



HISTORY OF SHĀH ISMĀ'ĪL SAFAWĪ



HISTORY OF SHĀH ISMĀ'ĪL SAFAWĪ

BY
GHULĀM SARWAR, M.A., PH.D. (ALIG.)

With a Foreword by
PROFESSOR HĀDĪ HASAN, B.A. (CANTAB.), PH.D. (LONDON)

1939

PUBLISHED BY
THE AUTHOR,
MUSLIM UNIVERSITY, ALIGARH

DEDICATED
BY KIND PERMISSION
TO
NAWWĀB MĪR YŪSUF 'ALĪ KHĀN BAHĀDUR,
NAWWĀB SĀLĀR JANG III
OF
HYDERABAD (DECCAN)

گر بگویم که مرا با تو سروکاری نیست
در و دیوار گواهی بدهد کاری هست
من چه در پای تو ریزم که پسند تو بود
سرو جان را نتوان گفتم که مقداری هست

FOREWORD

For several reasons Dr. Ghulām Sarwar's thesis, submitted for the degree of Ph.D. of the Muslim University, 'Aligarh, is of extreme value. Firstly, because of its theme: Shāh Ismā'il Ṣafawī, the founder of the Ṣafawī dynasty and one of the greatest kings of Īrān, has hitherto not been the subject of a complete and independent history. Secondly, because of its exhaustiveness and accuracy: the Indian MSS. were studied locally; rotographs of MSS. were obtained from Europe; and for the inspection of Īrānian MSS. the author visited Mashhad, Tīhrān, Isfahān and Shirāz. The people of Īrān enjoy a reputation for culture, grace and hospitality, but it is pleasant to speak from personal experience that the modern Īrānians are not merely true but even superior to their reputation. However, the material so assiduously collected was examined with minute, I might almost say microscopic, care. Thirdly and finally, because of its restraint and impartiality: the thesis is well-written and well-balanced, and its sober style makes it the more authoritative. Altogether the work is first-rate, and the Vice-Chancellor of the Muslim University, Dr. Sir Shāh Muḥammad Sulaymān, and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Professor A. B. A. Ḥalīm will no doubt feel very happy that a work of such sound scholarship should bear the impress of their excellent administration.

The research section of the Persian Department of the Muslim University, whereof this work is the first product, continues its existence because of the generous support of some personal friends of mine. Foremost amongst them is Nawwāb Mīr Yūsuf 'Alī Khān, Sālār Jang III, of Hyderabad (Deccan). Nobleman, litterateur, and aesthete he is India's Pitt the Younger. At the age of twenty-one he was the premier of Hyderabad; and now at the age of forty-eight he is the intellectual glory of the motherland. Then there are the two exquisitely polished princes of Bhopal—Nawwābzāda Fakhrū'l-Mulk Sa'idu'z-Zafar Khān and Nawwābzāda Yamīnu'l-Mulk Rashīdu'z-Zafar Khān both of whom studied at 'Aligarh. Finally, there is the talented pupil of mine Col. Maqbūl Ḥasan Qurayshī, Minister of Bahāwalpūr. To these kind friends I say in public: "No action, however small, is or ever can be lost, but like a stone thrown into the water generates innumerable consequences running in all directions to infinity". And one of the results of their action—of their generous patronage of literature—is this original research, solid and substantial, by young Dr. Ghulām Sarwar of Jhelum.

In conclusion, the Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta, has my sincerest thanks for the great care with which this history has been printed.

'ALIGARH:
May 7, 1939.

HĀDĪ ḤASAN.

P R E F A C E

“The Şafawî dynasty marks not only the restoration of the Persian Empire and the re-creation of the Persian nationality after an eclipse of more than eight centuries and a half, but the entrance of Persia into the comity of nations and the genesis of political relations which still to a considerable extent hold good.” Such are the remarks of E. G. Browne on the Şafawî dynasty, and it is a matter of regret that a critical account of the achievements of the Founder of such a dynasty should not yet have been written. Sir John Malcolm, Sir Clements Markham, and Sir Percy Sykes have, in their respective *Histories of Persia*, given a meagre account of Shāh Ismā‘il Şafawî, and even those accounts are full of historical inaccuracies. A little better account of this youthful monarch has been given by W. Erskine, A. Vambery, and H. Howorth, as far as his relations with the Uzbeks are concerned. S. Creasy has, to some extent, supplemented the account of Shāh Ismā‘il’s relations with Turkey. Sir E. Denison Ross has given an account of the early years of Shāh Ismā‘il’s life; and finally, E. G. Browne has touched upon the main features of Shāh Ismā‘il’s achievements in the *Literary History of Persia*. But a person, who, inheriting from his “darwish” ancestors nothing but “a beggar’s dish”, began his successful career of conquest at the tender age of thirteen with only a handful of followers, brought the whole of Persia under his own sway in the course of a few years, gave battle to one of the most powerful Ottoman Sultāns, and laid the foundations of a kingdom which endured in his family for more than two centuries, certainly deserved better and fuller attention.

With this view in mind, I have tried to present the account of Shāh Ismā‘il’s achievements as clearly and precisely as possible. Not being content with the scanty material available in India, I had the good fortune to visit the land “the earth of which has rubbed its face with the hoofs of the Shāh’s charger”, and collected all the material (including rare manuscripts) on which I could lay my hands. Further, I supplemented manuscripts from Persia with material from the British Museum, London, and the India Office Library. In short, before embarking on this task, I endeavoured to equip myself with all the extant material on the theme.

With these preparations I started my work, and it is needless to say what amount of labour, perseverance, and keen observation was required to go through all the unnecessary and tiresome details of events of little importance with which Persian historians have filled their pages: how far I have been successful in eliminating legend from history and fiction from fact—this my work should testify.

To trace the descent of Shāh Ismā'īl, an account of his ancestors has been prefixed to the original work. The facts relating to his childhood and his struggle for the throne, which have been grossly mis-stated by the Italian travellers, have been carefully brought out; and the Shāh's wars with rival rulers have been treated *in extenso*. Special attention has been paid to the Shāh's relations with the Central Asian Uzbeks and their expulsion from Khurāsān; and still more to his relations with Turkey. The causes of hostility between Persia and Turkey and the increase of enmity between the two countries, beginning from the death of Sultān Ḥaydar, father of Shāh Ismā'īl (893/1488), and culminating in the battle of Chāldirān (920/1514), are discussed in their political aspect: how different would have been the course of history had the combatants realized that Islām needs solidarity and union, not rivalry and cleavage. Shāh Ismā'īl's correspondence with Karl V, Emperor of Germany, has not been utilized by European scholars, nor have they discussed the Shāh's system of administration. Three appendices are given at the end of the work, of which the first, relating to the Āq-Quyūnlūs, is of special interest.

Finally, I am greatly indebted to my many friends in Īrān who gave me every conceivable facility for obtaining material for this history. The Īrānians are a fine people, but I hardly realized how fine they were until I had the pleasure of meeting them.

'ALIGARH,
January 7, 1939.

GĤULĀM SARWAR.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	vii
PREFACE	ix
ABBREVIATIONS	xiii
<i>PART ONE</i>	
CHAPTER	
I. AUTHORITIES	3
II. THE ANCESTORS OF SHĀH ISMĀ'ĪL	17
III. ISMĀ'ĪL MĪRZĀ'S EARLY LIFE AND HIS STRUGGLE FOR THE THRONE	30
(1) Ismā'īl Mīrzā's Childhood and His Flight to Gilān	30
(2) Ismā'īl Mīrzā's March from Lāhtjān and His Collec- tion of Troops	32
(3) Ismā'īl Mīrzā's War with Farrukh Yasār, the Shirwān Shāh, and the Conquest of Shirwān	35
(4) Ismā'īl Mīrzā's War with Alwand Mīrzā, the Ruler of Ādharbāyjān	37
(5) Ismā'īl Mīrzā's Accession to the Throne of Ādhar- bāyjān	38
<i>PART TWO</i>	
IV. SHĀH ISMĀ'ĪL'S WARS WITH RIVAL RULERS	43
(1) Pursuit of Alwand Mīrzā	43
(2) War with Sulṭān Murād and Annexation of the Persian 'Īrāq and Fārs	44
(3) War with Ḥusayn Kiyā-i-Chalāwī and the Conquest of the Forts of Gulkhandān, Firūz-Kūh and Ustā	47
(4) Rebellion of Muḥammad Karra and Re-conquest of Yazd	49
(5) Minor Events	51
(6) War with 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr and Annexation of Diyār Bakr	52
(7) Wars of Muḥammad Khān Ustājlū with 'Alā'u'd- Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr	53
(8) The Annexation of the Arabian 'Īrāq	54
(9) Minor Events	55

CHAPTER	Page
V. SHĀH ISMĀ'ĪL'S CAMPAIGNS IN THE EAST ..	58
(1) Causes of Hostility between Shāh Ismā'il and Shaybāni Khān	58
(2) The Campaign against Shaybāni Khān	60
(3) Visit to Hirāt and Return to 'Irāq	64
(4) Coalition with Bābur against the Uzbeks.. .. .	66
(5) The Loss and Recovery of Khurāsān	69
VI. SHĀH ISMĀ'ĪL'S RELATIONS WITH TURKEY ..	72
(1) Sultān Salim's March towards Ādharbāyjān	74
(2) The Battle of Chāldirān	78
(3) Occupation and Evacuation of Tabriz by Sultān Salim	82
(4) Capture of Diyār Bakr by the Ottomans.. .. .	84
VII. SHĀH ISMĀ'ĪL'S LIFE FROM CHĀLDIRĀN TILL HIS DEATH	86
(1) Minor Events	86
(2) Shāh Ismā'il's Correspondence with Karl V, Emperor of Germany	87
(3) Minor Events	89
(4) Disorders in Khurāsān	91
(5) Minor Events and Death of Shāh Ismā'il	93
<i>PART THREE</i>	
VIII. CHARACTER OF SHĀH ISMĀ'ĪL	99
IX. SYSTEM OF ADMINISTRATION UNDER SHĀH ISMĀ'ĪL	102
APPENDIX	
A. THE AQ-QUYŪNLŪS	105
B. CHRONOLOGY OF THE HISTORY OF SHĀH ISMĀ'ĪL ŞAFAWĪ	110
C. BIBLIOGRAPHY	114
INDEX	117

A B B R E V I A T I O N S

- A *Ḥabību's-Siyar*, Vol. III, Part IV (Bombay, 1273 A.H.).
- B *British Museum MS., Or. 3248.*
- C *Nusakh-i-Jahān Ārā* (B.M. MS., Or. 141).
- D *Aḥsanu't-Tawārīkh* (Calcutta, 1931).
- E *Khulāṣatu't-Tawārīkh* (Ṭīhrān MS.).
- F *Tārīkh-i-'Ālam Ārā-i-'Abbāsī* (Ṭīhrān, 1314 A.H.).
- G *Silsilatun-Nasab-i-Ṣafawīyya* (Berlin, 1924).
- H *Nasab Nāma-i-Ṣafawīyya* (Ṭīhrān MS.).
- I *Tārīkh-i-Shāh Ismā'il-wa-Shāh Ṭahmāsp* (Ṭīhrān MS.).
- J *Ḥabību's-Siyar*, Vol. III, Part III (Bombay, 1273 A.H.).
- K *Bābur's Memoirs* (Oxford, 1921).
- L *Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī* (English Translation), (London, 1898).
- M *Salīm Nāma* (B.M. MS., add. 24, 960).
- N *Munsha'āt-i-Salāṭīn*, Vol. I (Constantinople, 1264 A.H.).
- O *Nuzhatu'l-Qulūb* (Text), (Leyden, 1915).
- P *Jughrāfiyā-i-Mufaṣṣil-i-Īrān* (Ṭīhrān, 1310-11 Yazdigirdī).
- Q *Nafahātu'l-Uns* (Lucknow, 1915).
- R S. Lane-Poole's *Muhammadan Dynasties* (London, 1894).
- S E. G. Browne's *Literary History of Persia*, Vol. IV (Cambridge, 1928).
- T J. Malcolm's *History of Persia*, Vol. I (London, 1829).
- U C. Markham's *History of Persia* (London, 1854).
- V P. Sykes' *History of Persia*, Vol. II (London, 1915).
- W S. Creasy's *History of The Ottoman Turks* (London, 1877).
- X W. Erskine's *History of India*, Vol. I (London, 1854).
- Y A. Vambery's *History of Bokhara* (London, 1873).
- Z *Travels of a Merchant* (included in *A Narrative of Italian Travels in Persia*, Hakluyt Society, London, 1873).

PART ONE

CHAPTER I

AUTHORITIES

Before dealing with the extant authorities it is necessary to mention those works which I have not been able to find, and are probably lost.

(1) *Tārīkh-i-Aḥwāl-i-Salāṭīn-i-Turkmān* by Abū Bakr Ṭīhrānī. Ghiyāthū'd-Dīn in his *Ḥabību's-Siyar*¹, while writing the account of Amīr Ḥasan Beg, says, "Abū Bakr Ṭīhrānī was an author contemporary to Amīr Ḥasan Beg². During his reign he wrote the history of his achievements, and, as the book has not reached the compiler of this compendium, he could not string (the pearls of) the details of the history of that just king into the thread of writing³."

The authors of *Tārīkh-i-Ālam Ārā-i-Abbāsī*⁴ and *Nasab Nāma-i-Şafawīyya*⁵ also include this amongst their authorities.

As there is no direct connection between the reigns of Amīr Ḥasan Beg (857-96/1453-90) and Shāh Ismā'il (907-30/1501-24), therefore, its importance for the history of Shāh Ismā'il is not great.

(2) *Futūḥāt-i-Shāhī* (or *Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī*) by Şadru'd-Dīn Sultān Ibrāhīm Amīnī Harawī. Ghiyāthū'd-Dīn, in his *Ḥabību's-Siyar*, while writing notes on the ministers of Sultān Ḥusayn Mīrzā, gives a short account of the author, the gist of which is as follows:—

"He was one of the most learned men of his age, and was unequalled in prose and verse. In his early youth he was in the service of Muẓaffar Ḥusayn Mīrzā ibn Sultān Ḥusayn Mīrzā, but later on he was appointed minister by Sultān Ḥusayn Mīrzā, on whose death in 911/1506, he was retained in his post by Muẓaffar Ḥusayn Mīrzā. On the conquest of Khurāsān by Shaybānī Knān, the Uzbek, in 913/1507, he was tried and convicted by 'Abdu'r-Raḥīm Samarqandī, the minister of Shaybānī Khān. After his release, he led a secluded life till 916/1510-11, when Shāh Ismā'il conquered Khurāsān. He was adequately rewarded by the Shāh, and spent his days at Hirāt till 926/1519-20, when he left for the royal camp (i.e. of Shāh Ismā'il), where he was entrusted with the work of compiling the *History of the Royal Victories* (تاریخ فتوحات شاهی).⁶ He further adds,

¹ For details see p. 8, *infra*.

² For his detailed account see Appendix A, pp. 105-106, *infra*.

³ App. 14-15.

⁴ Fp. 14. For details see pp. 12-13, *infra*.

⁵ Hf. 13a. For details see p. 7, *infra*.

⁶ Jpp. 330-31.

“And he is still ¹ busy on that work with full endeavour and inexpressible exertion; and in writing that book, having shown his perfect elegance and eloquence, he disregards nothing pertaining to the beauty of style and sweetness of metaphors” ².

It is clear from the above statement that Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn was not only aware of the fact of the writing of the history, but he also knew of its beauty of style.

This statement is again supported by another evidence in *Ḥabību's-Siyar*. While writing the account of the battle between Sultān Ḥaydar (father of Shāh Ismā'il) and Farrukh Yasār, the Shirwān Shāh, Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn states ³ در فتوحات شاهی که مهبط فیوضات نامتناهیست سمت تحریر یافته که

(In *Futūḥāt-i-Shāhī*, which is the descending place of infinite favours, it is written that)

It is evident that the account of the battle and death of Sultān Ḥaydar that follows is taken from *Futūḥāt-i-Shāhī* (or *Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī*) though the name of the author is not mentioned.

The author of *B.M. Or. 3248* ⁴ does not mention the *Futūḥāt-i-Shāhī* (or *Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī*) amongst his authorities, but it is certain that he has consulted this history. He copies from *Ḥabību's-Siyar* almost word by word, without quoting its name, while the additional facts found in his history must have been taken from the *Futūḥāt-i-Shāhī* (or *Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī*), for, at that time there was no other complete history dealing with the reign of Shāh Ismā'il ⁵.

The authors of *Khulāsatu't-Tawārīkh* ⁶, *Tārīkh-i-Ālam Ārā-i-Abbāsī* ⁷, and *Nasab Nāma-i-Şafawīyya* ⁸ also mention the *Futūḥāt-i-Shāhī* (or *Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī*) amongst their authorities on the reign of Shāh Ismā'il.

The importance and superiority of this history over *Ḥabību's-Siyar* (Vol III, part IV) is evident; because, firstly, it was begun in 926/1519-20, that is, about three years before the commencement of *Ḥabību's-Siyar* (Vol. III, part IV) ⁹; and secondly, the work was undertaken by the orders of the Shāh; and the author, who was in the royal camp, had the opportunity of consulting such persons as had participated in the battles. This statement is supported by the following sentence in the *Tārīkh-i-Ālam*

¹ This portion of *Ḥabību's-Siyar* is written a little earlier than Rabī' II, 929/Feb., 1523, which date is mentioned in Jp. 346.

² Jp. 331.

³ Ap. 16. This portion is written a little later than Dhu'l-Q., 929/Sept., 1523, which date is mentioned in the end of Jp. 373.

⁴ For details see pp. 9-11, infra.

⁵ Another “*Incomplete History*” is mentioned by the author of *B.M. Or. 3248* (see p. 10, infra).

⁶ Ef. 2a.

⁷ Fp. 10.

⁸ Hf. 6a.

⁹ This part was begun a little later than Dhu'l-Q., 929/Sept., 1523, which date is mentioned in the end of Jp. 373.

Arā-i-'Abbāsī, which is given at the end of the account of the battle of Sulṭān Ḥaydar with Farrukh Yasār, the Shirwān Shāh. The sentence runs as follows:—

” در فتوحاتِ امینی آورده که حقیقتِ ابنِ اختیار را بفرمودهٔ عاقانِ سلیمان شان از معنی غازیان
مثل حسین بیگ لله و فرخ آقا و جمعی دیگر که در آن جنگ گاه حاضر بودند استماع نموده از قول
ایشان نوشته “ 1

(It is given in the *Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī* that, according to the orders of Khāqān, Solomon in dignity, the facts of this account were written on the testimony of religious warriors like Ḥusayn Beg Lala ² and Farrukh Āqā, and others who were present on that field of battle.)

While making further inquiries about this history and its author at Tīhrān (June, 1933), I was told that *B.M. Or. 3248* is *Futūḥāt-i-Shāhī* (or *Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī*). This, however, is incorrect, as is proved by the following identical sentences, the first taken from *Ḥabībū's-Siyar* and the second from *B.M. Or. 3248*:—

” نخست جنابِ سلطانی سیفِ الإنامی خواجه مظفر بتکچی بانِ بلدهٔ فاخره رسیده در بابِ استمالتِ
اکابر و اشراف و تقویتِ ملتِ شرفِ دودمانِ عیدِ مناف نشانی که از مصدرِ عنایت و الطافِ صدور
یافته بود رسانید و روزِ جمعه بمسجدِ جامع تشریف برده پیش از ادای نماز امیر صدرالدین سلطان
ابراهیم امینی بر ممبر آمد و آن فرمانِ واجبِ الاذعان را خوانده مضمونِ صدقِ مقرونِ آن موجب
اطمینانِ خواطرِ اکابر و اصاغر گردید “ 3

(Firstly, His Excellency, the scimitar of nobility, Khwāja Muzaḥfar Bitīkhī reached that elevated city, (and) brought the letter that was meant for consoling the leading men and nobles, and for strengthening the nation of the Honour of the family of 'Abd-i-Munāf (i.e. the nation of the Holy Prophet), and was issued from the source of kindness and favours. *On Friday, he went to the Jāmi' Mosque, and before performing the prayers, Amīr Ṣadrū'd-Dīn Sulṭān Ibrāhīm Amīnī rose to the pulpit, read the order, the obedience to which is necessary, (and) the truth-containing contents of which became the cause of consolation of the hearts of nobles and common people.*)

” و آن نشانِ موفورِ الاحسان را معمولِ جنابِ سیفِ الانامی خواجه مظفر بتکچی که در همان
روز با درویش محمد یگ یساول از استرآباد بشفِ پایوس سرافراز گشته بود بانِ بلدهٔ فاخره روانه

1 Fp. 15.

2 He was the commander of the left wing (see p. 25, *infra*).

3 Ap. 61.

فرمودند و ان رسولِ نای بآن صحیفه گرای چون بهرات رسید روزِ جمعه بجامع شهر تشریف برده پیش از ادای نیاز امیر صدر الدین ابراهیم امینی بر ممبر بر آمده آن فرمان واجب الاذعان را خوانده و مضمونِ بصدقِ مقرونِ آن موجبِ اطمینانِ خواطرِ اکابر و اصاغر گردید“¹

(That scimitar of nobility, Khwāja Muẓaffar Bitikchī arrived the same day from Astrābād in the company of Darwish Muḥammad Beg Yasāwul, and after an audience with the Shāh, he was despatched with that exceedingly kind letter to that elevated city. And when that great messenger reached Hirāt with that dignified letter, *he went to the Jāmi'* (Mosque) on Friday, (and) before performing the prayers, Amīr Ṣadru'd-Dīn Ibrāhīm Amīnī rose to the pulpit, read the order, the obedience to which is necessary, (and) the truth-containing contents of which became the cause of consolation of the hearts of nobles and common people.)

The author of *B.M. Or. 3248* has copied the last sentence from *Ḥabību's-Siyar*. It is clear, therefore, that had he himself been Amīr Ṣadru'd-Dīn Sulṭān Ibrāhīm Amīnī he would not have mentioned his name in the above sentence in this way. There is other internal evidence on this point, but the above-given extract is sufficient.

(3) *The Works of Khiyālī Tabrizī*², mentioned by the author of *Khulāṣatu't-Tawārīkh* amongst his authorities.

(4) *The Works of Najūmī Harawī*³, the historian of Khurāsān, mentioned by the author of *Afḍalu't-Tawārīkh* amongst his authorities.

(5) *The First Jild or a Daftar of the First Jild of Afḍalu't-Tawārīkh*. The *B.M. MS. Or. 4678* is designated as the First Daftar of the Second Jild of *Afḍalu't-Tawārīkh*⁴. It was composed during the reign of Shāh 'Abbās the Great (905-1038/1587-1629), and deals with the history of the reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsp (930-84/1524-76), the son and successor of Shāh Ismā'īl, from his accession to his death. It is clear, therefore, that the First Jild or a Daftar of it deals with the history of the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl.

Now come the extant authorities which are divided into two broad sections as follows:—

- (I) Authorities on the ancestors of Shāh Ismā'īl; and
- (II) Authorities on the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl.

(I) *Authorities on the Ancestors of Shāh Ismā'īl.*

(1) *Ṣafwat'u's-Ṣafā* by Darwish Tawakkuli ibn Ismā'īl commonly known as ibn Bazzāz. This work was composed in 750/1349 in the days of Shaykh Ṣadru'd-Dīn ibn Shaykh Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn Ishāq, and deals with the life of Shaykh Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn Ishāq and his ancestors. A recension was prepared

¹ Bf. 194b.

² Ef. 2a.

³ *B.M. MS. Or. 4678*, ff. 17b and 50a.

⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 14b.

by Abu'l-Fath al-Ḥusaynī in the reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsp (930-84/1524-76). This work has been consulted nearly by every author who has dealt with the ancestors of Shāh Ismā'il. It was lithographed in Bombay in 1929/1911.

(2) *Silsilat-u'n-Nasab-i-Ṣafawīyya* by Shaykh Ḥusayn ibn Shaykh Abdāl Zāhidī. This work was composed in the reign of Shāh Sulaymān (1077-1106/1666-94), and contains short biographical notes on Shāh Ismā'il's ancestors up to Fīrūz Shāh-i-Zarrīn Kulāh, and his successors down to the ruling Shāh. The biographical notices are really useful and supplement the earlier authorities, especially in dates. Selected verses of some members of the Ṣafawī family are also given. The last date mentioned in the work is 1059/1649. It was printed in Berlin in 1924.

(3) *Nasab Nāma-i-Ṣafawīyya* by Muḥammad Shafi' al-Ḥusaynī. This work was also composed in the reign of Shāh Sulaymān and was completed in 1090/1679. It is divided into three volumes. The first volume contains : (i) short biographical notices on Shāh Ismā'il's ancestors up to Imāmzāda Ḥamza ibn Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm; (ii) a comparatively detailed account of the reign of Shāh Ismā'il; and (iii) a more detailed account of the reigns of the three succeeding Shāhs, namely: Shāh Ṭahmāsp (930-84/1524-76), Shāh Ismā'il II (984-85/1576-77), and Muḥammad Khudā Banda (985-95/1577-87). The work ends with the accession of Shāh 'Abbās the Great (which took place in Dhu'l-Q., 995/Oct., 1587). As far as the account of Shāh Ismā'il's ancestors is concerned, it adds to some extent, especially in dates, to the information given by the earlier authorities. The author mentions *Baḥru'l-Ansāb*¹, *Ṣafwat-u's-Ṣafā*², *Tārīkh-i-Aḥwāl-i-Salāṭīn-i-Turkmān*³, *Nafahātu'l-Uns*⁴, *Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī*⁵, *Ḥabību's-Siyar*⁶, *Nusakh-i-Jahān Ārā*⁷, *Aḥsanu't-Tawārīkh*⁸, and *Tārīkh-i-'Ālam Ārā-i-'Abbāsī*⁹ as his authorities. It copies from them word by word.

Apart from these works, almost every history on the reign of Shāh Ismā'il contains short biographical notes on his ancestors.

(II) *Authorities on the Reign of Shāh Ismā'il.*

This section is divided into four sub-sections, namely:—

- (1) Purely Persian Authorities;
- (2) Supplement to the Affairs of Khurāsān and Transoxiana;

¹ Hf. 2a. For details see *Ethē's Catalogue of Persian MSS. in the India Office Lib.* (Oxford, 1903), pp. 74-75 and 332.

² *Ibid.*, f. 2b.

³ *Ibid.*, f. 13a.

⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 8a. For details see *Rieu's Catalogue of Persian MSS., Vol. I (London, 1879)*, p. 349.

⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 6a.

⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 14a. For details see p. 8, *infra*.

⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 14a. For details see p. 11, *infra*.

⁸ *Ibid.*, f. 14a. For details see p. 11, *infra*.

⁹ *Ibid.*, f. 12a. For details see pp. 12-13, *infra*.

- (3) Supplement to the Account of Shāh Ismā'il's Relations with Turkey; and
 (4) The Accounts of Contemporary Foreign Travellers.

(I) *Purely Persian Authorities.* They are subdivided into:—

- (a) Contemporary; (b) Early Non-Contemporary; and (c) Non-Contemporary.

(a) *Contemporary.*

(1) *Ḥabību's-Siyar fī Akhbār-i-Afrādi'l-Bashar* by Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn ibn Humāmu'd-Dīn better known as "Khwānd Amīr". This is a work on general history from the earliest times to Rabī' I, 930¹/Jan., 1524. It was undertaken by the author at the request of his patron Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Muḥammad, the minister of Ṭahmāsp Mirzā, governor of Hirāt, in 927/1521; but the author was still engaged in the first volume when he lost his patron, who was put to death, on Rajab 7, 927/June 14, 1521, by Amīr Khān Mawṣilū, the tutor of Ṭahmāsp Mirzā. Accordingly, Ṭahmāsp Mirzā along with Amīr Khān Mawṣilū was recalled by the Shāh and Sām Mirzā as appointed governor with Dürmish Khān Shāmlū as his tutor. The latter appointed Karīmu'd-Dīn Ḥabību'llāh his Seal-Keeper², under whose patronage the author resumed the work, and on its completion, dedicated it to him in 930/1524.

Volume III, part IV of *Ḥabību's-Siyar* deals with the detailed history of the reign of Shāh Ismā'il, with a brief account of his ancestors, and that of the Āq-Quyūnlūs³. The facts are in details, but the dates are few, though, as far as the affairs of Khurāsān are concerned, possibly all the dates are given. The style is elegant and engages the attention of the general reader.

The author, being resident at Hirāt, was not the eye-witness of the affairs recorded except those of Hirāt. In some places, therefore, there is lack of accuracy. On the whole, however, it is one of the best histories on the reign of Shāh Ismā'il, completed in Rabī' I, 930/Jan., 1524, only four months⁴ before the death of the Shāh.

The author mentions *Ṣafwatū's-Ṣafā*⁵ and *Futūḥāt-i-Shāhī*⁶ (or *Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī*) as his authorities. Besides these, he obtained information from the Shāh's officers who had participated in the battles and had visited Hirāt. The work was lithographed in Ṭīhrān in 1271/1855, and again in Bombay in 1273/1857.

¹ Ap. 110.

² See pp. 92-93, *infra*.

³ For the detailed account of the Āq-Quyūnlūs see Appendix A, pp. 105-109, *infra*.

⁴ Sir E. D. Ross incorrectly states in *J.R.A.S. for 1896*, p. 251, that it was finished one month before Shāh Ismā'il's death. The Shāh died on the morning of Monday, Rajab 19, 930/May 23, 1524. (See p. 94, *infra*.)

⁵ Ap. 6.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

(2) *Shāh Nāma* by Qāsim Qāsimī Gunābādī. It is a poetical history of Shāh Ismā'il, and, as appears from the prologue¹, it was begun during his reign, but was finished after the Shāh's death, and was dedicated to the same Karīmū'd-Dīn Ḥabībū'llah², to whom *Ḥabībū's-Siyar* was dedicated. After the prologue, the author praises 'Abdu'llāh Ḥātifi³, who had begun to write a poetical history of Shāh Ismā'il, but whose work was left unfinished on account of his death (in Muḥarram, 927⁴/Dec., 1520). The historical portion begins from Sultān Ḥaydar ibn Sultān Junayd (860/1455)⁵, and extends to the arrival of Ṭahmāsp Mirzā at Hirāt (922/1516)⁶. The author then records the death of the Shāh (930/1524)⁷ and ends the history with the praises of his patron⁸.

The historical value of this work is nil. The facts are few and even those are incorrect. It was lithographed under the name of "*Shāh Nāma-i-Qāsimī*" at Lucknow in 1870⁹.

(b) *Early Non-Contemporary.*

(1) *B.M. Or. 3248*. The name of the book is unknown, but it is a detailed history of the reign of Shāh Ismā'il, with a brief account of his ancestors, and that of his contemporary rulers.

As shown above¹⁰, this work is not the *Futūḥāt-i-Shāhī* (or *Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī*). Further, Dr. Rieu and Sir E. D. Ross have shown that this work is not by Amīr Maḥmūd ibn Khwānd Amīr¹¹. To this negative information the following positive fact should be added.

The author's full name is unknown, but it started with *Bijan*, as is proved by the following marginal note in the author's hand, unfortunately destroyed by the book-binder:—

”بوشیده نماند که عبارت نامه که قنبر آقا برده و رد و بدل او با سلطان مراد شد از نده کترین
بیچن¹² نیست و این عبارت نامه اران نسخه نام مربوط است که از آورده بودند
و بخواش خسرو آقا یوزباشی غلامان که سرکار تالیف ربط کتاب روی آن
کتاب کلمه چند نوشته لهذا در بعضی جا این فقرات نامائوس داخل این شده است
مخواتده معلوم شود که سبب تالیف صحیفه شریفه تنیر عبارت او“¹³

¹ *Shāh Nāma-i-Qāsimī* (Lucknow, 1870), pp. 9-10. ² *Ibid.*, pp. 94-102.
³ *Ibid.*, pp. 11-15. (Also see p. 101, infra.) ⁴ Jp. 346.
⁵ *Shāh Nāma-i-Qāsimī*, p. 20. ⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 92.
⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 94. ⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 98.
⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 102. Sp. 83 incorrectly states that the work is not published.
¹⁰ See pp. 5-6, supra.
¹¹ *J.R.A.S. for 1896*, pp. 250-251. (For the work of Amīr Maḥmūd ibn Khwānd Amīr see p. 11, infra.)
¹² This blank in the passage, as well as the others, are due to the carelessness of the book-binder, who has spoiled the MS.
¹³ Bf. 82a.

(It should not remain hidden that the contents of the letter, which Qanbar Āqā brought to Sulṭān Murād, and had a discussion with him, are not by *this meanest slave Bijan*....., but are taken from that "*Incomplete History*", which was brought from....., and by the desire of Khusrav Āqā Yūz Bāshī (master of panthers)..... Therefore, at some places these unpleasant sentences have been taken down in this (history)..... It should be known to the reader that the cause of the compilation of the excellent history.....¹.)

Bijan has, unfortunately, not mentioned his authorities, but it is certain that he has derived information from the following sources:—

- (1) *Ḥabību's-Siyar* (—the author has practically copied the whole of the corresponding portion of *Ḥabību's-Siyar*, and frequently the very words of *Ḥabību's-Siyar*);
- (2) *Futūḥāt-i-Shāhī* (or *Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī*) (especially for the early life of Shāh Ismā'īl, and other details, not to be found in *Ḥabību's-Siyar*);
- (3) The *Incomplete History* (described in the above-mentioned marginal note); and
- (4) Oral evidence of persons who participated in the battles.

Bijan ends the work with prayers for the young King² (i.e. Shāh Ṭahmāsp). This has led E. G. Browne³ and Sir E. D. Ross⁴ to fix the date of composition just after the accession of Shāh Ṭahmāsp, who was ten years and half old at the time of his accession in Rajab, 930/May, 1524. But the work was undoubtedly composed after 947/1540, which is given as the date of Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā's death⁵. Sir E. D. Ross believes that this incident was added by some copyist⁶. There is no doubt that this MS. was written by a scribe; but the copy was revised and corrected by the author himself, for there are several marginal notes in the author's hand who writes about him as "*this meanest slave*" [بندۀ کترین]⁷. The author has not made any marginal note about this incident, as he has done elsewhere; it is obvious, therefore, that Bijan himself has written this date. On the other hand, the work was composed before 955/1548 as it was consulted by Amīr Maḥmūd ibn Khwānd Amīr who wrote his work in this year⁸. This has been clearly proved by Sir E. D. Ross⁹. Therefore the work was composed between 947/1540 and 955/1548.

¹ These sentences cannot be translated due to the blanks, but the sense is quite clear.

² *Browne's Catalogue of Persian MSS. in the Cambridge University Lib. (Cambridge, 1896)*, p. 149.

³ *J.R.A.S. for 1896*, p. 250.

⁴ *J.R.A.S. for 1896*, p. 250.

⁵ *Id.* 5a.

⁶ *Id.* 277a.

⁷ *Id.* 82a (margin).

⁸ *J.R.A.S. for 1896*, p. 250.

In the absence of *Futūḥāt-i-Shāhī* (or *Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī*) Bijan's history is very valuable, especially, for the early life of Shāh Ismā'īl. It also supplements the *Ḥabību's-Siyar*, and gives a complete, exact, and detailed account of the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl.

(2) *Tarīkh-i-Shāh Ismā'īl-wa-Shāh Ṭahmāsp* by Amīr Maḥmūd ibn Khwānd Amīr. It deals with the accounts of the reigns of Shāh Ismā'īl and Shāh Ṭahmāsp along with a brief account of their ancestors. It was begun in 955¹/1548 and was finished in 957²/1550. As far as the account of the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl and his ancestors is concerned, it adds little to the earlier authorities. It is a valuable authority for the affairs of Khurāsān during the reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsp up to the year 957/1550.

(3) *Nusakh-i-Jahān Ārā* by Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Qāḍī al-Ghaffārī. It is a work on general history from the earliest times to 972/1564-65, and was composed in 972/1564-65. Apart from the Ṣafawīs, it supplies very valuable, though brief, material for the Āq-Quyūnlūs, and other minor rulers. The author does not mention his authorities, but it is evident that he has utilized all the previous works. He has taken special care to be brief and to the point, and has given all possible dates even of minor events.

(c) *Non-Contemporary.*

(1) *Aḥsanu't-Tawārīkh* by Ḥasan Beg Rūmlū. This is a history of the reigns of Shāh Ismā'īl, Shāh Ṭahmāsp, and Shāh Ismā'īl II (984-85/1576-77). The account begins from 900/1494, and is finished in 985/1577. It also contains a brief account of the contemporary rulers of Khurāsān, Transoxiana, and Turkey. The author has followed a strict chronological order and has recorded all the important events year by year.

The author does not mention his authorities, but he has consulted possibly all the previous works, and has copied from *Ḥabību's-Siyar* and Bijan's history without adding facts of real importance; and, therefore, in the presence of these earlier and more important works its value is not great.

This work has been edited by C. N. Seddon. It was printed in Calcutta in 1931.

(2) *Khulāṣatu't-Tawārīkh* by Qāḍī Aḥmad ibn Sharafu'd-Dīn Ḥusayn al-Ḥusaynī better known as Mīr Munshī al-Qummī.

This is a work on general history from the earliest times to 999/1590. The fifth volume deals with the Ṣafawī Kings³ along with their ancestors. The author states that he began the work by the orders of Shāh Ismā'īl II on the lines of the famous *Maḥla'u's-Sa'daym*⁴ of Kamālu'd-Dīn 'Abdu'r-Razzāq Samarqandī; but owing to the hardships which he suffered during

¹ If. 5a.

² *Ibid.*, f. 185a.

³ Ef. 2a.

⁴ For details see *Rieu's Catalogue of Persian MSS.*, Vol. I, pp. 81-82.

the reigns of Shāh Ismā'il II and his successor Muḥammad Khudā Banda (985–95/1577–87), he could not bring it out, as there was none to appreciate his work and to reward his labours. Therefore, when the peaceful time of Shāh 'Abbās the Great (995–1038/1587–1629) came, he revised the book and brought it out in 999¹/1590.

He has derived information from the following authors²:—

- (1) Amīr Sultān Harawī (or more properly Amīr Ṣadru'd-Din Sultān Ibrāhīm Amīnī Harawī, author of *Futūḥāt-i-Shāhī* or *Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī*);
- (2) Mīr Yaḥyā Sayfī Qazwīnī (or more properly Amīr Yaḥyā ibn 'Abdu'l-Latif al-Ḥusaynī al-Qazwīnī, author of *Lubbu't-Tawārīkh*—an abridgement of a general history from the earliest times to 948/1541, of which only a few pages deal with the reign of Shāh Ismā'il);
- (3) Mīr Maḥmūd ibn Mīr Khwānd (or more properly Amīr Maḥmūd ibn Khwānd Amīr, author of *Tārīkh-i-Shāh Ismā'il-ua-Shāh Tahmāsp*);
- (4) Khiyālī Tabrizī (—whose works I have not been able to discover);
- (5) Qāḍī Aḥmad Ghaffāri (or more properly Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Qāḍī al-Ghaffāri, author of *Nusakh-i-Jahān Ārā*); and
- (6) Ḥasan Beg Rūmlū (author of *Aḥsanu't-Tawārīkh*).

The author has also derived information from Darwish Tawakkulī ibn Ismā'il commonly known as ibn Bazzāz the author of *Ṣafwatul-ṣ-Ṣafā*³.

After giving a brief account of Shāh Ismā'il's ancestors, the author has followed a strict chronological order, and has recorded all the important events year by year on the lines of *Aḥsanu't-Tawārīkh*. Besides facts, he borrows the very words of his authorities.

The historical value of this work is not great as it gives only a few additional facts of real importance.

(3) *Tārīkh-i-'Ālam Ārā-i-'Abbāsī* by Iskandar better known as Munshī. It is a very detailed history of the reign of Shāh 'Abbās the Great (995–1038/1587–1629) with a short account of his predecessors. The first volume of this work was completed in 1025/1616. The introduction to the first volume, which deals with the ancestors of Shāh 'Abbās the Great, alone concerns us.

The author has utilized the following authorities for the reign of Shāh Ismā'il and his ancestors:—

Ṣafwatul-ṣ-Ṣafā, *Tārīkh-i-Aḥwāl-i-Salāṭīn-i-Turkmān*, *Nafahātu'l-Uns*, *Futūḥāt-i-Amīnī*, *Ḥabību's-Siyar*, *Lubbu't-Tawārīkh*, *Nusakh-i-Jahān Ārā*, and *Aḥsanu't-Tawārīkh*⁴.

¹ Ef. 3a.

² *Ibid.*, f. 2a.

³ *Ibid.*, f. 6a.

⁴ Fpp. 7, 14, 16, 10, 16, 20, 16 and 20 respectively.

The account is brief and to the point, but adds little to the information given by earlier authorities. There is the usual plagiarism noticeable in Persian histories. This work was lithographed at Ṭīhrān in 1314¹/1896.

The following later works, though they specially deal with the Ṣafawīs, add nothing of value :—

- (1) *Rawdatu's-Ṣafawīyya* by Mirzā Beg ibn Ḥasan Ḥasanī Junābādī (completed in 1038/1629).
- (2) *Khulāsa-i-Maqāl* by Muḥammad Ṭāhir ibn Muḥammad Yūsuf Qazwīnī. (An incomplete history of the Ṣafawīs up to the reign of Shāh Ismā'īl II, compiled in the reign of Shāh 'Abbās II (1052-77/1642-66) and dedicated to him.)
- (3) *Zubdatu't-Twārikh* by Kamāl Khān ibn Jalāl Munajjim (completed in 1063/1653).
- (4) *Khuld-i-Barīn (Rawḍa Eighth)* by Muḥammad Yūsuf (completed in 1078/1667).
- (5) *Tārikh-i-Ismā'īl* (Author's name unknown; a very detailed history of the reign of *Shāh Ismā'īl* completed in the reign of Shāh Sulayman (1077-1106/1666-94). India Office Library possesses a MS. copy of this book and Sīpāh Sālār Library, Ṭīhrān, possesses another. The historical value of this work is nil, as it is mere fiction and is full of incorrect and exaggerated facts.)
- (6) *Tārikh-i-Sultānī* by Sayyid Ḥusayn ibn Sayyid Murtaḍā al-Ḥusaynī (completed in 1115/1703).

