. 117-18, where the author states that 40,000 of them were killed by Sulṭān Salīm's order before 920/1514.

2. Ibid., pp. 55-6.
This prayer had been brought into use by 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, the second caliph. Instead, they were ordered to read the long prayer that was used in salutation to the Twelve Imāms. The words are said to have been written by Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī.¹

In the process of spreading the enforcement of his new doctrines Shāh Ismā'īl never failed to humiliate and even kill influential Sunnite clergymen and notables. He was sometimes patient and meek when listening to Shi'ite scholars and judges giving their points of view, but he was a different man when judging the Sunnites and their insults against his own religious persuasion.²

Of Shāh Ismā'īl's religious fervour and extremism the author of Ilchī-yi Niẓām Shāh has this to say:

"In order to spread his new religious teachings, Shāh Ismā'īl devoted his full powers to the enforcement of Twelver Shi'īsm, and was so dedicated in his zeal and so severe that none of the Sunnite inhabitants of Iran dared to reveal their beliefs or to carry out their religious observances. During that period the Twelver religion held people in its powerful grasp. Until Shāh Ismā'īl's day, [padding] was the

1. Inqilāb-Islām, pp. 55-6. This prayer, long prayer that is still commonly used in salutations to the Twelve Imāms. It was included in the official prayer manuals, and is said to have been written by Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, after it had been revealed to him in a dream by the Prophet Muhammad. For more details see Donaldson, op. cit., p. 295.

2. For instance, see Sharḥ-i Gulshan-i Rāz, p. 84; Majālis al-Mū'minīn, section VI; Rawdat al-Jīnān, vol. II, p. 160; Maulānā Badāmīyārī, 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 516-19; Tārīkh-Rashīdī, pp. 234-5; Jahān Gūshā, f. 197a-b; Mazzaoui, op. cit., p. 33.
no other kings or rulers of any kind, going back to the beginning of Islam, had extended the range and power of Twelver Shi'ism as he himself did. We can go so far as to say that he developed a new skill in carrying out this important politico-religious movement.¹

Defenders of the Safavid policy argue that the killing of the Sunnite inhabitants of Iran, Iraq and elsewhere by Shāh Ismā'īl I and his followers was done by way of revenge and that their actions were no more than answers to the general massacre, skinning alive, hanging by the testicles, pulling out the victim's tongue, and so on, which were the current and popular punishments employed by rulers such as the Umayyads, 'Abbāsids, Ghaznavids, Saljūqs, Ilkhanids and Timurids. These dynasties are said to have given freedom of worship only to Sunnites and therefore persecuted the Shi'ite inhabitants of their territories because of their beliefs.²

After Shāh Ismā'īl had established Twelver Shi'ism and made it the only state religion, the hatred and lust for revenge that had been building up in the Shi'ite minorities for a long time finally found full expression.

1. Ilchī, f. 32a-b. Part of the Persian text runs as follows: ... در زمان شاه اسماعیل، امپراتوری اسلام بزرگ کنار خود راه یافت و یاران نو داشت و رضیه ندارید، به صورت همکاری و با همکاری اعلام و برای دین مسلمانان و ریاست هزینه مسلمانان، گرفتن پایان ورود و فرمان ناز نفت، نجات و به طرف نزدیک، تمرکز می‌گردید و پس از فرمان ورود، طرف رفت و با نازنی وارد شد. ۱

Most contemporary Shi'ite historians agree that in 914/1508, when Shāh Ismā'īl captured Baghdad, he ordered the exhumation of the tomb of Abū Ḥanīfa Nu'mān b. Thābit Kūfī (born in 80-699/died in 150-767 in Baghdad). It is said that Abū Ḥanīfa died in Manṣūr's (the 'Abbāsid caliph's) prison in Baghdad, and that he was buried there. In 459/1066 a dome was built over his grave which was known as "al-Aʿzamiyya al-Imām al-Aʿżam". Very little is known of his life, except that he lived in Kūfa as a manufacturer and merchant of a kind of silk material. He was the pupil of ʿAbbās b. Sulaimān (died in 120 A.H.) who taught ecclesiastical law in Kūfa. Abū Ḥanīfa became his successor on religious law in Kūfa and the founder of the Ḥanafi school, but he never practised as a Qāḍī.

Abū Ḥanīfa is believed to have been the author of Fiqh al-Akbar and it is surprising that in spite of there being clear evidence in existence about the desecration of

2. E.I., p. 123.
3. Ibid. Cf. also ʿAṣāml, p. 23 where the author states: "بُطُورُ قُضَاءِ تَأَبَّرَ وَبَرَرَ" WHICH MEANS ""I FORGIVE THE OFFENDER.""
4. Inqilāb-Islām, p. 602, cited also in Marifat al-Madhīḥīb, f. 1b.
5. This refers to Abū Ḥanīfa's grave and Khādīm Beg
Abū Ḥanīfa's tomb and corpse, some modern European historians have deliberately neglected or ignored this fact. Seddon has even omitted the Persian text referring to the exhumation, for motives that are obscure.¹

However, it is obvious that Shāh Ismā'īl I could not have decided on his own initiative, as a single powerful authority, to destroy Abū Ḥanīfa's tomb and perform such an action. It is clear that there must have been other authorities to encourage him, as we know that the number of persecutions of Sunnites after the Battle of Chaldīrān was greatly reduced when compared to those before the battle. An explanation for this may be found by noting the number of powerful figures among the clergy and religious authorities who died before the above battle or in it; with them were buried their burning hostilities.²

Tālish who was appointed as the governor of Baghdād, given the title Khālīfat al-Khulafā and nicknamed "Abū l-Maṣūr". See Iṣqā, ff. 14b-15b; Browne, op. cit., p. 43; Aḥsan, I, pp. 226-33 (omitted in vol. II, p. 107).

1. For instance the following Persian text in Tākmīla, f. 128a which has been cited in Aḥsan, vol. I, p. 231 (omitted in vol. II); Muntāzam, p. 106:

2. For instance see Ḥabīb, pp. 545-8. For details of those who were killed in that battle see Inqilāb-
According to some Shi'ite historians, among whom we can include the author of Rawdat al-Safawiyya, when Shah Ismai'il conquered Baghdad in 914/1508, and suppressed the rebellions of the Sunnites of Ghazna\(^1\) who used to plunder the property of Shi'ite minorities in Iraq before 914/1508, the Shah returned to Baghdad. After visiting the Shi'ite shrines of Baghdad the King was encouraged to exhume the tomb of Abu Hanifa Nu'man b. Thabit Kufi, the founder of the Hanafi school.\(^2\) The same author goes on to say:

"Acting according to the two principles of 'branches of duty' existing in Twelver doctrine, namely 'Tawalla wa Tabarra'\(^3\)/Shah Ismai'il\(^4\) ordered the exhumation of the grave of Hanifa Kufi and after that he ordered that it should be used as a public toilet for which purpose it was used by the Shi'ite inhabitants of Iraq for two years. The Shah also ordered that anyone who went to that toilet to defecate should be given the sum of 25 dinars (in Tabriz currency)."\(^5\)

To celebrate this event one of the Shi'ite poets

---

\(^1\) Islam, pp. 199 and 320. The author on this page indicates the decree about the freedom of religious practice issued by Shah Ismai'il's order.

\(^2\) See page 429 below for this ambiguous reading.

\(^3\) Rawdat al-Safawiyya, f. 66a. Cf. also Ilchi, f. 15a about the above decree.

\(^4\) "Tawalla" or the association with the friends of Allâh and "Tabarra" or the separation from the enemies of Allâh. See L. Ivar, The Muharram Mysteries, (Helsingfor 1916), p. 18.

\(^5\) Rawdat al-Safawiyya, f. 66a.
composed the following verse:

"The Shi'ite defecated on Hanifa's grave, but
the Sunnite worshipped it.
The toilet of the Shi'ites is the place of
adoration for Sunnites."

The inhuman behaviour of Shāh Ismā'īl, which was a
result of his own experiences in youth and of the anti-
Sunnite fervour of his entourage, certainly made a great
impression on the Sunnite world. The extent of his anti-
Sunnite activities was such that before the Battle of
Chāldirān, Sultan Salīm I sent an envoy called Qādī
Chalabī to find out what had caused Shāh Ismā'īl to
dishonour the grave of a holy man. 2 According to 'Ālam-
ārā-yi Shāh Ismā'īl, when the Qādī came to Iran, he asked
Shāh Ismā'īl several questions which the Shāh showed
great reluctance to answer. Then Shāh Ismā'īl summoned
Shaikh Zāda Lāhīji and Shaikh 'Alī 'Arab, two of his
most learned Shi'ite advisers, and asked them how he
could answer the Qādī Chalabī's question. They prepared
him appropriately and he answered the Qādī's questions
and sent him back to Sultan Salīm. 3

1. Rawdat al-Safawīyya, f. 66a, where the author
presents the following Persian text translated above:

2. 'Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 515-18.
3. Ibid.

Cf. also Ilchī, f. 15a; 'Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 515-18.
It is interesting to know that one of Shāh Ismā'īl's answers was that the Shi'ites were jealous of Abū Ḥanīfa's grave since holy men among the Shi'ites did not have such magnificent domes over their tombs.¹

8. Shāh Ismā'īl and his Order to Exhume the Tombs of Jāmī and Imām Fakhr al-Dīn Kazī.

It has already been mentioned that Sultan Ḥusain Hāyqara was among those who tried to establish Twelver Shi'ism in Herāt, but because of the disapproval of Amīr 'Alī Shīr Nava'ī and 'Abd al-Raḥmān Jāmī the poet, and other Sunnites, he could not succeed.²

When Shāh Ismā'īl captured Herāt, after killing and massacring the Sunnite inhabitants, it is said that he ordered the exhumation of the tomb of 'Abd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (died in 898/1492) and Imām Fakhr al-Dīn Kazī (died in 606/1208-9).

However, immediately after mentioning the above events, the same author records Sultan Salīm's invasion of Iran. The same author states that the only thing that Shāh Ismā'īl could not imagine was the invasion of Iran by Sultan Salīm I. For more details see p. 520 of the above mentioned source.

According to the author of *Bustān al-Siyāḥa*, who had heard this story from a contemporary scholar, "when Shāh Ismā'īl managed to make Twelver Shi'ism dominant in Herāt and to plant the seeds of bigotry in the heart of the Shi'ites of Iran, wherever he captured an area and established his power, he stamped out the Sunnite doctrine and killed its followers. Wherever there were tombs of the religious scholars of the Sunnite sect, he destroyed them. One of the tombs that he destroyed was the tomb of Maulānā 'Abd al-Raḥmān Jāmī and the other was that of Imām Fakhr al-Dīn Rāzī."¹


After conquering Tabrīz in 907/1501, Shāh Ismā'īl gave particular attention to Twelver Shi'ism and its followers. In spite of very strict and harsh treatment, Sunnites still remained a majority in rural areas and provincial cities, and they did not want to renounce their

¹. *Bustān al-Siyāḥa*, p. 166. Cf. also chapter III, "Hātifī"; *Divān-i Kāmil Jāmī*, ed. by H. Raḍī, p. 192. The editor states that Jāmī was a Shi'ite at heart, but for the sake of appearances he used to pretend to be a Sunnī. Cf. also *Asāmī*, pp. 96-7 where the author gives the above story in full. The author of *Asāmī* on pp. 242-3 states that Imām Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad Fakhr Rāzī was born in Ray in 544 A.H. and died in Herāt in 606 A.H. However, it seems very doubtful to attribute hidden Shi'ite sentiments to Jāmī at a time when he could have demonstrated them publicly without danger. Certainly Shāh Ismā'īl believed him to be a Sunnī.
fathers' religion. Some of them managed to escape to Ottoman territory or to the Öz-Beg rulers of Khurāsān. Those who showed resistance found it was not effective and were cruelly put to the sword.¹

We are told that in many provinces, such as Isfahān, Šīrāz, Kāzīrūn, Yazd, Tabas and others, mass executions took place. Those who were unable to flee for their lives had no alternative but to accept the new form of worship. Many scholars accepted the Šī'a doctrine and so saved their lives, and received as some kind of reward, important jobs and high positions in government.² As the author of the ʿAḥsan al-Tawārīkh states, the number of people who had any knowledge about Twelver Šī'ism and its doctrines were very few and the number of books on the subject of Twelver Šī'ism was very small.³ Shah Ismāʿīl had to welcome those scholars who were forced to convert to his new religion; they were a key element in his advancement.