Similarly the works on general history by Indian authors hardly give new facts about the Ṣafawīs.

(2) *Supplement to the Affairs of Khurāsān and Transoxiana.*

(1) *Ḥabību's-Siyar*² (*Volume III, part III*). From this part only such portions are relevant to our purpose which deal with the reign of Sultān Ḥusayn Mirzā and his successors; Ṣāhīru'd-Dīn Muḥammad Bābur and Muḥammad Khān Shaybānī. The historical value of this part is great as the author was the eye-witness of most of the affairs of Khurāsān in general and its capital (Hīrāt) in particular.

(2) *Bābur's Memoirs*. The name of the work is self-explanatory. The original is in Chaghatāy Turkī. It was translated into Persian by:—

- (1) Pāyanda Khān and Muḥammad Qulī in 996/1886 (—incomplete);
- (2) 'Abdu'r-Raḥīm ibn Bayram Khān (—completed in 998/1590);
and
- (3) Shaykh Zaynu'd-Dīn Khwāfi in 998/1590 (—incomplete).

¹ Sp. 6 incorrectly states that the work is not published.

² For a detailed note on *Ḥabību's-Siyar* see p. 8, supra.

The account begins from Ramadān, 899/June, 1494, and extends to Jumāda I, 937/Dec., 1530, but unfortunately five gaps occur in the *Memoirs*, namely:—

- (a) From the end of 908 to the end of 909 (1503-4);
- (b) From the beginning of 914 to the beginning of 925 (1508-19);
- (c) From the beginning of 926 to the beginning of 932 (1520-25);
- (d) A part of the year 934 (from April 2nd to September 18th, 1528) and
- (e) The years 936-37 (1529-30¹)

We are not concerned with the period of the last two gaps, while the first three are beautifully supplemented by Mirzā Ḥaydar's *Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī* (described below).

The historical value of the *Memoirs* is admittedly great, as the author has given an exact, clear, and detailed account of all the important events in a strict chronological order².

An English translation of this work was begun by Dr. John Leyden, and was revised and completed by W. Etskine. It was first printed in London in 1826. It was annotated and revised by Sir Lucus King and was then printed at Oxford in 1921.

(3) *Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī* by Muḥammad Ḥaydar ibn Muḥammad Ḥusayn Gūrgān better known as Mirzā Ḥaydar. It is a history of the Khāns of Mughūlīstān and the Amīrs of Kāshghar from the time of Tughluq Timūr Khān to 952/1545, and also contains the author's own memoirs. The historical value of this work is great as its author was the eye-witness of most of the events, and had the opportunity of gathering facts from such persons who had participated in the battles. As far as the life of Bābur is concerned, it supplements the account left by Bābur himself in his *Memoirs*. The entire work was translated by Sir E. D. Ross, and was edited with commentary, notes, and map by N. Elias. It was published in London in 1895, and was re-issued in 1898.

(4) *Nuskha-i-Jāmi' al-Marāsīb-i-Ulu' al-bāb*. This is a collection of letters which passed between the rulers of Persia and those of the neighbouring countries, and includes the royal diplomas from the time of Alp-Arslān Saljūqī (455-66/1063-73) to the reign of Shāh Abbās II (1052-77/1642-66) of the Ṣafawī dynasty.

This collection was compiled by al-Qāsim Īwūghlī, who was appointed by Shāh Ṣafī I (1038-52/1629-42) to the post of a door-keeper. The work was completed in the reign of Shāh Abbās II. The last portion of the first volume and the first part of the second volume (ff. 46a-75b of *B.M. MS., vol. 1683*) alone concern us. Most of these letters are contained in the first

¹, Vol. I, Editor's preface, pp. ix-xi.

² or details see *ibid.*, pp. vii-ix.

volume of *Munsha'āt-i-Salāṭīn*¹ compiled and edited by Farīdūn Bey, and published at Constantinople in 1264/1848 and 1274/1858. Most of the letters are in Persian, while the rest are in Turkish or Arabic.

The historical value of these letters is great, but unfortunately most of them are undated, and some of them contain a most exaggerated and incorrect account of the events. (The letter of Shāh Ismā'il to Shaybānī Khān, the Uzbek, announcing his victory over 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr² serves as the best example.)

(3) *Supplement to the Account of Shāh Ismā'il's Relations with Turkey.*

(1) *Salīm Nāma* by Ḥakīmū'd-Dīn Idrīs ibn Ḥusāmū'd-Dīn 'Alī al-Bitlisī. This is a detailed history, in Persian prose and verse, of the reign of the Ottoman Sultān Salīm I (918-26/1512-20). The work was composed during the reign of Sultān Salīm I, but as the author died on Dhu'l-H. 7, 926³/Nov. 18, 1520, only two months after the death of Sultān Salīm I (Saturday, Shawwāl 9, 926⁴/Sept. 22, 1520), the history remained incomplete; till at the command of Sultān Sulaymān ibn Sultān Salīm I (926-74/1520-66), Abu'l Faḍl ibn Ḥakīmū'd-Dīn Idrīs collected his father's material, supplied the missing portions, and completed it in 974, 1566 in the reign of Sultān Salīm II (974-82/1566-74)⁵.

The historical value of this history is exceptionally great, as the author, Ḥakīmū'd-Dīn Idrīs, was the eye-witness of the affairs of the State in general, and of the battle of Chāldirān in particular. After the victory and occupation of Tabrīz, Ḥakīmū'd-Dīn Idrīs was ordered by Sultān Salīm to induce the petty rulers of Kurdistān to submit to the Sultān. He successfully carried out the mission, and in the course of two years the whole of the province of Diyār Bakr was captured by the Ottomans. He has given minute details of every event, and is indisputably the sole authority on the then Persia's relations with Turkey, for the accounts given by the Persian authors are at once brief and incorrect.

(2) *Munsha'āt-i-Salāṭīn*. This is a collection of State papers, compiled and edited by Farīdūn Bey in 982/1574. These letters were written by and to the Ottoman Sultāns, and their contemporary rulers, sons, ministers and provincial governors. Most of them are in Persian, and the rest are in Arabic or Turkish.

The historical value of these letters is undoubtedly great, as they supply facts, which are rare, and are not found in historical works. The remarkable feature is this that they clearly display the royal spirit of those times. (The letters of the Ottoman Sultān Salīm I to 'Ubaydu'llāh Khān Uzbek⁶ and to Shāh Ismā'il Ṣafawī⁷, dated Muḥarram and Ṣafar, 920/Mar. and Apr.,

¹ For details see below.

³ Mf. 41a.

⁶ Npp. 346-349.

² B.M. MS., add 7688, ff. 71a-72b.

⁴ Ap. 91.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 351-353.

⁵ Mf. 32b.

1514 respectively, serve as the best examples.) It is a matter of misfortune that most of the letters are undated, but if they are carefully studied, the approximate dates can be deduced. This collection was printed in two volumes in Constantinople in 1264-1848, and was reprinted in 1274/1858. The first volume, which comes down to 966/1558-59, alone concerns us.

(4) *The Accounts of Contemporary Foreign Travellers.*

A Narrative of Italian Travels in Persia. This work was issued by the Hakluyt Society, London, in 1873, together with "*Travels to Tania and Persia*", under the name of "*Travels of Venetians in Persia*". This is the only work which supplies a few facts about Persia under Shāh Ismā'il, but as far as the actual history of Shāh Ismā'il is concerned, it is thoroughly unreliable and contains numerous serious mistakes. Only a few points observed by the Italian merchant himself, who visited Tabriz in 915/1509, can be accepted as true.

CHAPTER II

THE ANCESTORS OF SHĀH ISMĀ'IL

Shāh Ismā'il, as given below, is the fifth in descent from Shaykh Ṣafiyū'd-Dīn Ishāq, the descendant of the seventh Imām, Mūsā al-Kāzīm :

Abu'l-Muẓaffar *Shāh Ismā'il* ibn Sultān Ḥaydar ibn Sultān Junayd ibn Shaykh Ibrāhīm better known as Shaykh Shāh ibn Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī ibn Shaykh Sadru'd-Dīn Mūsā ibn *Shaykh Ṣafiyū'd-Dīn Ishāq* ibn Shaykh Aminu'd-Dīn Jibra'il ibn Shaykh Ṣāliḥ ibn Quṭbu'd-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Ṣalāḥu'd-Dīn Rashīd ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥāfiẓ ibn 'Awaḍ al-Khawāṣṣ ibn Fīrūz Shāh-i-Zarrīn Kulāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Sharaf Shāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Ja'far ibn Muḥammad ibn Ismā'il ibn Muḥammad ibn Sayyid Aḥmad al-A'rābī ibn Abū Muḥammad Qāsim ibn Abu'l-Qāsim Ḥamza ibn al-Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm ¹.

The earlier ancestors of Shāh Ismā'il were only pious people, and they spent their days without having obtained any worldly distinction. The

¹ Ap. 3, Bf. 2a, Cf. 196b, Ef. 4a and If. 7b-8a. Fp. 5 omits Khwāja 'Alī but gives his account at the proper place (see Fpp. 12-13). Gp. 10 differs from the above authorities in two places: firstly, it omits Shaykh Ṣāliḥ as the son of Quṭbu'd-Dīn Aḥmad; and secondly, it gives Ṣāliḥ in place of Ṣalāḥu'd-Dīn Rashīd. But in giving Ṣalāḥu'd-Dīn Rashīd's short account on p. 16, it gives the name correctly as Ṣalāḥu'd-Dīn Rashīd. (Also see *J.R.A.S. for July, 1921*, p. 397, footnote 1.) Mirzā Ṭāhīr Waḥīd, author of '*Abbās Nāma*, the history of Shāh 'Abbās I (1052-77/1642-66) completed in 1073-74/1662-63 (ff. 13b-14a, Lytton Lib. 'Aligarh, Subḥānu'llāh Khān Sec. MS.) while giving the full pedigree, agrees with the above authorities from Shāh Ismā'il to Shaykh Ṣafiyū'd-Dīn Ishāq, but from the latter to Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm, he differs to a great extent, unfortunately without giving his authorities. He gives: "Ṣafiyū'd-Dīn Ishāq ibn Sayyid Jibra'il ibn Quṭbu'd-Dīn Ṣāliḥ ibn Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Awaḍ ibn Fīrūz Shāh ibn Mahdī ibn 'Alī ibn Abu'l-Qāsim ibn Ḥusayn ibn Aḥmad ibn Dā'ūd ibn 'Alī ibn Mūsā ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Imām Mūsā Kāzīm". A Ṭībrān MS. of the '*Abbās Nāma* (f. 9b) differs even from this, and gives: "Shaykh Ṣafiyū'd-Dīn Ishāq ibn Quṭbu'l-Awliyā Sayyid Jibra'il ibn Quṭbu'd-Dīn Ṣāliḥ ibn Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Awaḍ ibn Shāh Fīrūz ibn Mahdī ibn 'Alī ibn Abu'l-Qāsim ibn Bābur ibn Ḥasan ibn Dā'ūd ibn 'Alī ibn Mūsā ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Imām (Mūsā al-Kāzīm)" ². Hf. 1b agrees with the above authorities up to "Ismā'il" and then differs, giving: "Ismā'il ibn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-A'rābī". It further agrees with them up to "Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm". Sayyid Aḥmad Kasrawī Tabrizī has tried to prove that the Ṣafawīs are not the descendants of Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm, and hence they are not Sayyids (*Āyanda, Vol. II, Nos. 5, 7 and 11, Ṭībrān, 1927-28*).

first man, who, apart from his piety, became a strong and rich man, was Fīrūz Shāh-i-Zarrin Kūlāh.

Fīrūz Shāh-i-Zarrin Kūlāh was the custodian of the shrine of Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm at Mashhad¹. Sultān Aḥmad, a descendant of Ibrāhīm al-Adham, while intending to capture Mughān and Georgia, took Fīrūz Shāh along with him, and on reaching Ādharbāyjān, asked him to settle down at Ardabīl to instruct the people of Mughān and the neighbouring places in the rules of Islām. Fīrūz Shāh spent most of his time as a missionary at Ardabīl². He then moved towards Gilān and settled down in a village, named Rangīn, where he ended his days in peace and prosperity³.

'*Awāḍ al-Khawāṣṣ*. His name was Ismā'īl, but he was better known as 'Awāḍ al-Khawāṣṣ⁴. He succeeded his father, but left Rangīn and settled down in Isfaranjān, a village near Ardabīl, and spent his life in peace⁵.

Muḥammad al-Ḥāfiẓ succeeded his father. He is reported to have disappeared at the age of seven and returned after a lapse of seven years, and told that he had been carried away by "Jinns" who had instructed him in the Holy Qur'ān. He knew the Holy Qur'ān by heart, and acquired the title of "Ḥāfiẓ". He lived a pious life and instructed the people in the right path⁶.

Ṣalāḥu'd-Dīn Rashīd, the eldest son of Muḥammad al-Ḥāfiẓ, succeeded his father⁷. He distributed all his property amongst the poor, dressed himself like a "darwish"⁸, and went to the village of Gilkhwārān⁹, where he devoted himself to agriculture¹⁰. He died at the age of seventy¹¹.

Quṭbu'd-Dīn Aḥmad succeeded his father, and spent his days in peace till the irruption of the Georgians, whereupon, he migrated to Ardabīl¹². A short account of the Georgian irruption is as follows:—

Bukrāt Khān¹³, a Georgian chief¹⁴, set out with 12,000 men to punish Quṭbu'd-Dīn Aḥmad at Gilkhwārān, who was reported to have preached to the Christians to accept Islām¹⁵, and then to invade Ardabīl. Thereupon, Quṭbu'd-Dīn Aḥmad fled to Ardabīl with the whole of his family¹⁶, whom he hid in underground

¹ Hf. 2b-3a.

² *Ibid.*, f. 3a. Other authorities give different accounts. This is probably the most correct.

³ Ap. 4.

⁴ Hf. 3a.

⁵ Ap. 4.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁸ Bf. 4b.

⁹ Ap. 4. Gp. 12 "Kalkhorān". (Also see Sp. 36, footnote 3.)

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

¹¹ Fp. 8.

¹² Ap. 4.

¹³ Bf. 4b.

¹⁴ Ap. 4.

¹⁵ Bf. 4b.

¹⁶ Ap. 4. Gp. 12 incorrectly includes Amīnu'd-Dīn Jibra'īl, then only a month old, as the son of Quṭbu'd-Dīn Aḥmad. The child referred to here might be Amīnu'd-Dīn Jibra'īl, the son of Shaykh Ṣāliḥ and the grandson of Quṭbu'd-Dīn Aḥmad. Sp. 37 makes the same incorrect statement.

cells¹. Bukrāt Khān reached Gilkhwārān, and, having come to know of Quṭbu'd-Dīn Aḥmad's flight, hastened towards Ardabil². He plundered the city³ for three days⁴, and put several thousand⁵ Muslims to the sword.

A youthful volunteer, who stood on guard at the cell in which Quṭbu'd-Dīn Aḥmad and his family were hidden, was attacked by a Georgian, but he killed the assailant, and closed the mouth of the cell by an earthenware jar. The other Georgians, attracted by the cry of the dying man, rushed to the spot, and put the volunteer to the sword. A little later, Quṭbu'd-Dīn Aḥmad came out of the cell⁶ to inquire about the invaders⁷, and was attacked by the Georgians, who inflicted a severe wound on his neck, from which, however, he later on recovered⁸.

Quṭbu'd-Dīn Aḥmad died a few years after the birth⁹ of his great-grandson¹⁰ Shaykh Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn Ishāq, which took place in 650¹¹/1252-53; and Shaykh Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn Ishāq used to relate that when Quṭbu'd-Dīn Aḥmad took him on his shoulders he used to put his four little fingers into the scar left by the sword wound¹² inflicted by the Georgians.

*Shaykh Ṣālīḥ*¹³ succeeded his father, and spent his life quietly as a missionary¹⁴. He died at Gilkhwārān, and was buried there by his son Aminu'd-Dīn Jibra'il¹⁵.

Aminu'd-Dīn Jibra'il succeeded his father Shaykh Ṣālīḥ¹⁶, and took to agriculture. He adopted Khwāja Kamālu'd-Dīn 'Arab Shāh Ardabili as his spiritual director¹⁷. At the age of thirty, he went to Shirāz, and returned to his native place after the lapse of ten years¹⁸. He then married a lady, named Dawlatī, daughter of 'Umar¹⁹ ibn Jamāl²⁰, of Bāruq²¹, a village near Ardabil²². She gave birth to a son²³, in 650²⁴/1252-53, who was named Shaykh Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn Ishāq, who later on became a great saint²⁵, and from whom the *Ṣafawī dynasty* derives its name.

¹ Ap. 4.

² Bf. 4b.

³ Ap. 4.

⁴ Bf. 5a.

⁵ Gp. 12.

⁶ Ap. 4.

⁷ Hf. 3b.

⁸ Ap. 4.

⁹ Bf. 5a.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 5a. Gp. 14 and Hf. 4a incorrectly give "grandson". Sp. 37 makes the same incorrect statement.

¹¹ Gp. 16.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹³ Ap. 4. Gp. 14 and Sp. 37 both incorrectly omit this name, although the latter, while giving the full pedigree on p. 32, footnote 1, includes Shaykh Ṣālīḥ as the son of Quṭbu'd-Dīn Aḥmad.

¹⁴ App. 4-5.

¹⁵ Bf. 5b.

¹⁶ Ap. 5. Gp. 14 and Sp. 37 incorrectly give Quṭbu'd-Dīn Aḥmad.

¹⁷ Gp. 14.

¹⁸ Bff. 5b-6a.

¹⁹ Ap. 5.

²⁰ Gp. 15.

²¹ Ap. 5. Gp. 15 gives "Bārūq".

²² Gp. 15.

²³ Ap. 5.

²⁴ Gp. 16. Hf. 5a incorrectly gives "651".

²⁵ Ap. 5.

The author of *Silsilātu'n-Nasab-i-Şafawiyya* makes the following statements in support of the date of birth of this great Shaykh:—

“At the time of the birth of Şafiiyyu'd-Din Ishāq (i.e. in 650/1252-53) Shaykh Shamsu'd-Din Tabrizī had been dead five years, Shaykh Muḥyi'd-Din Ibnu'l 'Arabī twelve years, and Shaykh Najmu'd-Din Kubrā thirty-two years. He was twenty-two years old on the death of Jalālu'd-Din Rūmī, and forty-one on that of Shaykh (Muşliḥu'd-Din) Sā'di Shirāzī¹. He was five years old when Hülākū Khān (the Mongol) conquered Persia².

Aminu'd-Din Jibra'il died when Shaykh Şafiiyyu'd-Din Ishāq was six years old³ (i.e. in 656/1258), and was buried at Gilkhwārān⁴. He left six sons, namely: Muḥammad, Şalāḥu'd-Din, Ismā'il, Şafiiyyu'd-Din Ishāq, Ya'qūb and Fakhru'd-Din, and a daughter older than Şafiiyyu'd-Din Ishāq⁵.

Shaykh Şafiiyyu'd-Din Ishāq became religious-minded at a very early age. He saw visions⁶ and held conversation with the unseen world⁷.

Eventually, the fire of divine love flared up in his heart, and he began a search for a spiritual guide⁸. He used to go to the tombs of Shaykh Farrukh Ardabīlī, Shaykh Abū Sa'id and Shaykh Shihābu'd-Din Maḥmūd Aharī, and spent his time in offering prayers.

A few years later, he heard the fame of Shaykh Najibu'd-Din Buzghūsh Shirāzī⁹, and decided to see him. Thus, on the pretext of seeing his elder brother Şalāḥu'd-Din at Shirāz, he took leave from his mother¹⁰, but only reached there to find Shaykh Najibu'd-Din Buzghūsh¹¹ dead. He took repose in the monastery of Shaykh Abū 'Abdu'llāh-i-Khafif¹², and read the commentary of the Holy Qur'ān from Raḍiu'd-Din¹³. He also met Shaykh Muşliḥu'd-Din Sā'di¹⁴ the famous poet, but his object was to find a perfect spiritual guide. Thus he was advised by Amīr 'Abdu'llah, a notable saint,

¹ Gp. 16. From this it is concluded that these persons died in 645/1247, 638/1240, 618/1221, 672/1273 and 691/1291 respectively. This is further corroborated by the dates of the deaths of these persons given in Qpp. 416, 504, 379, 413 and 542 respectively.

² *Ibid.*, p. 16. It is concluded from this that Hülākū Khān conquered Persia in 655/1257. This is also further corroborated by the date of this event given in *T'ārīkh-i-Jahān Gushāy-i-Jwaynī*, Vol. III (London, 1931), pp. 36-56.

³ Bf. 6a.

⁴ Cf. 197a.

⁵ Gp. 16.

⁶ Ap. 5.

⁷ Gp. 17.

⁸ Ap. 6.

⁹ Fp. 9.

¹⁰ Ap. 6.

¹¹ He died in 678/1279 (Qp. 422). Bf. 6b incorrectly states that Shaykh Şafiiyyu'd-Din Ishāq was 20 years old when he was at Shirāz. It can easily be concluded from the date of death of Shaykh Najibu'd-Din Buzghūsh that Shaykh Şafiiyyu'd-Din was 28 years old when he reached Shirāz, for he was born in 650/1252-53.

¹² Ap. 6. He died in 331/942 (Qp. 223).

¹³ Bff. 6b-7a.

¹⁴ Ap. 6. He died in 691/1291 (Qp. 542).

to proceed to Gilān to meet Shaykh Zāhid¹ Gilānī, the most perfect guide, whereupon, he took leave from his brother, and returned to his native place.

Four years elapsed before Shaykh Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn Ishāq was able to trace the native place of Shaykh Zāhid. A person, named Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm, who had gone from Gilkhwārān to Gilān, reported that Shaykh Zāhid was in the village of Hilya-Karān in Gilān. It was winter, but Shaykh Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn Ishāq left for Hilya-Karān², on Sha'bān 27³, 683⁴/Nov. 8, 1284, reached there on Ramaḍān⁵ 1, 683/Nov. 12, 1284, and was cordially received by Shaykh Zāhid. He spent a strictly religious and mystical life according to the directions of Shaykh Zāhid, who was so pleased with him that he gave him one of his daughters, named Fāṭīma, in marriage, and nominated him his successor in place of his own son Jamālu'd-Dīn 'Alī. Shaykh Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn Ishāq returned to Ardabil in Shaykh Zāhid's lifetime, but he paid frequent visits to him in Gilān, and Shaykh Zāhid also often visited his disciple at Ardabil. Shaykh Zāhid died⁶ in Rajab⁷, 700/March, 1301, and was buried by Shaykh Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn Ishāq at Siyāward⁸ in Gilān. Thereupon, Shaykh Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn Ishāq returned to Ardabil, and was accepted as the head of the Order, and spent his life in directing people in the right path⁹.

Towards the end of his life¹⁰, he nominated his second son, Shaykh Ṣadrud-Dīn Mūsā¹¹, who was born on Shawwāl 1¹², 704¹³/Apr. 26, 1305, his successor¹⁴, because his eldest son, named Shaykh Muḥyi'd-Dīn, had predeceased him in 724/1323. He performed the pilgrimage¹⁵, and died on Monday, Muḥarram 12, 735/Sept. 12, 1334 at Ardabil¹⁶. He left three other sons, namely: Abū Saīd, 'Alā'u'd-Dīn and Sharafu'd-Dīn, who died soon after him. He also left a daughter whom he had given in marriage to Shamsu'd-Dīn ibn Shaykh Zāhid¹⁷.

Shaykh Ṣadrud-Dīn Mūsā succeeded his father¹⁸ in 735/1334 at the age of thirty-one¹⁹. His influence, like that of his father, on his followers was great, and they used to visit him at Ardabil in large numbers²⁰.

¹ Ap. 6. Shaykh Zāhid ibn Shaykh Rawshan Amīr ibn Bābil ibn Shaykh Bundār al-Kurdi as-Sanjānī. His full name was Tāju'd-Dīn Ibrāhīm. He was the disciple of Sayyid Jamālu'd-Dīn Gilānī (Cf. 197b and Hf. 7b give "Tabrizī") who was the disciple of Abu'l Qāsim Junayd Baghdādī (d. 273/886-87. Qpp. 81-82), whose chain of teachers reached 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib (Ap. 6).

² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

³ Bf. 7a.

⁴ This is the approximate date, as Shaykh Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn Ishāq left Shirāz after the death of Shaykh Najību'd-Dīn Buzghūsh which occurred in 678/1279. Gp. 28 incorrectly states that he was 25 years old at this time.

⁵ Bf. 7b. This date is doubtful. Considering the distance between the two places and the troubles which he suffered on the way (Gp. 24) it seems impossible for him to reach Shaykh Zāhid's native place in such a short time.

⁶ Ap. 6.

⁷ Gp. 39.

⁸ Ap. 6. Other authorities give "Siyāwrūd".

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹⁰ Gp. 39.

¹¹ Ap. 7.

¹² Hf. 7b.

¹³ Gp. 39.

¹⁴ Ap. 7.

¹⁵ Gp. 36.

¹⁶ Ap. 8.

¹⁷ Gp. 36.

¹⁸ Ap. 8.

¹⁹ Gp. 39.

²⁰ Ap. 9.

Malik-i-Ashraf¹, who was formerly a devotee of Shaykh Şadru'd-Dīn Mūsā, so much so that he would kiss the Shaykh's feet whenever he went to see him, became suspicious of the Shaykh's increasing influence, and summoned him to Tabriz. Failing in his attempt to poison the Shaykh, he kept him in confinement² for three months³; but finally, warned in a dream, he released the Shaykh, who returned to Ardabil. Subsequently, the tyrant tried to recapture the Shaykh, and commissioned Urghūn Shāh for the purpose, but the Shaykh escaped to Gilān⁴.

Other holy men were also ill-treated by this tyrant and left Ādharbāyjan. Khwāja Shaykh Kajachī, one of the leading men of Tabriz, fled to Shirāz, and from there to Syria. Qāḍī Muḥyi'd-Dīn Barda'ī took refuge at Sarāi Barga in Dasht-i-Qipchāq. One Friday, he went to the Jāmi' Mosque, and after the "Khutba", he described the tyrannies of Malik-i-Ashraf so vividly that Jāni Beg Khān ibn Ūzbeġ Khān⁵ determined to invade Ādharbāyjan, and punish the tyrant. Accordingly, Jāni Beg Khān set out⁶, in 758/1356, with a large army, invaded Ādharbāyjan, captured the tyrant near Tabriz and put him to death. He sent for Shaykh Şadru'd-Dīn Mūsā, received him with great honour and then allowed him to go to Ardabil⁷. Jāni Beg Khān left his son Bardi Beg Khān with 50,000 men at Tabriz, and himself returned to Dasht-i-Qipchāq, along with Tīmūr Tāsh and Sultān Bakht, the son and daughter of Malik-i-Ashraf⁸.

Towards the end of his life, Shaykh Şadru'd-Dīn Mūsā nominated his son Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī his successor⁹, performed the pilgrimage¹⁰, and died in 794/1391. He left two other sons, namely: Şalāhu'd-Dīn, who died childless, and Jamālu'd-Dīn, who left a daughter, named Khān-Zāda Pāshā, who was married to Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī's son Shaykh Ibrāhīm better known as Shaykh Shāh¹¹. His famous disciple was the poet¹² Mu'īnu'd-Dīn 'Alī¹³ Tabrizī better known as Qāsim-i-Anwār¹⁴, who died in 837¹⁵/1433.

Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī succeeded his father¹⁶ in 794¹⁷/1391, and spent a religious life like his ancestors in directing people in the right path¹⁸.

Towards the end of his life, Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī nominated his son, Shaykh Ibrāhīm better known as Shaykh Shāh, his successor, and went on a pilgrimage to Mecca. Shaykh Ibrāhīm, being unable to bear the pangs

¹ Ap. 10. Ap. 10 and If. 18a incorrectly call him "the ruler of Ādharbāyjan". Gp. 41 incorrectly calls him "the King of Persia". Malik-i-Ashraf ibn Amīr Chūbān was the Commander-in-Chief of Anūshīrwān Khān (745-58/1344-57) the last of the Ilak Khānī rulers of Ādharbāyjan. (*Howorth's Hist. of the Mongols, part III, London, 1888, pp. 585-653.*)

² *Ibid.*, p. 10.

³ Gp. 42.

⁴ Ap. 10.

⁵ Ef. 7a. He was of the line of Golden Horde and was the ruler of Dasht-i-Qipchāq (741-58/1340-57). (*Howorth's Hist. of the Mongols, part III, London, 1888, pp. 173-79.*)

⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 7a.

⁷ Ap. 11.

⁸ Ef. 8b.

⁹ Ap. 11.

¹⁰ Gp. 45.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 39-40.

¹² Qp. 535.

¹³ Cf. 198a.

¹⁴ Qp. 535.

¹⁵ Cf. 198a.

¹⁶ Ap. 11.

¹⁷ His father died this year.

¹⁸ Ap. 11.

of separation, followed suit and joined his father en route. The two together performed the pilgrimage, and on their return journey, Shaykh Khwāja ‘Alī fell ill, and died ¹ on Tuesday, Rajab 18, 830²/May 14, 1427 in Palestine ³, where his tomb is known as the “Tomb of Sayyid ‘Alī ‘Ajāmī” ⁴. Shaykh Ibrāhīm returned to Ardabil ⁵.

He left two other sons, namely: Jā‘far and ‘Abdu’r-Raḥmān ⁶.

Shaykh Ibrāhīm better known as Shaykh Shāh succeeded his father in 830/1427. He spent a quiet and pious life like his ancestors ⁷, and nothing more is known about him save that at the end of his life, he remained ill for a long time ⁸, nominated his son Sulṭān Junayd his successor, and died ⁹ in 851 ¹⁰/1447.

He left five other sons, namely: Abū Sa‘īd, Sayyid Aḥmad, Sayyid Bāyazīd, Khwāja Jān Mīrzā and Ibrāhīm Khwājagī ¹¹.

Sulṭān Junayd succeeded his father in 851 ¹²/1447, and his fame for piety attracted a large number of followers to Ardabil. They, however, aroused the envy of Jahān Shāh ¹³ ibn Qarā Yūsuf ibn Qarā Muḥammad, of the Qāra-Quyūnlū (Black Sheep) dynasty ¹⁴, and the ruler of Ādharbāyjān and the two ‘Irāqs, with his capital at Tabrīz ¹⁵, who wrote a strong letter to Sulṭān Junayd, ordering him to disperse his followers, and forbade them from coming to him in future ¹⁶, or to leave Ardabil ¹⁷, or to prepare himself to withstand his attack ¹⁸. Thereupon, Sulṭān Junayd left for Diyār Bakr with his followers along with their families. Amīr Hasan Beg ¹⁹ ibn ‘Alī Beg ibn Qarā ‘Uthmān, of the Āq-Quyūnlū (White Sheep) dynasty ²⁰, who was the ruler of Diyār Bakr, and was opposed to Jahān Shāh, honourably received Sulṭān Junayd at Ḥiṣn Kayf, and gave his sister, named Khadīja Begum, to him in marriage ²¹.

Sulṭān Junayd spent a few years at Ḥiṣn Kayf and then returned to Ardabil ²². Jahān Shāh had, in the meanwhile, picked up relationship with

¹ Ap. 11.

² Gp. 45.

³ Bf. 17a.

⁴ Gp. 45.

⁵ Ap. 11.

⁶ Gpp. 49-50.

⁷ Ap. 11.

⁸ Bf. 17a.

⁹ Ap. 11.

¹⁰ Gp. 65. Sp. 47 incorrectly states that Shaykh Ibrāhīm better known as Shaykh Shāh is even omitted entirely in succession by the *Tārīkh-i-‘Ālam Ārā-i-‘Abbāsī*. As a matter of fact “*Tārīkh-i-‘Ālam Ārā-i-‘Abbāsī*” devotes about half a page to him (see Fp. 13).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

¹² His father died this year. Up. 263 incorrectly calls him “the son of (Shaykh) Khwāja ‘Alī”.

¹³ App. 11-12.

¹⁴ Cf. 187b-189b.

¹⁵ Ap. 12. Df. 17b incorrectly calls him “the King of Persia”.

¹⁶ Bff. 18a-19a.

¹⁷ Ap. 12.

¹⁸ Bf. 19a.

¹⁹ Ap. 12. (For his detailed account see Appendix A, pp. 105-106, infra.)

²⁰ Cf. 190b-92a.

²¹ Ap. 12. Cf. 198b incorrectly states that Jahān Shāh gave his sister Khadīja Begum to Sulṭān Junayd.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 12. Vp. 241 incorrectly states that being prevented from returning to Ardabil, Shaykh Junayd lived at Shirwān.

Sultān Junayd's uncle, Shaykh Jā'far, who was opposed to Sultān Junayd, and had appointed him controller of the affairs of the shrine of Shaykh Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn Ishāq¹. Having come to know of Sultān Junayd's return and his relationship with Amīr Ḥasan Beg, Jahān Shāh again decided to kill Sultān Junayd, or failing that to exile him. This ill news filled Sultān Junayd with despair, and, with the object of courting martyrdom, he raised an army of 10,000 of his followers, and set out to invade the lands of the infidels² of Trebizond³ and Charkas⁴, that lay beyond the province of Shirwān.

When Khalīlu'llāh⁵ ibn Shaykh Ibrāhīm⁶, the Shirwān Shāh, came to know of Sultān Junayd's advance⁷, he came with 30,000 men, including 5,000 sent by Abu'l-Mā'sūm Khān, governor of Ṭabarsarān⁸.

Both armies met on the banks of the river Kur⁹, and a severe battle followed in which Sultān Junayd lost his life¹⁰. His body was brought out from the battlefield by some of his followers, and was buried at Ṭabarsarān¹¹. This happened in 860/1455, and this was the first battle fought by this family in the cause of religion¹².

He left two sons¹³, namely: Sultān Ḥaydar (nephew of Amīr Ḥasan Beg) who succeeded him¹⁴, and Khwāja Muḥammad whose mother was a Circassian slave girl¹⁵.

Sultān Ḥaydar succeeded his father¹⁶ in 860¹⁷/1455, and started his mission of instructing people in the right path on the lines of his ancestors.

His maternal uncle Amīr Ḥasan Beg put Jahān Shāh¹⁸ to death in 872/1468, and became the ruler of Ādharbāyjān and the two 'Irāqs. On account of the love which Amīr Ḥasan Beg¹⁹ and his wife Saljūq Shāh Begum²⁰ had for the pious family of Shaykh Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn Ishāq, he gave his daughter, named Ḥalīma Begī Āgha²¹ better known as 'Ālam Shāh Begum²², to his nephew Sultān Ḥaydar in marriage. Three sons were born

¹ Cf. 198b.

² Ap. 12.

³ Cf. 198b.

⁴ Bf. 19b.

⁵ Ap. 12.

⁶ Cf. 198b.

⁷ Ap. 12.

⁸ Bf. 20a.

⁹ *Ibid.*, f. 20a. Ap. 12 gives "Ṭabarsarān" on the margin.

¹⁰ Ap. 12. Vp. 241 incorrectly states that he was killed in a local skirmish.

¹¹ Bf. 20a. Later authorities give a village named "Qarūyāl".

¹² Cf. 199a.

¹³ Gp. 67.

¹⁴ Ap. 12.

¹⁵ Gp. 67.

¹⁶ Ap. 12.

¹⁷ His father died this year.

¹⁸ Ap. 13. He ruled for 31 years (841-72/1437-68) (Rp. 253).

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

²⁰ Cf. 199a.

²¹ Ap. 13.

²² Bf. 20b. According to another account her name was Martha, and she was the daughter of Despina Caton, who was the daughter of Calo Johannes, the last (but one) Christian emperor of Trebizond, of the noble house of Comneni (*Travels in Persia by Caterino Zeno*, pp. 14, 42 and iv, included in the volume named *Travels of the Venetians in Persia*, Hakluyt Society, London, 1873).

of this marriage¹, namely: Sultān 'Alī Mirzā better known as Sultān 'Alī Pādīshāh, Ibrāhīm Mirzā² and Ismā'il Mirzā, of whom the last was born on Tuesday, Rajab 25, 892³/July 17, 1487, and later became famous as *Shāh Ismā'il, the Founder of the Šafawī Dynasty*.

Sultān Ḥaydar made a scarlet cap of twelve gores, and ordered all his followers to make their head-dress after this fashion, wherefore, his followers were called "Qizil-Bāshes" (the Red-Heads).

He was a zealot, and, on assuming power, collected an army⁴ of 12,000⁵ followers, nominated his eldest son, Sultān 'Alī Mirzā, his successor⁶, and marched against the infidels⁷ of Charkas and Dāghistān⁸ by way of Shirwān.

Farrukh Yasār ibn Khalīlū'llāh, the Shirwān Shāh, reported⁹ to Ya'qūb Mirzā¹⁰ ibn Amīr Ḥasan Beg, his son-in-law¹¹ and the ruler of Ādharbāyjān (who also envied the increasing power of Sultān Ḥaydar), that the attack of Sultān Ḥaydar on Shirwān¹² was to avenge the death of his father¹³, and a prelude to the conquest of Ābharbāyjān. Whereupon, Ya'qūb Mirzā sent¹⁴ Sulaymān Beg¹⁵, with 4,000 horsemen, to reinforce the Shirwān army.

In the meanwhile, Sultān Ḥaydar had passed through Shakī, which lies to the north of Shirwān, and had encamped in the neighbourhood¹⁶ of the fort of Timūr Qāpī (or Darband)¹⁷. This fort, though considered impregnable, was attacked by Sultān Ḥaydar, and a tower had already fallen, when one of his followers, named Qarā Pīrī Beg Qājār, announced the arrival of the Shirwān Shāh along with the contingents of Sulaymān Beg. This made Sultān Ḥaydar fall back on Ṭabarsarān¹⁸.

Both sides arranged their armies in battle array. Sultān Ḥaydar appointed Qarā Pīrī Beg Qājār to command the right wing and Husayn Beg Shāmlū the left, while he himself commanded the centre. On the other side, the Shirwān Shāh appointed Abu'l Mā'sūm Khān, the governor of Ṭabarsarān, on the right, and Sulaymān Beg on the left, while he himself took his stand in the centre¹⁹. A fierce battle ensued in which Sultān Ḥaydar lost

¹ Ap. 13.

² Bf. 20b.

³ Ap. 13. Sp. 21, footnote 3, incorrectly states he was born on Rajab 5, 892/June 27, 1487.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁵ Np. 304.

⁶ Bf. 23b.

⁷ Ap. 16.

⁸ Bf. 21b.

⁹ Ap. 16.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 16. (For his detailed account see Appendix A, pp. 106-107, *infra*.) Up. 264 incorrectly calls him "the Ruler of Persia".

¹¹ Fp. 15.

¹² Ap. 16.

¹³ Bf. 21b.

¹⁴ Ap. 16.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 16. Bf. 22a gives "Sulaymān Bījan Ūghlī".

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹⁷ For the description of this fort see p. 57, *infra*.

¹⁸ Ap. 16.

¹⁹ Bf. 22b.

his life ¹. This happened on Tuesday, Rajab 20, 893 ²/July 1, 1488. Sultān Ḥaydar was buried at Ṭabarsarān ³, and twenty-two years later (i.e. in the middle of 915/end of 1509) his body was brought to Ardabil by the orders of his worthy son Shāh Ismā'īl and was buried by the side of his ancestors ⁴. Besides the above-mentioned three sons, he also left Muḥammad Mirzā, Sulaymān Mirzā, Ḥasan Mirzā and Dā'ūd Mirzā ⁵.

Sultān 'Alī Mirzā better known as Sultān 'Alī Pādīshāh succeeded his father ⁶ in 893 ⁷/1488, and a large number of his followers came to Ardabil to receive his blessings.

Ya'qūb Mirzā, though he suspected the son of Sultān Ḥaydar of avenging the death of his father ⁸ spared him his life for the sake of Ḥalīma Begī Āghā (mother of Sultān 'Alī Mirzā ⁹ and sister of Ya'qūb Mirzā), but sent one of his generals, at the head of a big contingent, to Ardabil to capture the three sons together with the wife of Sultān Ḥaydar, and to hand them over to Mansūr Beg Parnāk, governor of Fārs, to be imprisoned in the fort of Istakhr. This was effected ¹⁰ (about the end of Rabi' II, 894 ¹¹/end of March, 1489). The prisoners remained in custody for nearly four years and a half ¹², till the end of Shawwāl, 898 ¹³/beginning of August, 1493, when Rustam Mirzā ¹⁴ ibn Maḥṣūd Beg ibn Amīr Ḥasan Beg, the nephew of Ḥalīma Begī Āghā, and the ruler of Adharbāyjān, released them ¹⁵, and summoned them to Tabriz. He did so in order to send Sultān 'Alī Mirzā against Bāy-sunqur Mirzā ¹⁶ ibn Ya'qūb Mirzā, who had succeeded his father on the throne of Adharbāyjān in the middle of Ṣafar, 896 ¹⁷/end of Dec., 1491; and, who, towards the end of Rajab, 897 ¹⁸/May, 1492, had fled before Rustam

¹ Ap. 17.

² Gp. 68. Bf. 23b and Sp. 21 incorrectly state that he was killed in A.H. 895 and A.D. 1490 respectively. Df. 11b and Gp. 68 incorrectly state that he was twenty years old at this time. He succeeded his father 32 years back in 860/1455 (see p. 24, supra).

³ Ap. 17. Tp. 323 and Up. 264 incorrectly state that his remains were interred at Ardabil. Vp. 241 incorrectly states that his tomb at Ardabil became a place of pilgrimage.

⁴ See p. 57, infra.

⁵ Dp. 7.

⁶ Ap. 17.

⁷ His father died this year.

⁸ Ap. 17.

⁹ Bf. 24a.

¹⁰ Ap. 17.

¹¹ This date is concluded from the fact that they were released in the end of Shawwāl, 898/beginning of Aug., 1493, after nearly four years and a half (Ef. 14a, Cf. 199a.) Fp. 16 incorrectly gives "896".

¹² Cf. 199a.

¹³ Ef. 14a.

¹⁴ Ap. 19. (For his detailed account see Appendix A, p. 107, infra.)

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 19. Tp. 323, Up. 264, and Vp. 241 incorrectly state that they escaped.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 19. (For his detailed account see Appendix A, p. 107, infra.)

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

¹⁸ Cf. 194a.

Mirzā from Tabriz to Shirwān, and was now trying to invade and recover Ādharbāyjan by the help of an army supplied by¹ his maternal grandfather² Farrukh Yasār, the Shirwān Shāh³.

Rustam Mirzā received Sultān ‘Alī Mirzā with great honour and conferred on him the title of “Pādishāh”⁴. Hearing of his release, the followers of Sultān ‘Alī Pādishāh poured into Tabriz to kiss the feet of their master, whereupon, Rustam Mirzā requested Sultān ‘Alī Pādishāh to march against Bāysunqur Mirzā.

Sultān ‘Alī Pādishāh, together with Ayba Sultān, the commander-in-chief of Rustam Mirzā, advanced against Bāysunqur Mirzā, and reaching the ford of the river Kur they saw the hostile army on the opposite bank of the river. No action was taken by either side for a few days and both armies returned home without fighting a decisive battle⁵.

In the beginning of Dhu'l-Q., 898⁶/middle of August, 1493, Kūsa Hājjī Bāyandar, governor of Iṣfahān, revolted against Rustam Mirzā and read the “Khuṭba” in Bāysunqur Mirzā’s name. Encouraged by this news, Bāysunqur Mirzā again set out from Shirwān to invade Ādharbāyjan. Rustam Mirzā, finding himself attacked on two sides, again requested Sultān ‘Alī Pādishāh to take the field. Sultān ‘Alī Pādishāh despatched Qarā Piri Beg Qājār against Kūsa Hājjī Bāyandar, while he himself, together with Ayba Sultān, marched against Bāysunqur Mirzā, and encountered him near Āhar and Mishkīn⁷. Both sides arranged their armies for the battle. Sultān ‘Alī Pādishāh appointed Ḥusayn Beg Shāmlū and Rustam Beg Qarāmāni on the right, Dada Beg Ṭalish and Khādīm Beg Khalifa on the left, and Ayba Sultān the leader of the skirmishing party, while he himself commanded the centre. On the other side, Bāysunqur Mirzā appointed Shaykh Shāh ibn Farrukh Yasār on the right, Malik Salīm on the left, and he himself took his stand in the centre⁸. A severe contest followed in which Bāysunqur Mirzā lost his life and Sultān ‘Alī Pādishāh won the day⁹.

In the meantime, Qarā Piri Beg Qājār had encountered Kūsa Hājjī Bāyandar in a battle near Darguzīn, in which the latter lost his life. The news of both victories reached Rustam Mirzā the same night at Tabriz¹⁰.

When Rustam Mirzā got rid of his rivals, he allowed Sultān ‘Alī Pādishāh, with his brothers and mother, to go to Ardabil. Accordingly, they

¹ Ap. 19.

² Cf. 194a. Ap. 19 incorrectly calls him his “father-in-law”. Farrukh Yasār, the Shirwān Shāh, was the “father-in-law” of Ya‘qūb Mirzā (see p. 25, supra).

³ Ap. 19.

⁴ Bf. 26a.

⁵ Ap. 19.

⁶ Cf. 194a.

⁷ Ap. 19.

⁸ Bf. 26b.

⁹ Ap. 19. This event took place in Dhu'l-Q., 898/Aug., 1493, as has been given above. A on the margin of p. 19 incorrectly gives the date of Bāysunqur Mirzā’s death as “899”.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.

went home, and Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh resumed the work as the head of the Order, and innumerable devotees came to him in a short time. This roused the suspicion of Rustam Mirzā, who had Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh and his brothers conveyed to his camp¹, where strong guards were posted on them in order to completely cut them off from their devotees, who daily used to come to the camp in large numbers².

At last, in the end³ of 899⁴/middle of 1494, when Rustam Mirzā was leaving his winter-quarters of Khūy, he conceived a plan of putting Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh to death. The same night this news reached Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh, who, in the company of his brothers⁵, and chief devotees, like Husayn Beg Lala, Dada Beg Tālish, Qarā Piri Beg Qājār and Ilyās Beg Ayghūr Ūghli, fled instantly towards Ardabil⁶. Rustam Mirzā heard of their flight the next morning, and despatched⁷ Husayn Beg 'Alī Khānī and Ayba Sultān⁸ at the head of 5,000 men⁹, to capture the fugitives¹⁰ before they succeeded in entering Ardabil¹¹.

On his arrival at Shamāsi¹², a village near Ardabil, Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh came to know by his spiritual insight that on that day he would have to drink the cup of martyrdom at the hands of his enemies, and, consequently, he sent for his chief devotees and told them the sad news; but asked them not to be disheartened, for the banner of Ismā'il Mirzā's sovereignty would soon rise. He then took off his turban and placed it on Ismā'il Mirzā's head¹³, bound his girdle on Ismā'il Mirzā, nominated him his successor, and laid on him the obligation of avenging his death, and that of his father and grandfather. He then selected seven men, including Husayn Beg Lala, Qarā Piri Beg Qājār and Dada Beg Tālish, and ordered them to proceed to Ardabil with his brothers¹⁴.

¹ Ap. 20. Bf. 27a, Fp. 17 and Hf. 16b incorrectly give "Tabriz".

² *Ibid.*, p. 20.

³ Cf. 199b.

⁴ Ap. 20. Cf. 199b incorrectly gives "898". The correct date should be "the end of 899/middle of 1494", for Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh fought with Bāysunqur Mirzā in Dhu'l-Q., 898/Aug., 1493, i.e. almost the end of A.H. 898. He was then allowed to go to Ardabil, where he spent some time, and was again conveyed to Rustam Mirzā's camp, where also he spent some time. Moreover in the summer, i.e. the end of A.H. 898 Rustam Mirzā was at Tabriz, where he received the news of the victories, while here he is stated as "leaving the winter-quarters of Khūy".

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 20. Fp. 18 and Hf. 16b incorrectly state that he fled from "Tabriz".

⁶ Bf. 28a.

⁷ Ap. 20.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁹ Bf. 28b.

¹⁰ Ap. 20.

¹¹ Bf. 28b.

¹² *Ibid.*, f. 28b. Cf. 199b gives "Bārūq". Fp. 18 incorrectly gives "Shamāsi".

¹³ Ap. 20.

¹⁴ Bf. 28b.

The moment this was accomplished, the enemies appeared on the scene. Sulṭān 'Alī Pādīshāh¹, together with 300 followers² who had joined him en route, fought with utmost bravery, but the unequal contest was soon over³; and his dead body was brought to Ardabil by his mother's orders, and was buried by the side of his ancestors⁴.

¹ Ap. 20.

² Bf. 29a. Fp. 18 and Hf. 16b give "700".

³ Ap. 20.

⁴ Bf. 29a. This event took place in "the end of 899/middle of 1494". A on the margin of p. 20 incorrectly gives the date of Sulṭān 'Alī Pādīshāh's death as "the beginning of 898" (end of 1492). At that time he was undergoing imprisonment in the fort of Istakhr in Fārs. The actual release was effected in the end of Shawwāl, 898/beginning of Aug., 1493 (see p. 26, supra). Cf. 199b also incorrectly gives the date as "898". Bf. 29a, Dpp. 2-3 and Sp. 50 give the date of his death as "900/1494-95". This date is untenable: firstly, it cannot be the beginning of 900, because even Muḥarram 1st falls on Oct. 2, of 1494, and this time does not correspond with that of "leaving the winter-quarters of Khūy"; and secondly, it cannot be the end of 900, because in this way the time that passes from the death of Bāysunqur Mirzā (i.e. Dhu'l-Q., 898, after which Sulṭān 'Alī Pādīshāh was allowed to go to Ardabil) to the death of Sulṭān 'Alī Pādīshāh becomes nearly two years, and Rustam Mirzā being afraid of Sulṭān 'Alī Pādīshāh's waxing power, firstly, at Ardabil; and secondly, in his (i.e. Rustam Mirzā's) camp, could not have allowed so much time to pass in getting rid of so powerful a rival. Sp. 21 incorrectly states that Sulṭān 'Alī (Pādīshāh) fell in battle "about A.D. 1495". Up. 264 incorrectly states that Ibrāhīm Mirzā was also slain in this battle. Actually, Ibrāhīm Mirzā, along with his younger brother Ismā'il Mirzā, had left for Ardabil before the commencement of the battle. Fp. 18 incorrectly states that Ḥusyan Beg Lala and Dada Beg Ṭālish brought the dead body of Sulṭān 'Alī Pādīshāh to Ardabil. They had already left for Ardabil with the princes before the commencement of the battle.

CHAPTER III

ISMĀ'IL MĪRZĀ'S EARLY LIFE AND HIS STRUGGLE FOR THE THRONE

(1) *Ismā'il Mirzā's Childhood and His Flight to Gilān.*

Ismā'il Mirzā was born on Tuesday, Rajab 25, 892¹/July 17, 1487. He lost his father, Sultān Ḥaydar, in the campaign against Farrukh Yasār, the Shirwān Shāh, at Ṭabarsarān, on Tuesday, Rajab 20, 893²/July 1, 1488, when he was only a year old³. He was imprisoned, along with his mother and his elder brothers, in the fort of Istakhr in Fārs, in the end of Rabī', II, 894/end of March, 1489, by the orders of Ya'qūb Mirzā, ruler of Ādharbāyjan; and after a detention of nearly four years and a half, he was released in the end of Shawwāl, 898/beginning of Aug., 1493, by Rustam Mirzā, ruler of Ādharbāyjan.

After spending some time at Tabriz, he accompanied his mother and brothers to Ardabil. The growing influence of the family roused the suspicion of Rustam Mirzā, who had the princes conveyed to his camp, whence, however, they succeeded in effecting their escape towards the end of 899/middle of 1494; but they were overtaken at Shamāsī, a village near Ardabil, by a contingent of 5,000 men despatched by Rustam Mirzā and captured by Ḥusayn Beg 'Alī Khānī and Ayba Sultān.

Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh had barely nominated Ismā'il Mirzā his successor, when he fell in battle, as has been described above⁴, but the princes (Ibrāhīm Mirzā and Ismā'il Mirzā) reached Ardabil safely, and were hidden by their mother in the mausoleum of Shaykh Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn Ishāq. On the following day, Ayba Sultān reached Ardabil, and began to search for the princes and plunder the town. Thereupon, the princes left the mausoleum and hid themselves in Aḥmad Kākuli's house. Fearing the wrath of Ayba Sultān, Aḥmad Kākuli brought them out and took them to the house of a woman, named Khān Jān, where they remained for a month, unknown to all save their aunt⁵ Pāshā Khātūn⁶, the daughter of Sultān Junayd and the wife

¹ See p. 25, *supra*. Sp. 21, footnote 3, incorrectly states that he was born on Rajab 5, 892/June 27, 1487.

² See p. 26, *supra*. Sp. 21 incorrectly states that Shaykh Ḥaydar was killed in A.D. 1490.

³ Sp. 21 incorrectly states that "he was only about three years of age" at this time.

⁴ See pp. 26-29, *supra*.

⁵ Bff. 29a-29b.

⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 29b. Dp. 4 gives "Shāh Pāshā Khātūn".

of Muḥammadi Beg Turkmān. From there they were taken to the house of a lady, named Ūba-i-Jarrāḥa, of the Dhu'l-Qadr tribe, who, to elude the zealous search instituted by Ayba Sultān, hid them in the vault of the mausoleum of Allāh-Wirmish Āqā, situated in the Jāmi' Mosque of Ardabil.

Meanwhile, one of their followers, who had hidden himself in the Jāmi, Mosque, after a wound received in the battle between Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh and Ayba Sultān, came to know of the princes' presence, and conveyed this information to Rustam Beg Qarāmānī, who too had fled from the same battlefield, and had taken refuge along with eighty men in a mountain in the vicinity of Ardabil. Rustam Beg Qarāmānī took the princes at night to Kargān, a village in that mountain, and hid them in the house of Farrukh-Zād Gurgānī, the preacher, where they spent a few days¹.

Manṣūr Beg Qipchāqi, Ḥusayn Beg Lala, Qurq Sīdī 'Alī, Julbān Beg, Khādīm Beg Khalifa, Dada Beg Ṭalish and Kūk 'Alī Beg decided to remove the princes to the house of Amīra Ishāq, governor of Rasht, who had been for a long time on friendly terms with Muḥammadi Beg (the husband of the princes' aunt Pāshā Khātūn) and his brother Aḥmadi Beg². Then, along with eighty³ men, they were first taken to the house of Amīra Muẓaffar, governor of Tūl and Nāw. Ayba Sultān heard of this, and sent a message to Amīra Muẓaffar, demanding the princes. Ja'far Beg, governor of Khal-khāl, sent a like message, but, disregarding the messages, Amīra Muẓaffar sent the princes to Amīra Siyāwūsh, governor of Kaskar. Three days later, they were brought to Amīra Ishāq, governor of Rasht, and in spite of his requests, they stayed in a mosque, known as the "White Mosque". A goldsmith, named Amīra Najm, who lived close to the mosque, acted as servant to the princes during the period of their stay at Rasht.

The princes remained there for some time—from seven days to one month⁴—when Kārkiyā Mirzā 'Alī, ruler of Lāhijān, who was superior to all the rulers of Gilān in greatness of power and antiquity of family⁵, came to know of the princes' presence at Rasht, and realizing, that they were driven thither by the adversities of time, and that Amīra Ishāq had not the power to protect them, requested them to come to Lāhijān⁶. The princes, accordingly, went to Lāhijān⁷ (in the beginning of 900⁸/end of

¹ Bff. 29b-30b. Up. 264 incorrectly states that Ismā'il Mirzā was allowed to remain at Ardabil.

² *Ibid.*, ff. 30b-31a.

³ *Ibid.*, f. 31a. Ap. 20 and Fp. 18 give "200".

⁴ *Ibid.*, ff. 31a-31b.

⁵ Ap. 21.

⁶ Bf. 31b. A omits the detailed account given in Bff. 29a-32a.

⁷ Ap. 21.

⁸ This is the approximate date deduced from the above-mentioned facts. Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh died in the end of 899/middle of 1494, and nearly three months passed till their arrival at Lāhijān.

1494), were hospitably received¹, and were allotted beautiful buildings next to the college of Kiyā Farīdūn.

Shortly after, hearing of the princes' flight to Lāhijān, Ayba Sulṭān returned to Tabrīz, with Ūba-i-Jarrāha (who had protected the princes) and told the whole story to Rustam Mirzā, who, in the excess of his rage, had the woman strangled in the market-place of Tabrīz. Muḥammadi Beg and Aḥmadi Beg also suffered from his wrath, and their property was confiscated, but, eventually, by paying a fine of 30,000 "tankas", they were given pardon at the request of Qarā Dada.

Apart from other services which Kārkiyā Mirzā 'Alī rendered to the princes, he appointed Shamsu'd-Dīn Lāhijī to instruct them in the Holy Qur'ān, and to teach them Persian and Arabic. During this period, Amīra Najm, the goldsmith of Rasht²; Kārkiyā Sulṭān Ḥusayn³ and Amīra Hāshim, brothers of Kārkiyā Mirzā 'Alī, often came to see the princes⁴.

A few months later, Ibrāhīm Mirzā changed his cap of twelve gores for the head-dress of the Āq-Quyūnlūs, and left for Ardabil⁵.

Rustam Mirzā twice sent a message to Kārkiyā Mirzā 'Alī, demanding the custody of the princes, but received evasive replies. Thereupon, he decided to employ force, and sent Qāsīm Beg Turkmān with 300 men to Lāhijān, to arrest the princes; but Kārkiyā Mirzā 'Alī concealed Ismā'il Mirzā in a hanging basket, and swore on the Holy Qur'ān that the prince was not in Lāhijān. Qāsīm Beg Turkmān, accordingly, returned to Tabrīz with the empty message of Kārkiyā Mirzā 'Alī, and Rustam Mirzā himself decided to invade Lāhijān; but his plan could not materialize due to his death at the hands of his cousin⁶ Aḥmad Beg⁷ ibn Ughūrlū Muḥammad ibn Amīr Ḥasan Beg on the bank of the river Aras, in Dhū'l-Q., 902⁸/July, 1497. It was then that Ismā'il Mirzā began to lead a peaceful life⁹ at Lāhijān¹⁰, and confer blessings on his followers.

(2) *Ismā'il Mirzā's March from Lāhijān and Collection of Troops.*

Ismā'il Mirzā remained at Lāhijān for about five years¹¹, when, being desirous of (avenging his ancestors and) ending the civil war that followed

¹ Ap. 21.

² Bff. 32a-32b.

³ *Ibid.*, f. 32b. Dp. 9 incorrectly gives "Kārkiyā Sulṭān Ḥasan".

⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 32b.

⁵ Ap. 21. Tp. 323 and Vp. 241 incorrectly state that he died in Lāhijān. The latter also incorrectly states that Ismā'il (Mirzā) remained an only survivor of his father's family. For the rebellion and death of his step-brother Sulaymān Mirzā see p. 71, *infra*.

⁶ Bff. 33b-37b.

⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 37b. (For his detailed account see Appendix A, p. 107, *infra*.)

⁸ Ap. 21.

⁹ Bf. 37b.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 37b. Sir E. D. Ross in *J.R.A.S. for 1896*, p. 297, incorrectly gives "Ardabil".

¹¹ For he left in Muḥarram, 905/Aug., 1499 (Ef. 14b). Cf. 200a and Fp. 19 incorrectly state that he remained there for six years and a half.

Rustam Mirzā's death, he left for Ardabil¹, in the middle of Muḥarram, 905²/about Aug. 22, 1499. Kārkiyā Mirzā 'Alī, though opposed to the prince's departure on account of his tender age, made provisions for the journey, and accompanied him³ up to Ardū'i, a village near Daylamān⁴.

Ismā'il Mirzā proceeded to Tārum by way of Daylamān, with seven of his devoted followers, namely: Husayn Beg Lala, Dada Beg Ṭālish, Khādim Beg Khalifa, Rustam Beg Qarāmāni, Bayrām Beg Qarāmāni, Ilyās Beg Ayghūr Ūghli and Qarā Pirī Beg Qājār. Hearing of his march towards Ardabil, his followers poured in at every stage, and the number rose to 1,500 when he encamped at Tārum. He proceeded to Khalkhāl, where he spent a few days, and was well entertained by Shaykh Qāsim. Thence he went to Kū'i and stayed there for a month in the house of Malik Muẓaffar⁵ known as Khulfā Beg, who was the standard bearer of Sulṭān 'Alī Pādishāh⁶.

He continued his journey to Ardabil, where he paid a visit to the tomb of Shaykh Ṣafīyyū'd-Dīn Ishāq⁷, but he received an ultimatum from Sulṭān 'Alī Beg Chākārlū, the governor of the town⁸, to leave the place immediately or to prepare for war. Whereupon, due to the paucity of his followers, he left the place, and stayed in a village near Ardabil⁹.

Advised by Muḥammadi Beg Turkmān, Muḥammad Sulṭān Ṭālish personally requested Ismā'il Mirzā to visit Ṭawālish; and Ismā'il Mirzā, accordingly, went there¹⁰, and encamped at Arjuwān, a village near Āstārā¹¹ (on the Caspian Sea). Muḥammad Sulṭān Ṭālish proved his devotion to Ismā'il Mirzā, firstly, by rejecting the offer¹² of Alwand Mirzā¹³ ibn Yūsuf Beg ibn Amīr Ḥasan Beg, the ruler of Ādharbāyjān, to hand over Ismā'il Mirzā to him in return for the governorship of Ardabil and Khalkhāl; and

¹ Ap. 24.

² Ef. 14b. Cf. 200a, Fp. 19 and Hf. 18b incorrectly give "906". "906" and "907" respectively.

³ Ap. 24.

⁴ Cf. 200a.

⁵ Bf. 45a.

⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 45a. Sir E. D. Ross in *J.R.A.S. for 1896*, p. 333, incorrectly translates this sentence as "Malik Muẓaffar Tūkājī Sulṭān, son of the blessed martyr Sulṭān 'Alī Pādishāh known as Khulfā".

⁷ *Ibid.*, ff. 45a-45b.

⁸ Ap. 24. A omits the detailed account of Ismā'il Mirzā's return from Lāhūjān and his first visit to Ardabil.

⁹ Bf. 45b. Up. 264 incorrectly states that he established an independent government at Ardabil.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 45b. Ap. 24 incorrectly states that Muḥammad (Sulṭān) Ṭālish was on friendly terms with (Sulṭān) 'Alī Beg Chākārlū. Had he been so, he would not have personally requested Ismā'il Mirzā to visit Ṭawālish.

¹¹ Ap. 24.

¹² Bf. 46a.

¹³ *Ibid.*, f. 46a incorrectly gives "Rustam Mirzā". Rustam Mirzā had died in Dhul-Q., 902/July, 1497 (see p. 32, *supra*). (For the detailed account of Alwand Mirzā see Appendix A, pp. 108-109, *infra*). Tp. 323 and Up. 265 incorrectly mention "Alwand Mirzā as the son of Ya'qūb Mirzā".

secondly, by declining a sum of 1,000 tūmāns offered by Farrukh Yasār, the Shirwān Shāh, for the same purpose ¹.

Ismā'il Mirzā spent the winter of 905/1499-1500 at Arjuwān, and, in the ensuing spring, he consulted his chief devotees as to where he should proceed next, himself proposing to invade the infidel Georgia. The proposal was accepted, but they suggested that as the number of his followers was very small—only 300 men—he should first send swift messengers to the various provinces of Asia Minor and Syria to summon his followers. The suggestion was accepted and was given effect accordingly ².

He then paid a short visit to Ardabīl, and again consulted his chief devotees as to which route he should follow in his proposed campaign. They suggested that, as before leaving his winter-quarters ³ (i.e. Arjuwān) he had sent swift messengers ⁴ to Asia Minor and Syria to summon his followers he should first proceed to Arzinjān by way of Gūkaja Tangīz, where his followers would have an easy access to him. Whereupon, Ismā'il Mirzā took leave of his mother, and left for Arzinjān ⁵.

Near Gūkaja Tangīz, Ismā'il Mirzā came to know that Sulṭān Ḥusayn Bārānī, one of the grandsons of Jahān Shāh, the Qarā-Quyūnlū, who lived in the neighbourhood of Gūkaja Tangīz, was raiding the neighbouring territories with the intention of regaining the power which his ancestors had lost. While Ismā'il Mirzā was consulting his chief devotees about Sulṭān Ḥusayn Bārānī, a messenger came from him, and then he arrived in person to request Ismā'il Mirzā to accept the hospitality of his house. With 1,500 of his followers, Ismā'il Mirzā spent a few days in the house of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Bārānī, but suspecting the intention of his host ⁶, he left at night for Wuqūz-Alām ⁷.

At Wuqūz-Alām, he was reinforced by Qarāja Ilyās and his men from Asia Minor, who had escaped after being plundered at Shūra-Gil by the neighbouring chief named Mantash. Ismā'il Mirzā surprised the castle of Mantash, who managed to escape, but the garrison were put to the sword ⁸. He proceeded to the summer-quarters of Sang-i-Kul, inhabited by the Ustājilū tribe, spent a few ⁹ days ¹⁰ in the house of Ūghalān Ummat, and left for Sārūqāya, where he spent two months of the summer of 905-906/1500. In the environs of this village, he encountered a fierce bear, and in spite of

¹ Bf. 46a-47a.

² Ap. 24 incorrectly gives this account after his second visit to Ardabīl. Bf. 49a omits this account.

³ Bf. 49a.

⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 49b. Sir E. D. Ross in *J.R.A.S. for 1896*, p. 340, incorrectly translates "had sent orders by swift messengers" as "should send orders by swift messengers".

⁵ *Ibid.*, ff. 49b-50a.

⁶ App. 24-25.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 26. Fp. 20 incorrectly gives that he left for "Gūkaja Tangīz".

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

⁹ Cf. 200a.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 200a incorrectly gives "months".

his young age, slew the bear single-handed with an arrow. He then moved to Arzinjān ¹.

Seven thousand ² of his followers of the Shāmlū, Ustājlı, Rūmlū, Takkalū, Dhu'l-Qadr, Afshār, Qājār and Warsāq tribes ³, for whom he had sent messengers, joined him at this place. Among these were Muḥammad Beg Ustājlı and Abdī Beg Shāmlū, with 200 and 300 men respectively ⁴.

(3) *Ismā'il Mīrzā's War with Farrukh Yasār, the Shirwān Shāh, and the Conquest of Shirwān.*

Having become the commander of 7,000 men, Ismā'il Mīrzā determined to proceed against his enemies. Therefore, after consulting his chief devotees for the next expedition, he set out for Shirwān (in the beginning of 906/middle of 1500 to avenge the death of his ancestors).

On his arrival at Yāsīn, he despatched Khulfā Beg to subdue Georgia, who successfully returned with a large booty, which was distributed by Ismā'il Mīrzā amongst his troops. Ilyās Beg Ayghūr Ūghlı, the leader of another expedition for the re-conquest of the fort of Mantash, was equally successful. Ismā'il Mīrzā then proceeded to Aḥsan-Ābād, where Mantash came to him and apologized for his previous conduct. He was given pardon and was allowed to return to his fort, while Ismā'il Mīrzā continued his march ⁵.

Amīra Najm (or more properly Amīr Najmu'd-Dīn Mas'ūd), the goldsmith of Rasht, and one of the devout followers of the Ṣafawīs fled from Rasht, for fear of being put to death by Amīra Ishāq, at the instigation of his minister Kūsa 'Abbās, came to Ismā'il Mīrzā, while he was marching on Shirwān, and was taken in service ⁶.

Ismā'il Mīrzā then despatched Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī, with a contingent from Takkalū and Dhu'l-qadr tribes, to cross the river Kur at Qūmīn Ūlamī, and to discover the possibility of fording the river at Qūrī or Qanānj, before these places were occupied by the Shirwān Shāh. Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī found both fords impassable, and was still making up his mind, when Ismā'il Mīrzā suddenly came up, and plunging his horse into the river at the latter ford, crossed over with the main army and marched towards Shanākhi (about Jumāda I, 906/Dec., 1500).

On the way, Ismā'il Mīrzā received intelligence that Farrukh Yasār, the Shirwān Shāh, was ready for the battle and had encamped near the fort of Qibla ⁷, with 7,000 ⁸ infantry and 20,000 cavalry ⁹. He despatched Qulī

¹ App. 26-27.

² Bf. 53b. Fp. 20 and Hf. 18b incorrectly give "400".

³ *Ibid.*, f. 53b. (For a detailed note on these tribes see *Hasan Beg Rūmlū's Aḥsanu't Tawārīkh*. Trans. C. N. Seddon. Calcutta, 1934, pp. 221-22.)

⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 53b.

⁵ Ap. 27.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 27-28.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 29. Bf. 58a gives "6,000".

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

Beg alias Jūsh Mīrzā¹ to occupy Shābirān², and, on the following day, himself proceeded, at first towards Shābirān, but later to Shamākhi, which he found deserted. The Shirwān Shāh had, in the meanwhile, pitched his camp in the forest between the forts of Gulistān and Bighurd. As Ismā'il Mīrzā advanced to meet the Shirwān Shāh, the Shirwān Shāh made for the fort of Gulistān.

Both sides met at Jiyāni near the fort of Gulistān, and arranged their armies in battle array³. Ismā'il Mīrzā appointed the Shāmlūs on the right wing, Ustājilūs on the left, and the Takkalūs, Rūmlūs and Dhu'l-Qadr as the skirmishing party, while he himself commanded the centre. On the other side, the Shirwān Shāh appointed his generals on the right and left sides and himself commanded the centre⁴. A severe action followed, and Ismā'il Mīrzā, though less than fourteen years of age, fought in the front ranks for hours, and encouraged his followers to follow suit. Most of the soldiers of the Shirwān Shāh fell dead on the field of battle, while the rest, being unable to withstand the heavy charges of the Qizil-Bāshes, fled towards the fort⁵ of Gulistān⁶, along with the Shirwān Shāh⁷. They were eagerly pursued by the Qizil-Bāshes, and again most of them fell to the swords of the pursuers. Ḥusayr Beg Lala's attendant, named Shāh Kaldī Āqā, seized the Shirwān Shāh, and cutting off his head brought it to Ismā'il Mīrzā. The victor burnt the corpse of the Shirwān Shāh, and built pyramids of the heads of the enemy⁸.

In this war against the Shirwān Shāh, Ismā'il Mīrzā lost only one officer of note, namely, Mīrzā Beg Ustājilū⁹, father of Muḥammad Beg Ustājilū¹⁰. A large booty fell into the hands of the victors, which Ismā'il Mīrzā distributed amongst his troops.

Three days later, Ismā'il Mīrzā returned to Shamākhi, and received the news that Shaykh Shāh ibn Farrukh Yasār, who had escaped from the field of battle to Shahr-i-Naw, was again making preparations for the battle. Thereupon, Ismā'il Mīrzā despatched Khulfā Beg against him, but Shaykh Shāh succeeded in escaping to Gilān. Ismā'il Mīrzā himself reached Shahr-i-Naw, appointed Khulfā Beg governor of the town, and went to Maḥmūd-Ābād to spend the winter¹¹ (of 906/1500-1). Muḥammad Zakariyā, who had been the prime-minister of the Āq-Quyūnlū rulers of Ādharbāyjān for many years, came to Ismā'il Mīrzā, and was taken in service¹².

¹ Ap. 28. Bf. 56b gives "Ali Beg alias Jaysh Mīrzā" throughout the account.

² Bf. 56b. Ap. 28 incorrectly gives "Shirwān".

³ App. 28-29.

⁴ Bf. 58a.

⁵ Ap. 29.

⁶ All the authorities incorrectly give "Bighurd". The battle was fought at Jiyāni near the fort of Gulistān.

⁷ Bff. 59a-59b. Ap. 29 omits the details and only gives that he was killed in the battle.

⁸ Ap. 30.

⁹ Bf. 60a.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 130a.

¹¹ Ap. 30.

¹² Cf. 200b. Bf. 76b states that he came to Ismā'il Mīrzā when he was laying siege to the fort of Bākū.

Ismā'il Mirzā then despatched Muḥammad Beg Ustājilū and Ilyās Beg Ayghūr Ūghli for the conquest of the fort of Bākū. The strength of the fort detained them for a long period, and, eventually, in the ensuing spring, Ismā'il Mirzā himself came up to Bākū¹, and sent a message to Ghāzī Beg, son-in-law of the late Shirwān Shāh and the governor of the fort, to submit, but the mission proved unsuccessful, and the messenger was put to the sword². Thereupon, Ismā'il Mirzā made a general attack, and took the fort after a hard struggle which lasted for three days. Most of the garrison lost their lives in the fight, while the rest were given pardon, and Khulfā Beg was ordered to seize the treasures of the Shirwān Shāh. He did so, but in the excess of zeal, levelled the buildings to the ground and desecrated the grave³ of Khalilu'llāh⁴ (father of Farrukh Yasār), who had killed Sultān Junayd (grandfather of Ismā'il Mirzā). He exhumed the bones and burnt them to ashes⁵.

(4) *Ismā'il Mirzā's War with Alwand Mirzā, the Ruler of Ādharbāyjān.*

Ismā'il Mirzā next laid a siege to the fort of Gulistān, but a messenger, sent by his general, Shaykh Muḥammad Khalifa, who had gone towards Qarā-Bāgh to inquire about Alwand Mirzā, brought back the alarming report, that Alwand Mirzā, the ruler of Ādharbāyjān, was at Nakhjuwān, with 30,000 men, and that he deputed Muḥammad Qarāja towards Shirwān, Ḥasan Beg Shikar Ūghli⁶ towards Qarāja-Dāgh⁷, and Qarchaghāi Beg towards Ardabil, to check the advance of Ismā'il Mirzā's army⁸. Whereupon, Ismā'il Mirzā raised the siege, crossed the river⁹ Kur¹⁰, by a bridge of boats, built by Jūsh Mirzā at Jawād (in the end of 906/about May, 1501), and despatched Qarā Piri Beg Qājār against Ḥasan Beg Shikar Ūghli, who, accordingly, fell back on Nakhjuwān. Ismā'il Mirzā himself advanced towards Qarā-Bāgh, and hearing of his approach both Qarchaghāi Beg and Muḥammad Qarāja retreated to Nakhjuwān.

Ismā'il Mirzā then marched on Nakhjuwān with Qarā Piri Beg Qājār¹¹ and Ilyās Beg Ḥalwāji Ūghli¹² as his advance-guards. 'Uthmān Beg¹³ Mawṣilū¹⁴, sent by Alwand Mirzā to intercept the invaders, was captured with his companions by Qarā Piri Beg Qājār, and was put to the sword by Ismā'il Mirzā's orders.

Alwand Mirzā then wrote a letter to Ismā'il Mirzā, asking him to return to Shirwān, and rule the province as his nominee. The proposal was rejected and both parties proceeded to action¹⁵: Alwand Mirzā, with his 30,000 men, moved towards Chakūr-Sa'd and encamped at Shurūr¹⁶, a village

¹ App. 30-31.

² Bf. 61b.

³ Ap. 31.

⁴ Bf. 63b.

⁵ Ap. 31.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 31-32.

⁷ Bff. 66a-66b. Ap. 32 incorrectly gives "Garmārūd".

⁸ *Ibid.*, f. 66a.

⁹ Ap. 32.

¹⁰ Df. 200a.

¹¹ Ap. 32.

¹² Bf. 66b.

¹³ Ap. 32.

¹⁴ Bf. 66b.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, ff. 67b-68a.

¹⁶ Ap. 32.

by the side of the river Aras ¹; Ismā'īl Mirzā, with his 7,000 men ², followed him by way of Nakhjuwān, and engaged him in battle at Shurūr ³ (in the beginning of 907 ⁴/middle of 1501).

The disposition of the troops was as follows: Ismā'īl Mirzā appointed his chief devotees, like Ḥusayn Beg Lala, Dada Beg Ṭālish, Khādīm Beg Khalifa, Muḥammad Beg Ustājilū, Bayrām Beg Qarāmāni, 'Abdi Beg Shāmlū, Qarāja Ilyās Bāyburdlū, Qarā Piri Beg Qājār, Ilyās Beg Halwāji Ūghli, Ilyās Beg Ayghūr Ūghli, Sārū 'Alī Beg Takkalū and 'Alī Beg Rūmlū alias Dīw Sultān on the right and left wings, and himself commanded the centre ⁵. Alwand Mirzā, after ordering the camels in his army to be chained and to take their stand behind the army in order to prevent the troops from flying ⁶, appointed Latīf Beg, Sayyid-i-Ghāzī Beg, Mūsā Beg, Qarchaghāi Beg, Gulābi Beg, Khalīl Beg and Muḥammad Qarāja on the right and left wings, while he himself took his stand in the centre at an elevated place ⁷.

In the desperate battle that ensued, Ismā'īl Mirzā displayed his courage by attacking the front row of the enemy ⁸, and putting Qarchaghāi Beg and many others to the sword ⁹. This was the signal for a general attack ¹⁰, in which Latīf Beg ¹¹, Sayyid-i-Ghāzī Beg, Mūsā ¹² Beg, Muḥammad Qarāja ¹³, the generals, and a large number of the soldiers of Alwand Mirzā lost their lives. The rest turned to flee, but the lines of the chained camels barred their way, and they fell to the swords of the pursuers: Alwand Mirzā barely escaped with his life ¹⁴ to Arzinjān ¹⁵; while a large number of camels, horses, mules, and much costly material fell in the hands of the victors. Whereupon, Ismā'īl Mirzā liberally rewarded his troops ¹⁶.

(5) *Ismā'īl Mirzā's Accession to the Throne of Ādharbāyjān.*

Ismā'īl Mirzā left Shurūr for Tabriz, on the day following his victory over Alwand Mirzā, to occupy the vacant throne of Ādharbāyjān. He was received with great eclat by the dignitaries of the city, and was crowned king ¹⁷ in the beginning of 907 ¹⁸/middle of 1501, to be known henceforth as *Shāh Ismā'īl*.

¹ Bf. 68b.

² *Ibid.*, f. 67b. Vp. 241 incorrectly gives "16,000".

³ Ap. 32.

⁴ This is the date of Ismā'īl Mirzā's coronation which took place a few days after this battle.

⁵ Bf. 69a.

⁶ Ap. 33.

⁷ Bf. 69b.

⁸ Ap. 33.

⁹ Bf. 71a.

¹⁰ Ap. 33.

¹¹ Bf. 71a. Ap. 33 incorrectly gives "Luṭf Beg".

¹² Ap. 33.

¹³ Bf. 71a.

¹⁴ Ap. 33. Vp. 241 incorrectly states that he was killed by Ismā'īl (Mirzā).

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 33

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 34

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 34 gives "داخِلِ اِمَامِ سَنَةِ مِت و تَسْمَايَةِ" (In the beginning of the year 906).

All authorities are agreed that the coronation was in the year 907; A, therefore, whilst giving the wrong year of coronation (i.e. 906) supplies the additional information that

On the Friday succeeding his coronation, Shāh Ismā'īl had the *Khuṭba* read in his presence in the name of the Twelve Imāms¹. The coins of the Shāh struck in Tabriz contain on the obverse the marginal inscription “لا اله الا الله محمد الرسول الله و علي ولي الله”².

After assuming the royal power, Shāh Ismā'īl appointed Ḥusayn Beg Lala his counsellor³ and prime-minister⁴, Shamsu'd-Dīn Lāhijī⁵, who was his teacher (at Lāhijān)⁶, his chancellor, and Muḥammad Zakariyā his minister. He spent the winter of 907/1501-2 at Tabriz⁷.

coronation took place in “the beginning of the year”. This is confirmed by the last date (p. 37, *supra*)—spring of the year 906, which falls towards the end of the year 906. Sp. 49 incorrectly states “Crowned 905/1499-1500”. Further, on p. 52, S incorrectly states “Crowned 907/1501-2”. As the year 907 begins on July 17, 1501, therefore, “the beginning of 907” cannot extend to 1502. Gp. 68, Up. 265 and Vp. 241 incorrectly give the dates as 905/1499-1500, A.D. 1499 and 905/1499 respectively.

¹ Ap. 34.

² *R. S. Poole's Catalogue of Persian Coins (London, 1887)*, pp. 1-11.

³ Ap. 35.

⁴ Bf. 76b.

⁵ Ap. 35.

⁶ See p. 32, *supra*.

⁷ Ap. 35.

PART TWO

CHAPTER IV

SHĀH ISMĀ'IL'S WAR WITH RIVAL RULERS

At the time of the accession of Shāh Ismā'il to the throne of Ādharbāyjan (i.e. in the beginning of 907/middle of 1501), Persia was parcelled out amongst the following rulers:—

- (1) Sultān Murād¹ ibn Ya'qūb Mirzā ibn Amīr Ḥasan Beg in the Persian 'Irāq and Fārs;
- (2) Bārik Beg Parnāk² in the Arabian 'Irāq;
- (3) Qāsim Beg³ ibn Jahāngīr Beg (nephew of Amīr Ḥasan Beg) in Diyār Bakr;
- (4) Murād Beg Bāyandar⁴ in Yazd;
- (5) Muḥammad Karra⁵ in Abarqūh;
- (6) Abu'l-Faṭḥ Beg Bāyandar⁶ in Kirnān;
- (7) Qāḍī Muḥammad Kāshānī together with Jalālu'd-Dīn Mas'ūd⁷ in Kāshān;
- (8) Ḥusayn Kiyā-i-Chalāwī⁸ in Khwār, Simnān and Fīrūz-Kūh; and
- (9) Sultān Ḥusayn Mirzā⁹ in Khurāsān.

As mentioned above, Shāh Ismā'il spent the winter of 907/1501-2 at Tabrīz, and in the ensuing spring, he set out with the intention of overthrowing his rival rulers¹⁰.

(1) Pursuit of Alwand Mirzā.

Shāh Ismā'il celebrated Naw-Rūz in the spring of 907/1502, and thought of proceeding against Sultān Murād, the ruler of the Persian 'Irāq and Fārs¹¹; but news arrived that, having collected his forces at Arzinjān¹², Alwand Mirzā intended to march on Ādharbāyjan; whereupon, the Shāh changed his mind and set out towards Arzinjān on Shawwāl 24¹³, 907¹⁴/

¹, ², ³, ⁴, & ⁶ Bf. 77b. (For their detailed account see *infra*, Appendix A, pp. 108-109 and pp. 54, 44, 46 and 46 respectively.)