Among those who were converted to Twelver Šī'ism voluntarily or otherwise, we may list ʿAllāma Dawwānī, the most influential scholar of Šīrāz of the 9th-10th/15th-16th centuries.⁴ He was a scientist, judge and

3. ʿAḥsan, I, p. 61; Petrushevsky/Kishāvarz, p. 395.
religious authority in Shirāz and was a religious teacher of the school of the Masjid-i 'Atīq Shirāz. He is said to have been a man of wealth, ambitious to make more money, and was one of those Shāfi'ī scholars who were expert and powerful in religious matters, solving the kind of religious problems that his predecessors were incapable of solving.2

Dawwānī was the elder son of Maulānā Sa'd al-Dīn Asa'd, who was famous for having a respectable genealogy from the religious point of view. He lived in a village called Dawwān in the Kāzirūn district and practised as a judge in religious matters.3

In his youth Maulānā Dawwānī had studied under his father. He went to Shirāz, where he became a pupil of Maulānā Muḥī al-Dīn Kūshkīnārī and Khwāja Ḥasan Shāh Baqqāl, who were themselves former pupils of Muḥaqiq Sharīf.4 Dawwānī had also been a pupil of Maulānā Ḥumām al-Dīn Gulbārī and had once taken lessons on tafsīr under Shaikh Ṣafī al-Dīn Abīl, who was a learned Sayyid of Shirāz.5

1. Ḥabīb, IV, pp. 604-5; Aḥsan, I, p. 71; Majālis al-Mū'minīn, "Majlis Shishum".
4. Ḥabīb, IV, p. 604.
5. Ibid.
Maulānā's knowledge in religious matters was so great that many students from the two 'Irāqs, the Ottoman Empire, Arrān, Azarbāyjān, Hūrūm, Kirmān, Ṭabaristān, Jurjān, Khurāsān and other places used to come to him for instruction. 1 Maulāna was elected as the ṣadr of Mīrzā Yūsuf b. Mīrzā Jihān Shāh, but finally resigned and settled in the school of Baygum which was known as Dār al-Āytām. At the time of the Āq-qoyūnlū dynasty he was practising as a judge in Fārs. 2

Unfortunately, Khwānd Amīr does not give any clear information about his true religion and about his tendency towards Twelver Shi’ism except that he states that Maulānā composed the Treatise of Zūrā’ (Risāla-yi Zūrā’) 3 in Najaf in one day, working from dawn till sunset without any rest, when he was visiting the tomb of Ḥadrat ‘Alī. 4 As has been said, it is not known whether or not he really was a Shi‘a at heart, but it is said that at the beginning of his career he was a Sunnī and in principle followed the Ash‘arī Ṭarīqa. Then he became a Shāfī‘ī, and when Shāh Ismā‘īl conquered Tabrīz in 907/1501 and established Twelver Shi‘ism, he became a Shi‘ite and wrote his work called Nūr al-Hidāya in support of Twelver Shi‘ism. 5

1. Ḥabīb, p. 604.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid. p. 605; "(".
4. Ibid.
5. Ḥalabi, op. cit., p. 660.
Considering his conversion to Twelver Shi'ism it is almost certain that Dawwâni had not been a very strict or rigid believer in his father's religion and principles. Dawwâni knew what would happen to him if he continued his religious practice, as he saw the fate of those who showed resistance to changing their beliefs.

It is said that when Shâh Ismâ'îl sent out his decrees all over the Iranian territories, after his capture of Tabrîz in 907/1501, forcing the rulers to impose his new religion on the inhabitants, Maulânâ Dawwâni was one of those who went to the public pulpit and started to praise Twelver Shi'ism and Hadrat 'All's descendants, and cursed the enemy who suppressed them. When he had finished his speech and the assembly was over, his students, who were shocked by his behaviour and the way he praised the new religion, approached him and one of them asked:

"Maulânâ, since yesterday you were a Shâfi'i follower, what has happened that, in such a short space of time, you have converted without warning to the Ja'fari Madhhab and have forgotten your father's religion?"

Maulânâ Dawwâni replied:

"No thinking person throws away his life for the sake of the two Shaikhs."

---

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
This conversion allowed him to stay in his previous position. It is also said that Maulānā Dawwānī once asked one of his students, "Who is the Twelfth Imām?" The student replied, "Shaḥ Ismā'īl." Hearing this, Dawwānī became angry but said nothing.\(^1\) Dawwānī was the author of more than thirty works which space does not permit us to list here.\(^2\) He died in 908/1502 in Shīrāz.\(^3\)

1. The Happiness of Shaḥ Ismā'īl at the Death of Some Herātī Sunnites.

The records of many events that occurred during the reign of Shaḥ Ismā'īl involving religion in the Iranian territories and outside are found only as scattered references. The accounts given by the author of 'Alām-ārā-yi Shaḥ Ismā'īl seem most interesting and most favourable to the Shi'ite point of view, which differ from others.

2. For Dawwānī's works, see Aḥsan, I, pp. 71-2; Ḥablīb, IV, pp. 604-5; Ḥalabī, op. cit., pp. 660-663, where most of his works are recorded.
3. On the date of his death there is some disagreement. See Ḥablīb, IV, p. 605; Jahān-ārā, p. 255; Aḥsan, I, p. 15; Majalis al-Mū'minīn, Majlis Shīshūn; Mazzaoui, op. cit., p. 84; Ḥalabī, op. cit., p. 663.
According to the same author mentioned above, when the founder of the Safavid dynasty conquered Khurasan and killed Muhammad Khan Shaiban, a certain envoy, called Qulljân Beg, who was one of Najm Thânî's servants, was sent to Herât to inform the citizens about Shâh Ismâ'îl's conquest and his visit to that city. Qulljân Beg, who, because he was Amir Najm Thânî's slave, was very proud of himself, sent a messenger to Herât before entering the city, to inform the chiefs of Herât of his arrival. Since the Sunnite inhabitants of Herât and its kalântar did not come to welcome him and deliberately ignored him, he entered the city secretly and went towards the Jâmi' mosque. On his way he killed an influential Sunnite called Pahlawan Muhammad Ahdâth and continued towards the mosque. On arrival he immediately summoned a gathering of all the chiefs and religious authorities and Sunnite scholars at the mosque. The Sunnite inhabitants accordingly heeded his request and gathered there. After imposing the Twelver khutba on them, and cursing the three caliphs and the enemies of Twelver Shi'ism, he killed the Qâqî of Herât and its kalântar, who refused to curse the three caliphs. When

1. On his hatred of Sunnites see 'Â.A. Shâh Ismâ'îl, p. 397.

The Tarîkh Rashîdi, disagreeing with the above statement, says it was Shâh Ismâ'îl who killed the Shaikh al-Islâm, Ḥâfiz Zayn al-Dîn Ziyaratgâhî in the Mulkan mosque (p. 235). Cf. Jahân Gushâ, f. 194b; Ilchî, ff. 22b-23a; Rawdat al-Safawîyya, f. 79a-b.
the Sunnites of Herāt refused to curse the three caliphs in that mosque they were put to the sword. Qulijān then asked the Shaikh al-Islām of Herāt to give five thousand tūmāns to save his life, which he did. Qulijān, after receiving the money, ordered him to curse the three caliphs and since he refused to carry out this command, he was put to death. Qulijān then ordered the Shi'ite inhabitants to curse the three caliphs and the enemies of the immaculate Imāms and receive one tūmān each; they complied with his order, and in this way, Qulijān distributed the 5,000 tūmāns. Then he ordered the rest of the inhabitants to decorate and illuminate the city of Herāt as they used to do during the reign of Sulṭān Ḥusain Bayqara (died in 911/1506).¹

When Shāh Ismā'īl entered the city of Herāt² and saw the preparations, he was told that Qulijān Beg, the servant of Amīr Najm Thānī, had done such an excellent job of preparing the way for the Shāh that although Herāt had been a Sunnite city, the inhabitants had praised the king, exclaiming: "God, Muḥammad and 'Alī with eleven sons [sic] be with the victorious King."³

Shāh Ismā'īl wanted to hear Qulijān's personal account of the events that had taken place in Herāt; he recounted these while walking along with Shāh Ismā'īl, explaining

---

1. 'Ā.A. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 399.
2. Ibid.; cf. also Ḥabīb, IV, p. 515.
3. 'Ā.A. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 400.
the occurrences and his own severity. The Shāh was so happy and full of joy that he said smiling with admiration: "You killed the Shaikh al-Islām of Herat and distributed his gold among the Shi'ites. Since you have done such an excellent job, we give the Shaikh al-Islām's properties to you."¹

According to the author of Jahān Gushā-yi Khāqān, hundreds of Sunnites were killed that day because of their refusal to curse the three caliphs.²

11. Shāh Ismā'īl and the General Massacre of Āq-qoyūnlū

Turkomāns in 914/1508 in Baghda'd.

In 914/1508,³ in order to suppress Barīk Beg Purnāk,⁴ Shāh Ismā'īl set out for Iraq. After the capture of

1. "A. A. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 400.
2. Jahān Gushā, f. 194b.
3. See Habīb, IV, p. 492-4, where Khwānd Amīr gives the date as after the autumn of 914/1508

Jahān-ārā, p. 271 gives the same date.

Ahsan, I, p. 103 follows Habīb of Browne, op. cit., IV, p. 58; Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., p. 44; Savory "Consolidation", p. 72.

Baghdād, Barīk Beg, together with Sultan Murād, fled towards Halab. From there Sultan Murād joined ‘Alā’ al-Daula Dhūl-Qadar in Albistān and became his son-in-law. The contemporary historians, such as Khwānd Amīr, Rūmlū, Qāḍī Aḥmad Ghaffārī, and Yaḥyā Qazvīnī do not give any clue to the motivation for this massacre. For example, Qazvīnī, in Lubb al-Tawārīkh, merely states that:

"Shāh Ismā‘īl killed so many of the Iraqis that the River Tigris ran with human blood instead of water."1

The author of Ilchī-yi Niẓām Shāh presents a clear analysis of this dreadful massacre and states:

"Most of the Turkomāns, having families, had not been able to escape, and therefore stayed in Baghdad. At that time, following an order from Shāh Ismā‘īl, Dīw Sultan and some of his men began to slaughter these innocent people. They did this with arrow and sword, indiscriminately killing young and old of high and low rank. After killing them all, they threw their corpses into the River Tigris, so that the water of the river changed its colour, to become like the faces of hopeless lovers who have been separated; and owing to the smell of the putrid corpses the atmosphere in Baghdad changed completely. They then attacked the tribes of the Baghdad districts and after massacring them, took their camels and wealth as booty."2

1. Lubb, p.249.
2. See Ḥābīb, IV, p. 495; Jahān-ārā, pp. 271-2; Ilchī, f. 14b.
   For more details see Rudūd al-‘Alam, p. 491, index.
3. Ilchī, f. 14b.
Since Šāh Ismā'īl was very fond of illicit love-making drinking and feasting, it is ironic that he forbade his Qīzl-Ḥash to continue similar unlawful acts. One such was drinking.¹ The Šāh was himself a heavy drinker and was in the habit of enjoying feast-making with his amīrs. On this subject the author of Ḥabīb al-Siyar is a good source.²

We are told that during the year 908/1503, Šāh Ismā'īl had heard that there was some kind of conspiracy among the Sunnite inhabitants of Tabrīz who had remained loyal to Alwand Mīrzā³ and had co-operated with him. Šāh Ismā'īl, according to a Venetian merchant who was in Tabrīz in the same year, decided to punish the Āq-qoyūnlū Turkomāns by destroying their reputation by humiliating them and causing them to suffer great indignities.