⁵ Bf. 77b. He was formerly in the service of 'Alī Beg Bāyandar, governor of Abarqūh, but had seized the government by plotting against his master, who fled to his brother Murād Beg Bāyandar, governor of Yazd (Bff. 77b-78a).

⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 77b. (For their detailed account see p. 47, *infra*.)

⁸ *Ibid.*, f. 77b. (For his detailed account see pp. 45 and 47-49, *infra*.)

⁹ *Ibid.*, f. 77b. (For his detailed account see Jpp. 201-327.)

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, ff. 78b-79a.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, ff. 79a-79b.

¹² Ap. 35.

¹³ Bf. 79b.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 79b. Ef. 24a incorrectly gives "908".

May 2, 1502. Alwand Mirzā fled and took refuge in a fort near Sārūqāya ¹, but was pursued by the Shāh and escaped to Awjān by way of Tabriz ². The Shāh followed him and sent his advance-guards after the fugitive prince, who fled from Awjān to Hamadān and from there to Baghdād. Thereupon, the Shāh returned from Awjān to Tabriz to spend the winter (of 908/1502-3).

Alwand Mirzā found his power threatened at Baghdād by Qāsim Beg Bāyandar and left for Diyār Bakr ³. After disposing of the homonymous Qāsim Beg ibn Jahāngir Beg, the ruler of the province, in a battle, he governed the province till his death in 910 ⁴/1504-5.

(2) *War with Sultān Murād and Annexation of the Persian 'Irāq and Fārs.*

Sultān Murād, the ruler of the Persian 'Irāq and Fārs, spent the winter of 908 ⁵/1502-3 at Dalijān ⁶, and apprehensive of the growing power of Shāh Ismā'il, he collected 300 cannon and 70,000 men, and marched towards Hamadān, before the close of winter ⁷. He also sent his mother ⁸, Gawhar Sultān Khānum ⁹, to Qum to persuade Aslamash Beg, the governor of the town, to come to his help in the impending battle with Shāh Ismā'il. Aslamash Beg accordingly went to Hamadān with his men, and reinforced the troops of Sultān Murād.

Shāh Ismā'il celebrated Naw⁴Rūz in the spring of 908/1503, and sent a messenger, named Qanbar Āqā, to Sultān Murād, with a letter, asking him to submit. The negotiation proved barren ¹⁰, whereupon, the Shāh set out for Hamadān ¹¹, with 12,000 ¹² men, and encamped at Ūlma Qūlāghī ¹³

¹ Bf. 79b.

² Ap. 35. Sp. 55 states "Alwand . . . suffered a decisive defeat at his hands (i.e. at the hands of Shāh Ismā'il) in the summer of A.D. 1503". This statement contains two errors, for, firstly, no battle was fought; and secondly, the summer concerned is obviously of 1502 A.D., as Shāh Ismā'il started from Tabriz in the spring of 1502 A.D.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁴ Bf. 81a. Ap. 35 does not give the year of Alwand Mirzā's death. According to another account he was captured by Amir Beg Mawṣilū and was brought before the Shāh when he (i.e. the Shāh) was passing through Malāṭiya on his march against 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr in the summer of 912/1507, and was put to death by him. ("*Travels of a Merchant*", pp. 197-98, included in the volume named "*Travels of the Venetians in Persia*", *Hakluyt Society, London, 1873.*) None of the Persian authorities, however, supports this statement. (For the Shāh's march against 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr see pp. 52-53, *infra*.)

⁵ Ap. 35.

⁶ Bf. 81b. Ap. 35 and Cf. 202a incorrectly give "Walijān" and "Wilkān" respectively.

⁷ Ap. 35. Fp. 21 incorrectly states that Alwand Mirzā made these preparations to fight with Shāh Ismā'il.

⁸ Bf. 81b.

⁹ Cf. 193b, Dp. 65 and Ef. 25a. Bf. 81b gives "Gawhar Sultānum".

¹⁰ Ef. 81b-83b.

¹¹ Ap. 35.

¹² Bf. 83b.

¹³ *Ibid.*, f. 84a. Dp. 65 gives "'Āla Qūlāqī'".

near Hamadān. Sulṭān Murād now moved with his army towards Shāh Ismā'il's camp¹.

On the morning of Monday², Dhu'l-Ḥ. 24³, 908/Junc 21, 1503, the troops were drawn in battle array. Dada Beg Tālīsh, Ḥusayn Beg Lala, Muḥammad Beg Ustājilū, Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī, 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū, Yakān Beg Takkalū and Sārū 'Alī Beg Takkalū commanded the right and left wings of the Qizil-Bāsh Army. Khulfā Beg and Maṣūr Beg Qipehāqī formed the leaders of the skirmishing party, and Qarā Piri Beg Qājār controlled the 1,500 reserves, while Shāh Ismā'il himself directed the battle from the centre. On the other side, Sulṭān Murād appointed 'Alī Beg Turkmān to the right, Murād Beg to the left wing, and gave the control of the skirmishing party to Aslamash Beg⁴. He then ordered⁵ 300⁶ cannons to be chained in the front line, and took his command in the centre.

In the fierce contest that followed, Aslamash Beg with his Turkmān warriors repulsed the Qizil-Bāshes' skirmishing party which fell back on the centre. But at this moment Qarā Piri Beg Qājār fell with his reserves on Aslamash Beg, who was caught alive, and whose men were cut to pieces. Shāh Ismā'il could not restrain his warlike ardour, and charging upon his enemies, he slew a large number of them, whilst his Qizil-Bāshes routed Sulṭān Murād's army. 'Alī Beg Turkmān fell with 10,000 men, Kūzil Aḥmad, brother of Ayba Sulṭān and prime-minister of Sulṭān Murād, Aslamash Beg, and others were captured alive to be put to death by the Shāh's orders⁷, and only Sulṭān Murād succeeded in escaping with a few men to Shirāz. As usual, the victors captured a rich booty comprising camels, horses, mules and equipage.

After distributing spoils amongst his troops, and sending letters of victory to provincial rulers, Shah Ismā'il proceeded to the valley of Mount Alwand to spend the summer⁸ of 909/1503. Here he received the grim prize of his enemy's heads from Ilyās Beg Ayghūr Ūghlī, his governor of Tabriz, who had vanquished Nāṣir Maṣūr Turkmān and other rebels, and put most of them to the sword⁹.

The Shāh, however, had abruptly to terminate his retreat in the mountain valley. Sulṭān Murād began levying troops in Fārs, and the alert Shāh set out for Fārs¹⁰ by way of Iṣfahān. On the way, he received the news of Ḥusayn Kiyā-i-Chalāwī, the ruler of Khwār, Simnān and Firūz-Kūh¹¹, who, with his 12,000 men, was infesting the frontiers of 'Irāq¹²; thereupon, he issued orders to Ilyās Beg Ayghūr Ūghlī at Tabriz to immediately proceed¹³ towards Ray¹⁴, to check the inroads of Ḥusayn Kiyā.

¹ Ap. 36.

² Bf. 84b.

³ *Ibid.*, f. 85a. Hf. 20a incorrectly gives "Dhu'l-Ḥ. 14".

⁴ Bf. 85a.

⁵ Ap. 36.

⁶ Fp. 21.

⁷ Bff. 85a-87b.

⁸ Ap. 37.

⁹ Bff. 90b-91b.

¹⁰ Ap. 37. Ef. 26a incorrectly states that he went to "Qum".

¹¹ Bf. 91b.

¹² *Ibid.*, f. 96b.

¹³ Ap. 37.

¹⁴ Bf. 92a.

The Shāh continued his journey to Iṣfahān, where he was received by the citizens with great honour. Dūrmish Khān ibn ‘Abdi Beg Shāmlū, master of ceremonies, was appointed governor of Iṣfahān, but he delegated the charge to one of his servants, named Shāh Ḥusayn Iṣfahānī, and continued his attendance on the Shāh.

At this time, Kirmān was governed by Maḥmūd Beg Bāyandar¹, whose cousin Abu’l-Faṭḥ Beg, the previous governor of the town, had seized Shīrāz, but had lost his life in a hunting expedition by an accidental fall from the top of a mountain near Fīrūz-Ābād², on Saturday, Shā’bān 8, 908³/Feb. 7, 1503. The Shāh despatched Muḥammad Beg Ustājilū with 600 men to capture Kirmān⁴. Whereupon, Murād Beg⁵ Bāyandar, governor of Yazd, left the town in charge of his minister, Sulṭān Aḥmad Beg Sārū’ī, and fled to Kirmān. The Bāyandar Chiefs commanded between them 2,000 men, but, on the approach of Muḥammad Beg Ustājilū, they left the town and fled towards Khurāsān. Muḥammad Beg Ustājilū occupied the town, and then returned towards the royal camp⁶, which had meanwhile proceeded to Shīrāz⁷. Muḥammad Karra, governor of Abarqūh, sent presents to the Shāh, and was retained in his government⁸.

Meanwhile, Sulṭān Murād had consolidated his power in Fārs with the help of Ya’qūb Jān Beg, another brother of Ayba Sulṭān, and had encamped at Shūlistān near Fort Safid. Hearing of Shāh Ismā’il’s advance, Sulṭān Murād and Ya’qūb Jān Beg fled to Baghdād⁹. The former, having spent some time at Baghdād where he was set on the throne by Bārik Beg Par-nāk¹⁰, left for Aleppo, and after spending a few days¹¹ with Sulṭān Qānṣū¹², the ruler of Egypt and Syria, he proceeded to ‘Alā’u’d-Dawla Dhu’l-Qadr, the ruler of the Dhu’l-Qadr tribe, at Mar’ash¹³; the latter went to Mawsil, where he was put to death by Bashārat Beg to avenge the death of his brother Qāsim Beg, who had been put to death by Sulṭān Murād at Iṣfahān¹⁴.

Shāh Ismā’il continued his march on Shīrāz¹⁵, where he arrived on Saturday, Rabī’ II, 909¹⁶/Sept. 24, 1503. The governors of the various sub-provinces of Fārs paid their homage to the Shāh and were retained in their respective governments¹⁷.

About this time, Sulṭān Aḥmad Beg Sārū’ī, the acting-governor of Yazd, tendered his apologies, and requested the Shāh to appoint someone as governor of Yazd¹⁸. Accordingly, Shāh Ismā’il appointed Ḥusayn Beg

¹ Bf. 92a.

² *Ibid.*, ff. 88a-88b.

³ Cf. 196a.

⁴ Bf. 92a.

⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 94b. Bf. 92b incorrectly gives "Ashraf Beg".

⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 92b.

⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 94a.

⁸ Ap. 40.

⁹ Bf. 93a.

¹⁰ Dp. 73.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 150.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 151. His full name is Ashraf Qānṣū Ghūrī and he ruled for 16 years (906-22/1500-16) (Rp. 83).

¹³ Bf. 93a.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 90b.

¹⁵ Ap. 37.

¹⁶ Cf. 202a.

¹⁷ Ap. 37.

¹⁸ Bff. 94a-94b. Ap. 40 gives a vague account of Sulṭān Aḥmad Beg Sārū’ī.

Lala, governor of Yazd, who handed over the charge to Shu'ayb Aqā, one of his relatives and servants, and himself remained in the royal camp. Shu'ayb Aqā went to Yazd with Shāh Taqīyyu'd-Dīn Iṣfahānī, and assumed the charge of his office ¹ retaining Sulṭān Aḥmad Beg Sārū'ī as his minister.

Shāh Ismā'īl appointed Ilyās Beg Dhu'l-Qadr alias Kajal Beg governor of Fārs ², and started on his return march to Kāshān ³ on Jumāda II 1, 909 ⁴/Nov. 21, 1503. Qāḍī Muḥammad Kāshānī and Jalālu'd-Dīn Mas'ūd, governors of Kāshān, decorated the town and received the Shāh with great honour. The Shāh reciprocated the welcome by giving a banquet, and distributing presents; and, in particular, honoured Qāḍī Muḥammad Kāshānī by appointing him chancellor and colleague of Shamsu'd-Dīn Lāhījī. The Shāh then proceeded to Qum to spend the winter ⁵ (of 909/1503-4).

(3) *War with Ḥusayn Kiyā-i-Chalāwī, and the Conquest of the Forts of Gul-khandān, Fīrūz-Kūh and Ustā.*

At Qum, during the winter of 909/1503-4, Shāh Ismā'īl heard that Ilyās Beg Ayghūr Ūghlī, governor of Tabrīz, who had been ordered to proceed towards Ray to check*the inroads of Ḥusayn Kiyā-i-Chalāwī had been put to death. Apparently finding himself unable to meet with his few soldiers the attack ⁶ of 12,000 ⁷ men mustered by Ḥusayn Kiyā, Ilyās Beg Ayghūr Ūghlī had sought the shelter of the fort of Warāmīn. There he was besieged for a while, but, lured by fair promises, he and his companions paid a visit to Ḥusayn Kiyā's camp, where they were treacherously done to death ⁸. Ḥusayn Kiyā then invaded the adjoining territories and returned to Fīrūz-Kūh ⁹.

To avenge the assassination, Shāh Ismā'īl marched from Qum ¹⁰, on Sunday, Ramaḍān 9, 909/Feb. 25, 1504, towards Fīrūz-Kūh by way of Warāmīn, where he celebrated Naw-Rūz. On Ramaḍān 29, 909 ¹¹/March 17, 1504, he reached the fort of Gul-khandān, and after a heated contest ¹² with Kiyā Ashraf, the custodian of the fort ¹³, won the day, put the garrison to the sword, and razed the fort to the ground. He then pushed on to the fort of Fīrūz-Kūh, where he arrived ¹⁴ on Shawwāl 11, 909/March 29, 1504. Ḥusayn Kiyā put Kiyā 'Alī in charge of the fort, and fled before Shāh Ismā'īl to the fort of Ustā ¹⁵. After a grim struggle which lasted for ten days ¹⁶, in which Shāh Ismā'īl personally took part, and in which he lost many of his men, Maḥmūd Beg Qājār reached the battlements of the fort on the eleventh day. Others followed him and routed the enemy's forces. Kiyā

¹ Ap. 40.

² Bf. 94b.

³ Ap. 37.

⁴ Cf. 202b.

⁵ App. 37-38.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 38

⁷ Bf. 97b.

⁸ Ap. 38.

⁹ Bf. 97b.

¹⁰ Ap. 38.

¹¹ Bff. 97b-98b.

¹² App. 38-39.

¹³ Bf. 98b.

¹⁴ Ap. 39.

¹⁵ Bff. 99a-99b.

¹⁶ Ap. 39.

'Alī sued for peace, and was given pardon at the request of Amīra Najm ¹, but the garrison was slaughtered ², and the fort razed to the ground.

On Shawwāl 24, 909 ³/April 11, 1504, Shāh Ismā'il marched towards the fort of Ustā. Ḥusayn Kiyā left the fort with a strong detachment of his soldiers and laid an ambush ⁴. The Shāh despatched 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū and Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī to attack the fort from one gate, while he himself commanded the forces from the other. 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū and Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī were suddenly attacked, and though they displayed great valour, they failed to reach the fort. At the other gate ⁵, Ḥusayn Kiyā ⁶ and Murād Beg Jahān Shāhī ⁷ fell back before the attack of the Shāh and his 200 men, and closed the fort. After several days of incessant struggle, the Shāh cut off the water supply from the river ⁸ Ḥabla ⁹, and on the fourth day compelled the besieged to submit. The citadel, where Ḥusayn Kiyā ¹⁰, Murād Beg Jahān Shāhī and Sāyaltamash Beg ¹¹ had taken refuge, held out for three days longer ¹², but it was eventually stormed and taken on Dhu'l-Q. 27, 909 ¹³/May 13, 1504. The refugees fell into the hands of the victors; Murād Beg Jahān Shāhī and Sāyaltamash Beg were roasted alive ¹⁴; while Ḥusayn Kiyā was confined in an iron-cage ¹⁵, prepared by the victim himself for the prisoners he was hoping to secure in battle ¹⁶. Ten thousand ¹⁷ of the garrison were put to the sword, and only a few learned men and some others were given pardon at the request of the Shāh's officers ¹⁸. The fort was levelled to the ground, and the large booty, which fell into the Shāh's hands, was distributed amongst the troops ¹⁹.

For a few days, Shāh Ismā'il rested on his laurels by hunting in the neighbourhood ²⁰. Muḥammad Ḥusayn Mirzā ²¹ ibn Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mirzā, governor of Jurjān; Āqā Rustam and Nizāmu'd-Dīn 'Abdu'l Karīm, the rulers of Māzandarān ²²; Kārkiyā Sulṭān Ḥusayn ²³, brother of ²⁴ Kārkiyā

¹ Bff. 100a-101b.

² Ap. 39.

³ Bff. 101b-102a.

⁴ Ap. 39.

⁵ Bff. 102b-103a.

⁶ Ap. 39.

⁷ Bf. 103b.

⁸ Ap. 39.

⁹ Bf. 103b. Cf. 202b incorrectly gives "Ḥabal".

¹⁰ App. 39-40.

¹¹ Bf. 104b.

¹² Ap. 40.

¹³ Dp. 79. Cf. 202b incorrectly gives "Dhu'l-Ḥ. 1, 909" (May 17, 1504). The Shāh spent a few days ahunting and commenced his return march on Dhu'l-Ḥ. 3, 909/May 19, 1504 (Dp. 80).

¹⁴ Bf. 104b.

¹⁵ Ap. 40.

¹⁶ Bff. 102a-102b.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 104b. Ap. 40 gives "All".

¹⁸ Ap. 40.

¹⁹ Bf. 105a.

²⁰ Ap. 40.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 40. Bf. 105a incorrectly gives "Muḥammad Muḥsin Mirzā". Muḥammad Muḥsin Mirzā was at this time the governor of Mashhad and Tūs (and not of Jurjān) (see Jpp. 287-88). Sp. 56 also makes the same incorrect statement. Again Sp. 56 incorrectly states that Shāh Ismā'il went to Astrābād where he was met by Muḥammad Muḥsin Mirzā.

²² Bf. 105b.

²³ Ap. 40. Bf. 105 incorrectly gives "Kārkiyā Sulṭān Ḥasan".

²⁴ Bf. 105b. Bp. 40 incorrectly gives "the son of".

Mirzā 'Alī, ruler of Lāhījān, came to congratulate the Shāh on his victory, and returned to their respective governments.

Shāh Ismā'il commenced his return march¹ on Dhu'l-H. 3, 909²/ May 19, 1504. On the way, Ḥusayn Kiyā inflicted a wound on himself, and died³ at Kabūd-Gunbad near Ray, in the very town he had killed Ilyās Beg Ayghūr Ūghlī⁴; but his corpse remained in the cage till it was burnt in the Maydān of Isfahān. The Shāh proceeded to Sāwuj Bulāgh⁵ (now in the modern province of Tīhrān⁶), and received the homage of Suhrāb Beg Chalāwī, governor of the fort of Ārd-Sanad near Sāwuj Bulāgh⁷. From there he marched to the summer-quarters of Sūrlūq, where he received the news of the rebellion of Muḥammad Karra, governor of Abarqūh⁸.

(4) *Rebellion of Muḥammad Karra and Re-conquest of Yazd.*

It has been previously stated that Shu'ayb Āqā became governor of Yazd with Sultān Aḥmad Beg Sārū'i as his minister. When Shāh Ismā'il was conducting his campaign in Firūz-Kūh and Ustā against Ḥusayn Kiyā⁹, Sultān Aḥmad Beg Sārū'i seized the opportunity to put Shu'ayb Āqā and his servants to death, and resumed the reins of government. Thereupon, Muḥammad Karra, governor of Abarqūh, led a night attack on Yazd¹⁰ with 4,000 horse¹¹, put Sultān Aḥmad Beg Sārū'i to death, and occupied the town¹². He next appointed Mir Ḥusayn Maybudī his minister, and laid his heavy hands and taxes upon the inhabitants¹³.

Swift was the retribution. Leaving the summer-quarters of Sūrlūq (in the beginning of 910¹⁴/middle of 1504), the Shāh hastened by way of Isfahān¹⁵, and, though Yazd was strongly besieged, he took the town after a month by successive skirmishes. Most of the inhabitants were butchered, but Muḥammad Karra¹⁶ and Mir Ḥusayn Maybudī¹⁷ with few others held out in the fort for a month. Eventually, they were taken alive; Muḥammad Karra was confined in the same iron-cage¹⁸, which contained Ḥusayn Kiyā's corpse, and was later on burnt in the Maydān of Isfahān¹⁹. Mir Ḥusayn Maybudī was beheaded there and then²⁰.

¹ Ap. 40.

² Dp. 80.

³ Ap. 40.

⁴ Bf. 104b-105a.

⁵ Ap. 40. Bf. 106a, Dp. 80 and Ef. 28a incorrectly give "Sāwukh Bulāgh".

⁶ P, Vol. II, p. 311.

⁷ Bf. 106a.

⁸ Ap. 40.

⁹ See pp. 47-48, supra.

¹⁰ Ap. 40.

¹¹ Bf. 107a.

¹² Ap. 40.

¹³ Bf. 107a.

¹⁴ Cf. 202b gives "Jamāda II, 28, 910" (Dec. 6, 1504). Dp. 83 and Ef. 28a give "the month of Rajab, 910" (Dec., 1504). These dates are incorrect, for the month of December does not correspond with the fact that the Shāh proceeded from the summer-quarters of Sūrlūq.

¹⁵ Ap. 40.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 40-41.

¹⁷ Bf. 108a.

¹⁸ Ap. 41.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 41. Cf. 203a incorrectly states that he killed himself in the cage.

²⁰ Bf. 109a. Dp. 82 incorrectly gives his death under the year "909". Ef. 28a gives the date of his death as "Tuesday, Sha'bān 29, 909". Sp. 57 incorrectly states that he was put to death at Isfahān in the presence of the Turkish Embassy.

About this time, Ra'is Ghaybī, cousin of Muḥammad Karra, who had been left in charge of Abarqūh, rose in revolt, whereupon, the Shāh despatched 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū from Yazd to punish the rebels ¹.

During the siege of Yazd, Shāh Ismā'il received Kamālu'd-Dīn Ṣadr, the envoy of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mirzā, ruler of Khurāsān, to congratulate the Shāh on his conquests. But the improperly worded letter of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mirzā and his humble presents aroused the anger of the Shāh, who marched forthwith ² towards the frontier of Khurāsān to invade Ṭabas. This town was under the governorship of Muḥammad Walī Beg ³, Chief of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mirzā's stables ⁴, who had handed over the charge to Ṭardhī Bābā. Ignoring the fort where Ṭardhī Bābā had taken refuge, the Shāh rifled the town and eliminated ⁵ 7,000 ⁶ of its inhabitants ⁷. Thereupon, Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mirzā appeased the wrath of the Shāh and procured his return to Yazd by lowering the tone of his language and enhancing the value of his presents. About this time, Ilyās Beg Dhu'l-Qadr known as Kajal Beg, governor of Fārs, was put to death for ill-treating his subjects, and was replaced by Ummat Beg Sārū Dhu'l-Qadr, on whom was conferred the title of "Khalīl Sulṭān" ⁸.

Shāh Ismā'il re-appointed Ḥusayn Beg-Lala governor of Yazd ⁹, and returned to Isfahān to spend the winter ¹⁰ (of 910/1504-5). A few days later, there arrived an embassy from the Ottoman Sulṭān Bāyazīd II (886-918/1481-1512), with suitable presents to congratulate Shāh Ismā'il on his conquests ¹¹. The reception was held in the newly constructed palace in the garden of Naqsh-i-Jahān. Armed cavalry and infantry was drawn up in two lines before the audience-chamber. Dürmīsh Khān Shāmlū, master of ceremonies, with jewelled staff, and the guards with gold-plated maces, stood by the side of the Shāh. On one side of the throne were mace-bearers and archers comprising the military, on the other side civilian officers and theologians, like Qāḍī Muḥammad Kāshānī, Shamsu'd-Dīn Lāhījī, Sharīfu'd-Dīn Shirāzī and 'Alī Jabal Āmulī. The Ottoman embassy was then given audience before the Shāh ¹².

To impress the Ottomans with Ṣafawī majesty, Muḥammad Karra and the corpse of Ḥusayn Kiyā ¹³, together with Ra'is Ghaybī and other prisoners secured by 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū from Abarqūh and brought about this time

¹ Bf. 108a.

² Ap. 41. Ap. 41 and Dp. 84 incorrectly give the date as "the beginning of Sha'bān 910" (Jan. 1505). It does not correspond with the time when these events took place. Shāh Ismā'il came to Yazd in summer and captured it in two months, and, therefore, evidently before the beginning of winter.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

⁴ Bf. 110a.

⁵ Ap. 41.

⁶ Bf. 110a.

⁷ Ap. 41.

⁸ Bff. 110a-111b.

⁹ *Ibid.*, f. 111a.

¹⁰ Ap. 41. Cf. 203a incorrectly states that he returned on "Wednesday, Sha'bān 14, 910" (Feb. 1, 1505). (For reasons see note 2 above.)

¹¹ Ap. 41.

¹² Bf. 112b.

¹³ Ap. 41.

to Iṣfahān¹, were burnt publicly, the living and the dead, on the same day in the presence of the ambassadors², who were then dismissed with robes of honour, Arab horses and trappings³, and messages of friendship⁴.

Civil and military reasons were responsible for the violent death of Ghiyāthū'd-Dīn and Shāh Taqī'd-Dīn Iṣfahānī 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; the latter had conspired with Sultān Aḥmad Beg Sārū'i and Muḥammad Karra in their revolt against the Shāh.

In Lāhijān, Kārkiyā Sultān Ḥusayn organized a successful revolt against his brother, Kārkiyā Mirzā 'Alī, whose minister, Kiyā Farīdūn, he put to death. Kārkiyā Mirzā 'Alī transferred the government to his brother and became a recluse at Rānkūh⁵.

The Shāh celebrated the Naw-Rūz of 910/1505, and led a hunting expedition near the summer-quarters of Ulang-i-Kanīz⁶, in which 6,700⁷ animals were slain, and of the heads of these animals a minaret was built at Iṣfahān⁸.

(5) *Minor Events.*

From the summer-quarters of Iṣfahān the Shāh proceeded to Hamadān, and thence to Imānzāda Sahl 'Alī's tomb, in a village near Hamadān. He issued orders for the reconstruction of the mausoleum, and enclosing the tomb in a garden after the completion of the work, the Shāh moved to the summer-quarters of Sūrlūq.

In the ensuing winter of 911/1505-6, the Shāh proceeded⁹ to the frontier of Ādharbāyjān, for suppressing Shīr¹⁰ Šārīm, a robber-chief of Kurdistān. After slaughtering his followers and plundering the camp, for Shīr Šārīm succeeded in escaping, the Shāh moved to the river Qizil-Ūzūn.

Ḥusāmu'd-Dīn, ruler of Rasht and Fūman, rose in revolt but the despatch of the Qizil-Bāsh troops, which the Shāh was following by way of Tārum, brought the rebel to his senses¹¹. Through the intercession of Najmud-Dīn Mas'ūd¹² Rashtī, Ḥusāmu'd-Dīn was pardoned and was retained in his government.

The Shāh decided to spend the winter at Tārum¹³, and despatched Dada Beg Tālīsh towards Ṭabarsarān to avenge the death of his father (i.e. Shāh Ismā'il's) on the inhabitants of the town. The general returned successfully before the close of the winter. During this winter, Julbān Beg,

¹ Bf. 112b.

² Ap. 41. Ef. 28b incorrectly states that Ra'īs Ghaybī and other prisoners of Abarqūh were put to death at Shirāz.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

⁴ Dp. 97.

⁵ Bff. 113a-114a.

⁶ Ap. 42.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 42. Bf. 116a gives "56,706". This number seems to be exaggerated.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 42-43.

¹⁰ Bf. 117b.

¹¹ Ap. 43.

¹² Bf. 118b.

¹³ Ap. 43.

governor of Ṭarūm, was put to death by the Shāh's orders on account of his ill-treatment of the subjects.

Kārkiyā Mirzā 'Alī and his brother Kārkiyā Sulṭān Ḥusayn were killed by rebels at Rānkūh. The new governor appointed by the Shāh was Kārkiyā Sulṭān Aḥmad ibn Kārkiyā Sulṭān Ḥusayn, who inaugurated his rule by putting to death the assassins of his father and uncle ¹.

After celebrating Naw-Rūz at Ṭarūm, and indulging in horse-racing and polo at Sultāniyya, the Shāh proceeded to Sūrlūq in the beginning of 912/middle of 1506.

A punitive expedition under Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī, Khādīm Beg Khalifa ², 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū, father-in-law of Shāh Ismā'il, and Sārū 'Alī Beg Takkalū ³ plundered the camp of Shīr Šārim, and in a second skirmish captured alive, his son, brother and some of his officers ⁴. In the engagement 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū and Sārū 'Alī Beg Takkalū lost their lives ⁵: the fate of Shīr Šārim, who escaped, is unknown ⁶. The captives, who were brought to the Shāh at Khūy, in the winter of 912/1506-7, were barbarously massacred to avenge the death of Qizil-Bāsh officers ⁷.

(6) *War with 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr and Annexation of Diyār Bakr.*

While Shāh Ismā'il was celebrating Naw-Rūz at Khūy, 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr, for re-establishing the power of Sulṭān Murād, to whom he had given shelter at Mar'ash, and subsequently his daughter, was seizing the forts of Diyār Bakr ⁸ from Amīr Beg ibn Gulābī Beg ibn Amīr Beg Mawṣilū who had appropriated the province on the death of Alwand Mirzā in 910 / 1504-5. On the arrival of this news, the Shāh set out, with 20,000 men, towards Arzinjān in the beginning of 913/about May, 1507.

Thereupon, 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr fled to the fort of Albistān ¹⁰: then he imprisoned Ūghalān Ummat Chāwūshlū, the envoy of Shāh Ismā'il; finally, hearing of Shāh Ismā'il's passage through Qayṣariyya into Turkish territory ¹¹, he fled from Albistān to Mount Durnā.

Shāh Ismā'il came up to Albistān, and engaged the army deserted of its leader. On the third day the enemy broke and fled: the Shāh secured rich spoils, of which, curiously, he ordered the stores of wheat to be burnt to ashes ¹².

¹ Bff. 119a-120a.

² Ap. 44.

³ Bf. 120b.

⁴ Ap. 44.

⁵ Bf. 121b.

⁶ Ap. 44. Sp. 58 incorrectly states that Shīr Šārim was also captured and put to death.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 44. "

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 44-45.

⁹ Bf. 129a.

¹⁰ Ap. 45.

¹¹ Bff. 123b-124b.

¹² App. 45-46. Dpp. 93-94 omits this account. Further it contradicts this and states that no battle was fought between Shāh Ismā'il and 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr. This statement is literally, but not historically, true, for the battle was fought between Shāh Ismā'il and Dhu'l-Qadr troops, deserted by 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr.

Husayn Beg Lala, while fording the river, was surprised by Qāsim Beg alias Sārū Qapalān ibn 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr and lost 300 men. The Shāh now decided to move towards Diyār Bakr. The above-mentioned Amīr Beg Mawṣilū came to offer his homage, and was appointed Seal-Keeper¹; the fall of Kharput induced a few forts to capitulate; Muḥammad Beg Ustājilū² ibn Mīrzā Beg Ustājilū, brother-in-law of the Shāh³, was appointed governor of Diyār Bakr⁴, with the title of "Khān", and sent to the fort of Qarā Ḥamīd⁵, while the Shāh himself proceeded to Akhlāt. After receiving the homage of Sharafu'd-Dīn Beg, governor of Bitlis⁶, and spending a few days hunting in Bitlis, Arjsh and Akhlāt⁷, the Shāh returned to Khūy for the winter of 913⁸/1507-8.

(7) *Wars of Muḥammad Khān Ustājilū with 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr.*

Qāytmās Beg, brother of Amīr Beg Mawṣilū, held the fort of Qarā Ḥamīd before which Muḥammad Khān Ustājilū, the newly appointed Safawī governor, encamped to spend the winter of 913/1507-8. Instigated by Qāytmās Beg, the Kurds molested the Qizil-Bāsh camp, whereupon, Muḥammad Khān Ustājilū marched into the Kurdish territories, and, in a decisive and sanguinary fight, left 700 Kurds dead on the field of battle.

Alarmed at the success of the expedition, Qāytmās Beg sought help from 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr, who forthwith sent 10,000 men under the command of his own sons, Sārū Qapalān and Urdūāna Beg.

To meet this new menace, Muḥammad Khān Ustājilū had only 2,000 men, of which 800 represented the skirmishing party of his brother Qarā Beg. The battle commenced, and these latter were dismounted by a violent charge of Sārū Qapalān, but, eventually, the rare bravery of Muḥammad Khān Ustājilū enabled him to gain a complete victory. The enemy is alleged to have lost 700 officers in battle; 32 others, inclusive of Sārū Qapalān and Urdūāna Beg, were taken prisoner, and immediately decapitated, and trophies of their heads were sent as a present to the Shāh at Khūy. The casualty list is no doubt exaggerated, for an army of 10,000 men could hardly have had 732 officers exclusive of those who fled from the field of battle.

This engagement sealed the fate of Qāytmās Beg. He and his retinue were butchered, when after a short siege the fort of Qarā Ḥamīd fell into the hands of Muḥammad Khān Ustājilū⁹.

To avenge the loss of his sons and his army, 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr despatched, in the early spring of 913/1508, another force¹⁰, but of 15,000¹¹ men, under his two other sons, Kūr Shāh Rukh and Aḥmad Beg.

¹ Bff. 128a-129a.

³ Bf. 130a. (The Shāh's sister was married to him.)

⁵ Bf. 130a.

⁶ Ap. 46.

⁷ Bf. 130a.

² Ap. 46.

⁴ Ap. 46.

⁸ Ap. 46.

⁹ Bff. 130a-134a. Ap. 46 gives a short account of this battle.

¹⁰ Ap. 46.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 46. Cf. 204a and Dp. 105 give "14,000" and "11,000" respectively.

Meanwhile, Muḥammad Khān Ustājilū had moved to Mārdīn, and his brother Qarā Beg had invaded Jazīra, killing and plundering the Kurds. The advent of a second Dhu'l-Qadr army recalled Muḥammad Khān Ustājilū to Qarā Ḥamid. His 3,000 men were resolved into a right wing commanded by himself; a centre under Ācha Sultān Qājār; and a left wing under Qarā Beg. The 15,000 troops of the enemy comprised a right wing under Kūr Shāh Rukh, Murād Beg and Qāytmas Beg; a centre under Muḥammad Beg ibn 'Aziz Āqā; and a left wing under Aḥmad Beg, 'Abdu'llāh Beg and Ūrkamaz Beg.

The battle began with a repulse from the Qizil-Bāsh centre to meet the charge of the enemy's centre; then the right and left wings of the enemy advanced simultaneously upon the Qizil-Bāshes, whose right and left wings closed in upon the centre to sustain the charge. Then followed a fierce, compact, Qizil-Bāsh attack, which broke the enemy. The prisoners included Ūrkamaz Beg, Qāytmas Beg, and two grandsons of 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr (sons of Kūr Shāh Rukh), named Muḥammad Beg and 'Alī Beg, who escaped the general butchery in which Kūr Shāh Rukh, Aḥmad Beg, 'Abdu'llāh Beg, Muḥammad Beg ibn 'Aziz Āqā, Murād Beg, and fifty other officers perished without obtaining quarter.

The victims' heads were sent with four prisoners and a letter of victory to the Shāh at Hamadān, who was on his way to Baghdād. The prisoners were released; the grandsons of 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr received a pension; and Muḥammad Khān Ustājilū was rewarded with a golden belt, a cap, and robe of honour¹.

(8) *The Annexation of the Arabian 'Irāq.*

At Khūy, in the winter of 913/1507-8, Najmu'd-Dīn Mas'ūd was appointed counsellor.

The flight of Sultān Murād from Baghdād enabled Bārik Beg Parnāk to seize the reins of government. Shāh Ismā'il decided on displacing the usurper, and to procure a voluntary submission sent Khalīl Beg from Hamadān in the spring of 914/1508. When this was effected, the Shāh demanded from Abū Ishāq that his master Bārik Beg Parnāk should pay personal fealty: the response was the open revolt of Bārik Beg Parnāk, who cast the theologian Muḥammad Kamūna of Najaf into a dark pit, and levied arms and provisions.

Later, the usurper lost heart, and fled to Aleppo²; the theologian was released; and Ḥusayn Beg Lala, representing the advance-guard of Shāh Ismā'il, peacefully occupied Baghdād. Khādim Beg Khalīfa was appointed governor of Baghdād, which the Shāh entered amidst public rejoicing and

¹ Bff. 135b-140a. Ap. 46 gives a short account of this battle.

² App. 47-48. Fpp. 22 and 25 incorrectly states that he fled to Aleppo along with Sultān Murād. As given above, Sultān Murād had already left Baghdād.

sacrifice of bulls ¹, on Jumāda II, 25, 914 ²/Oct. 21, 1508, and inaugurated his entry by putting the servants of Bārik Beg Parnāk to death ³.

The Shāh visited various shrines of the Imāms: of Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī at Karbalā ⁴ on Rajab I, 914 ⁵/Oct. 25, 1508, where he presented twelve gold-plated chandeliers, silken carpets and screens; of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib at Najaf, where he appointed Muḥammad Kamūna as keeper, with instructions to rebuild the shrine, and presented a manuscript of the Holy Qur'ān, transcribed by himself in his childhood at Lāhijān ⁶; finally, of Mūsā-al-Kāzim, of Muḥammad Taqī, of 'Alī Naqī, and of Ḥasan al-'Askari. These latter received carpets, and gold and silver-plated chandeliers from the religious devotion of the Shāh ⁷, who ordered the shrines to be rebuilt ⁸; and subsequently visited Ṭāq-i-Kisrā, and on his way to Baghdād slew a huge lion with an arrow from his bow.

On a second visit rations were fixed for the shrines, whereof the old coffers were replaced ⁹, and at Najaf Qāḍī-i-Jahān Ḥusaynī spent 2,000 tūmāns for repairing the canal cut from the Euphrates by 'Alā'u'd-Dīn 'Aṭā Malik Juwaynī ¹⁰, brother of the Šāhib-Diwān Khwājā Shamsu'd-Dīn Muḥammad ¹¹.

Khādim Beg Khalifa, the above-mentioned governor of Baghdād, was now promoted to the governorship of the Arabian 'Irāq, with the title of "Khalifatu'l-Khulafā" ¹².

(9) *Minor Events.*

The Arabs of "Mushā'shā'" tribe in Ḥuwayza, ruled by a Sayyid, believed in the divinity of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, and during their prayers were reported to enjoy immunity from fire, sword or arrow. In the beginning of Shāh Ismā'il's career, the "Mushā'shā'" ruler was Sulṭān Muḥsin, but his son and successor Sulṭān Fayyāḍ advanced the divine origin for himself, and brought upon him the wrath of Shāh Ismā'il.

En route to Ḥuwayza, the Shāh detached Najmu'd-Dīn Mas'ūd, Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī and Ḥusayn Beg Lala ¹³, with 10,000 ¹⁴ men, to crush Malik Shāh Rustam, ruler of Lūristān, at Khurram-Ābād.

In the fierce battle with the Qizil-Bāsh army at Ḥuwayza, most of the fanatics, inclusive of Sulṭān Fayyāḍ, lost their lives ¹⁵, whereupon, the Shāh

¹ App. 48-49.

² *Ibid.*, p. 49. Cf. 204a and Fp. 26 give "Jumāda II, 20, 914".

³ Dp. 103.

⁴ Ap. 49.

⁵ Bf. 143a.

⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 144a.

⁷ Ap. 50.

⁸ Bf. 144a.

⁹ Ap. 50.

¹⁰ *B.M. MS., Or. 1540, f. 6a. Tārīkh-i-Jahān Gushā of Juwaynī, Vol. I (ed. Mīrzā Muḥammad) (Leyden, 1912), Persian Intr. p. 5.*

¹¹ Ef. 31b.

¹² Ap. 50.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 50-51.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 51. Bf. 147a gives "2,000".

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 51. Dp. 104 and Ef. 32a incorrectly state that on hearing of Shāh Ismā'il's advance towards Ḥuwayza, Sulṭān Fayyāḍ fled and that no battle was fought between them.

annexed the territory and proceeded via Dizfūl to Shūshtar. There he was joined by the Lūristān detachment ¹, which had been successful in securing the person of Malik Shāh Rustam ². For the grace with which the captive sought pardon in the Lurī dialect, he was allowed to retain his government ³, and his beard was strung with pearls by Dūrmish Khān Shāmlū at the bidding of the Shāh ⁴.

Shāh Ismā'īl proceeded from Shūshtar ⁵, by way of the Gilūya mountains ⁶, towards Shirāz to spend the winter ⁷ (of 914/1508-9). At Dāru'l-Jird ⁸, he organized a hunting expedition and slew numerous animals inclusive of mountain goats reputed to contain an "animal antidote" ⁹.

At Shirāz which was en fete, the Shāh received, through his envoy Akhī Beg, letters of submission from the rulers of Hurnuz and Lār. Yār Aḥmad Iṣfahānī was appointed minister; Qāḍī Muḥammad Kāshānī, the chancellor, was put to death for misdemeanour, in Ṣafar, 915/May-June, 1509, and was succeeded by Sharifu'd-Dīn 'Alī Astrābādī, descendant ¹⁰ of Sayyid Sharifu'd ¹¹-Dīn 'Alī Jurjānī; finally, Dada Beg Tālish, governor of Qazwīn, Sāwuj Bulāgh, Ray and Khwār, was replaced by Zaynal Beg Shāmlū ¹².