According to the same merchant:

"On his second arrival in Tauris, Ismael committed a most disgraceful act, as he caused twelve of the most beautiful youths in the town to be taken to his palace of Astibisti (Hasht Bihisht) for him to work his wicked will upon them, and gave

1. See Ḥabīb, IV, p. 516; Ilchī, f. 30a.
3. Ḥabīb, IV, p. 469.
them away one by one to his lords for the same purpose; a short time previously he had caused ten children of respectable men to be seized in like manner.\(^1\)

However, we hear of the same king that in \(916/1510\), during his first invasion of Khurāsān, he ordered his executioners to hang several of his great amīrs who had been drinking wine in his winter-quarters. As Khwānd Amīr states:

"When the beautiful crescent of the month of Shawwāl was seen by the thirsty people who kept fast, the glorious king went towards the feasting place prepared for that day, and, following its regulations, he performed the necessary duties of the \(\text{i'd-i Fitr}\). He then made many gifts to the poor and after that enjoyed food and drink. In that winter, the king stayed in that paradise city [Herāt], and there he became so strict in his ban on illegal pursuits, such as the drinking of wine, that several of his amīrs were hanged upside down until they died.\(^3\)"

According to the same author, the above punishment was meted out after the establishment of Twelver Shi'ism

---


2. The festival of the breaking of the Ramaḍān fast.

3. Ḥabīb, IV, p. 516. The above statement is cited nearly word for word in Jahān Gushā, f. 196a-b. However, it was in the same year that Shāh Ismā'īl, objecting to the argument between Shi'ite and Sunnite scholars held in the garden of Jahān-ārā, killed Maulānā Saʿd al-Dīn Taftāzānī, the Shaikh al-Islām of Herāt who had held that post for 30 years. The same statement is found in Rawdat al-Ṣafawīyya, f. 79b, and Jahān-ārā, p. 274.
in Khurasan in 916/1510.¹

In reality the motivating factor behind Shāh Ismā‘īl's action cannot have been the restrictions of the month of Ramadān alone as it seems hard to believe, on the basis of the evidence adduced in one of our chapters,² that Shāh Ismā‘īl really had a heartfelt respect for Islamic law and its religious regulations. Unfortunately Khwand Amīr and the other contemporary historians do not give any other clear motive for the punishments carried out by the king.³

Finally, in order to give a balanced picture in this examination of Shāh Ismā‘īl's religious zeal, it seems appropriate to quote from the account of the Venetian merchant about the kind of society that Shāh Ismā‘īl controlled and that he allowed to become even more degenerate during his reign:

"Also the harlots, who frequent the public places, are bound to pay according to their beauty, as the prettier they are the more they have to pay; and far worse than the others I have mentioned is this cursed, horrible, disgraceful custom, the evil odour of which ascends to heaven; and from the following instance you may learn their iniquities, as in this city there is a public place and school of sodomy, where likewise they pay tribute according to their beauty.

All the money they collect is for the

¹Habīb, IV, p. 516.
²See chapter, VIIpp. 468-74.
³Habīb, p. 516.
private advantage of the revenue farmers, and no difference is made between Christians and Mussulmans in going to the prostitutes." 1

The above accounts and those given in other chapters dealing with Šāh Ismā'īl's religious zeal give the impression that Šāh Ismā'īl did not care about or pay any attention to the business of putting a stop to illegal acts, as defined by Islamic law, for the simple reason that he himself enjoyed them. 2

CHAPTER VII

THE MIRACLES OF ŞHĀH ISMA'ĪL I
The present chapter attempts to explain the superhuman magnetism of Šah Ismai'īl I, the charisma which brought this man out of exile to a position of virtually unlimited power in Iran. Many of the sources used in this thesis show Ismai'īl to have been a man of some ambivalence who could order, or even execute, acts of extreme barbarity, yet on occasion display enlightened kindness. Very often he won the confidence and support of the common people by recognizing their economic needs. In this atmosphere of trust the people gathered like flies, feeding on the myths which wove a web around this royal spider.

Šah Ismai'īl was educated, among other tutors, by astronomers whose knowledge he used to manipulate his ill-informed band of supporters and his even more ignorant and superstitious subjects in general. He was credited by some with great gifts of prophecy and with a close and miraculous association with the Immaculate Imāms. He cunningly used this reputation to promote the Shī'ite confession and to incite its members to fanatical activity, so that the Šah's carnal thirst for power was slaked by the blood of men who thought that they were waging holy war against heretics.

Most modern historians have ignored or played down Ismai'īl's claims to divine powers, and the extent to which he depended on his god-like reputation. Perhaps the following pages will go some way towards redressing the balance of history.
PART ONE

1. Shāh Ismā'īl's Belief in Portents, in Astrology and in Horoscopy to Predict the Future.

According to contemporary historians, Shāh Ismā'īl had a strong belief in astrology and horoscopes. He had inherited this belief from his ancestors and he, in turn, passed it on to his descendants in the entire Safawī dynasty. Although he ruled his country as a despot and as a man who wielded great power, Shāh Ismā'īl was himself in the power of soothsayers and astrologers.

Most of his subjects, as in centuries past, believed in astrology, in the casting of horoscopes, and in other metaphysical practices, to the extent that they could not take any important step without consulting them. It is said that before the Shāh allowed his brother Ibrāhīm Mirzā to leave Lāhījān for Ardabīl he consulted the Qurān. On another occasion, when he intended to seize the throne of Āzarbāyjān he first felt compelled to listen to the advice of the astrologers.

Since he had a strong belief in astrology and soothsaying, Shāh Ismā'īl ordered a reward to be given to the

1. For the later period, see Zindīgānī, II, pp. 345-50.
2. See 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 37.
3. Ibid., p. 60.
man who brought the good news\(^1\) of Shāh Ṭahmāsb’s birth in ICASTH in 919/1513 and then he gave orders to Amīr Sayyid Muḥammad Sharīf to consult with astrologers in order to discover what his son’s prospects were for the future. He was told that there was an astrologer in KASHAN named Maulānā Naṣīr whose professional skill was unsurpassed.\(^2\) Shāh Ismā‘īl appointed an ilchī to go as quickly as possible to KASHAN and bring the astrologer to him in ICASTH. After his arrival, Shāh Ismā‘īl asked him what the future held for Ṭahmāsb.

The same author states that:

"The astrologers had declared that this would be an appropriate time for the prince to be brought to be seen by his father. Maulānā Naṣīr Ṭūsī (?) arrived at the same time and was taken to the Shāh too. After showing his respect by bowing to the king, Maulānā Naṣīr foretold three years\(^{(sic)}\) of Shāh Ṭahmāsb’s future and predicted that this prince would ascend the throne of Iran and that for twenty-five years he would fight for the preservation of the true religion. And the great King SultānKhwāndīgār of Rūm \(^{(Ottoman \text{Empire})}\) would obey him, and for 30 years the swords of the Qizil-Başh would not be drawn out of their sheaths. He would banish musical instruments and do away with crime, and he would be the father of numerous children."\(^3\)

---

2. ‘Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā‘īl, p. 95; cf. ‘Ā.Ā. Safawī, p. 174, where the author makes a similar statement and says that Shāh Ismā‘īl was twenty years old at this time, which is information not found elsewhere.
3. ‘Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā‘īl, p. 95; cf. Ilchī, f. 24b.

Some of this astrologer’s predictions did, in fact, come true, for instance that he would be the father of numerous children and so on; but that he was just, seems hard to believe. See chapter V on Shāh Ṭahmāsb I.
Shāh Ismā'īl sometimes also made predictions based quite simply on names, e.g. Mużaffar ("victorious"). We have already mentioned that it made no difference to Shāh Ismā'īl and his followers what, or who, brought supernatural signs and advice, or whence these signals were received. For them, what was important was that they were receptive to divine messages.

One instance of Shāh Ismā'īl's receiving a sign from an unexpected source took place in 916/1510, when the Shāh was attacking Marv, and came across the name of the scribe Khwāja Mużaffar Bitikčī. This man was a rich chieftain of the province of Jūrjān. When he visited Shāh Ismā'īl, the Shāh studied his name and said: "We will conquer the enemy" (as Mużaffar means "conqueror"). To thank Khwāja Mużaffar for his visit, the Shāh presented him with generous gifts and made him a government official and one of his own attendants. 2

2. Shāh Ismā'īl's Activities as a Soothsayer.

It seems preferable to interpret Shāh Ismā'īl's predictions as evidence of his astuteness and of his having good advisers rather than as signs of a supernatural genius. 3 It is said that when Shāh Ismā'īl

1. Ilchī, f. 20b; cf. Aḥsan, I, p. 115.
2. See Ilchī, f. 20b and Aḥsan, I, p. 115.
3. It was widely believed that Shāh Ismā'īl could tell what men thought or what the future would be. For more details see Jahān Gūshā, f. 49a.
reached Sarakhs en route to his attack on Khurāsān in 916/1510, he sent Dāna Muḥammad and a group of Qīzīl-Bāsh on ahead as his vanguard. Realizing what was afoot, Shaibak Khan sent two of his commanders, Jān Vafā Mīrzā and Qanbar Beg, and a large number of Öz-Begs, to bar the road and kill Dāna Muḥammad near the village of Tahirābād. Before he sent Dāna Muḥammad as his scout, Shāh Ismāʿīl said: "Dāna Muḥammad will not be able to return to us." And, according to the author of the Jahān Gushā-yi Khāqān, Dāna Muḥammad was killed in that ambush, just as Shāh Ismāʿīl had predicted.2

3. The People's Concern for Shāh Ismāʿīl and their Belief in him.

We have seen that since Shāh Ismāʿīl was successful in all his battles (except the Battle of Chaūdīrān), restored Iran to its former security, brought peace for the Shiʿites, and in some measure did away with the feudal hierarchy among the Iranian landowners, the Shiʿites in Iran were very devoted to him, especially the Twelver Shiʿites. The first and second chapters of this thesis have shown that from the very outset, in 905/1499, he had himself represented as the universal ruler and the saviour of his oppressed people. As Minorsky points

1. Jahān Gushā, f. 184b; Ilchī, f. 20b.
2. Ḥabīb, IV, p. 508; Jahān Gushā, f. 184b; Ilchī, f. 20b.
"It is not enough to say that the Safavid monarchy had sprung up as a theocracy. Such was, for instance, the origin of the Muslim community in Medina but, if Muhammad was only an apostle delivering messages from God, Shah Isma'il and his immediate ancestors considered themselves as hereditary and living emanations (mażhar) of the godhead."¹

Thus it was that this supporter of the Shi'ite faith, who, according to many historians, was simply waiting for this opportunity, was able to achieve what his father and grandfather had not managed to do in their day. By his intelligence and serious demeanour, perhaps by his genius, or simply by his strength of will and his air of absolute authority, Shah Isma'il won the hearts of his retinue and his subjects in general; they recognized him as superior to any ordinary mortal before 920/1514.²

His attendants believed that future events were shown to him in visions from the invisible world and that every action he took was supernaturally inspired. He was believed to possess the power of reading the thoughts of other people. He was believed to be able to destroy his enemies with supernatural God-given power. His prayers were considered strong medicine among his followers, and people always requested him to pray for them to be martyred.