In the beginning of summer 915/1509, the Shāh left for Iṣfahān. After indulging for two weeks in horse-racing, polo ¹³ and archery practice of "qabaq" ¹⁴, and widening the famous "Maydān", the Shāh made for Hamadān. The autumn was spent in the valley of Mount Alwand; the Shāh left for Khūy via Tabriz. Yār Aḥmad Iṣfahānī filled the vacancy created by the death of Najmu'd-Dīn Mas'ūd, and received the title of "Najm-i Thānī" (the Second Star), for he succeeded "Najm-i-Awwal ¹⁵" (the First Star).

In the beginning of the winter of 915/1509-10, Shāh Ismā'īl crossed the river Kur, by a bridge of boats at Jawād, to crush the rebel Shaykh Shāh ibn Farrukh Yasār of Shirwān, who had expelled Shāh Kaldī Āqā, the delegate of the Ṣafawī governor, Ḥusayn Beg Lala, and had seized the

¹ Ap. 51.

² Bf. 148b.

³ Ap. 51.

⁴ Bf. 149a.

⁵ Ap. 52.

⁶ Cf. 204a.

⁷ Ap. 52.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 52. Bf. 150b incorrectly gives "Dārāb-Jird", which lies towards the south-east of Shirāz (Opp. 187-88). Sp. 59 also makes the same incorrect statement.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 52. The number of the animals slain is not given. Sp. 59, footnote 2, incorrectly gives the number as "56,700"; while "56,706" is given in Bf. 116a in connection with the expedition arranged in the spring of 910/1505 near the summer-quarters of Ulang-i-Kanīz (see p. 51, supra).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

¹¹ Bf. 151b. Ap. 52 incorrectly gives "Sharafu'd-Dīn".

¹² Cf. 204b. E incorrectly gives it after the second invasion of Shirwān by Shāh Ismā'īl on f. 154b.

¹³ Ap. 52.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 52. It is a game which consists in shooting a suspended gourd with an arrow.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 52-53.

province. Shaykh Shāh fled to the fort of Bighurd; the Qizil-Bāsh advance-guard occupied Shamākhi; Bākū, Shābirān, and other forts returned to their allegiance: and Darband, which held out, was besieged by the Shāh in person ¹.

With its high ramparts and only two gates opening on to Shirwān and Dāghistān territory; its foundations sunk into the Alburz range and its length extending to the distance of three bow-shots in the Caspian Sea, the fort could laugh to scorn the power of the besieger ²: "its inhabitants obtain corn from the ear of the sky (i.e. Virgo), and for meat they can roast the lamb of the heavens (i.e. Aries)". Nevertheless, the Shāh breached and took the fort in a few days. The expelled governor was re-appointed to the post; Mansūr Beg became the warden of Darband ³; and the Shāh's head-butler ⁴, Muḥammad Beg Ustājlı, was made prime-minister ⁵ with the title of "Jāyān Sultān" ⁶.

After directing that the body of his father, Sultān Ḥaydar, be exhumed from Ṭabarsarān and buried in the ancestral graveyard at Ardabil—an order which was carried into effect—the Shāh re-crossed the river Kur at Jawād to spend the winter in Qarā-Bāgh.

The spring of 916/1510 was spent in Tabrīz; on the advent of summer, the Shāh issued orders from Sultāniyya for a general levying of troops from the provinces, and marched upon Khurāsān by way of Dīlang-i-Kharqān ⁷.

¹ Ap. 53.

² Bf. 153b.

³ App. 53-54.

⁴ Bf. 154b.

⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 154b. Previously, Ḥusayn Beg Lala was all in all governor, and prime-minister. Actually, however, he ruled in Shirwān by proxy and had delegated his powers to his servant Shāh Kāldi Āqā.

⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 154b. cf. Ḥāfiẓ: گدای شهر ننگه کن که میرِ مجلس شد

⁷ Ap. 54.

CHAPTER V

SHĀH ISMĀ'IL'S CAMPAIGNS IN THE EAST

The conquest of the Central Asian Uzbeks, who, under the leadership of Muḥammad Khān Shaybānī or Shaybānī Khān (ibn Būdāq Sulṭān ibn 'Abu'l-Khayr Khān¹ ibn Dawlat Shaykh Ūghalān ibn Īlatī Ūghalān² ibn Fūlād Ūghalān ibn Ayba Khwāja ibn Taghtāi ibn Bulaghtān ibn Shaybān ibn Jūjī ibn Chingīz Khān³), had become the sole masters of Khurāsān by extirpating the Timūrid dynasty⁴ of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā and his successors, is one of the most signal achievements of Shāh Ismā'il, whose eastern frontier thus became conterminous with the river Oxus.

(1) Causes of Hostility between Shāh Ismā'il and Shaybānī Khān.

After annexing Khurāsān in 913/1507, the virile Uzbek, Shaybānī Khān, had (in the winter of 915/1509-10) released a contingent for the invasion of Kirmān, which lay in Shāh Ismā'il's territories⁵. The pre-occupation of the Shāh in Darband enabled the raiders to put the mayor of Kirmān, Shaykh Muḥammad, to death⁶, and to plunder Kirmān and the adjacent territory⁷.

The first Ṣafawī envoy, Diyā'u'd-Dīn Nūru'llāh, failed in his mission to recall Shaybānī Khān to his senses; and the second envoy, Muḥyi'd-Dīn alias Shaykh-Zāda Lāhijī, sent from Ulang-i-Kharqān, was equally unsuccessful. In an insolent letter sent through Kamālu'd-Dīn Ḥusayn Abīwardī⁸, Shaybānī Khān claimed sovereignty over Persia in the name of his grandfather (Abu'l-Khayr Khān), and demanded that Ismā'il "the Superintendent" should introduce in the Ṣafawī coinage, and in the Khuṭbas of his mosques, the august titles of his Uzbek over-lord (i.e. Shaybānī Khān). Further, the ultimatum demanded that the Persian roads be kept in repairs for the victorious Uzbek armies desire to visit the Ka'ba; otherwise, "Ūbaydu'llāh Bahādur Khān (Ūbaydu'llāh Khān ibn Sulṭān Maḥmūd ibn Būdāq Khān ibn Abu'l-Khayr Khān) will march with his legions from Bukhārā, Samarqand, Hazāra, Nikūdarī, Ghūr and Gharjistān; Timūr

¹ Jp. 299. Vp. 222 incorrectly calls Shaybānī Khān "the son of 'Abu'l-Khayr Khān". (For his detailed account see Xpp. 127-305. Ypp. 244-273, and *Howorth's History of the Mongols, part II, Division II* (London, 1880), pp. 691-713.)

² Bf. 161b.

³ Dp. 123.

⁴ For its detailed account see Jpp. 201-374.

⁵ App. 54-55.

⁶ Bf. 176b.

⁷ Ap. 55.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

Bahādur Khān (Muḥammad Timūr Sultān ibn Shaybānī Khān) will lead his armies from the frontiers of Qunduz, Baqlān, Ḥiṣār-i-Shādmān and Badakhshān up to Turkistān; and Sunjūk Bahādur Khān (Sunjūk Khān ibn Abu'l-Khayr Khān), Ḥamza Bahādur Khān and Mahdi Bahādur Khān (Ḥamza Sultān and Mahdi Sultān) will direct the centre, and the right and left wings of an army, recruited from Andijān, Shāh-Rukhiya, Tāshkand, Shahr-i-Sabz, Utrār, Sirān, Ūrganj, Khwārazm, the banks of the river Oxus, Kāshghar and Munqāt to the borders of Dasht-i-Qipchāq and Qalmāq''¹.

To this blustering document, Shāh Ismā'il sent a calm reply expressing his resolve to circumambulate the tomb of Imām 'Alī ar-Riḍā¹⁰ (at Mashhad) and expecting a worthy reception from the Khān².

The origin of the Ṣafawi-Uzbek quarrel, given in the *Tarikh-i-Rashīdī*, is as follows:—

(Shāh Ismā'il had remonstrated with Shaybānī Khān for the wanton Uzbek attack upon Kirmān, which he called his hereditary dominions. To which he received the jeering answer) "that he did not understand on what Shah Ismael founded his claim to hereditary dominions; that sovereignty descended through the father not the mother³—through males not females; and that the unequal match between his family and the females of Uzun Hasan's (or Amīr Ḥasan Beg's) could confer no right. *He reminded him of the saying, that the son should follow his father's trade, the daughter her mother's; and insultingly sent him as a present, a lady's veil and beggar's dish; adding 'If thou hast forgot thy father's trade, this may serve to recall it to thy memory; but if thou wouldst place thy foot on the steps of the throne, remember:

'He that would clasp to his breast, Royalty as his bride,
Must woo her in the battle-fray, athwart sharp scymetars.'

"In conclusion he remarked, that, as he intended soon, like a good Musalmān, to perform the pilgrimage to Mekka, he would make a point of seeing him on his way through Irāk.

"The youthful warrior (i.e. Shāh Ismā'il), who professed to feel a pride in his descent from a family of holy darvishes, that gloried in their voluntary poverty, received the Uzbek's taunts with affected humility. He returned for answer, 'That if every man was bound to follow his father's trade, all being sons of Adam, must adhere to that of prophets: that if hereditary descent conferred the only right to sovereignty, he did not see how it had

¹ Bff. 177b-178b.

² Ap. 55.

³ The Uzbeks questioned the paternity of Shāh Ismā'il's ancestors; but acknowledged that the Shāh's mother was the daughter of Ūzūn Ḥasan or Amīr Ḥasan Beg, the Āq-Quyūnlū. On the other hand Shaybānī Khān was the direct descendant of Chingiz Khān.

descended from Peshdādi to the Kyāni dynasties of Persia, or how it had come to Chingiz or to him whom he addressed.

‘Boast not thyself, O, vain youth, of thy father, who is dead;
Pride not thyself on bones, as if thou wert a dog.’

“That he on his part proposed making a pilgrimage to the shrine of Imām Reza at Meshīd where he would have an opportunity of waiting on the Khan. In return for his present, he sent him a spindle and distaff; and alluding to his quotation, that Royalty must be wooed in the battle-field, he concluded, ‘And so say I also. Lo, I have tightened my girdle for a deadly contest, and have placed the foot of determination in the stirrup of victory. If thou wilt meet me face to face, like a man, our quarrel will at once be decided. But if thou wouldst rather slink into a corner, then thou mayst find what I have sent thee of some use.

We have spared quite long enough, let us now exchange hard blows in the field.

He who falls, borne down in the combat, let him fall’ .”¹

Shaybāni Khān had, in the beginning of summer 916/1510, led a wild and fruitless campaign against the elusive Hazāras east of Hirāt². The Uzbek troops were worn out by intense thirst, the transport camels died in large numbers, and winter was near at hand, when Shaybāni Khān retreated with his shattered forces to Hirāt. To allow the army to recuperate³, “he granted a general leave of absence to his troops, allowing every man to return for the winter to his own country and home, however distant”⁴.

(2) *The Campaign against Shaybāni Khān.*

Shāh Ismā‘il entertained his troops to a sumptuous feast at Sulṭān-Bulāghī, distributed 23,000 tūmāns and other presents amongst his officers, and began his march on Khurāsān.

Aḥmad Sulṭān, son-in-law of Shaybāni Khān and governor of Dām-ghān, Aḥmad Qunqurāt, governor of Astarābād, and similarly governors of other forts fled before the Shāh. Sayyid Rafī‘, Bābā Nūdhār, and other leading men paid homage to the Shāh at Bistām, and Khwāja Muẓaffar Bitikchī, minister to the fugitive governor of Astarābād, was appointed minister by the Shāh at Jājarm.

Shāh Ismā‘il was almost near Mashhad⁵, when Shaybāni Khān, who had demobilized his troops after his return from the Hazāra campaign⁶,

¹ I, pp. 232-33, Xpp. 299-300.

² *Ibid.*, p. 231. (For a detailed note on “Hazāras” see *Ḥasan Bey Rūmlū’s Aḥsanu’l-Tawārīkh* : Trans. C. N. Seddon, Calcutta, 1934, p. 238.)

³ *Ibid.*, p. 231.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 231, Xp. 297.

⁵ App. 55-56.

⁶ See above.

heard of the Shāh's advance and fled precipitately from Hirāt to Marw, followed by Jān Wafā Mirzā, governor of Hirāt. Then followed a mass flight of the Uzbeks from Hirāt, which compelled the pro-Uzbek party, represented by Khwāja Khurd and Sultān Maḥmūd, to take refuge in the fort of Ikhtiyārū'd-Dīn ¹.

The position now was as follows: Shāh Ismā'īl was at Mashhad visiting the shrine of Imām 'Alī ar-Riḍā, while Shaybānī Khān was at Marw, strengthening the fortifications and calling reinforcements from 'Ubaydu'llāh Khān ², Muḥammad Timūr Sultān ³, and other Khāns, i.e. from Bukhārā, Samarqand, and elsewhere ⁴.

At Tāhirābād took place the first engagement between the advance-guards of the Ṣafawīs and the Uzbeks ⁵, which resulted in the flight of the Uzbeks to Marw, notwithstanding the death of the Ṣafawī leader, Dānā Muḥammad Beg ⁶ Afshār ⁷, whom the Shāh had despatched from Sarakhs.

Shāh Ismā'īl reached Marw ⁸ on Sha'bān 20, 916 ⁹/Nov. 22, 1510, and besieged the city. For seven days the Qizil-Bāsh generals, like Diw Sultān Rūmlū, Jāyān Sultān Ustājilū, Bādinjān Sultān Rūmlū, Zaynal Sultān Shām-lū, and particularly Muḥammad Sultān Ṭālish battered at the city-gates, whence the Uzbeks refused to emerge in the absence of reinforcements from Transoxiana ¹⁰.

Dreading the enormous casualties that would accrue if his officers' plan of carrying the city by assault was accepted, the Shāh planned a ruse on Wednesday, Sha'bān 28, 916/Nov. 30, 1510, and withdrew his army ten miles from Marw to the village of Maḥmūdī. "You wrote to us," said the Shāh in a letter to Shaybānī Khān, "that you would proceed towards 'Irāq and Ādharbāyjān en route to Mecca, and wanted us in consequence to keep the road in repairs. (And conversely) we informed you of our desire to proceed to Khurāsān, to circumambulate the tomb of Imām 'Alī ar-Riḍā at Mashhad, and desired you to salute our world-conquering flag. Lo, we have paid a visit to the holy tomb, but you have not yet come forward to receive us. We then came to meet you at Marw, but you closed the city-gates upon us; wherefore, we have returned to spend the winter elsewhere in Khurāsān and shall come again in spring to meet you." The letter was despatched on Thursday evening. On Friday morning, the Shāh struck camp for Talakhtān, leaving ¹¹ 300 ¹² horse under Amīr Beg Mawṣilū at the bridge of Maḥmūdī canal with instructions to fly on the immediate appearance of the Uzbek army ¹³.

¹ Ap. 56.

² *Ibid.*, p. 56.

³ Dp. 116.

⁴ Ap. 56.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 57. Sp. 65 incorrectly states that the decisive battle was fought at Tāhirābād. For the actual place of the battle see p. 62, *infra*.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

⁷ Bf. 182b.

⁸ Ap. 57.

⁹ Dp. 117.

¹⁰ Bff. 182-184a.

¹¹ App. 57-58.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 58. Ef. 37b gives "600", but no other authority agrees with it.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

Lured by the feigned retreat, and disregarding the counsels of his generals, Shaybānī Khān marched from Marw¹, on Friday, Sha'bān 30, 916/Dec. 2, 1510, at the head of an army² variously estimated at 15,000³, 20,000⁴, 28,000⁵, or 30,000⁶, which had not yet been augmented with the expected quotas from Transoxiana. On the way, he received the Shāh's letter, and sent back his prime-minister and ex-cupbearer⁷, Khwāja Kamālu'd-Dīn Maḥmūd, with instructions to detain the Shāh's envoy at Marw, and to send reinforcements from the city. The flight of Amīr Beg Mawṣilū from the Maḥmūdī canal bridge confirmed Shaybānī Khān in his hasty conclusions; and he crossed the Siyāh-Āb "like lightning" in pursuit of the enemy.

The strength of the Ṣafawī army is variously estimated at 3,000 to 4,000⁸ or 17,000⁹ or even 40,000¹⁰: the higher figure seems more reliable for the troops were recruited from all the provinces of Persia¹¹. Between Maḥmūdī canal (ten miles from Marw) and Talakhtān¹², therefore, on Friday, Sha'bān 30, 916¹³/Dec. 2, 1510, the Ṣafawī army, captained by the Shāh in person, and containing his celebrated generals: Najm-i-Thānī, Bayrām Beg Qarāmānī, Jāyān Sultān Ustājilū, Dīw Sultān Rūmlū, Ḥusayn Beg Lala, Dada Beg Ṭālish, Dūrmish Khān Shāmlū, Amīr Beg Mawṣilū, Muḥammad Sultān Ṭālish, Bādīnjān Ṣultān Rūmlū and Zaynal Sultān Shāmlū, was drawn up in full battle array, when Shaybānī Khān appeared with his Uzbeks in the hope of harassing a flying enemy. Bitterly repenting of his folly, but courageous to the end, Shaybānī Khān fought a desperate battle in which his wing-commanders, Jān Wafā Mīrzā and Qanbar Bey, overthrew the advancing-squadrons of the Ṣafawīs. At that critical moment, Shāh Ismā'īl prostrated himself before God and prayed for success. Then with his drawn sword he hurled his charger into the thick of the fight. He was followed by his soldiers, who made a general attack on the enemy. The Uzbeks were utterly routed; 10,000 of them were killed in battle or slain in pursuit and drowned in the Siyāh-Āb¹⁴. The Uzbek roll of honour included Jalālu'd-Dīn Maḥmūd, Mu'izu'd-Dīn Ḥusayn, 'Abdu'llāh Marwī¹⁵, Māmūshī and Qāḍī Mansūr¹⁶; also the wing-commanders, Jān Wafā Mīrzā and Qanbar Bey, who were put to death after capture.

Far more tragic was the fate of Shaybānī Khān, who, whilst escaping with 500 horse, inadvertently rode into an enclosed farmyard with no gate on the further side. In this death-trap he and his companions were pierced

¹ Bff. 186a-186b.

⁴ Lp. 234.

⁷ Ap. 58.

¹⁰ Lp. 234.

¹² See p. 61, supra. Sp. 65 incorrectly states that the decisive battle was fought at Ṭahirābād near Marw.

¹³ See above.

¹⁵ Ap. 59.

² Ap. 58.

⁵ Vp. 243.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

¹¹ See p. 57, supra.

¹⁴ Bff. 187b-189a.

¹⁶ Bf. 190b.

³ Cf. 205b.

⁶ Fp. 28.

⁹ Fp. 28.

by the arrows of Būrūn Sultān¹ Takkalū² and his Qizil-Bāshes, and fell in a ghastly heap: 'Aziz Āqā alias Ādī Bahādūr disentangled the body of the Uzbek monarch, cut off the head, and hurried with the trophy to the presence of the Shāh.

After removing the skull, which was converted into a drinking cup, the head stuffed with straw was sent to the Ottoman Sultān Bāyazīd II with the message: "We have heard that it used to be said in your assembly: strange is the sovereignty we see displayed in the head of Shaybānī Khān: lo, we are now sending you the same head stuffed with straw"³. Further, after the fall of Marw, effected without opposition, the Shāh invited the Uzbek premier, Khwāja Kamālū'd-Dīn Maḥmūd, to a drinking party. "Do you recognize this cup?" said the Shāh, who was drinking out of the gold-plated skull of Shaybānī Khān⁴. "Yes, glory be to God," replied Kamālū'd-Dīn; "and how favoured by fortune was he! Nay, fortune still abides with him, so that even now he rests in the hands of so auspicious a being as thyself, who continually drinks the wine of Delight."⁵

This was the end of Shaybānī Khān: he was 61 years of age at the time of his death and had reigned eleven years⁶. Of his 10,000 followers, who had fallen with him in battle⁷, the victor raised pyramids of skulls⁸, to decorate the gates of the town of Marw, which had peacefully capitulated. Dada Beg Ṭālish became the new governor of Marw⁹; the inhabitants, save the Uzbeks¹⁰, were given quarter: and Khān-Zāda Begum was sent with honour to her brother Bābur¹¹. This lady had fallen into the hands of Shaybānī Khān at Samarqand in the summer of 906¹²/1601, and had borne him a son, Khurram Shāh Sultān, who was appointed governor of Balkh in 913¹³/1507. Subsequently, she was divorced out of fear that she might, in concert with her brother, plot against her husband's life. She was then given in marriage to Sayyid Hādī, who fell fighting for Shaybānī Khān in the battle against Shāh Ismā'īl¹⁴.

To commemorate his success, Shāh Ismā'īl struck gold coins¹⁵, and sent proclamations of victory to various provinces¹⁶.

¹ App. 59-60.

² Bf. 189b.

³ *Ibid.*, ff. 189b-190b.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ff. 190b-191b.

⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 191b. (Translation from Spp. 65-66.)

⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 192a. "According to the version current in Central Asia, his mortal remains were buried in the same year that he died, 916/1510, in the splendid college he had built in Samarkand, and his grave there is held in universal reverence down to the present day as that of a شهيد (Martyr)" (Yp. 270).

⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 190b.

⁸ Ap. 61.

⁹ Bf. 191b.

¹⁰ Ap. 60. According to Lp. 235 a general massacre took place in the town.

¹¹ K, Vol. I, p. 15.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 15. Lp. 196 gives that Shaybānī Khān proposed to make peace with Bābur, if he would give his sister Khān-Zāda Begum in marriage to him. "Bābur Pādishāh gave up Khān-Zāda Begum in exchange for his own life and escaped."

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

¹⁴ Lp. 239.

¹⁵ Bf. 191b.

¹⁶ Ap. 60.

The poets of Transoxiana composed “کلاه سرخ” as the chronogram of Shaybānī Khān’s death, from which the wits of Persia obtained the complete anagram “خبرس هلاک”¹.

(3) *Visit to Hirāt and Return to ‘Irāq.*

On Ramaḍān 7, 916/Dec. 8, 1510, Qulī Jān Beg, a servant of Najm-i-Thānī, reached Hirāt as the precursor of Shāh Ismā‘īl. The pro-Şafawī party rose upon the police-officers, Muḥammad Lakūrā² and Muḥammad ‘Alī³, who, together with a hundred Uzbeks, were put to death.

A week later, Khwāja Khurd was persuaded by Najm-i-Thānī and Khwāja Maḥmūd to evacuate the fort of Ikhtiyāru’d-Dīn; and on Ramaḍān 20, 916/Dec. 21, 1510, the Shāh made his public entry into Hirāt and alighted in the Bāgh-i-Jahān Ārā. Ḥusayn Beg Lala was appointed governor of the city and Ghiyāthu’d-Dīn Muḥammad chief-justice⁴. Badi’u’z-Zamān Mīrzā ibn Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā, who had fled to India after his defeat by the Uzbek governor, Aḥmad Qunqurāt, at Astarābād⁵, was awarded a daily pension of a thousand dīnārs, and was ordered to reside at Shunb-i-Ghāzān near Tabrīz⁶; while Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā ibn Badi’u’z-Zamān Mīrzā was appointed governor of Dāmghān⁷.

For the honour shown to Khān-Zāda Begum, Khān Mīrzā brought the thanks of Bābur⁸; and Shujā‘ Beg ibn Dhu’n-Nūn, ruler of Qandahār, came in person to tender his allegiance to the Shāh⁹.

Rustam Rūz-afzūn, the ruler of eastern Māzandarān¹⁰, died, whereupon, his son and successor, Āqā Muḥammad, found himself confronted with a pretender, Nizāmu’d-Dīn ‘Abdu’l-Karīm, who claimed all Māzandarān for himself. To arbitrate between the rivals¹¹, and in particular to realize the arrears of tribute¹², Khwāja Muẓaffar Bitikchī was despatched to Māzandarān¹³.

In the beginning of 917¹⁴/April, 1511, Shāh Ismā‘īl left Hirāt for the subjugation of Transoxiana¹⁵. ‘Ubaydu’llāh Khān and Muḥammad Timūr Sulṭān, the rulers of Bukhārā and Samarqand respectively, had tried to rush reinforcements to Marw, but finding that Shaybānī Khān was already dead, had returned with his widow Mughūl Khānum, whom ‘Ubaydu’llāh Khān had taken to wife¹⁶. Envoys from these two and Jānī Beg Sulṭān¹⁷ (ibn Khwāja Muḥammad ibn Abu’l Khayr Khān¹⁸), the ruler of Karmina and Khujand, met the Shāh at Maymana. Eventually, through

¹ Bf. 192a.

² Ap. 60.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 60. *Bf. 194a gives “Pahlawān”.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 60-61.

⁵ Bf. 176a.

⁶ Jp. 368.

⁷ Bf. 196b.

⁸ Lp. 239. (Also see p. 66, *infra.*)

⁹ App. 63-64.

¹⁰ Ap. 75.

¹⁰ Bf. 201b.

¹¹ App. 63-64.

¹² Bf. 201b.

¹³ Ap. 64.

¹⁴ Bf. 197b.

¹⁵ Ap. 63.

¹⁶ Bf. 200a.

¹⁷ Ap. 63.

¹⁸ Rp. 273.

the intercession of Khwāja Maḥmūd, a treaty was signed, whereby the Uzbeks were left in possession of Transoxiana and the Shāh was guaranteed absence of molestation in his territories on this side of Oxus. Balkh and its dependencies such as Andkhwud, Shibarghān, Jijiktū, Maymana, Fāryāb and Marghāb up to the Oxus¹ were put in charge of Bayrām Beg Qamrāmāni². Shujā' Beg of Qandahār, who had shown signs of disobedience, was imprisoned in the fort of Ikhtiyāru'd-Din, and order having been restored in Khurāsān the Shāh struck camp for 'Irāq.

At Simnān, the rival claimants of Māzandarān waited on the Shāh. Āqā Muḥammad was awarded the territory ruled by his father Rustam Rūzafzūn; the rest of Māzandarān was to be administered by 'Abdu'l-Karim³. Thirty thousand⁴ tūmāns were to be paid conjointly by these rulers into the royal treasury, and Khwāja Muzaffar Bitikchī was to realize the money⁵.

At Ray, the Shāh received the immigrants of Asia Minor, led by Şūfiyān Khalifa Rūmlū, the successor of Bābā Shāh Qulī ibn Bābā Ḥasan Takkalū⁶. These people, from Karmiyān in Asia Minor, known as Takka-Īli, were hereditary supporters of the Şafawis: Bābā Ḥasan Takkalū had visited Sulṭān Junayd once and Sulṭān Ḥaydar twice⁷; and tradition and the victories of Shāh Ismā'il alike demanded that the son of Bābā Ḥasan Takkalū should wait upon the son of Sulṭān Ḥaydar. But Bābā Shāh Qulī decided to go with a retinue⁸, and since he and his followers were Ottoman subjects, the Ottoman governor of Mantsha-Īli and Takka-Īli attacked these seditionists⁹, with a thousand men¹⁰, but was worsted in the fight, and was put to death with most of the troops¹¹; whereupon, the number of Şafawī devotees rose to 10,000 or even to 20,000¹².

Qarā Kūz Pāshā, the governor of Qarāmān, hastened to crush the rebellion¹³, but lost his life in the ensuing skirmish¹⁴, whereupon, the rebels invaded the surrounding districts¹⁵ and proceeded to Siwās.

The revolt had now reached such proportions that the Ottoman Sulṭān Bāyazid II was constrained to send his princ-minister, Khādīm 'Ali Pāshā, with 50,000 men, to effect its suppression. In the desperate battle, that

¹ Ap. 63. A incorrectly adds "Gharjistān" to the list. It was not yet conquered by the Shāh. (For the conquest of Gharjistān see p. 90, infra.)

² *Ibid.*, p. 63. He was also created a "Khān" (Bf. 201a).

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 63-64.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 64. Bf. 202a and Dp. 124 incorrectly give "20,000" and "3,000" respectively.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

⁶ Bf. 202b.

⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 42b.

⁸ *Ibid.*, f. 202b.

⁹ *Ibid.*, f. 202b.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 202b. Dp. 124 gives "4,000".

¹¹ *Ibid.*, f. 203a.

¹² Mf. 51a.

¹³ Bf. 203a.

¹⁴ Mf. 51b. Bf. 203a incorrectly states that he fled from the field of battle.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 51b.

took place at the village¹ of Kük-Khāni², the Ottoman premier was killed together with most of his soldiers; but Bābā Shāh Qulī also lost his life, and was succeeded by Şūfiyān Khalifa Rūmlū, whom the rebels elected to be the head of their Order³.

Unhampered and unmolested, the rebels devastated the surrounding districts⁴, and after passing Arzinjān on their way to Persia, attacked a caravan of 500 tradesmen, seized the goods and ruthlessly slaughtered the merchants⁵. Similarly, at Shabistar, they looted the house of Shaykh Ibrāhīm, whom together with his son, they put to death. Consequently, upon the arrival of these wild devotees at Tabriz, the inhabitants charged them with highway robbery and murder⁶; and the Shāh, notwithstanding the fact that the accused were his partisans, put several of them to death. Subsequently, however, he granted land at Turbat in Khurāsān to Şūfiyān Khalifa Rūmlū⁷.

During the winter of 917/1511-12, amidst the Shāh's hunting expeditions—one at Qum, another at Farāhān, and two others at Sāwa, wherein the animals slain were 26,000, 57,000, 16,000 and 15,000 respectively—there arrived at Qum envoys from the Ottoman Sulṭān Bāyazīd II and from Sulṭān Qānṣū Ghūrī of Egypt to tender congratulations and offer presents on the conquest of Khurāsān. Shāh Ismā'il sent them back with presents and messages of friendship.

Of administrative events, mention should be made of the first instalment of 10,000 tūmāns brought by Khwāja Muẓaffar Bitikchī⁸, and of the resignation of Sharīf'n'd-Dīn 'Alī, the Chancellor, who was succeeded by Niẓāmu'd-Dīn 'Abdu'l-Bāqī⁹.

In the ensuing spring (of 918/1512), the Shāh moved to the summer-quarters of Sūrlūq, where he arranged for a hunting expedition in which 24,000 animals were slain. At the end of summer, the Shāh proceeded to Isfahān to spend the winter¹⁰ (of 918/1512-13).

(4) *Coalition with Bābur against the Uzbeks.*

The news of the defeat of Shaybāni Khān conveyed by Khān Mirzā in Ramaḍān, 916/Dec., 1510, induced Bābur to strike for the recovery of his throne of Samarqand; and though the winter was severe, he advanced from Kābul, joined forces with Khān Mirzā at Badakhshān, and advanced on Hiṣār-i-Shādmān, then occupied by Ḥamza Sulṭān and Mahdī Sulṭān. This campaign proved abortive; Bābur returned to Qunduz; and Khān Mirzā was despatched to Shāh Ismā'il to thank him for the safe transport of Khān-Zāda Begum, and to obtain support and assistance.

¹ Bf. 203a-203b.

² Mf. 51b, but according to Turkish historian cited by Sp. 71 "Gyuk Chāy".

³ Bf. 203b.

⁴ Mf. 51b.

⁵ Bf. 203b-204a.

⁶ Mf. 52a.

⁷ Bf. 204a.

⁸ App. 64-65.

⁹ Bf. 208a.

¹⁰ Ap. 69.

On Khān Mirzā's return¹, but without the expected reinforcements², Bābur marched once more against the Uzbeks, and (early in 1511 A.D.) succeeded in dispersing their ranks: Ḥamza Sulṭān and Mahdī Sulṭān were taken captive and put to death³ as traitors for they had once been in Bābur's service and had deserted him to join the cause of Shaybānī Khān⁴.

Encouraged by this success, Bābur sought the help of Shāh Ismā'il⁵, to enable him to recover Samarqand and Bukhārā, which belonged to him by right of inheritance⁶, promising in return to strike coins in the name of the Shāh⁷. Eventually, the Shāh's reinforcements under the command of Aḥmad Beg Ṣūfi Ūghli and Shāh Rukh Beg Afshār reached Bābur at Ḥiṣār-i-Shādmān, whereupon, he set out and occupied Bukhārā. The Uzbek rulers fled⁸ towards Turkistān, and the allied forces entered Samarqand in the middle of Rajab, 917⁹/Oct., 1511. After faithfully carrying out his promise to the Shāh as regards the coinage¹⁰, Bābur allowed the Qizil-Bāsh troops to return home¹¹.

In the spring of 918/1512, the Uzbek rulers, seeing that the Qizil-Bāsh troops had been demobilized and sent home, took heart, and completely overthrew Bābur in a desperate battle, fought near Bukhārā¹², in Ṣafar, 918¹³/May, 1512. Bābur was constrained to renounce Bukhārā and Samarqand, and to take refuge in Ḥiṣār-i-Shādmān, whither, 300 Qizil-Bāshes under the command of Sulṭān Muḥammad Shirāzī were rushed as reinforcements from the governor of Balkh, Bayrām Khān Qarāmānī. This news made the Uzbeks return from "Chaghāniyān"¹⁴, although how they advanced to so far without taking Ḥiṣār-i-Shādmān is uncertain.

To help Bābur, his faithful ally, and to pull the Uzbek thorn up by the root, Shāh Ismā'il sent the flower of his army consisting of 12,000¹⁵ horse, officered by Zaynu'l-'Ābidīn Beg Ṣafawī, Qarā Piri Beg Qājār, Zaynal Sulṭān Shāmlū¹⁶, Bādinjān Sulṭān Rūmlū and Khwāja Maḥmud¹⁷, under

¹ Lpp. 237-239.

² *Ibid.*, p. 243 incorrectly states that he returned with the auxiliary force which had been sent by Shāh Ismā'il.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 243-245.

⁴ Xp. 145. Ap. 66 incorrectly states that they lost their lives in the battle.

⁵ Ap. 66.

⁶ Bf. 206b.

⁷ Ap. 66. Lp. 245 omits the whole of this statement.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 66. ⁹ Lp. 246.

¹⁰ Ap. 66. Lp. 246 does not support this statement. It is, however, proved by numismatical evidence (see *R. S. Poole's Catalogue of Persian Coins, London, 1887*, Intro., pp. xxiv-xxix). K, Vol. II, Supp., p. 72, incorrectly states that Bābur struck the coins in his own name.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 66. Lpp. 245-246 incorrectly states that Bābur allowed them to return from Bukhārā.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67.

¹³ Lp. 260.

¹⁴ Ap. 67.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 66. Lp. 260 gives "60,000", which seems to be exaggerated.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 66.

¹⁷ Bf. 207b.

the supreme command of Najm-i-Thānī¹. En route, Ḥusayn Beg Lala and Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Muḥammad brought their quotas from Hirāt and Dada Beg Ṭalīsh from Marw. On reaching Balkh, Najm-i-Thānī despatched Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Muḥammad to summon Bābur from Ḥiṣār-i-Shādman; and taking Bayrām Khān Qarāmānī from Balkh, he crossed the river Oxus by a bridge of boats at Tirmidh in Rajab, 918/Sept., 1512. At Tang-i-Jukjuk, also known as Darband-i-Āhanīn, Bābur joined the Ṣafawī army, which now set out for Bukhārā.

The fort of Khuzār voluntarily capitulated, but the garrison and Āq-Fulād Sulṭān, the governor, were treacherously done to death. The fort of Qarshī was taken on the third day of the siege, and as a reprisal for the conduct of the governor, Shaykhum Mirzā, who had refused to submit, 15,000 inhabitants of Qarshī, notwithstanding the intercession² of Bābur³ and Ghiyāth'ud-Dīn Muḥammad, were ruthlessly massacred. After these wild orgies Najm-i-Thānī moved on to Bukhārā⁴.

On the approach of the Ṣafawī army, the Uzbeks changed their tactics and took refuge in the fort of Ghujduwān. Najm-i-Thānī laid siege; the fort held out; the provisions of the besiegers ran short; and disregarding the suggestion of Bābur and Khwāja Maḥmūd to suspend operations till spring, Najm-i-Thānī decided to force the issue by a general assault. Before this could be done, "Ubaydu'llāh Khān and Jānī Beg Sulṭān came up with a large army to the succour of the garrison, and an open battle was consequently fought⁵, on Ramaḍān 3⁶, 918/Nov. 12, 1512. The Uzbek attack was repulsed with the loss of 200 men, but Bayrām Khān Qarāmānī received a fatal shot⁷, and his death disheartened the Qizil-Bāsh army. Dada Beg

¹ Ap. 66. According to Persian sources the campaign of Najm-i-Thānī was originally directed against Bābur, who had ill-treated a servant of Najm-i-Thānī at Samarqand. This servant poisoned the Shāh's mind against Bābur, charging him with rebellion. This is totally incorrect. Bābur, on the other hand, had been true to his words, not only in connection with the coinage, but he also adopted the Qizil-Bāshes' costume for himself and for his troops. This, however, caused great hatred against Bābur in the minds of his subjects (Lp. 246 and footnote), and was one of the chief causes of his defeat at the hands of the Uzbeks in Ṣafar, 918/May, 1512. Yp. 276 and Xp. 323 incorrectly call Najm-i-Thānī "the governor of the province of Khurāsān". He was "counsellor" to the Shāh.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 66-68.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 215a.

⁴ Ap. 68. Yp. 276 and *Howorth's Hist. of the Mongols, part II, Division II (London, 1880)*, p. 713, incorrectly state that Bābur was at this occasion greatly disgusted with Najm-i-Thānī, and left him to proceed to Bukhārā alone.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 68. Sp. 74 footnote and K, *Vol. II, Supp.*, p. 74, incorrectly give the date as "Ramaḍān 17, 918/Nov. 26, 1512 and Oct. 22, 1514" respectively. (Also see Xp. 325, footnote 1.)

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

Tālish was the first to flee¹, followed successively by Bābur and his reserves², Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Muḥammad and Khwāja Maḥmūd³.

Notwithstanding these defections, Najm-i-Thānī, who was a good soldier though a bad general, fighting with his hand not his head, charged the Uzbek ranks, and, for a while, his sword ran red with the blood of the enemy⁴, but finally he was surrounded by 'Ubaydu'llāh Khān's soldiers⁵, fell from his horse⁶, and was captured alive. He was brought before 'Ubaydu'llāh Khān and instantly beheaded⁷. His head, uplifted on a spear, was paraded before the Qizil-Bāsh army, which turned and fled pursued by the Uzbeks⁸. Muḥyi'd-Dīn Yaḥyā and Mīr Jān were overtaken and slain; Ḥusayn Beg Lala and Aḥmad Beg Ṣūfī Ūghli saved their life though not their honour, by alluding pursuit⁹; and only the memory remained of Bayrām Khān Qarāmānī, Najm-i-Thānī and Zaynu'l-'Abidin Beg Ṣafawī to atone Persia for the humiliation of a crushing defeat.

(5) *The Loss and Recovery of Khurāsān.*

Encouraged by the victory of Ghujduwān, Jānī Beg Sultān crossed the river Oxus and made for Hirāt. This news arrived at Hirāt¹⁰ on Ramaḍān 17, 918/Nov. 26, 1512, followed three days later by the fugitives Ḥusayn Beg Lala and Aḥmad Beg Ṣūfī Ūghli, and a little later by another fugitive, Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Muḥammad, who had parted company with Khwāja Maḥmūd at Balkh¹¹. Hurriedly the fortifications of Hirāt were improved and the four gates of the city—Malik, Fīrūzābād, Khwush and 'Irāq—were placed in charge of Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Muḥammad, 'Imādu'd-Dīn Muḥammad, Sultān Maḥmūd and an unspecified officer respectively.

Jānī Beg Sultān laid the siege of Hirāt in Dhu'l-Q., 918/Jan., 1513, and though he was helped subsequently by 'Ubaydu'llāh Khān, the city held out for two months, until on the morning of Naw-Rūz¹², Friday¹³, Muḥarram 3, 919/Mar. 11, 1513, the siege was raised to the intense delight of the inhabitants¹⁴. Near Murghāb, however, the retreating Uzbeks met Muḥammad Timūr Sultān and his reinforcements¹⁵, whereupon, Jānī Beg Sultān parted company to proceed to his seat of government at Karmīna, whilst 'Ubaydu'llāh Khān returned with Muḥammad Timūr Sultān to occupy Tūs and Mashhad. The fall of these towns and the absence of help from the Shāh made the Qizil-Bāsh party desert Hirāt: the city was taken by Muḥammad Timūr Sultān, who struck coins in his name¹⁶.

¹ Bf. 216b.

² Ap. 69. Lp. 261 states that after the battle "Bābur retired, broken and crest-fallen, to Ḥiṣār(-i-Shādmān)".

³ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

⁴ Bf. 217a.

⁵ Ap. 69.

⁶ Bf. 217a.

⁷ Ap. 59.

⁸ Bf. 217a.

⁹ Ap. 69.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 70-71.

¹³ Cf. 207a.

¹⁴ Ap. 71.

¹⁵ Bf. 220a.

¹⁶ Ap. 71.

Meanwhile Shāh Ismā‘il was in winter-quarters at Iṣfahān in 918 ¹/1513. A son was born to him, on Dhu'l-Ḥ. 26, 918 ²/Mar. 3, 1513, at Shāh-Ābād near Iṣfahān ³, and was named ‘Abu'l-Faṭḥ Ṭahmāsp Mirzā. Hard on the heels of this joy, followed news of the tragic defeat at Ghujduwān, and of the Uzbek invasion of Khurāsān. Burning with revenge, the Shāh marched via Sāwa, Firūz-Kūh, Sulṭān Maydān, Kālpūsh and Ulung-i-Rādikān to Mashhad. At Sāwa, he stayed ten days and ordered provisions for a three months' campaign; at Firūz-Kūh, where the halt was again ten days, he made Sharifu'd-Dīn ‘Alī (who had returned from ‘Irāq) chancellor, and Niẓāmu'd-Dīn ‘Abdu'l-Bāqī counsellor; at Bistām, he reviewed the army during a few days' halt; and at Kālpūsh, he received the welcome news that ‘Ubaydu'llāh Khān had fled from Mashhad to Marw, en route to Bukhārā, and that Muḥammad Timūr Sulṭān had likewise fled from Hirāt to Samarqand.

On the flight of Muḥammad Timūr Sulṭān, disturbances arose in Hirāt especially, as the city was depleted of its leading citizens, like Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Muḥammad, Sulṭān Maḥmūd, Jalālu'd-Dīn Qāsim Farnakhwudī, Qāsim Khwānd Amīr and Shāh Ḥusayn Khiyābānī, who were forced to accompany the Uzbek chief to Samarqand.

For a time, ‘Abu'l-Qāsim Bakhshī seized the city; then expelled by the Ṣafawī party he returned with 2,000 men from Karkh and Bādghīs, and aided by the traitors Shihābu'd-Dīn Ghūrī and Niẓāmu'd-Dīn ⁴ ‘Abdu'l-Qādir ⁵ Mashhadī ⁶ laid siege to the city. On the eighth day Piri Sulṭān, the Shāh's governor of Fūshanj, forced his way into Hirāt; Shihābu'd-Dīn Ghūrī and 300 of his comrades were overtaken and slain, but ‘Abu'l-Qāsim Bakhshī and Niẓāmu'd-Dīn ‘Abdu'l-Qādir Mashhadī managed to escape to Gharjistān.

Meanwhile the Shāh had arrived at Ulang-i-Rādikān. The ex-governor of Marw, Dada Beg Ṭālish, who had fled before the Uzbeks, was paraded in the royal camp, clean-shaven, dressed in woman's clothes, and mounted on an ass ⁷, with his face backwards ⁸; later, on the same day, he received pardon and a robe of honour. As Hirāt had been re-occupied by Ṣafawī troops, it was necessary to appoint a governor: Zaynal Sulṭān Shāmlū was selected for this purpose, and was honoured with the title of “Khān”; similarly Amīr Beg Mawsilū was appointed governor of Qāyīn with the title of “Sulṭān”.

After visiting the shrine at Mashhad, the Shāh moved to Bādghīs and then to Bābā-Khākī ⁹. The punitive expedition of Jūha Sulṭān ¹⁰ wreaked vengeance on the nomads of Bādghīs, who had surprized the Qizil-Bāsh refugees from Ghujduwān, and for the murder of Khwāja Maḥmūd ¹¹ at

¹ See p. 66, supra.

² Ap. 70.

³ Bf. 218b.

⁴ App. 70-73.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 73. Bf. 224a incorrectly gives “‘Abdu'l-Bāqī”.

⁶ Bf. 224a.

⁷ App. 73-74.

⁸ Dp. 138.

⁹ Ap. 74.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 74. Dp. 139 gives “Chūha Sulṭān”.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 74-75.

Pīl-Chirāgh¹, in the beginning of Rajab, 919/Sept., 1513, at the hands of Adham, a nomad-chief of Kharzuwān, when the Khwāja was on his way from Balkh to the royal camp²; Dīw Sultān Rūmlū and Amīr Sultān Mawṣilū were ordered to reduce Shibarghān, Andkhuwd and Balkh. Shibarghān fell without resistance; Andkhuwd was taken after a six days' siege; its inhabitants were massacred, and its defender³, Qarā Baqqāl⁴, was placed in a pillory⁵, and sent captive to the Shāh; and Balkh, like Shibarghān, voluntarily capitulated. Acting on the royal instructions, Dīw Sultān Rūmlū assumed the governorship of Balkh; and Amīr Sultān Mawṣilū proceeded to the seat of his governorship at Qāyin.

There remained the reduction of Qandahār, which had been seized by Shujā' Beg after his escape from the fort of Ikhtiyāru'd-Dīn in the summer of 917⁶/1511. The arrival of Shāh Rukh Beg Afshār made the rebel reiterate his apologies and renew his promise of regular payment of tribute, whereupon, the Safawi expedition returned to the royal camp⁷.

Having recovered Khurāsān, the Shāh struck camp for 'Irāq. A punitive expedition under Niẓāmu'd-Dīn 'Abdu'l-Bāqī and Jāyān Sultān Ustājilū, despatched from Nishāpūr, failed to capture the rebel, Sultān Muḥammad Mirzā⁸, but slew most of the insurgents of Nisā⁹ and Abīward¹⁰, and rejoined the camp at Isfahān¹¹.

More formidable was the revolt of the Shāh's half-brother Sulaymān Mirzā. Taking advantage of the Shāh's preoccupations in Khurāsān, he left Ardabil and entered Tabrīz at the head of a large following; but the inhabitants rained stones and darts from the housetops, and Sulaymān Mirzā, finding his triumphal entry converted into a funeral procession, was constrained to fly to Shunb-i-Ghāzān, where he was put to death by Muṣṭafā Beg Ustājilū. For this service, Muṣṭafā Beg Ustājilū, who was brother of the premier, Jāyān Sultān Ustājilū, received the governorship of Tabrīz and the title of "Mantashā Sultān"¹².

The Shāh spent the winter of 919/1513 at Isfahān, and on the advent of spring marched to Hamadān¹³.

¹ Ap. 74. Bf. 226b gives "Pul-i-Chirāgh".

² *Ibid.*, pp. 74-75. Khwāja Maḥmūd had fled from Ghujduwān to Balkh; thence to the camp of Bābur at Kishn; thence, towards the end of Jumāda II, 919/Aug., 1513, he had returned to Balkh, and was now on his way from Balkh to the royal camp.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 75. Dp. 139 gives "Qarā Būqāl". ⁵ Bf. 227b. ⁶ Ap. 75.

⁷ Bff. 228a-228b. Ap. 75 states that on the approach of Shāh Rukh Beg Afshār, Shujā' Beg fled from Qandahār, and his uncle Sultān 'Alī took refuge in the city-fort. Shāh Rukh Beg Afshār followed Shujā' Beg to Mastūn, invaded the territory, and returned to the royal camp.

⁸ Ap. 76. He was the son of Abu'l-Muḥsin Mirzā and grandson of Sultān Ḥusayn Mirzā.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

¹⁰ Bf. 234b.

¹¹ Ap. 76.

¹² Bff. 234b-235b.

¹³ Ap. 77.

CHAPTER VI

SHĀH ISMĀ'IL'S RELATIONS WITH TURKEY

Shāh Ismā'il was contemporary with the following three Ottoman Sultāns: (1) Bāyazīd II (deposed 918/1512), (2) Salīm I (d. 916/1520), and (3) Sulaymān (d. 974/1566).

Sultān Bāyazīd II pursued a dual policy: indirect anti-Şafawī, as long as Shāh Ismā'il was weak; and direct pro-Şafawī, the moment Shāh Ismā'il became strong. In his answer to Ya'qūb Mirzā, of the Āq-Quyūnlū dynasty, announcing the defeat and death of Sultān Ḥaydar (father of Shāh Ismā'il, 893/1488), Bāyazīd II offers congratulations to the "Bāyandarī hosts" over the "Ḥaydarī faction"¹. Similarly, in his letter to Alwand Mirzā, the Āq-Quyūnlū, sent by a special envoy, Maḥmūd Āqā Chāwūshbāshī, (before 907/1501), Bāyazīd II urges the Āq-Quyūnlū family to unite against their common enemy, "the Red-Heads". Further, in another letter to the same Alwand Mirzā, (before 907/1501), Bāyazīd II promises help against the "Qizil-Bāshes"².

On the other hand, in his letter to Shāh Ismā'il, who had requested that his disciples in Asia Minor may not be prevented from visiting the shrines at Ardabīl³, Bāyazīd II says that though the pseudo-pilgrims are merely trying to evade military service, nevertheless, for the sake of continuing friendly relations, he has issued instructions to permit the pilgrims to perform the pilgrimage conditional upon their return to Ottoman territory⁴. Similarly, in his answer to Shāh Ismā'il who offered apologies for passing through Qayşariyya⁵, because he was pursuing his foes, and did not intend any violation of Ottoman territory⁶, Bāyazīd II accepts the Shāh's assurances and hopes that friendly relations will continue with that "puissant monarch and august sovereign, the ruler of the countries of Persia, the prince of the lands of Turkey and Daylam, the Jamshīd of the age, the Kay-Khusraw of the epoch, the divinely aided, glorious king Ismā'il"⁷, and that he has ordered his officials "not to omit one jot or tittle in maintaining harmony and co-operation"⁷. In the same spirit, two different embassies, with messages of friendship, were sent by the Sultān to the Shāh, the one arriving at Işfahān, in the winter of 910/1504-5, to congratulate

¹ Np. 305.

² *Ibid.*, p. 338.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 339.

⁴ This passage through Qayşariyya is mentioned not in the Shāh's letter but in the Sultān's reply (Np. 340). (Also see p. 52, *supra*.)

⁵ Np. 339.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 340.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 340.

Shāh Ismā'il on his conquest of the Persian 'Irāq and Fārs¹; the other arriving at Qum, in the winter of 917/1511-12, to congratulate Shāh Ismā'il on his victory over Shaybānī Khān². This second eubassy is particularly noteworthy because the Sultān had just been insulted by receiving the stuffed head of Shaybānī Khān, from the very man he was now congratulating.

On Šafar 7, 918/Apr. 24, 1512, Bāyazīd II was deposed and the vacant Ottoman throne was filled by the energetic Salīm³. Aḥmad, the eldest son of Bāyazīd II, disputed the succession, and lost his life⁴; whereupon, Murād, the son of Aḥmad, advanced his own claim, was routed in battle and constrained to fly towards Persia⁵.

Shāh Ismā'il was not slow to benefit from the internal troubles of Turkey. In the summer of 918/1512, he despatched Nūr 'Alī Khalifa Rūmlū, governor of Arzinjān, to effect an emigration of his followers from Turkish territory. Accordingly, Nūr 'Alī Khalifa Rūmlū collected 2,000 to 4,000 Qizil-Bāshes at Qibla Hīṣār, and was proceeding towards Malāṭīya, when he was surprised near Tūqāt by Fāyīq Pāshā, governor of Malāṭīya. The Ottomans were routed and the insertion of Shāh Ismā'il's name in the Khuṭba attested the submission of Tūqāt⁶.

At Qār Jabrī, Nūr 'Alī Khalifa Rūmlū received the fugitive prince Murād, but on returning with him to Tūqāt, the capricious town had revolted: it was taken by storm and put to ashes. Prince Murād went ahead to Persia and Nūr 'Alī Khalifa Rūmlū was on the way to Arzinjān, when he was overtaken by 15,000 men despatched by Sultān Salīm under the command of Sinān Pāshā, Ḥusayn Beg and Tāju'd-Dīn Beg. Once again success attended the Persian arms; the destruction of Sinān Pāshā and 1,500 men precipitated the flight of the Turks; and Nūr 'Alī Khalifa Rūmlū completed his journey to Arzinjān laden with spoils⁷.

Near Tabrīz, Prince Murād was received by Dīv Sultān Rūmlū and escorted to the presence of the Shāh in his summer-quarters at Pīshbārmāq⁸: there he was endowed with feudal estates in Fārs⁹, but he fell ill at Kāshān¹⁰ en route to Fārs and, dying at Iṣfahān¹¹, was buried outside the Tūqāji Gate near the tomb of Shaykh 'Alī Sahl Iṣfahānī¹².

The seduction of his subjects, the infringement of his sovereignty, the defeat of his troops, and the protection of his rebellious nephew, were rankling in the mind of Sultān Salīm, when there came from Muḥammad Khān Ustājlı, the heroic governor of Diyār Bakr, an open challenge to arms. The Sultān was still meditating when there followed a second letter with a sword, a veil, and a complete suit of female apparel: "if thou art ready for

¹ See p. 50, supra.

³ Mf. 57a.

⁵ Bff. 238a-239a.

⁷ *Ibid.*, ff. 239a-240a.

⁹ Ap. 70.

¹¹ Ap. 70.

² See p. 66, supra.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ff. 61a-63a.

⁶ *Ibid.*, ff. 237b-238a.

⁸ *Ibid.*, f. 243a.

¹⁰ Bf. 234b.

¹² Bf. 243b.

battle, bind the sword on thy waist and come; or else wear these clothes and bring not on thy tongue words of manliness, nor speak (evermore) of conquering lands”¹.

The cup was now full to the brim, and, in the winter of 919/1513-14, when Sulṭān Salīm was at Adrianople², he was unanimously advised by his generals and learned men of his empire to wage war against the Qizil-Bāshes³; whereupon, his first move was to eliminate some 40,000 of his Asiatic subjects, young and old, who were pro-Şafawī in their faith⁴; and the second was to weaken his adversary by conspiring with the enemies of his enemy, that is, the Uzbeks. In a long letter, dated the end of Muḥarram, 920/Mar., 1514, sent by the hand of Muḥammad Beg to the Uzbek ‘Ubayd(u’llāh) Khān, Salīm denounces that “Şūfī at whose hands the people of the Eastern lands are rendered desperate”⁵, and urges ‘Ubayd(u’llāh) Khān to avenge the death of his father⁶. This last statement, however, is an error, for it was the death of Shaybānī Khān, the uncle of ‘Ubaydu’llāh Khān, that had to be avenged.

(1) *Sulṭān Salīm’s March towards Ādharbāyyān.*

Sulṭān Salīm left Adrianople, en route for Persia, on Saturday, Muḥarram 22, 920/Mar. 19, 1514, and must have travelled slowly, for he arrived in Constantinople on Şafar 2, 920/Mar. 29, 1514. It took him three weeks to mobilize his troops; and having appointed his son, Sulaynān, regent at Adrianople⁷, he left for Qarānān on Tuesday, Şafar 23, 920/Apr. 19, 1514. A Persian spy, entrusted with the task of reporting on the strength and movements of the Ottoman army, had been arrested, and by his hands⁸, the Sulṭān sent to the Shāh, on Şafar 27, 920/Apr. 23, 1514, his first ultimatum⁹—a reflection at once of his character and of the spirit of his times¹⁰:

“This address is from us, the repository¹¹ of glory, the slayer of infidels and polytheists, the destroyer of the enemies of religion, the annihilator of the grandeur of the Pharaohs¹², the spoliator of the crowns of the Khāqāns,

¹ Bf. 244b.

² Mf. 68b.

³ *Ibid.*, ff. 66a-66b.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ff. 68b-70b.

⁵ Np. 347.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 348.

⁷ Mf. 73b.

⁸ *Ibid.*, ff. 68b-69b.

⁹ *Ibid.*, f. 72b.

¹⁰ For the Persian Text see Npp. 351-353.

¹¹ Mf. 71a “جلالت مآب”. Np. 351 gives “خلافت مآب” and, therefore, Sp. 13 translates it as “the Refuge of the Caliphate”. This, however, is incorrect, because Sulṭān Salīm assumed the title of Caliph after the conquest of Egypt in 923/1517 (Wp. 150).

¹² In translating this phrase as “the humbler of the Pharaoh’s pride” S adds the following footnote (note 1, p. 14): “Literally, ‘he who rubs on the dust the noses of the Pharaohs’, alluding to Sulṭān Salīm’s conquest of Egypt and overthrow of the Mameluke dynasty”. The latter statement contains anachronism, for the Sulṭān wrote this letter in Şafar, 920/Apr., 1514, while he conquered Egypt in 923/1517 (Wpp. 142-146).

the Sultān of religious warriors and volunteers; Farīdūn in glory, Alexander in pomp, Kay-Khusraw in justice and equity, Dārā in noble descent, Sultān Salīm Khān ibn Sultān Bāyazīd Khān ibn Sultān Muḥammad Khān ibn Sultān Murād Khān: to thee, the ruler of Persia, the supreme commander and war-lord, the Daḥḥāk of times, the Dārāb of strife, the Afrāsīyāb of the age, whose name ¹ is Amīr Ismā‘īl.....

“The purport of this introduction is to signify that according to the dictum:

When the male-lion departs from the thicket,
The jackal enters therein with a piercing howl,

thou hast violently usurped the eastern lands benefiting by the distractions of the Bāyandārī hosts; and from the ignominious rank of a servant thou hast raised thyself to the glorious status of a master ²; accordingly, for the relief of sufferers, the redress of the down-trodden, the execution of divine commandments, and the maintenance of royal honour, we donned the casque and the mail instead of silk and brocade: and by the favour and grace of God, we crossed the Sea during the month of Ṣafar....., (920/Apr., 1514), with ‘laurel victory sitting on our sword and smooth success strewn before our feet’, escorted by lion-mettled swordsmen and warriors: when they draw their swords from the sheath of rancour the life of the miserable foe is terminated in its ascendant: and when they insert the arrow in the bow of enmity the death-sign of the victim is cast in the Sign of the Sagittarius. By the favour of God, the High and Glorious, we hope to crush the arm of thy oppression with the grip of our power: to banish from thy silly head the idle thought of sovereignty; to avenge the meek and the lowly whom thou hast oppressed, and to set thy house on fire with the embers of thy own incendiarism” ³. Finally, Sultān Salīm asks Shāh Ismā‘īl to return all the lands which formerly belonged to the Ottomans or to prepare for war ⁴.

It will be recalled that the Sultān had incited the Uzbeks to attack Shāh Ismā‘īl. He now wrote in a similar strain to Muḥammad Beg the Āq-Quyūnlū—the letter was sent by an envoy, Aḥmad Jān, and is dated the end of Ṣafar, 920/Apr., 1514—inviting his co-operation against the Red-Heads ⁵.

On Rabī‘ I, 7, 920/May 2, 1514, the Sultān reached Sayyid-i-Ghāzī ⁶, where the army was propitiated by the donation per man of a thousand ‘Uthmānī. Thereupon, a vanguard of 2,000 men was despatched to Sīwās under Aḥmad Pāshā. The Sultān himself reached Qūniya (Iconium) on

¹ Sp. 114 incorrectly translates “ نامداری ” as “the famous”.

² Mf. 72a.

³ *Ibid.*, f. 72a.

⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 72a. Wpp. 133–136 gives a very free translation of the whole letter with numerous additions and subtractions.

⁵ Np. 353.

⁶ Mf. 72b gives “Sayyidighāzī”.

Rabi' I, 9, 920/May 4, 1514, and Askinja-Khāni on Jumāda I, 3, 920/June 26, 1514. The purse-strings were again relaxed: every soldier of Rumelia and Anatolia received fifty per cent increment in salary plus an immediate gift of a thousand Āqcha 'Uthmānī. Aḥmad Beg Qarāja Pāshā preceded the Sultān at the head of 500 men, and, on Jumāda I, 8, 920/July 1, 1514, the Sultān reached Siwās ¹.

At Siwās, the Sultān reviewed his forces. Separating the grain from the chaff, he retained 100,000 men and disbanded 40,000, whom youth and senility had rendered unfit for battle. A train of 60,000 camels carried provisions for the army ²; the commissariat department was in charge of 5,000 men; Sinān Pāshā, governor-general of Anatolia, commanded the right wing, and Ḥasan Pāshā, governor-general of Rumelia, the left wing, each of 40,000 men ³; and the Sultān was in the centre with 20,000 Janissaries in front ⁴.

The Ottomans now marched to Arzinjān ⁵, and on the report of their advance, Muḥammad Khān Ustājlu, governor of Diyār Bakr, stripped the province bare of all inhabitants, banishing them to Ādharbāyjān; and as he retreated stage by stage, he burnt out all the fields and meadows, so that the absence of food and fodder may incapacitate the Ottomans from molesting the Qizil-Bāshes ⁶.

These tactics began to corrupt the morale of the Ottomans: murmurs arose at the pursuit of an invisible foe through a devastated ⁷ land. The Sultān pretended ignorance of the discontent in the army, but wrote a letter in Turkish to rouse the dormant ardour of Shāh Ismā'il: he had previously called on the Shāh to repent and become his vassal ⁸, he now—end of Jumāda I, 920/July, 1514—taunted him with unwillingness to try the fortune of battle ⁹.

This fresh challenge to arms was, however, unnecessary, for, on Jumāda I, 27, 920 ¹⁰/July 20, 1514, Sultān Salim received at Āq-Dih near Kamākḥ ¹¹, the following reply from Shāh Ismā'il ¹²:

"We derived much pleasure from a perusal of your letter which indicated enmity but breathed valour and fortitude; we do not know, however, your object and motive.

"In the reign of your father, whose abode is in paradise, may God illuminate his proofs, the impertinence of 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr compelled us to pass through Turkish territory; nevertheless, friendship and harmony continued to subsist on both sides, so much so, that we (even)

¹ Mf. 72b. •

² *Ibid.*, f. 74b.

³ *Ibid.*, f. 78a.

⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 75a.

⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 75b.

⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 80b.

⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 75b.

⁸ Second letter of Sultān Salim, in Persian, to Shāh Ismā'il, undated (Np. 355).

⁹ Third letter of Sultān Salim, in Turkish, to Shāh Ismā'il (Mff. 76b-77a).

¹⁰ Mf. 77a.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, f. 77a.

¹² For Persian text see Npp. 356-357.

expressed our regard for you when you were (merely) governor of Trebizond. We are unaware, therefore, of the cause of your present resentment, but no doubt it is the pride of sovereignty that brings you hither, and:

Verily words bring the quarrel to such a pitch
That households of long standing crumble to pieces.

“Hitherto, our reasons for neglecting (the conquest of) Turkey have been twofold: firstly, most of the Turkish nationals are (already our subjects, being) the disciples of our illustrious ancestors, may God the Forgiver pardon them all; secondly, from ancient times we have been friends with that war-like family, and we neither desired then nor do we now desire that chaos should visit that land, as it did in the reign of Tīmūr¹. These trifles do not upset us, and why should we be worried?—for the enmity of kings is traditional:

‘He that would clasp to his breast, Royalty, as his bride,
Must woo her in the battle-fray, athwart sharp scymetars.’

But there is no justification for improper language.”²

The Sultān put the messenger to death³. Meanwhile, the army continued to grumble at the interminable march through a devastated region; the audacious governor of Qarāmān, Hamdam Pāshā, suggested retreat and forfeited his life⁴, Jumāda II, 1, 920/July, 24, 1514; Zaynal Pāshā was appointed the new governor⁵; and the army was ordered to resume the march. “The Janissaries”, writes Creasy, “broke out into open tumult, and boldly demanded to be led back to their homes. Selim had pretended not to observe their murmurs on former occasions during the march, but he now rode boldly into the midst of them. ‘Is this’ he cried, ‘your service to your Sultān? Does your loyalty consist of mere boast and lip-worship? Let those among you who wish to go home, stand out from the ranks, and depart. As for me, I have not advanced thus far merely to double on my track. Let the cowards instantly stand aloof from the brave, who have devoted themselves with sword and quiver, soul and hand, to our enterprise’. He ended by quoting a passage from a Persian poem:

‘I never flinch or turn back from the purpose
Which once have gained dominion o’er my soul.’

He then gave the word of command to form column and march, and not a Janissary dared leave his banner.”⁶

On Jumāda II, 16, 920/Aug. 8, 1514, Amīr Aḥmad, the Persian governor of Tarjān, who had fallen into the hands of the Turkmān chief, Farḡshād

¹ He refers to the battle of Angora between Bāyazīd I and Tīmūr (Dhu'l-Ḥ. 19, 804/July 20, 1402) resulting in the collapse of the Ottoman troops, and followed by tumult and civil war in Turkey.

² Npp. 356-357.

³ Mf. 77a.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ff. 75b-76a.

⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 77b.

⁶ Wpp. 137-138.

Beg, was brought to camp and put to death; two days later, the Sultān reached Askī-Dih, and despatched Muṣṭafā Beg and Muḥammad Beg to reduce Bāyburd. At the village of Süykan, the envoy of Mirzā Chābuk re-confirmed the allegiance of the Prince of Georgia; the garrison of Bāyazid tendered fealty¹; the Sultān despatched another letter challenging Shāh Ismā'īl to battle (end of Jumāda II, 920²); and received the welcome gift of a number of Qizil-Bāsh heads sent by 'Alī Beg ibn Shāh Suwār Beg Dhu'l-Qadr³. But even more welcome was the news sent by this general, that on receipt of the Sultān's letter at Hamadān⁴, the Shah had mobilized his troops⁵, and now pitched camp near Khūy⁶.

(2) *The Battle of Chāldirān.*

"And they are surely be esteemed the bravest spirits, who, having the clearest sense both of the pains and pleasures of life, do not on that account shrink from danger." (Pericles.)

The two most desperate battles that the Ottomans ever fought in Asia are Angora and Chāldirān: the former, Bāyazid I, "the Thunderbolt", lost against Timūr (July 20, 1402); the later, Salīm I, "the Grim", won against Shāh Ismā'īl (Aug. 23, 1514). "Such extraordinary efforts of power and courage will always command the attention of posterity: but the events, by which the fate of nations is not materially changed, leave a faint impression on the page of history." Angora retarded, though it did not arrest, the progress of the Ottomans; Chāldirān, similarly, apart from the Turkish occupation of Tabriz, lasting eight days, and the loss of personal confidence on the part of Shāh Ismā'īl, who never again led a military expedition, produced only one permanent result, namely, the loss of the Persian province of Diyār Bakr.

Chāldirān is a plain about 80 miles towards the north-west of Tabriz⁷. Of the combatants, Shāh Ismā'īl was the first to arrive⁸, and by indulging in a quail-shoot demonstrated his unruffled temper⁹; then followed Muḥammad Khān Ustājlı and Nūr 'Alī Khalīfa Rūmlū, the governors of Diyār Bakr and Arzinjān respectively¹⁰, increasing the Shāh's army to 40,000¹¹; finally, on Tuesday, Rajab I, 920¹²/Aug. 22, 1514, Sultān Salīm

¹ Mf. 77b.

² Sp. 75. But the equation end of Jumāda II, 920=Aug. 21, 1514 given by E. G. Browne is incorrect for the battle of Chāldirān itself was fought on Aug. 23, 1514.

³ Mf. 81a.

⁴ Ap. 77.

⁵ Np. 357. App. 77-78 incorrectly denies the mobilization of Persian troops and says that the Shāh brought into the field only 12,000 men who happened to be with him. Cp. 245 incorrectly states that envoys were sent by Shāh Ismā'īl to seek aid from Egypt and Hungary.

⁶ Mf. 81a.

⁷ Ap. 38. Up. 270 incorrectly gives "Khui" as the place of the battle.

⁸ Mf. 83b.

⁹ Bf. 247b.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 246b.

¹¹ Mf. 84a.

¹² *Ibid.*, f. 83b.

appeared on the scene with his 100,000 fighting troops inclusive of artillery. There can be no doubt that the Turks were in an overwhelming majority, for these numbers are given by the Turkish eye-witness, Ḥakīmu'd-Dīn Idris Bitlisī; according to Persian sources the disparity was even greater, 12,000 ¹ or 20,000 ² Persians against 120,000 ³ or even 212,000 ⁴ Ottomans.

In the Persian council of war, Nūr 'Alī Khalīfa Rūmlū agreed with the suggestion of Muḥammad Khān Ustājilū, that an immediate attack should be made upon the Ottomans, before they could bring up their field-guns and fastening them with strong chains make the Ottoman front impregnable and unassailable; but Dürmīsh Khān Shāmlū wanted the enemy's arrangements to be completed, so that the Persians may have a chance of displaying their bravery and military ardour in full view on the field of battle, and the intrepid Shāh readily assented to this proposal ⁵.

The disposition of the Ṣafawī army was as follows: Shāh Ismā'īl commanded the reserves ⁶; Nizāmu'd-Dīn 'Abdu'l-Bāqī ⁷ (counsellor ⁸), Sharīfu'd-Dīn 'Alī ⁹ (chancellor ¹⁰), and Muḥammad Kamūna ¹¹ (shrine-keeper of Najaf ¹²) were in the centre ¹³; Dürmīsh Khān Shāmlū ¹⁴ (master of ceremonies ¹⁵) commanded the right wing ¹⁶; Muḥammad Khān Ustājilū ¹⁷ (governor of Diyār Bakr ¹⁸ and brother-in-law of the Shāh ¹⁹) commanded the left wing ²⁰; Nūr 'Alī Khalīfa Rūmlū ²¹ (governor of Arzinjān ²²), Mantashā Sulṭān ²³ (governor of Tabriz ²⁴), Khalīl Sulṭān Dhū'l-Qadr (governor of Fārs ²⁵), Ḥusayn Beg Lala ²⁶ (ex-counsellor ²⁷), Khulfā Beg ²⁸, Pīrā Beg Chāwūshlū ²⁹ and Sulṭān 'Alī Mīrza ³⁰ Afshar ³¹ were appointed on the right and left wings ³², while Sārū Pīra (commander of the horse-guards ³³) and Yūsuf Beg Warsāq ³⁴ (governor of Kamākḥ ³⁵) were in charge of the skirmishing party. The absence of Diw Sulṭān Rūmlū (governor of Balkh ³⁶), Zaynal Khān Shāmlū (governor of Hirāt ³⁷), and Amīr Sulṭān Maṣṣilū (governor of Qāyin ³⁸) obviously indicates the precautionary measures of

¹ Ap. 77.

² Fp. 31. Up. 245 gives "60,000".

³ Bf. 247a.

⁴ Ap. 78.

⁵ Bff. 246b-247a.

⁶ Ap. 78. Fp. 31 and Mf. 88b incorrectly state that he commanded the centre. Up. 245 and Wp. 138 incorrectly state that he himself led one of the wings.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

¹² Bf. 144a.

¹³ Ap. 78.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

¹⁵ Bf. 112b.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 249b. Ap. 78 incorrectly states that he commanded the left wing.

¹⁷ Ap. 78.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

¹⁹ Bf. 130a. (Also see footnote 3, p. 53, supra.)

²⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 249b. Ap. 78 incorrectly states that he commanded the right wing.

Fp. 31 incorrectly states that he was the leader of the skirmishing party.

²¹ *Ibid.*, f. 247a.

²² *Ibid.*, f. 237b.

²³ *Ibid.*, f. 247a.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 235b.

²⁵ App. 80-81.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

²⁹ Bf. 247a.

³⁰ Ap. 78.

³¹ Bf. 247a.

³² *Ibid.*, f. 247a.

³³ *Ibid.*, f. 247a.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 247a.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 257a.

³⁶ Ap. 75.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

the Shāh for defending his north-eastern frontier against the Uzbeks; but the inclusion of the name of Khādīm Beg Khalifa in the Persian casualty list shows that the governor of the Arabian 'Irāq¹ also participated in the battle of Chāldirān.

As anticipated by Muḥammad Khān Ustājilū, the centre of the Turkish van consisted of field-guns, 300 in number², chained together³, and supported by a line of chained camels and mules⁴. Behind the cover of artillery, Sultān Salīm, with his ministers, Aḥmad Pāshā Harsak, Aḥmad Pāshā Dūqa-Kin and Muṣṭafā Pāshā, commanded the body-guard of Janisaries⁵, whose total number inclusive of gunners, as admitted by the Turkish authority, was 20,000⁶ or according to the incorrect Persian version 12,000⁷; Sinān Pāshā (governor-general of Anatolia) and Ḥasan Pāshā (governor-general of Rumelia) led the right and left wings of 40,000 Asiatic and 40,000 European troops respectively; while 'Alī Beg ibn Shāh Suwār Beg Dhu'l-Qadr⁸, Atak Beg alias Ālqūj Ūghli, and curiously the admiral Majāl Ūghli⁹ were to deliver the Ottoman attack. As the total strength of the army was a hundred thousand men, it is obvious that the squadrons of 'Alī Beg, Atak Beg and Majāl Ūghli must have been drawn from the forces of Sinān Pāshā and Ḥasan Pāshā. The names of Farhād Pāshā and Qarāja Pāshā are 'given amongst the list of Ottoman commanders¹⁰, but their position in battle is not indicated.

On the morning of Wednesday, Rajab 2, 920¹¹/Aug. 23, 1514, Sārū Pīra, commander of the Persian horse-guards, opened the battle of Chāldirān with a wild cavalry charge¹²; the Turkish advance-guards suffered enormous casualties¹³, but eventually Majāl Ūghli repulsed the attack¹⁴. Thereupon, Shāh Ismā'il poured his reserves upon the left wing of the Ottomans, and in personal combat slew Atak Beg alias Ālqūj Ūghli, whom he cut through to the waist with his sword¹⁵: altogether fourteen Turkish commanders including Uways Beg (Warden of Alāja Hiṣār¹⁶) and Sulaymān Beg (Warden of Parazdīn) were slain in the first charge of the Shāh¹⁷. In a frantic effort to retrieve the disaster, Ḥasan Pāshā (governor-general of Rumleia) lost his life; the Ottoman left wing tottered, and the Sultān had to rush reinforcements¹⁸. More successful was Sinān Pāshā, commander of the Turkish right wing, who repulsed the Persians and put Khādīm Beg Khalifa, governor of the Arabian 'Irāq, to death¹⁹. The Turkish artillery, which had hitherto been silent, opened fire²⁰. When the smoke cleared, Muḥammad

¹ Mf. 91b.

² *Ibid.*, f. 88b.

³ Ap. 78.

⁴ Mf. 87a.

⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 83b.

⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 75a.

⁷ Ap. 78.

⁸ Mf. 83b.

⁹ Bf. 247a. •

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 247a.

¹¹ Mf. 83a.

¹² Bf. 248a.

¹³ Mf. 84b-85a. It is difficult to credit the Turkish authority that the advance-guards were decimated.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 86b.

¹⁵ Ap. 79.

¹⁶ Mf. 85a. Sp. 76 calls him "governor of Cæsarea".

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 85a.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, f. 86a.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, f. 89b.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 86b.

Khān Ustājilū, Niẓāmu'd-Din 'Abdu'l-Bāqī, Sayyid Sharīfu'd-Dīn 'Alī and Sayyid Muḥammad Kamūna had fallen ¹. The artillery continued its deadly fire, but more venomous was the blood of the Shāh at the sight of his fallen comrades: he led another furious charge, as it were into the jaws of death, and had to sacrifice another batch of comrades, like Sārū Pīra, Ḥusayn Beg Lala, Khulfā Beg, Yūsuf Beg Warsāq and Pīra Beg ². Thereupon, Khalīl Sulṭān Dhu'l-Qadr (governor of Fārs) added disobedience to cowardice, and withdrew, or fled, from the field of battle ³; but the Shāh remained unmoved by defection, and opposing the liquid flame of his blood to the fire of the Turkish guns, made a third charge, right on the Ottoman artillery, cut his way through the chained guns ⁴, and was only stopped from reaching the Ottoman centre by the lines of chained camels and mules. Wounded on his hand and arm, Shāh Ismā'il rolled to the ground on his horse; a Turkish soldier pressed forward to secure the head; but Sulṭān 'Alī Mirzā Afshār, who bore a close resemblance to the Shāh in dress and appearance, cried aloud, "I am the Shāh of Persia", whereupon, the assailant turned aside, just enabling Shāh Ismā'il to effect his escape on a horse, which had been quickly procured by his devoted servants ⁵. Later, the hero Sulṭān 'Alī Mirzā Afshār was taken to Sulṭān Salīm's camp where death and immortality awaited him ⁶.

By now the sun had set ⁷, and with it the sun of Shāh Ismā'il's fortune. With 300 men he fled to Tabriz ⁸ and thence to Darguzīn ⁹ in 'Irāq; his wives were captured ¹⁰ but were released the next day in the general amnesty that the Sulṭān granted to women ¹¹, children, learned men and artisans ¹². Neither the Turkish nor the Persian casualties are known: according to Bijan ¹³, they amounted to 3,000 Ottomans and 2,000 Persians respectively ¹⁴. These numbers, considering the duration of the battle from sunrise to sunset, and the valour, hatred, religious zeal, and the numbers of the combatants—140,000 according to the lowest computation—must obviously be rejected. It would be idle conjecture, therefore, to determine how many Persians were killed, how many fled, and how many were put to death after capture: only two facts are well-established, firstly, that the Sulṭān suspecting an ambush forbade the pursuit of the Ṣafawī army ¹⁵; secondly, that the military prisoners, whether officers or soldiers, were put to the sword ¹⁶.

¹ Bf. 250a.

² *Ibid.*, f. 250b.

³ *Ibid.*, f. 251a.

⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 251a.

⁵ Mff. 87a-87b.

⁶ Bf. 255a.

⁷ Mf. 87b.

⁸ Bff. 252a-253a.

⁹ Ap. 79.

¹⁰ Mf. 90a.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, f. 91a. Sp. 76 gives that the Sulṭān handed over to Ja'far Bey one of Shāh Ismā'il's wives.

¹² *Ibid.*, f. 91a. Vp. 246 incorrectly states that all male prisoners were put to the sword.

¹³ *B.M.M.S., Or. 3248.*

¹⁴ Bf. 253a.

¹⁵ Mf. 88a.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 91a.

“If the sword be ‘alif’ then the blood-drops would be zeros; such were the numbers of the slain¹,” says the *Salīm Nāma*.

Sultān Salīm celebrated the victory, which he had purchased by the lives of Ḥasan Pāshā (governor-general of Rumelia²), Ḥasan Beg (governor of Morea³), Uways Beg (warden of Alāja Ḥiṣār), Sulaymān Beg (warden of Parazdīn⁴), Ayās Beg of Latakia⁵, Atak Beg and other high officials⁶, by erecting a pyramid of his enemies’ skulls on the field of battle⁷; and by sending proclamations of victory to his son, Sulaymān, to the Khān of Crimea, to the Kurdish chieftains, to Sultān Murād, the Āq-Quyūnlū, to Malik Shāh Rustam of Lūristān, and others. The texts of these “Fath-Nāmas” are given in the compendium of Faridūn Bey.

All the relevant facts about Chāldirān have now been given. Equal in religious zeal, personal bravery and martial discipline, Shāh Ismā‘il was inferior to Sultān Salīm in the numbers of his troops (40,000 against 100,000) and in the total absence of artillery. Had the advice of Muḥammad Khān Ustājilū been followed and the battle of Chāldirān fought on the first of Rajab when the Ottoman army, worn by travel and disarranged, had just arrived, the Persians might have secured a victory. But the Persians, anxious to display their bravery, did not desire to steal a victory, and the extra day, with the formidable 300 Turkish guns, proved fatal. Nevertheless, at a time when the Ottomans were a terror to Europe, Shāh Ismā‘il sustained the full weight of the military power of the Ottomans, and within two weeks, upon the retreat of the conquering army, the vanquished Shāh had advanced and re-occupied his capital.

(3) *Occupation and Evacuation of Tabriz by Sultān Salīm.*

From Chāldirān Sultān Salīm marched towards Tabriz⁸ by way of Khūy, whence he despatched Aḥmad Pāshā Dūqa-Kīn, Parī Chalapī and Ḥakimu’d-Dīn Idrīs Bitlisī, with 400 Janissaries, to occupy Tabriz⁹, which submitted without resistance. Sultān Salīm made his triumphal entry into Tabriz (on Rajab 15, 920¹⁰/Sept. 5, 1514), but, contrary to expectation, he did not pollute his triumph by a general pillage of the city or the massacre of its inhabitants¹¹; and the Khuṭba read in the Sultān’s name showed that the Ottoman flag had displaced the Ṣafawī¹². The fugitive Badi’u’z-Zamān Mirzā was granted an interview¹³.

¹ Mf. 91b.

² See p. 80, supra.

³ Sp. 76.

⁴ See p. 80, supra.

⁵ Sp. 76.

⁶ See p. 80, supra.

⁷ Sp. 76.

⁸ Ap. 79.

⁹ Mf. 93b.

¹⁰ For he started on his return march on Rajab 23, 920/Sept. 13, 1514, eight days after his entry into Tabriz (Mff. 94b-95a).

¹¹ Bf. 253a. P, Vol. II, p. 153 and Up. 246 incorrectly state that the Sultān sacked the city.

¹² Mf. 94a.

¹³ Bf. 253b. K, Vol. II, p. 41, footnote 6 incorrectly states that Badi’u’z-Zamān Mirzā was taken prisoner by Sultān Salīm when the latter captured Tabriz in 920/1514.

The war council and cabinet rejected the proposal of the Sultān to spend the winter of 920/1514-15 at Tabriz; accordingly, eight days after his entry into the Şafawī capital, the Sultān started on his return march, on Rajab 23, 920¹/Sept. 13, 1514, and took with him Badi' u'z-Zamān Mirzā², and a few families of leading men, skilled artisans and experienced craftsmen³.

A fortnight after its evacuation, Tabriz was re-occupied by the Shāh, who appointed Shāh Ḥusayn Işfahānī and Jamālud-Dīn Muḥammad⁴ Astarābādī⁵ his counsellor and chancellor respectively. Qarā Beg, brother of Muḥammad Khān Ustājilū, was appointed governor of Diyār Bakr, with the title of "Khān", and received in marriage his brother's widow, the sister of the Shāh. Nūr 'Alī Khalifa Rūmlū and Ācha Sultān Qājār were despatched to their respective governments⁶. Gūr Sulaymān was sent to Shirāz, and, by Shāh's orders, put Khalīl Sultān Dhu'l-Qadr, governor of Fārs, and a fugitive from Chāldirān, to death. 'Alī Beg Dhu'l-Qadr was appointed the new governor of Fārs with the title of "Khān"⁷.