¹. Minorsky, Tadhkirat al-Mulûk, p. 12; cf. also Jahân Gushâ, f. 252a, where the author clearly points out that the people saw him as a god.
². Jahân Gushâ, f. 252a.
One has to accept, however, that the fawning courtiers who surrounded Shâh Ismâ'îl exaggerated the stories about him in order to magnify him in the people's eyes. They distorted events that were the result of the king's good judgement or of his or his amîrs' astuteness or which were mere accidents of fate, and attributed them to the Shâh's spiritual and supernatural power, claiming that he was undoubtedly the messenger of God and the shadow of God (Zîll Allâh) upon earth.¹

On the subject of the people's supposed love of their king, it will be sufficient to quote the following observations by the Venetian merchant:

"This Sophy is loved and reverenced by his people as a god, and especially by his soldiers, many of whom enter into battle without armour,² expecting their master Ismael to watch over them in the fight. There are also others to go into battle without armour, being willing to die for their monarch, rushing on with naked breasts, crying 'Schiac, Schiac' [Shaikh, Shaikh]. The name of God is forgotten throughout Persia and only that of Ismael remembered;³ if anyone falls when riding or dismounted he appeals to no other god but Schiac, using the name in two ways; first as god Schiac; secondly as prophet; as the Mussulmans say 'Laylla, Laylla

1. See for instance Jahân-ārā, pp. 265-66, and also Savory, "Consolidation", p. 91. For the relation between murshîd and murîds, see Jahân Gushā, f. 64a-b.

2. These people, according to the author of Shâh Jang (pp. 267-8), must have been of the Tâlish tribe who believed that armour makes the warrior heavy and therefore not free to move easily or fight bravely.

3. This attitude survived till the end of the Şafawî dynasty. See Zindîgânî, II, pp. 353-66; D'Alessandri, op. cit., p. 223; for the period in question see Minorsky, Tâdhkîrat al-Mulûk, pp. 12-13.
Muhamet resuralla," the Persians say: 'Laylla ìjyllala Ismael velli alla'; besides this, everyone, and particularly his soldiers, consider him immortal, but I have heard that Ismael is not pleased with being called a god or a prophet..."¹

1. The correct transcription is "Lā Ilāha ilā Allāh, Muḥammad rasūl Allāh" and "Lā Ilāha ilā Allāh Ismā'īl wall Allāh."

    The second statement of Shi'ite doctrine was of course: "There is no God but Him and 'Alī is a friend of God."

PART TWO

The Karamât or Miracles of Shâh Ismâ'îl I.

1. The Foretelling of the Conquest of Tabrîz.

Shâh Ismâ'îl could attract those who were around him by his sobriety, intelligence and gentle attitude. His adherents came by degrees to think of him as God on earth. If the defeat at Châldirân had not taken place, his followers would have been certain that he was God because every day and even in ordinary matters, they witnessed him predicting something which came true. As a consequence of these apparent powers, they believed that Shâh Ismâ'îl could support them materially and spiritually, fulfilling their desires and solving their problems.

It is obvious that self-seeking flatterers and rumour-mongers had a large part in spreading reports of false miracles and supernatural happenings among a gullible populace which, according to many contemporary historians, was unable to read or write. A more accurate interpretation of Shâh Ismâ'îl's "miracles" would be to

1. See Jahân Gushâ, f. 252a where the above Persian text appears.

For more details see chapter VI, p. 387.

regard them as happy accidents or intelligent guesses which had fortunate results. Among the many "miracles" attributed to Shāh Ismā'īl I, a few will be enough to demonstrate the kind of shrewd guess-work that he or his Sūfīs could claim to be inspiration from God.

It is said that before Shāh Ismā'īl captured the capital of Azerbaijan, he announced to his men that it had been revealed to him by inspiration that the city was ready for his coup. But in fact a specific series of events led him to venture to make this pronouncement. Shāh Ismā'īl had mounted an aggressive incursion against Alwand Mīrzā and Farrukh Ysār, the King of Shīrvān, and had been informed of Alwand Mīrzā's advance against him. He was at the time besieging the fort of Gulistān. To avoid suffering the same fate as his father, who had been besieged, surrounded on all sides and finally killed by his enemies in the province of Tabarsaran, Shāh Ismā'īl was advised to give up the siege of Gulistān and withdraw towards Azerbaijan, which at that moment was more secure than Shirvan or any other area. Realizing that the capture of Gulistān would not have been easy, he summoned his amīrs to show them that his action in withdrawing would make good sense. He asked them: "Do you want Azerbaijan or the fort of Gulistān?" They answered,

1. See Ḥabīb, IV, pp. 462-3; Aḥsan, I, p. 57; Jahān Gushā, f. 65a.
2. See Aḥsan, I, p. 57.
"Azarbāyjān." Shāh Ismā'īl then said: "Last night inspired knowledge was given to me by the Immaculate Imāms and by the guidance of the True Way, that if I want the throne of Azarbāyjān, I must first withdraw from the fort of Gulistān."¹

We have seen that his amīrs would follow Shāh Ismā'īl obediently because of their utter devotion to him. On this occasion the author of Jahān Gushā-yi Khāqān states:

"Because of the completeness of their devotion towards Ḥadrat Shāh Ismā'īl, the amīrs believed every word that fell from the tongue of the Murshid-i Kamīl to be absolute truth, never dreaming of any doubt that any event he predicted would come true. His prediction that he would take the throne of Azarbāyjān made them so happy that their shout of joy reached beyond the sky of Kayvān."²

2. Shāh Ismā'īl's Water-Divining in the Desert Near Hamadān.

One obvious example of the astuteness of Shāh Ismā'īl and of the great amīrs who were closest to him

1. Habīb, iv, p. 462; Jahān Gushā, f. 65a; Ahsan, I, p. 47.
2. Jahān Gushā, f. 65b; cf. also Habīb, iv, pp. 462-3, where Khwānd Amīr records another anecdote to the effect that one of the inhabitants of the fort of Gulistān begged the Shāh to withdraw. Cf. 'Ā.Ā., Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 52-4.

Kayvān represents the planet Saturn, the seventh heaven.
took place in 908/1503 during Shâh Ismâ'îl's campaign against Sultân Murâd in Allâh Bâlàghî near Hamadân. Before he reached his destination, Shâh Ismâ'îl put on a show of inspiration that made his supporters believe in him more wholeheartedly than they had done before. The story runs as follows:

On Sunday, 23rd Dhul-Hijja 908/20 June 1503, Shâh Ismâ'îl camped at a place where the shortage of water was extreme. His courtiers said:

"This place and the unfortunate people who live here are both suffering from drought. Like a mirage the land is a partner with the sky in drinking from the same spring, the sun. If the victorious army could camp in a place where the water is plentiful enough to supply the extra demands made by a battle and hot weather, it would be better for the health and comfort of the king's followers and for the fortunes of the king."2

We are told that "the king implored the mercy of God - who in His kindness sends help before we ask for it - and was inspired to declare: 'We will be watered by the spring that comes from success and will need no water from the cloud of the God-given farm; and the poisons of drought will vanish.'"3

The authors of the Rawdat al-Šafawiyya and Habîb

---

1. As already mentioned Ahsan (vol. I, p. 65) gives ٍ، and the other sources follow suit, but since the spring was discovered through divination I think ٍ which means "God's spring" gives better sense.


3. Ibid.
al-Siyar, both state that, still inspired by God, the king ordered his victorious army to dig a well at that spot. They began digging according to his instructions, and after they had dug down a little way, clear spring water gushed out of the earth. The victorious army was delighted by the Shāh's supernatural power and inspiration and they gave greater credence to his powers, and became more loyal to their leader. They began to give thanks for the example of the Šafawīd dynasty. Terror and anxiety vanished from their faces and they camped on that spot.¹

3. Shāh Ismā'īl and the Miracle of the Ḥabla Rūd.

We have already seen that Shāh Ismā'īl and his amīrs knew that it would take a long time to capture the Fort of Istā simply by besieging it.² So they looked for a way to enter the castle without losing any of their men. Unfortunately for Ḥusain Kiyā Chalāvī, one of his relatives called Shāh Malik³ climbed down the castle

¹. Ḥabīb, IV, p. 470; Rawdat al-Šafawiyya, f. 46b.
². This episode is discussed in chapter IV, pp. 290-4.
³. See Ilchī, f. 10b. Ilchī is the only source which refers to him:

"...بل ایمان خصمت پرده مأمور لواکه فرودگر به از وی انسانی همچون لیسا در ایام راهپیمایی ناپدید کرده به دستور شاه و در دید شجاعت برای بوسیه تهیه..."
walled by a rope one night and joined Shāh Ismā'īl's army. Shāh Ismā'īl held him dear and gave him a good position in his service. In return, Shāh Malik told the king about the only way to capture the fort. The next morning Shāh Ismā'īl claimed, as usual, that he had been told in a vision that there was only one way to capture the fort.

The author of 'Alam-arā-yi Shāh Ismā'īl states that:

"When night fell, the conquering king began to pray to the court of God who supplies all needs, and he begged Him for the capture of the fort. He went to sleep and saw the āmīr al-mu'mīnīn 'Alī (the praise of God be upon him), in his dream, ordering him to go to the widest point on the dry bed of the diverted river Chīl Rūd on the following morning and find the line which marked where the present river used to flow."¹

He further ordered him:

"You must tell your soldiers to dig at that spot because it marks the original course of the river which now flows to the castle. When Jāmāsp Ḥakīm built that castle, he diverted the river away from its original course to flow around the castle, and filled the old riverbed with stones and mud. You must first clear the channel and then divert the river so that it returns to its old course. This will force the people in the castle to surrender for lack of water..."²

The author of 'Alam-arā-yi Shāh Ismā'īl indicates that when the conquering King woke up he summoned Ḥusain Beg Lala, Amīr Najm Zargar, and other commanders and told them of his vision. Next morning he mounted his horse and, together with his great āmīrs, went to the main

1. 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 129. Cf. Ilchī, f. 10b.
2. 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 129; cf. Ilchī, f. 10b and Habīb, IV, p. 477.
branch (i.e. the original course) of the diverted river and found the channel to which the amīr al-mū'minīn 'Allī had guided him the previous night in his dream. He then ordered all his amīrs and troops to excavate that river-bed out of love for the Shāh "Shāhī Sevan". Surprisingly, some of the men suggested to him that "in such a rocky and stony place, the spade and pick will do nothing; and cutting or digging those stones is a very hard and difficult task which will not be finished soon enough." The Shāh answered: "At one time the river flowed through here, but, acting on Gushtāsp's orders, the Ḥakīm Ḵᵛājā Jāmāsp - who was the ruler of Māzandarān - built this castle out of the rock of the mountain you see over there, and he also diverted the river, so that it flows around the castle, as at present, to supply the water needed at the castle. He then filled the previous passage. You must evacuate and clear this old channel and divert the river to its original route." Then the world conqueror took the spade with his blessed hand and thrust it downwards, so that it went into the stony ground. Then, with the rest of the victorious army, his great amīrs took their spades and picks and began to dig the passage. Their efforts were eventually rewarded by the fall of the castle.

1. "A.A. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 128-130; cf. Ilchī, f. 10b and Ḥabīb, IV, p. 477 which gives a slight variation as well as a demonstration of Khwānd Amīr's eloquent style and handling of words.