To return to Sultān Salim. He passed through Nakhjuwān and Ayrīwān, and reached Amāsiya on Shawwāl 5, 920⁸/Nov. 23, 1514, but thousands of his horses and transport camels fell victims to the severity of cold and the scarcity of fodder⁹. Nūru'd-Dīn¹⁰ 'Abdu'l-Wahhāb brought an apologetic letter with suitable presents from Shāh Ismā'il, to which Sultān Salim replied by imprisoning the envoy and his companions, Qāḍī 'Isā and Shukru'llāh Mughānī, in the fort of Yaki-Hişār¹¹. Another letter from the Shāh, brought by Kamālu'd-Dīn Beg and Bayrām Āghā, with messages of friendship, also remained unanswered¹².

After spending the winter of 920/1514-15 at Amāsiya, the Sultān marched on Kamākh, where he arrived on Rabī' II, 5, 921¹³/May 20, 1515. Muḥammad Beg, the Persian governor, refused submission¹⁴, the fort was taken by storm, and the garrison put to the sword. Aḥmad Pāshā Qarāychīn Ūghlī was appointed the Turkish governor¹⁵; and the Sultān marched towards Mar'ash, to punish 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr¹⁶, whose men had

¹ Mff. 94b-95a. All Persian authorities ridiculously state that Sultān Salim left Tabriz for fear of the expected attack of Shāh Ismā'il on Tabriz with a newly mobilized army from 'Irāq. Actually, Shāh Ismā'il did not move from Darguzīn until he received the news of the Sultān's departure from Tabriz.

² Jp. 368. He died of plague four months after his arrival at Constantinople (Jp. 368). K, Vol. II, p. 41, footnote 6, incorrectly states that he died in 923/1517.

³ Mf. 95b.

⁴ App. 79-80.

⁵ Bf. 255a. Bf. 254b incorrectly states that Jāyān Sultān Ustājilū was appointed prime-minister. Actually, he had been appointed to this post in the winter of 916/1509-10 (see p. 57, supra).

⁶ Bp. 255a.

⁷ Ap. 81.

⁸ Mf. 95a.

⁹ *Ibid.*, f. 97a.

¹⁰ Np. 365.

¹¹ Mff. 98b-99a.

¹² Npp. 364-366.

¹³ Mff. 102a-102b.

¹⁴ Bf. 257a-257b.

¹⁵ Mf. 104a.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 110b.

butchered the guards and taken the provisions collected by the Sultān for another expedition to Persia ¹.

Sinān Pāshā (governor-general of Anatolia) preceded the Sultān with 10,000 ² horse, and slew 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr in a fierce battle. His head was sent to the Sultān as a trophy along with the prisoners of war who included the relatives of 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr and his brother 'Abdu'r-Razzāq Beg. The Janissaries received each a 1,000 Āqcha 'Uthmāni as their share of the vast booty that was taken; and Sultān Qānsū Ghūrī of Egypt was presented with the stuffed head of 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr ³. After appointing 'Ali Beg ibn Shāh Suwār Beg Dhu'l-Qadr governor of Mar'ash, the Sultān proceeded to Constantinople ⁴. Meanwhile, Muṣṭafā Pāshā, governor of Trebizond, had attacked Arzinjān with 10,000 men. Nūr 'Ali Khalifa Rūmlū, the Persian governor of the town, lost his life in a bloody battle, and Arzinjān was added to Ottoman territory ⁵.

(4) Capture of Diyār Bakr by the Ottomans.

As mentioned above, Qarā Khān was appointed the Persian governor of Diyār Bakr ⁶, but the Kurdish chiefs were in open revolt, and through the effort of Ḥakimu'd-Dīn Idris Bitlisī, had transferred their allegiance to Sultān Salīm, who had sent them a "Fath-Nāma" from Chāldīrān.

In the winter of 920/1514-15 Qarā Khān advanced on the fort of Qarā Ḥamīd with 5,000 men. The inhabitants refused submission and sought help from Sultān Salīm, who despatched a strong detachment under Yakad Aḥmad, whereupon, Qarā Khān retired, and Yakad Aḥmad occupied the fort. Shāh Ismā'il's reinforcements brought by Kurd Beg were defeated by the Kurdish chiefs ⁷; but apprehensive of another Ṣafawī attack, the Kurdish chiefs re-solicited the help of the Sultān. Accordingly, Muṣṭafā Pāshā, governor of Trebizond, was despatched with 10,000 men; Shādī Pāshā, governor of Amāsiya and Siwās, brought a further reinforcement of 5,000 men. The Qizil-Bāshes now retired, and Mārdīn was occupied by the Ottomans. But the Turkish generals Shādī Pāshā and Muṣṭafā Pāshā fell out; the former retired to the seat of his government, and the latter to the fort of Qarā Ḥamīd; while Mārdīn was reoccupied by the Qizil-Bāshes ⁸.

¹ Bff. 261a-261b.

² Mf. 110b. Bf. 261b exaggerates the number to "40,000".

³ *Ibid.*, ff. 110b-111b. 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr was the ruler of Mar'ash, Albistān and their dependencies, consisting of 80,000 houses. Four persons of this family, namely: (1) Mahk Arslān, (2) Sulaymān, (3) Nāṣīru'd-Dīn, and (4) 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr have ruled. The last of these had acquired great power by deceitfully extracting wealth from the Ottoman Sultān Bāyazid II and from Sultān (Qānsū Ghūrī) of Egypt. (Bff. 139a-139b). Sp. 77 incorrectly states that 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr was killed at Kamākh near Arzinjān. Actually, he was defeated and killed near Mar'ash, the seat of his government.

⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 111b.

⁵ Bff. 259a-260b.

⁶ See p. 83, supra.

⁷ Mff. 112a-114b.

⁸ *Ibid.*, ff. 117b-120a.

These recent developments were reported to the Sultān by Ḥakimu'd-Dīn Idrīs Bitlīsī, whereupon, Khusraw Pāshā, governor of Qarāmān, Aḥmad Pāshā Qarāyehīn Ūghlī, governor of Kamākh, Sinān Āghā and Bālī Āghā, with 20,000 horse and 1,000 (sic) guns, took the field for the reduction of Diyār Bakr. Meanwhile Qarā Khān had also been reinforced at Mārdīn, in particular with 600 royal horse-guards; but even so he was unable to retain Mārdīn, and moved to Karkh¹. Here he routed 2,000² horse despatched by Muṣṭafā Pāshā, the Ottoman commander, and slew every one of them in pursuit.

To avenge the loss, Muṣṭafā Pāshā left the fort of Qarā Ḥamid and took field in person; the Qizil-Bāshes retreated, but were overtaken near Qawj Ḥiṣār. A severe battle ensued in which Qarā Khān lost his life along with most of his soldiers, and the survivors fled towards Mawṣil³. This decisive victory was followed by an immediate reduction of a number of forts held by the Qizil-Bāshes⁴, and eventually, the whole of the province of Diyār Bakr was annexed by the Ottomans⁵.

¹ Mf. 120a-122b.

² *Ibid.*, f. 122b. Bf. 265a gives "5,000".

³ *Ibid.*, ff. 122b-124b.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ff. 124b-126a.

⁵ Bf. 267b.

CHAPTER VII

SHĀH ISMĀ'IL'S LIFE FROM CHĀLDIRĀN TILL HIS DEATH

From the time of the battle of Chāldirān till his death, which occurred on Monday, Rajab 19, 930 ¹/May 23, 1524, Shāh Ismā'il remained inactive. The rebellions arose in various provinces, were suppressed, not by him, but by his generals. The Ottomans captured the whole of Diyār Bakr, Bābur the towns of Balkh and Qandahār, and 'Ubaydu'llāh Khān Uzbek invaded Khurāsān, but the Shāh never led his forces in person: he had transferred his activity to the hunting-field or else shown in his wine-parties the passivity of an ease-loving monarch.

(1) *Minor Events.*

During 920/1514, Shāh Ismā'il spent the winter at Tabriz, the spring at Ardabīl, and the summer at Sihand ², where he received the head of Sultān Murād, the Āq-Quyūnlū. Now Sultān Murād, who had been living with 'Alā'u'd-Dāwla Dhu'l-Qadr, had joined Sultān Salim in his campaign against Shāh Ismā'il, but had returned before the battle of Chāldirān to Diyār Bakr. In the spring of 921/1515, he collected 8,000 men, and was raiding the neighbouring territories, where Ācha Sultān Qājār defeated him with 800 men, and sent his head as trophy to the Shāh who awarded the victor with the title of "Qudūrmush Sultān ³".

In the winter of 921/1515-16, a son, Alqāsp Mirzā, was born to the Shāh at Tabriz. Amīr Sultān Mawṣilū and Diw Sultān Rūmlū, governors of Qāyin and Balkh respectively, came to the Shāh with tidings of a severe famine in Khurāsān, and the inability of Zaynal Khān Shāmlū to cope with the situation ⁴. About this time, Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā, governor of Dāmghān, rose in rebellion, captured Astarābād, but on the approach of Būrūm Sultān Takkalū and Khwāja Muzaffar Bitikchī, fled towards Gharjistān ⁵.

Thereupon, the Shāh appointed Ṭahmāsp Mirzā governor of Khurāsān, with Amīr Sultān Mawṣilū ⁶ and Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Muḥammad as his tutor and minister respectively. Ṭahmāsp Mirzā left for Khurāsān in the early spring of 922/1516 and reached Hirāt in Rabi' I, 922/April, 1516, where Amīr Khān Mawṣilū took over the affairs of the government.

¹ See p. 94, *infra*.

² App. 79-80.

³ Bff. 256b-257a.

⁴ App. 80-82.

⁵ Jpp. 368-369.

⁶ Ap. 82. He was also created a "Khān" (Bf. 260b).

The Shāh continued to stay during the summer of 922/1516 and the ensuing winter ¹ at Tabriz ². During this winter, Malik Qurqura, a Georgian chief, was displaced by another Georgian chief, Minūchihir, but later, recovered his principality through the help of Diw Sulṭān Rūmlū, Charkas Ḥasan Takkalū ³, Nāznīn Beg Qājār, Qāzān Beg Rūmlū ⁴ and Ḥasan Beg, officers of the Shāh. Minūchir fled, the fort of Tūtak was taken after a fortnight's struggle; and the Qizil-Bāsh troops returned to camp with pretty slaves and other treasures for the Shāh ⁵.

Having spent the summer of 923/1517 in the summer-quarters of Sūrlūq, the Shāh moved towards Nakhjuwān. During this journey, three sons were born to him in the course of a week ⁶: the first, on Tuesday ⁷, Sha'bān 21, 923/Sept. 8, 1517, who was named Sām Mirzā and placed under the charge of Dūrmish Khān Shāmlū; the second, on Friday ⁸, Sha'bān 24 ⁹/Sept. 11, who was named Rustam Mirzā; and the third ¹⁰, on Tuesday ¹¹, Sha'bān 28 /Sept. 15, was named Bahrām Mirzā ¹².

At Nakhjuwān, the envoys of Shaykh Shāh of Shirwān renewed the allegiance of their master, whereupon, Shāh Ḥusayn Isfahānī and Jamālu'd-Dīn Muḥammad were sent to Shaykh Shāh to assure him of the Shāh's friendship ¹³.

Minūchihir, who had fled to Asia Minor, returned with Qizil Aḥmad Ūghlī to recover his territories. Thereupon, once again Diw Sulṭān Rūmlū was despatched to Georgia: Qizil Aḥmad Ūghlī was defeated and slain; Minūchihir fled, and Diw Sulṭān Rūmlū successfully returned ¹⁴ to Nakhjuwān ¹⁵.

Having spent the summer of 924/1518 at Sūrlūq and towards Mount Bisūtūn, the Shāh arrived at 'Qum on Ramaḍān 1, 924 ¹⁶/Sept. 6, 1518.

(2) *Shāh Ismā'il's Correspondance with Karl V, Emperor of Germany.*

Just as the Ottomans were trying to win over the Uzbeks to crush the power of Shāh Ismā'il, so were European nations trying to crush the

¹ App. 82-83.

² *Ibid.*, p. 83. Bf. 263b incorrectly gives "Nakhjuwān".

³ Bff. 271a-271b.

⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 271b. Dp. 162 gives "Nārīn Beg Qājār and Qāzāq Beg Rūmlū".

⁵ *Ibid.*, ff. 271b-272a. It, however, incorrectly states that these affairs took place during the winter of 923-24/1517-18.

⁶ Ap. 83.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 83. Bf. 263b incorrectly gives "Saturday".

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

⁹ Bf. 264a. Ap. 84 incorrectly gives "26".

¹⁰ Ap. 84.

¹¹ Bf. 264a.

¹² Ap. 84.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 84-85. B incorrectly gives this account under the year "922".

¹⁴ Bf. 277b.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 277b. Dp. 167 incorrectly gives "Chakūr-Sa'd".

¹⁶ Ap. 85.

power of the Ottomans by intriguing with Shāh Ismā'il; consequently, Lodwick II, son of Waladislaw II, king of Hungary (922-33/1516-26), despatched an envoy, named Frère Petrus, with a letter to Shāh Ismā'il. The king of Switzerland (Pādishāh-i-Sūzītāni) also sent an envoy to him; and though the replies of Shāh Ismā'il to these monarchs have not been preserved, the Persian translation of a letter in Latin from Shāh Ismā'il to Karl V, Emperor of Germany (925-65/1519-57) has been quoted in the *Kāwa* ¹. The letter is dated Shawwāl, 924/Oct., 1518, and was sent by the hands of the above-mentioned envoy (i.e. Frère Petrus).

“We have seen with pleasure a letter brought by Frère Petrus from the king of Hungary, and we send this letter by the hands of the same envoy. We propose that you and ourselves should advance simultaneously on our common enemy—you from that side (of Europe) and we from this side (of Asia). The best time for such a concerted attack would be next April (i.e. of 1519/Rabi' II, 925), and by the help of God we shall succeed in this mission. We have also received a letter from the king of Switzerland (Pādishāh-i-Sūzītāni) by way of Tabarner (sic), and gave the envoy our reply, but have not yet received an answer. Many Ottoman subjects tell us that Christian rulers are fighting with one another: we are astonished to hear this, because this dissension increases the enemy's power. We have written to the king of Hungary to be cautious about the above-mentioned enemy; because he has 'mobilized an army to attack him. In this enterprise, he (i.e. the Ottoman Sultān) has been continually persuading us, with letters and envoys, to help him; but we have always rejected his proposals ², because we want to be with you in your good fortune and bad fortune, even as you have suggested to us; and whosoever deserts or betrays his companion, will be punished by the Omnipotent. Therefore, after settling the affairs (of your State), you should busy yourself in mobilizing an army. God willing there should be no need to write another letter to incite or excite you; the (vast intervening) distance makes it very difficult to send a letter to you, especially as the Ottoman Sultān has captured the seas. We have none else except this man (i.e. Frère Petrus) who could be sent as our envoy to you.” ³

After six years (i.e. in 930/1524), this letter reached Karl V, who wrote, from Toledo, an answer in Latin, on Aug. 25, 1525/Dhu'l-Q. 6, 931, and despatched it by the hands of the same envoy:

“Dignified King and beloved brother,

Last year (i.e. 1524/930) a person named (Frère) Petrus brought a letter from Your Majesty, inviting us to be ready in April ⁴, for a

¹ *New Series, Vol. II, No. 7 (Berlin, 1921), pp. 7-8.*

² This statement is incorrect. None of the Persian authorities supports it.

³ *Kāwa, New Series, Vol. II, No. 7 (Berlin, 1921), p. 8.*

⁴ It refers to April, 1519. (See above.)

combined war against our common enemy, the Sultān of the Ottoman Turks. Unfortunately we did not receive your letter in time, so that we could have acted on it. Curiously also, the said letter did not bear (your) seal and signature, as is customary with royal correspondence; wherefore, for a long time, we doubted the credentials of the envoy and the genuineness of the letter, but eventually, for the sake of the friendship that subsists between us, we set our doubts at rest. Our delay in reply has been occasioned by our desire for further news, to acquaint us with our duty in enterprizing of such great moment and consequence. But during our suspense, the only news that arrived was that Your Majesty had received a physical injury and had expired; but we hope that that rumour is unfounded.

“There are many points to be considered. Firstly, to collect and lead an army of such dimensions is not easy; secondly, we have been suffering from a serious ailment for the last few months; finally, we were waging war with (Francis I), King of France, whom, after many defeats wherein he lost the bulk of his army, we have now secured as a prisoner of war. For the prosecution of our desire to secure peace in Christendom, there is nothing left for us, after this victory, but to advance on the Turks. Hence the same envoy is returning from us to Your Majesty to acquaint us with your intentions regarding the proposed war. You should convey us your idea through your own trusted envoy, and it is better if the idea is translated into action as soon as possible, for we are perfectly ready to wage war in coalition with Your Majesty”.¹

If ever this letter reached Persia, it must have been in the reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsp, who succeeded to the throne on Monday, Rajab 19, 930/May 23, 1524. The news of Shāh Ismā‘il’s death, however, and of the accession of Shāh Ṭahmāsp had not reached the Emperor of Germany up to Jumāda II, 6, 935/Feb. 15, 1529, for on this date another letter from Karl V was despatched to Shāh Ismā‘il from Toledo by the hands of an army commander John Balbi to negotiate a treaty with Persia. The fate of this second letter is also uncertain².

(3) *Minor Events.*

‘Abdu’l-Karīm and Āqā Muḥammad, rulers of Māzandarān, withheld the payment of tribute till after a four days’ siege Dūrmīsh Khān Shāmlū took the fort and slaughtered the garrison of Kalīs on Dhu’l-Ḥ. 11, 924/Dec. 14, 1518. Meanwhile, the Shāh had proceeded from Qum to Isfahān to spend the summer of 925/1519.

¹ *Kāwa, New Series, Vol. II, No. 7 (Berlin, 1921), pp. 8-9.*

² *Ibid.*, pp. 9-11.

At Isfahān, the Shāh killed 15,000 animals, in a hunting expedition: the winter was spent¹ at Qum², and the spring at Ulang-i-Rādikān. The revolt of Amira Dubbāj, who had succeeded his father, Ḥusāmu'd-Dīn, in the governorship of Rasht and Fūman, was suppressed by Dürmish Khān Shāmlū without resorting to arms³; but about this time Balkh was permanently lost and Gharjistān annexed to Persian territory.

In Rabi' I, 922/April, 1516, Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā and Urdū Shāh, ruler of Gharjistān, laid siege to Balkh, and with the help of the traitor Muḥammad Ḥaydar 'Alī occupied the town on Rabi' II, 3, 922/May 6, 1516. After two months and a half, the confederates fell out, Urdū Shāh decreed that his brother Qiwām Beg should become the governor of Balkh; Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā suborned the followers of Urdū Shāh, and besieged Balkh. After a month's siege Urdū Shāh was lured out of the town and assassinated. Thereupon, Qiwām Beg applied to Bābur at Kābul for help: Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā raised the siege of Balkh and fled; and Balkh passed from the possession of Qiwām Beg to Ibrāhīm Jālūq, the governor of Bābur⁴.

Amir Khān Mawṣilū, regent at Hirāt on behalf of Prince Tahmāsp, tried to benefit from the afflictions of Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā in Gharjistān (end of 923/beginning of 1518). Weakened by these new foes⁵, Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā could not resist the attack of Ibrāhīm Jālūq, into whose hands he had the misfortune to fall. Conveyed a prisoner from Balkh to Kābul, Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā returned to Balkh as the governor, for he had repaired his fortune by marrying at Kābul the daughter of Bābur⁶.

There remained the principality of Gharjistān vacated by Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā. Shāh Muḥammad Sayfu'l-Mulūk, the usurper, struck for independence (925/1519), but fled before the Persian general Ibrāhīm Sulṭān, and was lost to view on his way to Jijaktū. Thereupon, Muḥammad Beg was appointed the Persian governor of Gharjistān⁷.

To return to the royal camp at Sulṭāniyya. In the beginning of Shawwāl (926/Oct., 1520), the Shāh received the news of the Ottoman's advance on Baghdād from Shāh 'Alī Beg alias 'Awaḍ Sulṭān, governor of the Arabian 'Irāq, whereupon, Dürmish Khān Shāmlū, Zaynal Khān Shāmlū and Jūha Sulṭān were sent to Baghdād, while the Shāh himself marched towards Mount Bisutūn⁸. The Baghdād expedition, however, ended abruptly, for Sulṭān Salim⁹ died on Saturday, Shawwāl 9, 926¹⁰/Sept. 22, 1520. The Shāh now moved to Qum and thence to Isfahān, to spend the winter of 926-27¹¹/1520-21.

¹ App. 85-87.

² *Ibid.*, p. 87. Cf. 209b incorrectly gives "Tabriz".

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 87-88.

⁴ Jpp. 268-273.

⁵ Bf. 276b.

⁶ Jp. 273.

⁷ Bff. 280b-282b.

⁸ Ap. 88.

⁹ Bf. 284b.

¹⁰ Ap. 91.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

In the ensuing spring, the Shāh returned to Sāwa, where the Baghdād-expeditionary force rejoined him. Ordering the troops to spend the summer at Früz-Kūh, the Shāh moved to Hamadān, where he celebrated the marriage of his daughter ¹, Khānish Khānum ², with Amīra Dubbāj. The title of "Muzaffar Sultān" was conferred on the bridegroom, and the Shāh moved on to Nabāb-i-Marāghā, to celebrate the marriage of another daughter with Sultān Khalīl ibn Shaykh Shāh of Shirwān ³. The Shāh went to Tabrīz, and a month later, left for Nakhjuwān, to spend the winter of 927-28/1521-22 ⁴. The revolt of the Georgian chief, Lawand Khān ⁵, was quickly suppressed by Dīw Sultān Rūmlū; and a new division was made of Māzandarān: two-thirds of the province to be administered by 'Abdu'l-Karīm and one-third by Āqā Muḥammad for an annual tribute of 4,000 tūmāns and 3,000 tūmāns respectively. This altercation was resented by Āqā Muḥammad, who fought with 'Abdu'l-Karīm, lost the engagement, fled, and was brought a prisoner to camp by Jūha Sultān. 'Abdu'l-Karīm was now given the whole province for the total tribute of 7,000 tūmāns per annum ⁶. The Shāh spent the summer of 928/1522 at Sihand ⁷ and Awjān ⁸.

(4) *Disorders in Khurāsān.*

Favouritism dictated to Amīr Khān Mawṣilū, regent of Khurāsān, the displacement of the minister Majdu'd-Dīn Muḥammad by Amīr Samarqandī, and fraternity influenced the appointment of Ibrāhīm Sultān as counsellor. The new minister imposed heavy taxes ⁹, and the news of the consequential unrest reached Turkey. An Ottoman spy, who was caught in the Shāh's camp (at Nakhjuwān) towards the end of 923 ¹⁰/1517, disclosed that he had been instructed to report on "the rebellion of Amīr Khān"; whereupon, the Shāh, thoroughly alarmed, promptly sent for Amīr Khān from Khurāsān. The summons reached Hirāt in Dhu'l-Ḥ., 923/Dec., 1517, and as the Uzbeks were threatening Khurāsān, Amīr Khān despatched Khwāja Muḥaffar Bitikchī and Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Muḥammad to explain to the Shāh the cogent military reasons which were preventing the regent from complying with the royal mandate. Curiously, it took the messengers three months to proceed from Hirāt to Nakhjuwān. They arrived in Rabī' I, 924/Mar., 1518; Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Muḥammad was granted the revenues

¹ Ap. 90.

² Cf. 210a. 'Abdu'l-Fattāh Fūmani's *Tārīkh-i-Gīlān* (St. Petersburg, 1858), pp. 6-8 incorrectly gives "Khayru'n-Nisā Begum". It also incorrectly gives the date of marriage as "Sha'hān, 923".

³ App. 93-94.

⁴ Bf. 288b. Ap. 94 incorrectly states that the Shāh spent this winter at "Tabrīz".

⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 288b.

⁶ App. 92-93.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

⁸ Bf. 297b.

⁹ Ap. 94.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 94. Bf. 291a incorrectly gives "926".

of Hirāt-Rūd, and Khwāja Muẓaffar Bitikchī was awarded the title of "Sultān".

Amīr Khān chafed at the royal liberality or caprice, and on the arrival of Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Muḥammad at Hirāt, towards the end of Ramaḍān, 924/Sept., 1518, treated him coldly. A few days earlier, on Ramaḍān 3, 924/Sept. 8, 1518, Amīr Khān had put Amīr Samarqandī to death and had appointed 'Alī Jān Karāh-Rūdi in his place. Ibrāhīm Sultān disagreed with the harsh policy of his brother, left for the royal camp, and was retained there as the Shāh's Seal-Keeper. Finally, the Shāh sent Abū Sa'īd Isfahānī to tell the regent to change his attitude towards Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Muḥammad¹.

Meanwhile, Bābur had besieged Qandahār, and the appeals of Amīr Khān to raise the siege had been disregarded².

In the spring of 927/1521, 'Ubaydu'llāh Khān crossed the river Oxus, with 30,000 men, for the invasion of Khurāsān. The news reached Hirāt on Jumāda II, 16, 927³/May 25, 1521. Amīr Khān⁴ strengthened the fortifications, and appointed Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Muḥammad on the Malik Gate, Piri Sultān and Šūfiyān Khalifa Rūmlū on the 'Irāq Gate, Marjūmak Sultān on the Khwush Gate, and Nakhwud Beg on the Firūzābād Gate. The fort of Ikhtiyāru'd-Dīn was put in charge of Ishāq Beg and Maqṣūd Beg, the wall from the fort of Ikhtiyāru'd-Dīn to the tower of Sultān Aḥmad Mirzā was entrusted to Pir Aḥmad Beg, Hidāyat Beg and Qāsim Beg, and these elaborate arrangements were completed by Amīr Khān taking his own position in the city-garden with 500 reserves.

'Ubaydu'llāh Khān reached Hirāt on Jumāda II, 19, 927/May 28, 1521, and partly invested the city. At Bāgh-i-Zāghān the Uzbeks were repulsed by Shātīr 'Abdu'llāh, and similarly at the Malik Gate by Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Muḥammad. The 'Irāq Gate likewise remained unpierced, and the Uzbeks, losing heart, left for Transoxiana on Rajab 4, 927⁵/June 11, 1521.

On Rajab 6, 927⁶/June 13, 1521, Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Muḥammad was imprisoned in the fort of Ikhtiyāru'd-Dīn, and the next day⁷ he was strangled to death by Qāsim Beg. In his message to the Shāh the personal animosity of the regent was concealed by imputing to the late minister the design of surrendering Hirāt to Bābur⁸. The Shāh, however, issued peremptory orders for the recall of Ṭahmāsp Mirzā and the dismissal of the regent: the new governor was Sām Mirzā and the new regent Dürmish Khān Shāmlū. Dürmish Khān reached Hirāt on Dhu'l-Ḥ. 6, 927/Nov. 7.

¹ App. 94-96. *

² *Ibid.*, pp. 96-97.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 97. Yp. 278 incorrectly states that at this time Khurāsān was governed by Sām Mirzā and Dürmish Khān.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 97-99.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 99.

⁷ I.e. "Rajab 7". Dp. 174 incorrectly gives "Rajab 8".

⁸ App. 99-100.

1521, and proceeded straight to Sabzawār whence he returned to Hirāt with Ṭahmāsp Mirzā and Amīr Khān. The order for the new appointments was served at Hirāt a few days later by Khīḍar Beg; and on Ṣafar 3, 928/Jan. 2, 1522, the ex-governor and ex-regent left for the royal camp. Karīmu'd-Dīn Ḥabību'llāh arrived at Hirāt as the new Seal-Keeper ¹.

Meanwhile, Bābur, at the request of Dürmish Khān, had raised the siege of Qandahār and had returned to Kābul. Accordingly, Dürmish Khān sent an envoy, Tāju'd-Dīn Ḥasan Chalapī, to thank Bābur for acceding to his request; but shortly after, on Jumāda II, 27, 928/May 24, 1522, there arrived at Hirāt envoys from Bābur bringing for Dürmish Khān the extraordinary information of the fall of Qandahār. For, Shujā' Beg, finding that the siege of Qandahār was raised, had left for the river Sind (or Indus) appointing 'Abdu'l-Bāqī the officiating governor. This traitor, however, threw open the gates of Qandahār to Bābur ².

In his capacity of regent, Dürmish Khān appointed Zaynal Khān Shāmlū governor of Jurjān; Zaynu'd-Dīn Sultān of Isfarāyin and Nishāpūr; Būrūn Sultān Takkalū of Mashhad and Ṭūs; Ṣūfiyān Khalīfa Rūmlū of Turbat; Aḥmad Sultān Afshār of Hirāt-Rūd, Langar-i-Gihyāthiyya, Farāh and Sabzawār (now in Afghānistān); and retained Chakūrka Sultān in the governorship of Sabzawār (in Persia). Sām Mirzā reached Hirāt on Ramaḍān 17, 928 ³/Aug. 10, 1522.

Amīr Khān fell seriously ill on the way, and reached the royal camp ⁴ in the summer-quarters of Awjān in the end of Jumāda II, 928 ⁵/May, 1522. For the murder of Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn Muḥammad, the following persons: Fīr Aḥmad Beg, Hidāyat Beg, 'Alī Jān Karāh-Rūdi, Qāsim Beg, Nizāmu'd-Dīn Ṭabasi and 'Idāyatu'llāh were imprisoned, and their property was confiscated. Amīr Khān escaped prosecution because of his serious illness. But he died shortly after on the night of Sunday, Sha'bān 12, 928 ⁶/July 7, 1522.

(5) *Minor Events and Death of Shāh Ismā'īl.*

In the beginning of the winter 929/1522-23, the Shāh moved to Tabrīz ⁷ and granted lands in Khurāsān and Fārs to the Ottoman refugees, Walad Beg ibn 'Alī Beg ibn Shāh Suwār Beg Dhu'l-Qadr, and a group of the Ghazālī Arabs ⁸. Jalālu'd-Dīn Muḥammad Tabrīzī was appointed counsellor in place of Shāh Ḥusayn Isfahānī, who was murdered by Mihtar Shāh Qulī, Keeper of the Royal Saddle-Room ⁹, on Jumāda I, 28, 929 ¹⁰/April 14,

¹ App. 100-103.

² *Ibid.*, p. 103.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 103-105.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 105.

⁵ Bf. 297b.

⁶ Ap. 105.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 105.

⁸ Bf. 298b-300a. Dp. 172 incorrectly mentions this event under the year "927".

⁹ Ap. 106-108.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 106. Dp. 178 incorrectly gives "Jumāda II, 8, 929" (Apr. 24, 1523). This does not correspond with the days of the Naw-Rūz celebrations during which the counsellor was murdered.

1523. The assassin, who owed 7,000 tūmāns to the royal treasury, was torn to pieces by the victim's servants, to whom he was handed over by the Shāh. Curiously, the date of the counsellor's assassination is given by the chronogram of his full name "میرزا شاه حسین اصفهانی" ¹.

Jāyān Sultān Ustājilū, the premier, died and was succeeded by his son Bāyazīd Beg Ustājilū ².

The Shāh sent Jamālu'd-Dīn Muḥammad and Damūri Beg to Shaykh Shāh of Shirwān who had promised to give one of his daughters in marriage to the Shāh. The marriage was celebrated by proxy in Shirwān, and the bride arrived with a rich dowry on Dhu'l-Ḥ. 25, 929 ³/Nov. 4, 1523.

The winter of 930/1523-24, the Shāh spent at Nakhjuwān, and in the ensuing spring, he marched towards Shirwān, but on receiving, at the river Kur, the news of Shaykh Shāh's death, he appointed Sultān Khalīl ibn Shaykh Shāh governor of Shirwān, and moved on to Shakī. He spent a few days hunting in Mount Shāh-Dāghī and returned to Tabriz by way of Ardabil ⁴.

Lawand Khān, the Georgian chief, invaded Shakī ⁵, and put Ḥasan Beg ⁶, the governor, to death, whereupon, the local inhabitants elected Darwish Muḥammad Beg ibn Ḥasan Beg as their governor.

Bāyazīd Beg Ustājilū, the premier, died and was succeeded by Diw Sultān Rūmlū ⁷.

Shāh Ismā'il was unwell at Shakī, but recovered at Ardabil. Later, on his way to Tabriz, he was attacked by high fever at Šā'in-Kadūki, and died at Tabriz ⁸, on the morning of Monday ⁹, Rajab 19, 930/May 23, 1524. Jamālu'd-Dīn Muḥammad washed the Shāh's body for burial, and he was interred at Ardabil by the side of his ancestors. At the time of his death, Shāh Ismā'il was only thirty eight years of age, but had reigned twenty four years ¹⁰. The words "طاب مضجعه" ¹¹ (may his grave be fragrant) yield 930 A.H. and constitute the chronogram of his death.

Shāh Ismā'il left four sons, namely: (1) Ṭahmāsp Mirzā, who succeeded him, (2) Alqāsp Mirzā, (3) Sām Mirzā and (4) Bahrām Mirzā; and five daughters, namely: (1) Khānish Khānum, (2) Parī Khān Khānum, (3) Mahīn Bānū Sultānum, (4) Farangīs Khānum ¹² and (5) Zaynab Khānum ¹³.

¹ App. 106-108.

² Bf. 302a.

³ App. 108-110.

⁴ Bff. 302b-303b.

⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 303b.

⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 303b. Dpp. 180-181 gives "Ḥusayn Beg".

⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 303b.

⁸ *Ibid.*, ff. 303b-304a. Tp. 328, Up. 271 and Vp. 246 incorrectly state that he died at "Ardabil".

⁹ *Ibid.*, f. 304a and Cf. 211b. Dp. 181, Ef. 53b and If. 97a incorrectly give "the night preceding Monday".

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 304b.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, f. 305a.

¹² Dp. 183.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 183. Ef. 54b gives "Shāhzāda Sultānum".

“He not only eliminated all his numerous rivals in Persia, but greatly enlarged her frontiers ¹ and almost restored the ancient frontiers of Sāsānian times”². He ruled over Adharbāyjān, Persian ‘Irāq, Khūzistān, Fārs, Kirmān and Khurāsān, to which were occasionally added the province of Diyār Bakr, and the towns of Marw, Balkh ³ and Qandahār.

¹ Sp. 81.

² *Ibid.*, p. 60.

³ Dp. 182.

PART THREE

CHAPTER VIII

CHARACTER OF SHĀH ISMĀ'IL

The character of Shāh Ismā'il given by Persian historians is as follows:—

“During his reign he treated his subjects with justice and kindness, and due to his fear none could open the gates of tyranny on the faces of people ¹. He had inherited bravery from 'Ali, the refuge of the Friendship of God ². 'In the battle-field he was a lion wielding a dagger, and in the banquet-hall a cloud raining pearls. Such was his bounty that pure gold and worthless salt were alike in his sight, while by reason of his lofty spirit the produce of ocean and mine did not suffice for the donations of a single day, and his treasury was generally empty. He had a passion for the chase and alone used to slay lions. He had issued orders that whoever should bring news of a lion should receive from his officers a horse and saddle; and he who should bring news of a leopard an unsaddled horse ³. He would go forth alone and kill lions and leopards.' ⁴

“Originally he contemplated to conquer the whole world, but his ideas did not materialize due to the intervention and predominance of the Iṣfahānīs; because, firstly, Najm-i-Thānī prevented him from extirpating the enemy in person, led a huge army to Transoxiana and annihilated it (including himself); and secondly, Shāh Ḥusayn Iṣfahānī drew him to games and drinking, so much so, that for (the last) ten years (of his life), the king, who was Jupiter in grandeur, spent his time in 'Irāq and Ādharbāyjān, and never thought of extirpating foreign foes; so that the original idea of conquering the whole world went out of his mind.

“Such excesses resulted in extreme weakness in the limbs of that dignified king, and he passed away to the immortal world in the prime of his life.” ⁵

“During his reign he fought five (great) battles:—

- (1) With Farrukh Yasār the Shirwān Shāh at Jiyānī (in the middle of 906/end of 1500);

¹ Bf. 304b. Ilyās Beg Dhu'l-Qadr known as Kajal Beg and Julbān Beg, the governors of Fārs and Ṭārum respectively, were put to death by the Shāh's orders, for they ill-treated the subjects.

² Ef. 54a.

³ Bf. 304b (translation from Sp. 82).

⁴ Dpp. 182-183 (translation from Sp. 82).

⁵ Eff. 54a-54b.

- (2) With Alwand (Mirzā) at Shūrūr (in the beginning of 907/middle of 1501);
- (3) With Sulṭān Murād at Ūlama Qūlāghī near Hamadān (on Dhul'-H. 24, 908/June 21, 1503);
- (4) With Shaybānī Khān in the neighbourhood of Marw (on Sha'bān 30, 916/Dec. 2, 1510); and
- (5) With (the Ottoman) Sulṭān Sālīm I at Chāldirān¹ (on Rajab 2, 920/Aug. 23, 1514)."

The most conspicuous feature of his character is his bravery. He slew a bear single-handed near Sārūqāya when he was thirteen², and later, when he had grown to manhood, he shot a lion, unassisted in 'Irāq³. Similarly, in the field of battle his personal bravery was exceptional. At the age of thirteem and a half, with 7,000 men, he engaged the Shirwān Shāh in a bloody battle⁴. Here, as elsewhere, he fought in the front rank for hours. It was his bravery that routed the Uzbeks, and it was inspite of his bravery that he was routed at Chāldirān. He shared the spoils of war with his troops, but if he could be kind to his friends, he could be unkind, cruel or even ruthless to his enemies. He burnt the body of the Shirwān Shāh⁵; and he made a drinking cup of the skull of Shaybānī Khān⁶. He erected pyramids of human skulls in Shirwān and Khurāsān⁷; and of animal skulls in Isfahān⁸.

He was an accomplished archer: says a contemporary merchant who visited Tabriz in the end of 915/1509: "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.....In the archery trials at the apple, he is so expert that of every ten knocked down he hits six.....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"⁹. Further, the same merchant describes the Shāh's appearance: "At present he is about thirty-one¹⁰, very handsome, of a magnanimous countenance, and about middle height; he is fair, stout, and with broad shoulders, his beard is shaved and he only wears a moustache, not

¹ Dp. 183. In all these battles except the last he was victorious.

² See pp. 34-35, supra.

³ See p. 55, supra.

⁴ See pp. 35-36, supra.

⁵ See p. 36, supra.

⁶ See p. 63, supra.

⁷ See supra pp. 36 and 63 respectively.

⁸ See p. 55, supra.

⁹ Zpp. 201-202.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 202. This is incorrect. At this time (i.e. in 915/1509) Shāh Ismā'īl was 23 years and a half old.

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" ¹.

The same contemporary merchant then describes how Shāh Ismā'il is loved by the people: "This sophi is loved and revered by his people as a god, and especially by his soldiers, many of whom enter into battle without armour, expecting their master Ismael to watch over them in the fight. 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 (Shaykh, Shaykh ²)".

The Shāh composed two "*Diwāns*" ³, one in Turkish and the other in Persian verse ³ in honour of the Imāms, whose shrines he protected and reconstructed. Barring these renovated shrines, the only contribution of Shāh Ismā'il in town-building and planning is the widening of the famous Maydān of Isfahān ⁴.

To commemorate his achievements, Shāh Ismā'il ordered Riyāḍi of Zāwa and 'Abdu'llāh Hātifi of Jām to write the history of his reign: the former died in 921 ⁵/1515 and the latter in 927 ⁶/1520, leaving their historical poems unfinished. *Shāh Nāma-i-Mādī* or *Shāh Nāma-i-Qāsimī* by Qāsim Qāsimī Gunābādī is extant and has been lithographed at Lucknow in 1870 A.D.⁷ This Qāsimī has further celebrated in "Mathnawī" verse the Shāh's skill in polo; the treatise bearing the alternative names of *Kār Nāma* or *Gū-wa-Chawgān* ⁸. These trite verses together with the well-known *Ḥabību's-Siyar* of Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn represent the entire output of the extant Persian literature dealing with the reign of Shāh Ismā'il.

¹ Zp. 202.

² *Ibid.*, p. 206.

³ Bf. 304b. He composed poetry under the pen-name of "Khaṭā'i". Gpp. 68-72 gives a selection from his *Turkish Diwān*.

⁴ See p. 56, supra.

⁵ *Tuḥfa-i-Sāmī, Part V (Patna, 1934)*, p. 55.

⁶ Jp. 346.

⁷ See p. 9, supra. Sp. 83 incorrectly states that the work is not published.

⁸ *Rieu's Catalogue of Persian MSS., Vol. II (London, 1881)*, p. 660b.

CHAPTER IX

SYSTEM OF ADMINISTRATION UNDER SHĀH ISMĀ'IL

Shāh Ismā'il was essentially a self-made sovereign. Without inheriting a kingdom or even a principality from his ancestors, he brought all Persia under his sway, and laid the foundations of a kingdom which endured in his family for more than two centuries.

The system of administration was as follows:—

The Shāh embodied in himself the absolute power of the kingdom, and was the sole master of his subjects. He was also the chief-justice and the commander-in-chief of his realms. He himself decided all important cases and personally led his expeditions against the enemy.

The Council consisted of the following persons, who were directly appointed by the Shāh:—

- (1) The Wakīl (Counsellor), one;
- (2) The Amīrū'l-Umarā (Prime-minister), one;
- (3) The Ṣadr (Chancellor), one; and
- (4) The Wazīr (Minister), number not limited.

There were also two other officers of note, namely:

- (1) Īshak Āqāsi Bāshī (Master of Ceremonies), one; and
- (2) The Muhr-Dār (Seal-Keeper), one.