2. "A.A. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 128-130. See also chapter IV, pp. 290-4.
4. **Shāh Ismā'īl's Conversations with the Immaculate Imāms.**

One of the links with the supernatural attributed to Shāh Ismā'īl was his regular conversation with the Immaculate Imāms, mostly Ḥāḍrat 'Ālī and the other Imāms, especially the eighth Shi'ite Imām, Imām Rida (148-203/765-817). A particular instance of this occurred in 916/1510 before Shāh Ismā'īl attacked Marv. We read that his great amīrs suggested:

"Your Majesty, with your good fortune and dignity, set out from Āzarbāyjan for Mašḥad immediately, with no delay. For the horses, camels and other animals are not in the sort of condition one might desire (most of them having lost their strength or weight, or having died); and since Shāhī Beg Kān is the independent king of all Turkestan and Khurāsān, fighting against him with a well-prepared strategy and a clever policy would be desirable. It would not be out of keeping with intelligence, wisdom and forethought if you ordered your men to camp at Mašḥad for a while until we can prepare the necessary supplies and equipment. After that we could advance against Shāhī Beg Kān."

The same author goes on to say:

"When the shadow of the God heard these suggestions from his great amīrs, he smiled and said: 'Warriors and Sūfis, I have heard what you have

---

1. See 'Ā.A. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 347-8. This is a unique statement. The author says that after staying for three days in Mašḥad, Shāh Ismā'īl, of course, decided to attack Shāhī Beg Kān and when his idea was rejected by his great amīrs, the above suggestion was offered. It seems that all the previous preparations and the making of gifts to his Qizil-Başh were because they did not wish to fight the Üz-Begs.

See also chapter IV on Shaibak Kān Öz-Beg (pp. 297-301)."
suggested and know that you want good fortune
for both my religion and my kingdom. As far
as I am concerned, I am an attendant at the
court of the Immaculate Imāms, and till now,
what I have done has been in obedience to
their orders. And at this moment the Imām
Riḍā has ordered us to fight against Shāhī
Beg Khān without any delay. If you do not
believe me, I will give you proof of his
confirmation.' Then the King suggested the
following: 'We shall write a letter in your
presence, asking for permission to fight, and
place it on the sarcophagus of the blessed
Imām Riḍā (God's praise be upon him). I shall
lock the doors of that illuminated haram and
you yourselves will guard it. The next day we
will open the blessed doors together and
retrieve the letter. If the Immaculate Imām
Riḍā (God's praise be upon him) has given his
permission, we will fight against Shāhī Beg
Khān; if not, we will return at once.' Then
the King dictated the following letter:

'This message is addressed from the
faithful slaves, Ismā'īl and all
his troops, to the dignified court,
adored by the people:
These slaves wish to fight against
Shāhī Beg Khān. If victory is our
destiny, please inform us; or, if we
should be patient until another
occasion, order us to return.'

The same author states that they put the letter on
the sacred chest, sealed the doors of that holy place
and returned to their own quarters. The next day the
shadow of God, together with his great chiefs and amīrs,
unsealed the blessed doors and entered the sacred area.
When they opened the letter they saw the hand-writing of

1. It seems that Shāh Ismā'īl was very sure of Shaibak's
weakness; for this reason he did not want to give
him a chance to gather his scattered troops.

2. 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 348.
the blessed Imam Riḍā and the message:

"We hereby command you to fight. Set out, and the victory will be yours."¹

When the amīrs saw this confirmation of Shāh Ismā'īl's plans, they asked the King's forgiveness and promised him that they would never offer such disrespectful opposition again; they vowed to sin no more and praised their Lord.² It was then that Shāh Ismā'īl moved towards Marv.

¹ Ibid., p. 349, quoted from the original Ms. (f. 235). The folio number is not given.
² Ibid. For another occasion see Habīb, IV, p. 447; Jahān Gushā, f. 33b; ‘Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, pp. 38-9.
CHAPTER VIII

THE KING AT LEISURE
PART ONE

Festive Decoration.

The illumination and decoration of cities in early Safavid times are recorded with particular care in the Habib al-Siyar and also in the Rawdat al-Safawiyya and the Tarikh Jahan Gusha-yi Khaghan, where there is information about the entry of Shah Isma'il into Kashan.

"In 909/1503 Shah Isma'il forced Sultan Murad to withdraw to Iraq. When the people of Kashan learned that the king was going to pass through their city on his return journey to Qum, all the chiefs and nobles, for instance Qadi Muhammad and Maulana Jalal al-Din Mas‘ud and others, prepared to give him a great welcome. Therefore the subjects, merchants, shopkeepers and all the inhabitants of Kashan (the Shi‘ites) started to decorate and illuminate the city of Kashan especially the shops, and the bazaar and its counters, which were decked out in brocades woven in seven colours and with merchandise and goods from Egypt and European countries..."

The Shah finally arrived in the city of Kashan and, seeing that kingly reception, became so happy that he participated in their celebration. The Shah further ordered his amirs and attendants to express their happiness by preparing a great feast. Therefore they chose a large open space in Kashan, with a good view, and the tent of heavenly dignity was placed there. Later on, the Shah entered into the splendid arrangements which were made to receive the royal guest, and the whole city of Kashan and its suburbs had the appearance of celebrating a merry festival such as had never taken place before. Shah Isma’il participated, drinking wine poured from the hand of handsome cup-bearers. They drank so much that their faces became flushed with the red wine. The handsome faces and the excellent disposition of the cup-bearers illuminated the banqueting area. The sweet singers with their pleasant and joyous songs made the feast one of mirth and joy, and banished sorrow from the faces of the people. And the musicians with their instruments such as the

lyre and harp (or psaltery?) made the people forget their sadness and sorrow and become cheerful."

After the singers and musicians had finished their entertainment, the superintendent of the kitchen and his assistants brought in cooked food and food of different colours and of every kind, so many dishes that they could not be counted or described.

Then, as is the custom of Iranians, courtiers and ministers offered their presents to the king, and then the prefects brought robes of honour made of fine cotton cloth, the Squirrel skin (پوست سپایب) and Valtān cloth, along with velvet ... red silken cloth and red boots and garments decorated with gold. Then they honoured each one of the guests according to their rank and privilege; all the guests who were present at that banquet were given something as a present. Then the Shāh appointed Qāqā Muhammad Kāshī as his șadr and set out for Qum.

Another instance of Shāh Ismā'īl's participation in feasting and of his enjoyment of decorations is narrated in the Rawdat al-Ṣafawiyya. When the Shāh had invaded Shirvān for the second time and captured Baku (915/1509) he returned to Tabrīz. On his arrival most of the people of Tabrīz, full of joy and enthusiasm, (as it is said) decorated and illuminated the bazaar, shops and streets.

1. Ḥabīb, pp. 473-4.
2. Ḥabīb, p. 474. See also Rawdat al-Ṣafawiyya, ff. 49b-50a; Jahān Gushā, ff. 284b-5a.
3. Ḥabīb, pp. 474-5.
4. Rawdat al-Ṣafawiyya, f. 73a.
along his route, like a picture-gallery, as joyfully as they could. After his arrival in Tabrīz, Shāh Ismā'īl took part in their feast and stayed there for a few days before setting out for his winter palace at Khūy.¹

1. Rawdat al-Safawīyya , f.72a.

On many other occasions when Shāh Ismā'īl visited cities they were illuminated and decorated for him. One could list for instance a visit to 'Irāq-i 'Arab in 914/1508, and others to Herāt in 916/1510, and 919/1513, might be cited.

In Herāt he usually celebrated in the garden of Jahān-āra (see Jahān Gushā, f. 198b). Great celebrations were also held before he invaded Khurāsān in 916/1510; according to the Ḥabīb (pp. 505-6), he spent about 23,000 tumāns on this occasion.

For more details of other occasions see "The Travels of a Merchant in Persia", pp. 201-2; Angiolello, op.cit., pp.110- and Ḥabīb, IV, p. 519.
SPORT.

It has already been mentioned that in 907/1501, on his way back to Tabriz, Dada Muhammad, one of Babā Shāh Qulī's disciples, saw Shāh Ismā'īl playing polo in Sahib-ābad Square. This compares with a similar statement by the author of Tarikh Jahān Gushā-yi Khāqān that in 915/1509, in Isfahān, Shāh Ismā'īl ordered the Isfahān maidān to be widened in order that he could spend a few days playing and shooting certain objects with arrows, called Qapaq Andāzī.\(^2\)

On one occasion, the Venetian merchant, who happened to be in Tabriz in 908/1502, states:

"At the end of a year Ismael returned to Tauris, where on his arrival great rejoicings took place; I happened to be there myself, having gone to recover debts from the traitor Chamainit of Casvene [Gazvin]. For a fortnight Ismael continued to join in archery every day with his lords in a maidan, in the midst of which was a pole, on which was placed a golden apple (twenty apples, ten of gold and ten of silver, being provided for the day's sport), at which they shot from their bows while running, and whoever hit it took it for his own. Every time one was hit they rested for a time, drinking delicate wines and eating sweet meats; during the sports two beautiful youths stood beside the monarch, one holding a gold vase, and the other two plates of sweet meats; the lords having their wine and sweet meats separately. When Ismael rests, the youths approach with the wine and sweet meats;

---

1. For more details see Jahān Gushā, ff. 42b-43a; Add. 200, 42b-43a; 'Ā.Ā. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 41.
he does so sometimes, even when no apple has been hit. He always has a guard of a thousand soldiers to attend him at these sports; besides there is a crowd of about thirty thousand people, composed of citizens and soldiers, round the maidan. At the entrance of the garden nearest to the palace there is a large saloon, where a supper is prepared for the lords who have joined in the sports.... At present he is about thirty one.... In the archery trials at the apple, he is so expert, that of every ten knocked down he hits six; during the sports, music is played and dancing girls perform after their manner, singing the praises of Ismael...."1

Hunting.

As a legacy of Shāh Ismā'īl's early years in Lāhījān, noted for its woodland surroundings, he loved hunting and fishing so much that he used to go hunting every year till his last days. It was enough for him if a person could spot an animal in the wild; he would go there and hunt that animal with bow or sword. He used to hunt at least eight kinds of animals and birds, and his skill as a hunter amazed the Venetian merchant, who writes:

"Coi (Khūy) in ancient times was a large city, as can be seen by the great space occupied by the ruins. In this place, it was anciently the custom (which is still observed) for the troops to assemble when the King of Persia was about to take the field with his army....., a large palace has been built, which in the Persian tongue is called Douler Chana (probably Daulat Khāna), signifying 'pleasant abode'. This palace is all walled round with bricks,..... It has two gates, with two fine courts, beautifully decorated..... Before the gate which looks west are three round turrets, each of them eight yards in circumference, and about fifteen or sixteen high. These turrets are built of the horns of Namphroni stags, and it is considered that there are none like them in the world. The Persians also consider these things very magnificent. Therefore for show they have built these three turrets of the horns of these animals, as the mountains are rocky and full of game. And Sultan Sciech Ismael boasts that he and his lords have killed all these animals. And truly Shciech Ismael takes the greatest pleasure in the chase; and to show that he is a skilful hunter he has had these three turrets built, and takes more delight in living in this place than in Tauris, as this country is well adapted for hunting."1

The hunting activities of Šāh Ismā‘īl can be divided into eight categories.

I. The Battue.

This kind of hunting required that, before the Šāh went hunting, thousands of his subjects from villages near and far were forced or hired to participate in encircling game. These people were sometimes eaten by fierce animals or were killed by heavy snow or cold. Such deaths are not recorded in the time of Šāh Ismā‘īl I, but according to the author of the Tarikh-i Gilān, Šāh ‘Abbās I sometimes used to ignore the fact that people were killed in helping to provide for his satisfaction.¹ In this kind of hunting, the number of hunted animals of all kinds was so high that counting them was very difficult, and the hunt-keeper often failed to count them accurately.

In 910/1504, the Šāh went on a battue of which the author of Rawdat al-Šafawīyya grandiloquently speaks

The Šāh, after the general massacre of Šabas, and after releasing the envoys of Sultan Bayazīd II, ordered his yearly battue to be prepared:

"The order, obeyed by the whole world, was issued that all the governors, amirs, soldiers, chiefs, nobles, courtiers and inhabitants of Iṣfahān² should gather the wild animals from all

¹ See 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Fūmanī, Tarikh-i Gilān, pp. 156-8.
² This order was issued in the same year that famine struck Iṣfahān.
those provinces to Kanīz Ulang where the greenness of the pasturage is of heavenly excellence. The purity of its water is wonderful. Its size is equal to the area of the imaginable world. \(\text{Shāh Ismā'īl}\), to prepare this battue, issued an order to all his provincial governors and summoned their troops to encircle the mountain goats, deer and other wild animals which existed in those provinces, and not to leave any of them behind. He further announced to them that they should assemble their prey on the plain of Kanīz Ulang. Later on the Shāh himself set out for that place from Isfahān. When he reached the spot, he ordered his great amīrs and nobles to encircle that vast area and the mountains nearby and guide the animals towards him, like a shepherd who directs his animals. They did so, and in time they rounded up all the animals in Kanīz Ulang. The number of the animals (which included the) wild ass, deer, tiger, wild cat, wolf, fox, rabbit, pig, bear and others, was so great that the hunt-keepers could not count them. Then the Shāh went into the circle alone, mounted on his horse. Occasionally he drew blood from the animals with the point of his arrow or with his mace; and an hour afterwards he caught the fugitive animals, for instance wild ass, tiger, wild cat and deer with his noose, and

1. This should be Ulang Kahlz rather than "Kanīz Ulang".

Hābib \(\text{vol. IV, pp. 481-82}\) gives a similar story but claims that on that day nearly 6,700 animals were killed and all of them were gathered together at "Kanīz Ulang" from Shīrāz to Qum. For "Olang" or "Ulang" which means a pasture on the route see A. A. Nafīsī (Nāżim al-Ātibbā), Farhang-i Nafīsī, vol. I (Tehran 1317-18, p. 375, "Olang"); and Muḥammad Padishāh, commonly called Shād, Farhang-i Annandrāj, ed. by M. Dabīr Siyāqī, vol. I (Tehran 1335 Sh.), pp. 411-12. It seems that the author of Rawdat al-Ṣafawiyya is more accurate than the Hābib. Cf. also Jahān Gūshā, f. 115a-b where the author states that 56,706 animals were killed then and the Shāh ordered a minaret to be built from their skulls. Cf. also Ilčhī, ff. 12b-13a.
forced them to have intercourse with their females. Sometimes he used to break the head or horns of the stags with his whetstone. When he was satisfied with the blood he had shed and with his hunting, he ordered his amirs to continue the rest of the hunting according to their ranks. First the amirs and the nobles were sent to hunt and when they had become tired all of the other participants did the rest of the hunting. At this particular battue, Shāh Ismā‘īl and others in turn hunted nearly 26,700 wild animals and the people in charge distributed this game among amirs, sultāns, nobles and their servants. The Shāh then ordered his builders and engineers to build a tower of their skulls which to this day still remains in front of the king's stable in Isfahān. Any stranger who comes to this city, at first sight thinks of the dignity and greatness of the king and then imagines the hunt as the size of the tower prompts him."

In another important hunting-party which took place in 917/1511, according to the Rawdat al-Šafawiyya, 26,000 animals were slain. Of a third battue, which lasted twelve days, in the Farāhān area at the end of the spring of the same year the author of Rawdat al-Šafawiyya states

---


"In the Middle East the ruler's subjects did the hunting-dog's job of gathering the animals... and according to Iranian custom, they used to catch the animals alive, put an earring in their ears and then set them free. It happened several times that Shāh 'Abbās I caught some animals that had earrings in their ears and set them free, because they were set free by Shāh Ismā‘īl and his son Ẓahmāsib I."

The accuracy of the above text is in doubt.

"They did not rest for twelve days and nights in driving the animals through the deserts and mountains of that province until they were gathered in the appointed encircled field. Because of the king's good fortune, there were gathered there so many wild animals that the birds could not find any empty place to perch except on the horns of the wild animals, such as wild game, deer and stags. The herds of animals and beasts were so enormous that, of the wolf, deer, rabbit, fox, tiger and so on, nearly, 12,000 were hunted. After this particular hunt two more battues took place in the Sāweh and Tafrish areas. In the first one 16,000 and in the second one 15,000 wild beasts were hunted."

II. Fishing.

The king was very interested in catching fish. During the time that he stayed in Lāhijān, he became fond of fishing as Lāhijān's rivers were full of fish. Whenever he arrived at a river which had fish, he renewed the memory of his early years by fishing. When he was leaving Lāhijān he spent a month fishing.

It is told of Shāh Ismā'īl that in 924/1518 he went to his summer-quarters of Sūrluq and from there went to the Talwār river for fishing. He spent a month fishing there and then from Sūrluq he moved to the Chamkāl river, where he spent forty days fishing.

1. Rawḍat al-Ṣafawlyya, f. 83a; cf. Ḥabīb, p. 522.
2. Jahān Gushā, f. 44b. See also Aḥsan, vol. I, p. 27 where Rūmūr states:

"Most of the time his royal Majesty was employed in fishing."

III. Bear Hunting.

As we mentioned before, in 906/1499 Ismā‘īl Mirzā (later Shāh Ismā‘īl) after capturing Muntish Sultan’s castle and causing him to flee, was informed in his summer-quarters of Sārī Qaya at Turjān that there was a cave near that area where a huge bear lived, causing many problems to the local people. Shāh Ismā‘īl went with his Sūfis towards that cave and after surrounding it and making a commotion from all sides, caused the bear to come out. The Shāh then killed that huge bear with one arrow. This episode happened in his thirteenth year.1

IV. Leopard Hunting.

The king had issued standing orders to his amirs that whoever brought news of a leopard would be given a horse without a saddle. On one occasion the author of the ‘Ālam-ārā-yi Shāh Ismā‘īl states about his hunting in Luristān:

"In 914/1508 when the king invaded Iraq and captured Baghdād he was told that the governor of Luristān had rebelled against him. He therefore sent Amir Najm Zargar and Bayram Beg Qarāmānī along with Husain Beg Lala to suppress him. They managed somehow to bring him to Shāh Ismā‘īl’s presence in the Shūshtar area. The king as usual had ordered a battue to be prepared, so that the provinces of Shūshtar and Luristān and other areas had made suitable

1. See Habīb, pp.452-3; Ahsan, I, p. 36; Jahān Gushā, f. 53a.
preparations. But when the Luristanis prepared for the battue they noticed that a male leopard had entered the circle from the open side of the Sadmarra Mountain and had killed many boars (zangūl) and also fifteen of the hunt-keepers.1 Malik Rustam therefore informed the king, who ordered a horse to be given to the man who had brought the news, and then mounted on his horse and said no one should follow him except the one who had brought news of the leopard. Malik Rustam begged to follow him too, but the king did not accept his request. The Shāh set out for the area where the game was gathered.2 When the king arrived, the leopard attacked him, but the king managed to shoot an arrow into its forehead. He himself sat on the ground and the leopard jumped from a rock, missed him and died after collapsing on the ground.3

V. Lion Hunting.

Shāh Ismā'īl had ordered that a horse with a saddle would be given to any person who brought news of a lion. A message reached him, according to contemporary historians,

1. This is the only case that is recorded by Shāh Ismā'īl's contemporary historians.

2. For zangūl or boar hunting see Falsafi, Zindiganl, vol. II, p. 298 where he says the hunting of zangūl continued till the time of Shāh 'Abbās I. In 1016/1607 he engaged in this kind of hunting in Gilān. It is astonishing that the Tālish people used to hunt zangūl with their bare hands, by taking hold of the zangūl's ears, but so it is related.

3. 'A.A. Shāh Ismā'īl, p. 181. This boar-hunting is not mentioned in any other contemporary works which I have consulted. The Persian text runs: 

"گرد از دنیا نهج تنگ تا ایند خود را گزیند و به همراه امر کن مرا بیا ناک می‌دانم..."
in 914/1508\(^1\) when he went to visit the Ṭāq-i Kisra\(ā\) in Baghdad. While there, he was informed that in that area there was a jungle where huge lions gathered and harmed the local people, and no one could do anything about them. Most of the amīrs and Sūfīs offered their help in order to kill the lions, but the king did not accept their services and he himself managed to kill the chief lion by striking it with a single arrow in the head. When the amīrs and Sūfīs saw his bravery, they praised him

"Sky and earth clamour, With praise for your hand and the power of your arms."\(^2\)

VI. Wild Goat Hunting.

One of Shāh Ismā‘īl's recreations was to hunt the mountain goat, the body of which contained bezoar.

1. See Ḥabīb, p. 496. See also Ahsan, I, p. 103; Jahān Gushā, f. 145a-b; ‘A.A. Shāh Ismā‘īl, p. 165.

2. Ḥabīb, p. 496; Ahsan, I, p. 103; Jahān Gushā, f. 145a-b; ‘A.A. Shāh Ismā‘īl, p. 165.

The author of ‘A.A. Shāh Ismā‘īl mentions another case in the same year, when Shāh Ismā‘īl went to the desert of Sīb (سیب) and killed two more lions. A third story describes how the Shāh used a trick on this occasion. He placed several cows and sheep in front of the lions to keep them busy, then the stated lions went on their way and the Shāh continued on his way. For more details see the above work, pp. 165-166. In this way the public road cleared-foron this occasion the Shāh was not hunting.
which was used as medicine. This kind of goat inhabited the mountains of Shirāz and the king used to hunt it both for the fun involved and for medicine.

In 914/1508 when the Shāh had managed to quieten the rebels of Shūshtar and Luristān, he set out for Shirāz to spend the winter season there. When he reached the neighbourhood of the village of Dārābjirdhe was told that in the mountains nearby there were many mountain goats, all rich in bezoar. The Shāh ordered his Qizil-Bāsh to surround the mountain and drive the goats towards its narrow passes. It took several days and nights to encircle the game. So many animals were herded together that they could not be counted by the hunt-keepers. Then Shāh Ismā'īl mounted on his horse and went into the circle and killed many of them. Then as usual he ordered his amirs to participate in the rest of the hunting. After killing all of the assembled animals they set out for Shirāz.¹

¹. Jahān Gushā, f. 150b.

However, it seems to me that this kind of hunting or shooting was organized in order to keep the Qizil-Bāsh in good shape yearly. In these hunts, they could use their arrows, swords, axes, and practice their horsemanship, so that this hunt was good training for them. As we have already noticed, just before the Battle of Chāldirān got properly under way the Shāh left his Qizil-Bāsh struggling with the enemy and he himself went to use his arrows in hunting birds.
VII. Bird Shooting.

It is said that since the king was sure that there were many Shi'a sympathisers in the army of Sultan Salim at the Battle of Chaldiran (920/1514), he went nonchalantly to hunt quail with some of his men just before the battle.¹

VIII. Horse Hunting.

Another of the Shāh's favourite activities was horse hunting and it is said that this was the last type of hunting in which the Shāh participated in 930/1524 in the Shāh Dāghī mountain near Shakkī.²

1. Jahān Gushā, f. 247a where an illuminated miniature shows the hunter in action. The main version of the above story has been translated below. Most of the historians who deal with the Battle of Chaldiran state that on arriving in the Chaldiran area, the Shāh planned the lines of his victorious amirs. For instance the right and left wings included Dūrmish Khān Shāmlū (his wife's brother), Khalil Sultan Dhul-Qadar, Ḥusain Beg Lala, Khūlafā Beg, Nur 'Ali Khalīfa, Khān Muḥammad Üstājlū, Pirī Beg Chāwushlū, Muntashā Sultan, & Sultan 'Ali Mirzā Afshār. He also appointed Sārī Pirī Qurchī Bāshī and Yusuf Beg Varsaq together with a group of soldiers, as the quartermaster of the troops and further appointed Amir 'Abd al-Ḥaqī the Amīr al-ʿumāra and Sayyid Muḥammad Beg Kamūna Najafī and Sayyid Sharīf al-Dīn 'Ali ʿālīr with others to key positions in the victorious army, while he himself with some of his men went out quail hunting.

For more details see Inqilāb- Islām, pp. 199, 214, 216-217.

Under the year 930/1524 Qâdi Ahmad Ghaffârî states that the Shâh went to his winter-quarters at Nakhchivân and took part in horse hunting, where his father-in-law, Shaikh Shâh, joined him.¹

On this occasion, the author of Târîkh-i Jahân Gushâyi Khâqân records that on that day, the king ordered his amirs and Qizil-Bash to encircle game on the Shâh Dâghî mountain. It is said that the previous kings had not pursued any hunted beasts which went to that mountain, because it was believed that pursuing prey on that mountain was not auspicious. The king was told about the mountain's bad luck, but he insisted on hunting those horses which had banded together on the mountain.²

We are told that the king hunted a considerable number of beasts and went back to Ardabîl. On his way to Tabrîz he fell sick and died.³

1. Jahân-ärâ, ibid.
I. The Šhāh and Wine.

We are told that most of the Šafawīd kings except Šhāh Ţahmāsb I and Šhāh Sulṭān Ḥusain, the last king of the Šafawīd dynasty, used to drink wine and were accustomed to drinking heavily.¹ Šhāh Ismā'īl carried such drinking to excess and had been fond of wine from his boyhood. At one stage in his reign he forbade the drinking of wine and the making or selling of it, but a moment later re-instituted these practices and broke his own prohibition.²

There is evidence that he was a drinker of wine as early as 907/1501. According to Ilchī-yi Niẓām Šhāh, in the winter of the above-mentioned year, "his pious majesty was in his winter-quarters of Tabrīz and spent his whole time feasting and drinking wine from the hands of handsome cup-bearers."³

The same source mentions several other occasions on which the Šhāh drank wine, one of which was in Muḥarram 910/1504 in Kharqān and Takht-i Sulaimān.⁴

1. Rawdat al-Šafawīyya, f. 124b.
3. Ilchī, f. 8 where the author under the year 907/1501 states:

4. Ibid., f. 12a where the Persian text runs as follows:
II. The Shāh and Drunkenness.

It is said that after the Battle of Chaldirān, Shāh Ismā‘īl spent most of his time feasting and drinking and enjoying handsome cup-bearers, women and wine. Sometimes when he had become intemperate, his attendants feared for their lives, and knew that they would not be immune if they did anything wrong. A serious case of this is the murder of Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain Iṣfahānī in 929/1523. We have already mentioned the main cause of his death\(^1\) and here we quote further from the account of an eye-witness:

"At Naurūz (New Year)\(^2\) 929/1523, when the King was feasting and drinking in the Hasht Bihisht Palace, he summoned Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain Vizier. Mihtar Shāh Quṭb was ordered to fetch Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain. Shāh Quṭb, in line with his previous enmity towards Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain, took this order very seriously and insisted on bringing him at once. Mirzā Shāh Ḥusain, seeing

However, there are several other occasions that Khwānd Amir in Ḥabīb al-Siyar records. For example, in vol. IV, pp. 474, 482-3, 499, 505, 506, 517-18, 530, 542, 550, 555-6, 562-3, 565-6, 568, 572, 574, 594, 596 and 602 which is the last page dealing with Shāh Ismā‘īl's affairs. Khwānd Amir on each of these pages refers to Shāh Ismā‘īl's feasts and wine consumption.

1. See also chapter IV, p. 307.
2. Khwānd Amir in Ḥabīb \(595\) states it was in the winter of 929/1523. Cf. Ilchī, f. 30a, and Jahanāra, p. 280:
him carrying the summons to excess, because he himself was sure of the special favour of the king and of his own greatness, became angry and ordered him to be struck on the neck. Mihtar Shāh Quli came with disordered clothing into Shāh Ismā'īl's presence. Finding him drunken he exaggerated the event, and told him the whole episode. Shāh Ismā'īl at the height of his drunkenness told Mihtar Shāh Quli: 'Had not you hand?'

Mihtar bowed down and returned at once, taking several qūrchīs who were present at the court with him. He told the qūrchīs that the king had ordered him to kill Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain; therefore the fearless Turkomāns who were waiting for this chance stabbed Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusain and the rest tore him into pieces.¹

The author of Ilchī-yi Niẓām Shāh states:

"The narrator of this episode gives this story in the pearl- and jewel-words of Hadrat Shāh ʿĀlam Maḍār, Shāh Ṭahmāsb who said:

'On that day I was sitting at the right side of Mīrzā (Shāh Ḥusain) when the bloodthirsty Turkomāns entered. They attacked Mīrzā (Shāh Ḥusain) with their swords and when the court became crowded and disordered, Asad Beg Qazvīnī put me on his shoulder and ran away out of the court. At that place, they cut Mīrzā into pieces. His pious Majesty was very sorry when he discovered the occurrence and was angry at Mīrzā's death.... His death took place on Tuesday the last day of Jumāḍā al-ʿᾹkhir 929/April 1523."²

¹ Ilchī, f. 30a; Ḥabīb p.595; Jahān-ārā p.280. The author of Ilchī states:

"هما حضرت شاه درخواست می‌زیست، مگرودت متاسفی؟"

² Ilchī, f.30a.

³ Ilchī, f. 30b. This detailed narrative is not mentioned in any of the other histories which have been consulted. The Persian text runs as follows:

"...و این باعث‌زادن کتاب بازمانده از این نویسنده شاه عالم می‌شده. و در آن روز سر بر جا نمی‌بینیم..."
Shāh Ismā'īl's Death.

There are only two manuscripts among the sources examined which mention the cause of the rapid death of Shāh Ismā'īl.

However, it is widely believed that after the Battle of Chaldirān, because of his sorrow and hopelessness, he lost his proud and youthful zeal and, instead of lending his energies towards fighting and conquest, began to feast and drink wine so exceedingly that it caused his death. On the cause of his death there are many statements which cannot be regarded as pin-pointing the main cause. However,

Cf. Ḥabib, p. 595 where Khwānd Amīr states:

Cf. Jahān-ārā, p. 280, after the new year on the last day, on Tuesday 28th Jumādā al-Akhīr, 929;

Lubb, p. 258 where the author agrees with Jahān-ārā and Ḥabīb. Cf. also Aḥsan, vol. I, p. 178 where Rūmī gives:

"On Wednesday 8th Jamādā I, 929/April 24, 1523."

Ghulām Sarwar, op. cit., pp. 93-4 where he agrees with Ḥabīb and gives:

"On Jumādā I, 28, 929/April 14, 1523."
the authors of Ilchi-yi Niẓām Shāh and Rawdat al-Ṣafawiyya appear to give more accurate statements than any other historians. The former states:

"After the Battle of Chāldirān, Nawwāb Jahān Panāh (Shāh Ismā'īl) for five or six years in a row had his winter-quarters sometimes in Tabrīz and sometimes in Nakḫchīvān, where most of his time was spent in hunting or in the company of handsome youths, or drinking cups of red wine and listening to music and musicians. He left the kingdom and his financial affairs in the hands of Mīrzā Shāh Husain..."¹

The same author goes on to say:

"Since his intercourse with women (نسوان) and his wine drinking to excess was more than normal, he gradually lost his strength and much sickness overcame him, to the extent that, day by day, he gradually got worse and finally died in 930 in the Šavālān range, near Sarāb."²

The second statement seems to be more helpful than the first one as it clarifies the main cause of death. The author of the Rawdat al-Ṣafawiyya states:

"Since he had settled his governmental affairs and had nothing to worry about, and had captured the area from the water of the Jahlūn to the banks of the rivers Tigris and Euphrates, and improved the situation of all his territories and made them as paradise, the king of the Iranians and the Arabs began to seek amusement.

¹ Ilchi, f. 12a where the Persian text runs as follows:

² Ilchi, f. 31a. The Persian text runs as follows:
The area of Sayin Gadi between Sarab and Ardabil where Shah Ismail passed away.
He started to feast and drink and had nothing else to do except his amusements. Constantly, from morning till afternoon and from afternoon till morning, he drank pure wine and sat with tulip-cheeked beauties like the sun, not caring to sit with his great men and attendants and those who wished him cared for and healthy. He went on like this continually, and his condition day after day gradually deteriorated and could not continue normally. Because of his constant drinking on an empty stomach, which did not desire any food, his physical system began to decay and he suffered from kidney trouble and diarrhoea. His doctors did their best, but it was no use. And the decline of his appetite and his failure to eat food reached such an acute stage that the smell of food annoyed him. When the attendants of the feast and his close relatives needed food, they used to go out of his room secretly and eat their food, and on their return tried to hide the reason for their leaving the room. They dared not mention the word 'food' and took care to prevent any smell of food from reaching the king. His sickness gradually became so severe that no drugs were of any value to him; his system was completely out of order. So it was that he died on Monday night 19th Rajab 930/May 24, 1524, in Sâyín (Gâdîkî). His great amirs and all the Qîzil-Bâsh bared their heads and wept so loudly that their cries reached to high heaven. The drum of sovereignty which
The tombs of Shāh Ismā'īl I and his father Shāh Ṣafdar in Ardabil.
used to be played every morning and afternoon was silenced. Mourning was continued for several days and no one wished to do anything except mourn. Finally, Dāw Sultān Rūmūl and Kapak Sultān Ustājlū and others, with the help of Amir Jamāl al-Dīn Muhammad Ṣadr Astarābādī, bathed the Shāh's corpse and after praying and performing the ablutions (ʿablūs), took his body back to Ardabīl

where at the present time it is buried under the tomb which is known as (کناری شاه اسماعیل), the dome of Shāh Ismā'īl.  

1. Rawdat al-Safawīyya, f. 125a. Part of the Persian text runs as follows:


"In a small dark room is the tomb of Shah Ismael, the first king of the Seffevies, which is overlaid by a very beautiful casement of fine work like mosaic, composed of ivory, tortoise shell, and turquoises, inlaid with passages from the Koran, and which in our estimation, was the most valuable, as well as the most curious object that we had yet seen in this place. This also was a present from Homayoun Shah."
The date of Shāh Ismā'īl's death (930 A.H.) is given by the words: žil(sio) (Shadow), "Khusrau-i Dīn" (King of the faith), "Shāh, Shāh, Shāh", "Jā-yi pidar girifti", "Shāh-i Jahān kard jahān Kā wīdā", and "fūzī bihisht", as expressed in the following chronograms:

1. "حاشمدرو نبهن اسا معلم ارچیان رفته و غلب شین تابع" شده
2. "نشایع کبیرنماران خشت نمی بنی تابع و نفات آن شگهر کمین نبرد ری برای راست نزین از شروتن تولب خوش عردیم" 2
3. "ماع این لفتا را تابع فرین سامتم" نشاد و شناد و نشادان درند "شا"،
4. "حا بار شاهی نازی براکت نز فرین" تابع سلطنت شد، جای بیرگی فمت نیست،
5. "نیا که ارز سنک دران انفعال نشاد چنان که یون را وداع" نگت قضا از بری سای 18ود" ظغت

1. Jahan Gusha, f. 305a; Tarikh-i Sultan, f. 314a; ʿA.A. Abbāsī, p. 33; Ahsan, p. 183.
3. Danishmandan, p. 136, on the authority of Ḥayratī.
5. Ilchī, f. 32a, on the authority of Shāh Ṭahīr Dīkanī, Danishmandan, p. 136.
However, there are two other chronograms:

"May his grave be fragrant."

(See Jahān-ārā, p. 281; Jahān Gushā, f. 305a).

The other one reads:

This chronogram is not correct since it stands for A.H. 1420.
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In case of Persian authors, full names are given; for all others, initials are given instead of Christian names.
II. Published Primary Sources

A. In Persian:

Āzar, Luṭf ‘Ali Beg b. Āqākhān Bigdīl Shāmlū, Ḍātashkada-yi Āzar. 4 Volumes (Tehran, 1336SH).


Fakhrī Heravī, Tadhkīra-yi Rawdat al-Salāṭīn, completed between 958 and 962AH, ed. by ʿAlī Rida Khayyāmpūr, (Ṭabrīz, 1345).


Part of this book (from the year 1194-1300/1770-1883) has been translated into English by H Busse: History of Persia under Qajar Rule (New York 1972).


Fūmanī, ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ, Tārīkh-i Gīlān, ed. by Manūchīhr Sūṭūda, (Bunyād wa Farhang’s edition, Tehran, n.d.). This work was also published in Rasht in 1314 SH.

Hidāyat, Riḍā Qull Khān, Majmāʿ al-Fuṣḥā, ed. by Maẓāhir Muṣaffā, 7 vols. (Vols. I and IV, Tehran, 1336-1339 Sh.).

Ḫusainī, Majd al-Dīn Muḥammad (Majdī), Zināt al-Majālis, (Tehran, 1940).

Ḵāshī, Wāʿiz, Rawḍat al-Shuhadāʾ, (written in 905/1499) published by Kitābfurūshī-yi Islāmiyyah (Tehran, 1341 Sh.).

(This is a biographical book which contains more than 1,000 of the Ṣafawīd poets' names and their work; written in the 11th century A.H.)

Rāzī, Aḥmad Aḥmad, Haft Iqlīm (completed in 1002/1593).
1. ed. by Jawād Fāḍil in 3 volumes. n.d.
2. ed. by E. Denison Ross and Khān Bahādur Maulavī Ṭāhir al-Muqtadir, Calcutta, 1918 (Asiatic Society of Bengal), Fasc. I.
3. ed. by A.H. Harley and Maulavī, (Calcutta, 1927), Fasc. II.

Raḥīm al-Dīn Fadl Allāh, Munša Fāṭ, ed. by M. Shafi, Lahore, 1945/1364.

Rūzbihān Khunjī, Fadl Allāh, Mihmān-nāma-yi Bukhārā, ed. by M. Sutūda, (Tehran, 1341). This work has also been edited by Raʿnā Jalīluva, Moscow, 1976.
Sam Mirza, Tufta-yi Sam1, Mashhad Shrine Ms. no. 4198/157. This work has been edited by Wahid Dastgirdi, (Tehran, 1314 Sh).

Sadig Afshar, Majma' al-Khawass translated from Chaghatai Turkish into Persian by A.R. Khayyampur, (Tabriz, 1327 Sh).

San1' al-Daula, Mu'tamid al-Sultan, Muntazam-i Nasiri, two volumes, vol. II, (Tehran, 1299 A.H.).

Shirvan1, Jan b. Zayn al-'Abidin, Bustan al-Siyaha, (Tehran, 1342). This work was finished in 1247/1831.

Shukri, Yad Allah, 'Alam-ara-yi Safawi, Tehran, 1350


Wahid Qazvin1, Muhammad Tahir, 'Abbas-Nama or Sharh-i Zindigan1-yi Shah 'Abbasi Tahani (1053-1073/1643-1662). This work was written between 1015-1110/1606-1698, ed. by Ibrâhim Dihgan, (Arak, 1329 Sh).
B. In English:


III. Published Secondary Sources.

A. In Persian:

Āqāsī, Mahdī, Tārīkh-i Khūy, (Tabrīz, 1350).

Anwār, Qāsim, Diwan-i Qāsim Anwār, ed. by Naṣrallāh Falsafī, (Tehran, 1337).


Bāstānī-Pārizi, Siyasat wa Iqtiṣād-i ʿAṣr-i Şafawi, (Tehran, 1357).

Bayānī, Khān Ḥābā, Tārīkh-i Nizāmī-yi Iran, (Tehran, 1353 Sh).

Bayburdī, Sarhang, Tārīkh-i Arasbārān, (Tehran, 1341).

Careri, G., An authorized translation of Voyage Du Tour Du Monde, Tome II. De la Perse, (Paris, 1719), translated into Persian by ʿAbbās Nakhjiwānī and ʿAbd al-ʿAlī Kārang:

Safar nāma-yi Gemelli Careri, (Tehran, 1348 Sh).

Falsafī, Naṣrallāh, Zindigānī-yi Shāh ʿAbbās Awval, 5 volumes, (Tehran, 1353).

"Chand Maqāla-yi Tārīkh-i wa Adabl, "Jang-i Chāldirān", (Tehran, 1343 Sh).

Farhang-i Juhgrāfiyā-yi Iran, vols III and IV, (Tehran, 1330 Sh).

Ḥalabī, Alī ʿAṣghar, Tārīkh-i Falāṣafā-yi Irānī, (Tehran, 1351 Sh).

Ḥakim, Sulṭān Muḥammad Taqī Khān, commonly called Ḥakim, Ganj-i Dānish, (Tehran, 1305/1887).


I’timād al-Saltāna, Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān, Ṣadr al-Tawārīkh, ed. by Muḥammad Mushirī, (Tehran, 1349).

Iqūbāl, ‘Abbās, Tārīkh-i Mufaṣṣal Iran, (Tehran, 1312 Sh).


Kasrawī, ‘Āmmad, Shaikh Ṣafī wa Tabārash, (Tehran, 1306 Sh).

" " Chihil Maqāla, ed. by Yaḥyā Zūkā, (Tehran, 1335 Sh).

" " Mushaḥshaṭiyān, (Tehran, 1336 Sh).

" " Āzarī Yā Zabān-i Bāstān-i Āzarbāyjān, (Tehran, 1352 Sh)....

Laṃosh, Sarhang, The History of Turkey, translated into Persian by Saʿīd Naḥīũ, under the title of Tārīkh-i Turkiyeh, (Tehran, 1316).
Manṣūr, Fīrūz, ʿĀṣāhī Az Dīlī Ṭārīkh, (Tehran, 1337).
Masrūr, Ḥusain, Dāh Naftār Qizil-Basht, (Tehran, 1335).
Muḥammad Pādīshāh commonly called "Ṣ̱ād",
Farhang-i Ṭānnandrag, ed. by Muḥammad Dabīr Siyāqī, vol. I, (Tehran, 1335 Sh·).
Muḥirī, Muḥammad, Sīkkāh-yi ʿṢ̱āh Iṣmāʿīl Awwal, (Tehran, 1351 Sh).
Mūrṭāwīl, Manuṣhīr, "Dīn wa maḏhab dar aḥd-i Ilkhanīyān", in Nashriyya-yi Dānishkada Adabiyyāt (Tabrīz, 1337).
Navāʾī, A. Ḥusain, Aṣnād wa Mukātibāt Ṭārīkhī-yi Irān az Timūr tā ʿṢ̱āh Iṣmāʿīl, (Tehran, 1341).

" " Shāh Iṣmāʿīl Ṣafawī, (Tehran, 1347).
" " ʿRāzī Dar Dīlī Ṭārīkh", in Majalla-yi Gauhar, (Tehran, 1355 Sh·), no. 13.
Orūg Beg Turkoman, Don Juan of Persia, translated into English by G. Le Strange (London, 1926) and translated into Persian by Masʿūd Rajab-Niyā, (Tehran, 1338).
Petrushevskii, I.P., Pigulevskaya, N.V., Yakubovskii, A.Iu., Stroeva, L.V. and Belenitskii, A.M.:
into Persian by Karim Kishawars under the title of *Tarikh-i Iran az Dauran-i Bastan ta Sadeh-yi dahum-i Milad*, Tehran, 1354 sh.

Petrushevskii, I.P. Islam V. Iran V VII-XV Vekakh.

Kurs Lektsii. Leningrad, 1960. Translated into Persian by Karim Kishawars, under the title of Islam Dar Iran, (Tehran, 1354 Sh.).

Razl, 'Abd Allah, *Tarih-i Mufasal Iran*, (Tehran, 1335 Sh.).

Rehman Zada Safawi, *Zindiganiyi Shah Ismail II Safawi*, (Tehran, 1314 Sh.).


Shaibanl, M. "Rawabiti Iran ba Orupiyen Dar Awayil-i Shahanshah-yi Safawiyya, in Majalla-yi Barrasihayi Tarih, Sali Chahtarum, nos. 5-6. (Tehran, 1348 Sh.).

Sharlati, 'Ali, *Tashayyu'i 'Alavi wa Tashayyu'i* Safawi, (Tehran, 1350).

Ṭabarî, Eḥsān, Islâm wa Tashayyu', (Tehran, 1348 Sh·).

Tarbiyat, MuḥammadʿAlī, Dānishmandān Āzarbāyjān, (Tehran, 1314 Sh·).

Yarəğaṭir, Ehsan, Shīr-i Fārsī dar 'Ahd-i Shāhrukh, (Tehran, 1334 Sh·).
B. In English:


" " "Note on an Apparently Unique Manuscript History of the Șafavī Dynasty in Persia" in J.R.A.S. (1921), pp. 395-418.


" " Taʿziyyeh: Ritual and Drama in Iran, (New York 1979).


Davar, F.C. E. Iran and its Culture, Bombay, 1953.


Ethe, H., *Catalogue of the Persian, Turkish, Hindustani and Pushtu Mss. in the Bodleian Library* begun by Prof. E.D. Sachau and continued, completed and ed. by Hermann Ethe, Oxford, 3 vols., 1889-1954.


Hasluck, F.W.,


" " Hudūd al-‘Ālam, translation and commentary (by V. Minorsky), London, 1937.


"" "Iran; Opposition, Martyrdom, and Revolt" in Unity and Variety in Muslim Civilization, ed. by G.E. Grunebaum (Chicago, 1955), pp. 183-206.


" " "Shah Sewan" in *E.I.*, vol. 4

" " "Tabriz" in *E.I.*, vol. 4.


" " "Uzun-Ḥasan" in *E.I.*, vol. 4.


Poole, R.S. *Catalogue of the Coins of the Shahs of Persia in the B.M.* (London, 1887).


" " "Haydar, Shaykh" in *E.I.* new ed. vol. III, pp. 315-16.


C. In Turkish:


İsmâ’îl, Şâh, **Dîwân-i Şâh İsmâ’îl**, ed. by H. Ārasî and Z. İbrahimof, (Baku, 1946) in آذربایجان ایلیه مملکتی حکومتی بیشینبیلی ایران - باکو - 1946.


D. **In German:**


1. Translated into Persian by K. Jahāndarī, under the title of *Tashkīl-i Daulat-i Milī Dar Iran*, (Tehran, 1346 Sh).

2. Translated into Turkish by Tevfik Biyiklioglu, under the title of *Uzun Hasan Ve Şeyh Cüneyd*, Ankara, 1948.

Litten, W. *Das Drama in Persien*, Berlin, 1929.