The qualifications of the counsellor, prime-minister, chancellor and minister (posts whose status was in descending order to their enumeration) were proved loyalty, experience and wisdom. These four were consulted by the Shāh in affairs of State, whereas the Master of Ceremonies controlled State ceremonies and received royal guests; and the Seal-Keeper, as his name shows, was in charge of the royal seal, described as "a diamond set in a beautifully worked ring of gold; half the size of a nut; and engraved in minute letters with the name of Ismael encircled by the names of the Twelve Imāms"¹. Occasionally, as a mark of honour, the Shāh ordered that documents bearing the royal seal should be counter-sealed with the counsellor's or the premier's seal.

Nothing is known of the system of account-keeping or taxation. The main sources of revenue were: (1) booty secured in wars, (2) land-revenue, (3) taxes on merchants paid in cash, and (4) tribute from feudatory princes.

¹ Zp. 206.

War Department.—There was no regular standing army save special horse-guards of the Shāh and of the provincial governors known as “Qūrchīs”. Troops consisting only of cavalry were collected from the provinces at the time of need, and later sent back to their respective provinces.

The provincial governors kept standing troops to maintain peace, to check foreign invasion and to form the royal army whenever sent for. All important expeditions were led by the Shāh in person, or else the governors were the commander-in-chiefs of their respective troops.

An Italian merchant thus describes the Persian soldiers whom he saw at Tabriz in 916/1510. “They are accustomed to wear a red caftan and above that a high conical turban made with a dozen folds, representing the twelve sacraments of their sect, or the twelve descendants of Ali¹; besides this they neither shave either their beard or whiskers (sic). Their dress has never changed; their armour is of beautifully worked and carved steel cuirasses, besides coats of mail, helmets like those of the Mamelukes (of Egypt); their harness is very strong, bound with cotton; sometimes it is of the fine steel of Siraz (Shīrāz), and sometimes of copper, but not like ours (i.e. the Italians), but all in pieces like that of Soria (Syria): they have other helmets or head-pieces of heavy mail. Every one rides, and so there are no foot soldiers; they use lances, swords, and slings, besides bows with many shafts”².

Correspondence Department.—Information on this account is not available save that horse-riders (Qūrchīs) were utilized for speedy communication.

Administration of Justice.—As mentioned above, the Shāh himself was the chief-justice, who settled all important affairs of State after consultation with the counsellor and prime-minister.

Next to the Shāh, the counsellor was the highest authority to hold the court, and was responsible to the Shāh for stability and good work of the government. No details are available, however, of regular courts in the country.

Provincial Government.—Generally military men were appointed governors of provinces; and they had the right to delegate their powers. Sometimes governors were appointed on the condition of paying regular tribute to the royal treasury. The number of standing troops in each province was according to the income of that province. Besides being commander-in-chiefs, the governors were also chief-justices of their respective provinces. They had the power to appoint sub-governors, who were responsible to them for the welfare of their subjects. Almost every town had a fort properly guarded by a warden, but nothing else is

¹ This is incorrect. ‘Ali (ibn Abī Tālib) is included in the Twelve Imāms.

² Zpp. 206-207.

mentioned by Persian historians regarding administration of justice and maintenance of peace in towns and villages.

Shāh Ismā'īl's Counsellors.

(1) *Husayn Beg Lala* was in the service of Sultān Ḥaydar and Sultān 'Alī Pādishāh and was appointed by the latter tutor to Shāh Ismā'īl. He was appointed counsellor and premier, in the beginning of 907/middle of 1501, and held both offices till the winter of 913/1507-8. Thereafter, he continued as premier till the winter of 916/1509-10. He fell fighting at Chāldirān on Rajab 2, 920/Aug. 23, 1514.

(2) *Najmū'd-Dīn Mas'ūd Rashtī* was a goldsmith by profession. He served Shāh Ismā'īl and his brother Ibrāhīm Mirzā in their childhood at Rasht, was appointed counsellor in the winter of 913/1507-8, and held this office till his death in the middle of 915/1509.

(3) *Yār Ahmad Isfahānī* was a nobleman of Isfahān. He was appointed minister in the winter of 914/1508-9 at Shirāz, and became counsellor in the middle of 915/1509 with the title of Najm-i-Thānī (the Second Star) for he succeeded Najm-i-Awwal (the First Star). He was the commander-in-chief of the Transoxiana expedition and met his death at the hands of 'Ubaydu'llāh Khān Uzbek on Ramaḍān 3, 918/Nov. 12, 1512.

(4) *Nizāmu'd-Dīn 'Abdu'l-Bāqī Yazdī* was a nobleman of Yazd. He was appointed chanceller in Dhu'l-Ḥ., 917/Feb., 1512, and counsellor in 918/1513. He was killed in the battle of Chāldirān on Rajab 2, 920/Aug. 23, 1514.

(5) *Shāh Husayn Isfahānī* was in the service of Dürmish Khān Shāmlū, master of ceremonies, and was appointed governor of Isfahān in the summer of 909/1503. He was appointed counsellor in Sha'bān, 920/Oct., 1514, and was assassinated by Mihtar Shāh Qulī, Keeper of the Royal Saddle-Room, on Jumāda I, 28, 929/Apr. 14, 1523, from whom he demanded arrears of 7,000 tūmāns due to the royal treasury.

(6) *Jalālu'd-Dīn Muḥammad Tabrīzī* was a nobleman of Tabrīz and was appointed counsellor in Jumāda II, 929/Apr., 1523. During the reign of Shāh Tahmāsp he was burnt to death in 930/1524 at the instigation of his rival Diw Sultān Rūmlū, the premier. When he was sewn in a bag to be burnt, he recited:

گرتم خانه در کوئی بلا در من گرفت آتش کسی کو خانه در کوئی بلا گیرد چنین گیرد¹

I sought my abode in the lane of calamity (and) I caught fire;

Whosoever takes his abode in the lane of calamity comes to this end.

¹ Dp. 184.

APPENDIX A

THE ĀQ-QUYŪNLŪS

The first Āq-Quyŭnlŭ to assume royal power was Amīr Ḥasan Beg (or Ūzŭn Ḥasan) ibn 'Alī Beg ibn Qarā 'Uthmān.

Amīr Ḥasan Beg (or Ūzŭn Ḥasan) succeeded to the throne of Diyār Bakr¹ in 857²/1453. To strengthen himself against the powerful Ottoman Sulṭān Muḥammad II (855-86/1451-81), Kalo Joannes, the last (but one) christian emperor of Trebizond, and of the noble house of Comneni, gave his daughter, named Despina Caton, in marriage to Amīr Ḥasan Beg; but this alliance did not prove useful, for, Kalo Joannes died, and was succeeded by his brother David, who was captured by the Ottomans, and Trebizond was annexed to the Ottoman empire³ in 1461⁴.

Amīr Ḥasan Beg received Sulṭān Junayd (grandfather of Shāh Ismā'il) at Ḥiṣn Kayf, and gave his sister, named Khadija Begum, in marriage to him and kept him as his guest for a few years⁵.

Jahān Shāh, the Qarā-Quyŭnlŭ ruler of Adharbāyjan, set out from Tabriz⁶, on Shawwāl 8, 872⁷/May 4, 1468, to annex Diyār Bakr. His vanguard was surprised by Amīr Ḥasan Beg in the desert of Mīsh⁸, he himself was put to death while he was staying behind⁹, and his head was sent to Sulṭān Abū Sa'id 19, the Timŭrid ruler of Khurāsān. His two sons, named Muḥammadi and Yūsuf, were also captured, of whom the former was put to death and the latter blinded¹¹.

Ḥasan 'Alī, another son of Jahān Shāh, invoked the help of Sulṭān Abū Sa'id, who advanced from Khurāsān, but before his arrival in Adharbāyjan, Ḥasan 'Alī was deserted by his soldiers at Marand and was thus compelled to flee back to Miyāna, where he joined Sulṭān Abū Sa'id. Amīr Ḥasan Beg tried to make peace, but the mission proved unsuccessful, and Sulṭān Abū Sa'id advanced on him. In the ensuing battle, on Rajab 16, 873/Jan. 30, 1469, Sulṭān Abū Sa'id was defeated and taken prisoner. Two days later, he was handed over to Mirzā Yādgār Muḥammad, the Timŭrid, and was put to death on Rajab 22, 873¹²/Feb. 5, 1469.

Hasan 'Alī succeeded in making his escape to Hamadān, but was pursued by Ughŭrlŭ Muḥammad ibn Amīr Ḥasan Beg, and put to death in Shawwāl, 873¹³/Apr., 1469.

Amīr Ḥasan Beg now became the master of Adharbāyjan and the two 'Irāqs, and fixed his capital at Tabriz¹⁴.

¹ Ap. 14.

² *Browne's Lit. Hist. of Persia, Vol. III (Cambridge, 1928)*, p. 404.

³ Zp. 9. Also footnote on the same page.

⁴ *Cambridge Modern Hist., Vol. I (Cambridge, 1907)*, p. 78.

⁵ See p. 23, supra.

⁶ Cf. 191a.

⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 190b.

⁸ *Ibid.*, f. 191a.

⁹ Jpp. 187-188.

¹⁰ Cf. 191a.

¹¹ Jp. 188.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 188-191.

¹³ Cf. 190a-190b.

¹⁴ Ap. 14.

In 878/1473, at the instigation of the Venetian Republic ¹, he twice tried his fortune on the field of battle against the Ottoman Sultān Muḥammad II ², firstly, in the ford of the river Euphrates near Malāṭīya ³, where he defeated the Turks with a heavy loss ⁴; and secondly, at Askī-Dih ⁵, where he sustained a crushing defeat, and his son Zaynal Beg lost his life in the battle ⁶.

In 879/1473, Ughūrlū Muḥammad rebelled against his father, Amīr Ḥasan Beg, but on the approach of Amīr Ḥasan Beg, he fled and took refuge with the Ottoman Sultān Muḥammad II ⁷. In the following year he was lured back by his father on the pretext of death, and was put to sword ⁸.

Amīr Ḥasan Beg further connected his relation with the Ṣafawī family by giving his daughter, Ḥallīma Begī Āghā better known as 'Ālam Shāh Begum, in marriage to Sultān Ḥaydar ibn Sultān Junayd ⁹.

In 881/1476-77, Amīr Ḥasan Beg invaded Georgia and captured Tiflis, and breathed his last on the night preceding Shawwāl 1 ¹⁰, 882 ¹¹/Jan. 6, 1478. He had seven sons, namely: Ughūrlū Muḥammad, Maqṣūd Beg, Zaynal Beg, Sultān Khalīl, Ya'qūb Mirzā Yūsuf Beg and Masīḥ Mirzā, of whom the first three predeceased him ¹².

Sultān Khalīl (governor of Fārs during his father's life time) succeeded to the throne, and appointed his brother, Ya'qūb Mirzā, governor of Diyār Bakr.

Sultān Khalīl proved weak, and the nobles of his court declared for Ya'qūb Mirzā, who, thereupon, advanced on Ādharbāyjān. In the ensuing battle near Marand ¹³, on Rabi' II, 14, 883 ¹⁴/July 15, 1478, Sultān Khalīl lost his life and Ya'qūb Mirzā occupied Tabriz.

Ya'qūb Mirzā ascended the throne. Aḥmad Beg ibn Sultān Khalīl and Kūsa Ḥājji Bāyandar, rose in revolt at Shirār and Iṣfahān respectively, but the rebellions were easily suppressed. Similarly, in 886/1481-82, Bāyandar Beg rose in revolt at Iṣfahān, but was killed by the king's vanguard commanded by Ṣūfī Khalīl.

In 887/1482-83, Ya'qūb Mirzā invaded Georgia, and in the following year he built a beautiful palace, named Hasht Biḥisht (Eight Paradises), outside Tabriz ¹⁵.

Being envious of Sultān Ḥaydar's increasing power, Ya'qūb Mirzā seized the opportunity of helping Farrukh Yasār, the Shirwān Shāh, against Sultān Ḥaydar, who had set out from Ardābil for the invasion of Charkas' and Dāghistān. In the ensuing battle, on Rajab 20, 893/July 1, 1488, Sultān Ḥaydar lost his life, and his son and successor, Sultān 'Alī Mirzā aroused the suspicion of Ya'qūb Mirzā, whereupon, in the end of Rabi' II, 894/end of March 1489, Sultān 'Alī Mirza, his brothers, Ibrāhīm Mirzā and Ismā'īl Mirzā, and their mother, were imprisoned in the fort of Istakhr in Fārs ¹⁶.

¹ *A Narrative of Italian Travels in Persia. (Haklyut Society, London, 1873), pp. 36-37.*

² Cf. 192a.

³ *Browne's Lit. Hist. of Persia, Vol. III (Cambridge, 1928), p. 412.*

⁴ Cf. 192a.

⁵ Mf. 77b.

⁶ Cf. 192a. *Browne's Lit. Hist. of Persia, Vol. III, p. 412 incorrectly gives 1474 A.D. as the date of the second battle.*

⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 192a.

⁸ *A Narrative of Italian Travels, pp. 37-39.*

⁹ See p. 24, supra.

¹⁰ Cf. 192a.

¹¹ Ap. 14.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 14. Cf. 192b states that Maqṣūd Beg was put to death by Sultān Khalīl shortly after his father's death.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

¹⁴ Cf. 192b.

¹⁵ Ap. 15.

¹⁶ See p. 26, supra.

Ya'qūb Mirzā died at Sulṭān-Būd in Qarā-Bāgh¹ on the evening of Safar 11², 896³/Dec. 24, 1490, and left three sons, namely: Bāysunqur Mirzā and Sulṭān Murād by Gawhar Sulṭān Khānum, daughter of Farrukh Yasār, the Shirwān Shāh, and Ḥasan Beg by Qulī Jān Khānum, daughter of Sulaymān Beg⁴.

Bāysunqur Mirzā ascended the throne. Differences arose amongst the nobles, some of whom supported the king's uncle Mas'ūḥ Mirzā. The result was a severe skirmish, in which the pretender and most of his supporters were killed. Further, Rustam Mirzā ibn Maqṣūd Beg ibn Amīr Ḥasan Beg was imprisoned in the fort of Alanjīq⁵; but another potential rival Maḥmūd Beg⁶ ibn Ughūrlū Muhammad fled to Shāh 'Alī Parnāk at Hamadān, where the Khuṭba was read in his name. Finally, Maḥmūd Beg advanced on Ādharbāyjān, and encountered Bāysunqur Mirzā at Darguzān, but was defeated in battle, and put to death after capture.

After this victory, Šūfī Khalīl, commander-in-chief of Bāysunqur Mirzā, assumed great power, which invoked the resentment of other nobles⁷. In the end of 896⁸/about Oct., 1491, Sulaymān Beg, governor of Diyār Bakr, advanced on Ādharbāyjān, and encountered Bāysunqur⁹ Mirzā near Van¹⁰. The nobles, who were opposed to Šūfī Khalīl, captured Šūfī Khalīl and Bāysunqur Mirzā, and brought them to Sulaymān Beg, who put the former to death, and submitted to the latter, whereupon, they proceeded to Tabriz¹¹.

Ibrāhīm ibn Dānā Khalīl¹² alias Ayba Sulṭān, a noble of Bāysunqur Mirzā's court, got envious of Sulaymān Beg's power, released Rustam Mirzā from the fort of Alanjīq, and advanced on Tabriz in the end of Rajab, 897/middle of May, 1492. Bāysunqur Mirzā tried to encounter the invader, but his nobles who were opposed to Sulaymān Beg, went over to Rustam Mirzā, and Bāysunqur Mirzā only saved his life by making his escape to Shirwān. Sulaymān Beg fled to Diyār Bakr, where he was put to death by Nūr 'Alī Beg, brother of Ayba Sulṭān, and Rustam Mirzā occupied Tabriz¹³.

Rustam Mirzā ascended the throne in the end of Rajab, 879/middle of May, 1492. His treatment of the Šafawī family has been given before in detail¹⁴.

In Dhu'l-Q., 902/July, 1497. Aḥmad Beg ibn Ughūrlū Muḥammad advanced on Ādharbāyjān. This Aḥmad Beg had, after the death of his uncle, Ya'qūb Mirzā, in 896/1490, fled to Turkey, had married a daughter of the Ottoman Sulṭān Bāyazīd II (886-918/1481-1512), and had been living there since then. Rustam Mirzā marched from Tabriz, and the armies met on the bank of the river Aras. Before the commencement of the battle, Rustam Mirzā's nobles turned traitors, and declared for Aḥmad Beg, who put Rustam Mirzā to death and occupied Tabriz.

Aḥmad Beg ascended the throne. Ḥusayn Beg 'Alī Khānī, a powerful noble of Aḥmad Beg's court, succeeded in disposing off his rival nobles, Muẓaffar Beg Parnāk and Ayba Sulṭān, of whom the former was put to death, and the latter was appointed governor of Iṣfahān. On his arrival at Kirmān, Ayba Sulṭān instigated Maṣṣūr Beg Parnāk, governor of Fārs, to avenge the death of his brother Muẓaffar Beg Parnāk on Ḥusayn Beg 'Alī Khānī, and promised help. Maṣṣūr Beg Parnāk agreed, and both of them marched on Iṣfahān.

On receipt of this news, Aḥmad Beg set out to crush the rebellion. The armies met at Ulang-i-Kaniz near Iṣfahān¹⁵ on Rabi' II, 18, 903¹⁶/Dec. 14, 1497. Aḥmad Beg lost his life in the battle, and Ayba Sulṭān proceeded to Qum, where he read the Khuṭba

¹ Ap. 18.

² Cf. 193b.

³ Ap. 18.

⁴ Cf. 193b.

⁵ Ap. 18.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 18. Cf. 193b gives "Muḥammad Beg".

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁸ Cf. 194a.

⁹ Ap. 18.

¹⁰ Cf. 194a.

¹¹ Ap. 18.

¹² Cf. 194a.

¹³ App. 18-19.

¹⁴ See pp. 26-32, supra.

¹⁵ Ap. 21.

¹⁶ Cf. 194b.

in the name of Sultān Murād ibn Ya'qūb Mirzā, who had been living in Shirwān since the death of his brother Bāysunqur Mirzā in 898/1493.

Of Muḥammadi Mirzā and Alwand Mirzā, sons of Yūsuf Beg ibn Amīr Ḥasan Beg, who had been with Ahmad Beg in the battle of Ulang-i-Kaniz, the former fled to Yazd, where Murād Beg Bāyandar read the Khuṭba in his name; and the latter to Diyār Bakr, where he was similarly proclaimed king by Qāsim Beg ibn Jahāngir Beg brother of Amīr Ḥasan Beg.

In the spring (of 903/1498), when Ayba Sultān made for Tabriz, Muḥammadi Mirzā captured the whole of the Persian 'Irāq and encamped at Ray¹. Meanwhile, Ayba Sultān and Sultān Murād, who had emerged from his retreat in Shirwān, fell out whereupon, Sultān Murād was imprisoned² at Rū'in-Dizh³.

Ayba Sultān sent for Alwand Mirzā from Diyār Bakr, and set out in his company⁴ to attack Muḥammadi Mirzā, but as Muḥammadi Mirzā had fled to Ḥusayn Kiyā-i-Chalāwī in the fort of Ustā, Ayba Sultān left his brother Kūzil Ahmad at Warāmīn and returned to Qum. A few days later, Muḥammadi Mirzā made a night-attack on Kūzil Ahmad and plundered his camp; Kūzil Ahmad, however, succeeded in making his escape to Qum⁵, whence he, together with Ayba Sultān and Alwand Mirzā, fled towards Tabriz. The fugitives were overtaken by Muḥammadi Mirzā at 'Aziz Kaniti⁶ in Shawwāl, 904⁷/May, 1499: Ayba Sultān lost his life in the skirmish⁸: Alwand Mirzā again fled to Diyār Bakr⁹, and Muḥammadi Mirzā made for Tabriz.

Muḥammadi Mirzā now ascended the throne, but was, shortly after, compelled to flee before Alwand Mirzā, who advanced from Diyār Bakr with a new army to occupy Tabriz.

Alwand Mirzā, on accession, immediately began to consolidate his power; nevertheless, Muḥammadi Mirzā succeeded in raising an army, and marching on Iṣfahān¹⁰.

Meanwhile, Sultān Murād had been released by Kūzil Ahmad from Rū'in-Dizh, and had gone to Shīrūz¹¹, where he had established his own rule. On receiving the news of Muḥammadi Mirzā's advance on Iṣfahān, Sultān Murād marched from Shīrāz, and encountered him at Khwāja Ḥasan-Māḍī near Iṣfahān¹² in 905¹³/1499-1500. Muḥammadi Mirzā lost his life in the battle¹⁴, and Sultān Murād proceeded to Sultāniyya.

Thereupon, Alwand Mirzā set out from Tabriz to check Sultān Murād's advance. The armies met at Šā'in-Qal'a, but through the intercession of a pious man, named Bābā Khayru'llāh, peace was concluded between them, on the condition that Ādharbāyjan¹⁵, Mughān¹⁶, Arrān and Diyār Bakr should belong to Alwand Mirzā; and 'Irāq, Fārs and Kirmān to Sultān Murād, the river Qizil-Ūzūn forming the boundary between the two kingdoms. Alwand Mirzā returned to Tabriz and Sultān Murād to Qazwin. He then came to Shīrāz, suppressed the rebellion of Qāsim Beg Parnāk by putting him to death, and proceeded to Kāzarūn where he spent the winter (of 906/1500-1). It was during this winter that Ismā'īl Mirzā ibn Sultān Ḥaydar captured the province of Shirwān¹⁷.

¹ App. 21-22.

² Bf. 39b-40a.

³ Cf. 195a.

⁴ Bf. 40a. Ap. 22 omits this account and incorrectly gives that Ayba Sultān and Sultān Murād went to attack Muḥammadi Mirzā.

⁵ Ap. 22.

⁶ Bf. 40a-40b.

⁷ Cf. 194a.

⁸ Ap. 22.

⁹ Df. 40b.

¹⁰ Ap. 22.

¹¹ Bf. 40b Ap. 22 omits this account.

¹² Ap. 22.

¹³ Cf. 195a.

¹⁴ Bf. 41a. Ap. 22 incorrectly states that he was taken to Sultāniyya by Sultān Murād.

¹⁵ App. 22-23.

¹⁶ Bf. 41b.

¹⁷ App. 22-23.

The details of Alwand Mirzā's life from his battle with Ismā'īl Mirzā till his death in Diyār Bakr in 910/1504-5 have been given before ¹. Further, the details of Sulṭān Murād's life, from his war with Shāh Ismā'īl till his flight to 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr, the ruler of Mar'ash ² (by whose daughter he had two sons, namely: Ya'qūb and Ḥasan ³), and his death in the spring of 921/1515, have also been given before ⁴. The Āq-Quyūnlū dynasty extinguished on the death of Sulṭān Murād.

¹ See pp. 37-38 and 43-44, supra.

³ Bf. 256b.

² See pp. 44-45, supra.

⁴ See p. 86, supra.

APPENDIX B

CHRONOLOGY OF THE HISTORY OF SHĀH ISMA'IL ŠAFAWĪ

<p style="text-align: center;">650/1252-53. 656/1258.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Rajab, 700/Mar., 1301. Sawwāl, 704/Apr., 1305.</p> <p>Muḥarram 12, 735/Sept. 12, 1334. Muḥarram, 735/Sept., 1334.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">794/1391. 794/1391.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Rajab 18, 830/May 14, 1427. 830/1427.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">851/1447.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">851/1447. 857/1453.</p> <p>(Circa) 860/1455. (Circa) 860/1455.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shawwāl, 872/May, 1468. Rajab 22, 873/Feb. 5, 1469.</p> <p>(Circa) Rajab, 873/Feb., 1469.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shawwāl, 873/Apr., 1469. 878/1473.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">880/1475.</p> <p>Night preceding Shawwāl 1, 882/Jan. 6. 1478.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Shawwāl, 882/Jan., 1478.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Rabi' II, 14, 883/July 15, 1478. Rabi' II, 883/July, 1478.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">887/1483.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Rajab 25, 892/July 17, 1487. Rajab 20, 893/July 1, 1488. 893/1488.</p>	<p>Birth of Shaykh Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn Iṣḥāq. Death of Amīnu'd-Dīn Jibra'īl. Death of Shaykh Zāhid Gīlānī. Birth of Shaykh Ṣadru'd-Dīn Mūsā. Death of Shaykh Ṣafīyyu'd-Dīn Iṣḥāq. Succession of Shaykh Ṣadru'd-Dīn Mūsā. Death of Shaykh Ṣadru'd-Dīn Mūsā. Succession of Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī. Death of Shaykh Khwāja 'Alī. Succession of Shaykh Ibrāhīm better known as Shaykh Shāh. Death of Shaykh Ibrāhīm better known as Shaykh Shāh. Succession of Sultān Junayd. Accession of Amīr Ḥasan Beg (or Ūzūn Ḥasan), the Āq-Quyūnlū, to the throne of Diyār Bakr. Death of Sultān Junayd. Succession of Sultān Ḥaydar. Death of Jahān Shāh, the Qarā-Quyūnlū. Death of Sultān Abū Sa'īd, the Tīmūrīd. Accession of Amīr Ḥasan Beg to the throne of Ādharbāyjan. Death of Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Jahān Shāh. Wars of Amīr Ḥasan Beg with the Ottoman Sultān Muḥammad II. Death of Ughūrlū Muḥammad ibn Amīr Ḥasan Beg. Death of Amīr Ḥasan Beg. Accession of Khalīl Sultān to the throne of Ādharbāyjan. Death of Sultān Khalīl. Accession of Ya'qūb Mīrzā to the throne of Ādharbāyjan. Construction of the famous palace of Hasht Bihisht (Eight Paradises) by Ya'qūb Mīrzā. Birth of Ism'āil Mīrzā ibn Sultān Ḥaydar. Death of Sultān Ḥaydar. Succession of Sultān 'Alī Mīrzā.</p>
--	--

- (Circa) End of Rabi' II, 894/end of March, 1489. Imprisonment of the sons and wife of Sulṭān Ḥaydar in the fort of Istakhr in Fārs.
- Ṣafar 11, 896/Dec. 24, 1490. Death of Ya'qūb Mirzā.
- Ṣafar, 896/Dec., 1490. Accession of Bāysunqur Mirzā to the throne of Ādharbāyjān.
- End of Rājab, 897/middle of May, 1492. Flight of Bāysunqur Mirzā from Tabriz.
- End of Rājab, 897/middle of May, 1492. Accession of Rustam Mirzā to the throne of Ādharbāyjān.
- End of Shawwāl, 898/beginning of Aug., 1493. Release of the Ṣafawī family from the fort of Istakhr.
- Dhu'l-Q., 899/Aug., 1493. Death of Bāysunqur Mirzā.
- (Circa) End of 899/middle of 1494. Ismā'il Mirzā ibn Sulṭān Ḥaydar nominated head of the Ṣafawī Order.
- (Circa) End of 899/middle of 1494. Death of Sulṭān 'Alī Pādishāh.
- (Circa) End of 899/middle of 1494. Flight of Ibrāhīm Mirzā and Ismā'il Mirzā to Gilān.
- (Circa) Beginning of 900/end of 1494. Arrival of Ibrāhīm Mirzā and Ismā'il Mirzā at Lāhijān.
- Dhu'l-Q., 902/July, 1497. Death of Rustam Mirzā.
- Dhu'l-Q., 902/July, 1497. Accession of Aḥmad Beg to the throne of Ādharbāyjān.
- Rabi' II, 18, 903/Dec. 14, 1497. Death of Aḥmad Beg.
- Shawwāl, 904/May, 1499. Accession of Muḥammadi Mirzā to the throne of Ādharbāyjān.
- (Circa) End of 904/middle of 1499. Flight of Muḥammadi Mirzā from Tabriz.
- (Circa) End of 904/middle of 1499. Accession of Alwand Mirzā to the throne of Ādharbāyjān.
- Middle of Muḥarram, 905/about Aug. 22, 1499. Ismā'il Mirzā's march from Lāhijān.
- 905/1499. Peace concluded between Alwand Mirzā and Sulṭān Murād.
- Middle of 906/end of 1500. Battle of Ismā'il Mirzā with Farrukh Ya'sār, the Shirwān Shāh.
- Middle of 906/end of 1500. Death of Farrukh Ya'sār, the Shirwān Shāh.
- beginning of 907/middle of 1501. Battle of Ismā'il Mirzā with Alwand Mirzā, the ruler of Ādharbāyjān.
- beginning of 907/middle of 1501. Accession of Ismā'il Mirzā to the throne of Ādharbāyjān.
- Shawwāl, 907/May, 1502. Pursuit of Alwand Mirzā by Shāh Ismā'il.
- Dhu'l-Ḥ. 24, 908/June, 21, 1503. Battle of Shāh Ismā'il with Sulṭān Murād, the ruler of the Persian 'Irāq and Fārs.
- 909/1503-4. Annexation of the Persian 'Irāq and Fārs by Shāh Ismā'il.
- 909/1504. Conquest of the forts of Gulkhandān, Firūz-Kūh and Ustā by Shāh Ismā'il.
- Middle of 910/end of 1504. Re-conquest of Yazd by Shāh Ismā'il.
- 910/1504-5. Death of Alwand Mirzā.
- Summer of 912/1507. Battle of Shāh Ismā'il with 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr.
- Summer of 912/1507. Annexation of Diyār Bakr by Shāh Ismā'il.

Winter of 912/1507-8.	Wars of Muḥammad Khan Ustājilū with 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr.
Summer of 913/1508.	Annexation of the Arabian 'Irāq by Shāh Ismā'il.
913/1508.	Annexation of Khurāsān by Shaybāni Khān.
Winter of 914/1508-9.	Annexation of Lūristān by Shāh Ismā'il.
Summer of 915/1509.	Unsuccessful invasion of Hazāra by Shaybāni Khān.
Winter of 915/1509-10.	Re-conquest of Shirwān by Shāh Ismā'il.
Winter of 915/1509-10.	Remains of Sultān Ḥaydar brought from Tabarsarān to Ardābil for burial.
Winter of 915/1509-10.	Invasion of Kirmān by the Uzbeks.
Summer of 916/1510.	First invasion of Khurāsān by Shāh Ismā'il.
Sha'bān 30, 916/Dec. 2, 1510.	Battle of Shāh Ismā'il with Shaybāni Khān in the neighbourhood of Marw.
Sha'bān 30, 916/Dec. 2, 1510.	Death of Shaybāni Khān.
Ramaḍān, 916/Dec., 1510.	Occupation of Hirāt by Shāh Ismā'il.
(Circa) End of 916/beginning of 1511.	Rising of Shāh Quli in Asia Minor.
Beginning of 917/April, 1511.	Shāh Ismā'il's march towards Transoxiana, and peace concluded between him and the Uzbeks.
Rajab, 917/Oct., 1511.	Occupation of Samarqand by Bābur.
Şafar 7, 918/Apr. 24, 1512.	Deposition of the Ottoman Sultān Bāyezid II.
Şafar 7, 918/Apr. 24, 1512.	Accession of Sultān Salīm I to the throne of Turkey.
Şafar, 918/May, 1512.	Defeat of Bābur by the Uzbeks.
(Circa) Summer, 918/1512.	Invasion of Turkish territory by Nūr 'Alī Khalifa Rūmlū.
Ramaḍān 3, 918/Nov. 12, 1512. *	Battle of Ghujduwān.
End of, 918/beginning of 1513.	Invasion of Khurāsān by the Uzbeks.
Dhu'l-Ḥ. 26, 918/Mar. 3, 1513.	Birth of Ṭahmāsp Mirzā ibn Shāh Ismā'il.
Summer of 919/1513.	Second invasion of Khurāsān by Shāh Ismā'il.
(Circa) Ramaḍān, 919/Nov., 1513.	Revolt and death of Sulaymān Mirzā brother of Shāh Ismā'il.
Şafar 23, 920/Apr. 19, 1514.	Sultān Salīm's start from Constantinople for the invasion of Adharbāyjān.
Şafar, 920/Apr., 1514.	Sultān Salīm's first letter to Shāh Ismā'il.
(Circa) Jumāda 1, 920/July, 1514.	Shāh Ismā'il's reply to Sultān Salīm's three letters.
Rajab 2, 920/Aug. 23, 1514.	Battle of Chāldirān.
Rajab 13, 920/Sept. 5, 1514.	Occupation of Tabriz by Sultān Salīm.
Rajab 23, 920/Sept. 13, 1514.	Sultān Salīm leaves Tabriz for Constantinople.
Spring of 921/spring of 1515.	Death of Sultān Murād, the last of the Aq-Quyūnlūs.
Rabi' II, 921/May, 1515.	Capture of the fort of Kamākh by Sultān Salīm.
(Circa) Rajab, 921/June, 1515.	Capture of Arzinjān by the Ottomans.

Summer of 921/summer of 1515.	Extirpation of the Dhu'l-Qadr dynasty by Sulṭān Salīm.
(Circa) End of 921/end of 1515.	Death of Badī'u'z-Zamān Mirzā at Constantinople.
921/1515.	Annexation of Diyār Bakr by the Ottomans.
(Circa) Winter of 922/1515-16.	Birth of Alqāsp Mirzā ibn Shāh Ismā'il.
Winter of 922/1515-16.	Ṭahmāsp Mirzā appointed governor of Khurāsān.
Rabi' II, 3, 922/May 6, 1516.	Capture of Balkh by Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā.
(Circa) End of 922/end of 1516.	Capture of Balkh by Bābur.
Sha'bān 21, 923/Sept. 8, 1517.	Birth of Sām Mirzā ibn Shāh Ismā'il.
Sha'bān 24, 923/Sept. 11, 1517.	Birth of Rustam Mirzā ibn Shāh Ismā'il.
Sha'bān 28, 923/Sept. 15, 1517.	Birth of Bahrām Mirzā ibn Shāh Ismā'il.
Shawwāl, 924/Oct., 1518.	Shāh Ismā'il's letter to Karl V, Emperor of Germany.
(Circa) 925/1519.	Annexation of Gharjstān by the Persians.
Shawwāl 9, 926/Sept. 22, 1520.	Death of the Ottoman Sulṭān Salīm I.
Shawwāl 9, 926/Sept. 22, 1520.	Accession of Sulṭān Sulaymān to the throne of Turkey.
Spring of 927/1521.	Unsuccessful invasion of Khurāsān by the Uzbeks.
End of 927/end of 1521.	Recall of Ṭahmāsp Mirzā from Khurāsān and appointment of Sām Mirzā.
Jumāda II, 928/May, 1522.	Capture of Qandahār by Bābur.
Rajab 19, 930/May 23, 1524.	Death of Shāh Ismā'il.

APPENDIX C

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 'Abbās Nāma, Mirzā Ṭāhīr Waḥīd (Lytton Lib., 'Alīgarh, Subḥānu'llāh Khān Section MS.).
- 'Abbās Nāma, Mirzā Ṭāhīr Waḥīd (Ṭīhrān MS.).
- 'Afdālu't-Tawārīkh (B.M.MS., Or. 4678).
- Aḥsanu't-Tawārīkh, Ḥasan Beg Rūmlū (ed. C. N. Seddon), (Calcutta, 1931).
- Aḥsanu't-Tawārīkh, Ḥasan Beg Rūmlū (Trans. C. N. Seddon), (Calcutta, 1934).
- Āyanda, Vol. II (Ṭīhrān, 1927-28).
- Bābur's Memoirs (Trans. Leyden and Erskine; annotated and revised by Sir Lucus King), (Oxford, 1921).
- British Museum MS., Or. 3248.
- Cambridge Modern History, Vol. I (Cambridge, 1907).
- Catalogue of Oriental MSS. belonging to E. G. Browne, E. G. Browne and R. A. Nicholson (Cambridge, 1932).
- Catalogue of Persian Coins, R. S. Poole (London, 1887).
- Catalogue of Persian MSS. in the Bodleian Lib., H. E. Ethē (Oxford, 1889).
- Catalogue of Persian MSS. in the British Museum, C. Rieu, Vols. I, II, III and Supp. (London, 1879, 1881, 1883 and 1895).
- Catalogue of Persian MSS. in the Cambridge University Lib., E. G. Browne (Cambridge, 1896).
- Catalogue of Persian MSS. in the India Office Lib., H. E. Ethē (Oxford, 1903).
- Collection of Letters (B.M.MS., add. 7654).
- Ḥabību's-Siyar, Ghīyāthu'd-Dīn (Lytton Lib., 'Alīgarh, 'Abdu's-Salām Collection MS.).
- Ḥabību's-Siyar, Ghīyāthu'd-Dīn (Bombay, 1273 A.H.).
- Ḥabību's-Siyar, Ghīyāthu'd-Dīn (Ṭīhrān, 1271 A.H.).
- Hašt Bihisht, Ḥakīmu'd-Dīn Idrīs Bitlīsī (B.M.MS., add. 7646).
- Hašt Bihisht, Ḥakīmu'd-Dīn Idrīs Bitlīsī (Ṭīhrān MS.).
- History of Bokhara, A. Vambéry (London, 1873).
- History of India, W. Erskine (London, 1854).
- History of the Mongols, H. Howorth (Part II, Division II and Part III), (London, 1880 and 1888).
- History of the Ottoman Poetry, E. J. W. Gibb, Vol. II (London, 1902).
- History of the Ottoman Turks, S. Creasy (London, 1877).
- History of Persia, J. Malcolm (London, 1829).
- History of Persia, C. R. Markham (London, 1854).
- History of Persia, P. M. Sykes (London, 1915).
- J.R.A.S. (London, 1896 and 1921).
- Jāmi' Mufīdī, Muḥammad Mufīd Mustawfī (Ṭīhrān MS.).
- Jughrāfiya-i-Mufaṣṣil-i-Īrān, Mas'ūd Gayhān (Ṭīhrān, 1310-11 Yazdigirdī).
- Kāwa (New Series), Vol. II (Berlin, 1921).
- Khulāsa-i-Maqāl, Muḥammad Ṭāhīr ibn Muḥammad Yūsuf Qazwīnī (Bodleian Lib. MS., No. 300).
- Khulāsatu't-Tawārīkh, Qādī Aḥmad ibn Sharafu'd-Dīn (Ṭīhrān MS.).

- Khuld-i-Barin, Muḥammad Yūsuf (E. G. Browne's Lib. MS., No. G. 141-5(15)).
- Khuld-i-Barin, Muḥammad Yūsuf (Ṭihrān MS.).
- Literary History of Persia, E. G. Browne (Cambridge, 1928).
- Lubbu't-Tawārikh, Amīr Yaḥyā ibn 'Abdu'l-Latif al-Ḥusaynī al-Qazwīnī (B.M.MS., Or. 140).
- Majālisu'l-Mu'minin, Sayyid Nūru'llah Shūshṭarī (Ṭihrān, 1299 A.H.).
- Mirātu'l-Mumālik, Sidi 'Alī Ra'īs (Trans. A. Vambery), (London, 1899).
- Muhammadan Dynasties, S. Lane Poole (London, 1894).
- Munsha'āt-i-Salāṭin, Faridūn Bey (Constantinople, 1264 A.H.).
- Nafahātul-Uns, Nūru'd-Dīn 'Abdu'r-Raḥmān Jāmī (Lucknow, 1915).
- Narrative of Italian Travels in Persia (Hakluyt Society, London, 1873).
- Nusakh-i-Jahān Ārā, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Qāḍī al-Ghaffārī (B.M.MS., Or. 141).
- Nuzhatu'l-Qulūb, Ḥamdu'llāh Mustawfī (ed. G. le Strange), (Leyden, 1915).
- Nuzhatu'l-Qulūb, Ḥamdu'llāh Mustawfī (Trans. G. le Strange), (Leyden, 1919).
- Rawḍatu'ş-Şafawīyya, Mirzā Beg ibn Ḥasan Ḥasanī Jūnābādī (B.M.MS., Or. 3388).
- Şafwatu's-Şafā, Darwish Tawakkulī ibn Ismā'il (Bombay, 1329 A.H.).
- Salim Nāma, Ḥakīmu'd-Dīn Idrīs Bitlisī (B.M.MS., add. 24, 960).
- Shāh Nāma-i-Qāsīmī, Qāsīm Qāsīmī Gūnābādī (Lucknow, 1870).
- Sharaf Nāma, Sharaf ibn Shamsu'd-Dīn (St. Petersburg, 1862).
- Silsilatu'n-Nasab-i-Şafawīyya, Ḥusayn ibn Abdāl Zāhidī (Berlin, 1924).
- Tārikh-i-'Ālam Ārā-i-'Abbāsī, Iskandar Munshī (Lytton Lib. 'Alīgarh, 'Abdu's-Salām Collection MS.).
- Tārikh-i-'Ālam Ārā-i-'Abbāsī, Iskandar Munshī (Ṭihrān, 1314 A.H.).
- Tārikh-i-Gilān, 'Abdu'l Fattāḥ Fūmanī (St. Petersburg, 1858).
- Tārikh-i-Ismā'il (India Office Lib. MSS., No. 536).
- Tārikh-i-Ismā'il (Ṭihrān MS.).
- Tārikh-i-Jahān Gushāy of Juwaynī, Vol. I (ed. Mirzā Muḥammad), (Leyden, 1912).
- Tārikh-i-Jahān Gushāy of Juwaynī, Vol. III (London, 1931).
- Tārikh-i-Rashīdī, Mirzā Ḥaydar (Trans. Sir. E. D. Ross and ed. N. Elias), (London, 1898).
- Tārikh-i-Shāh Ismā'il-wa-Shāh Ṭahmāsp, Amīr Maḥmūd ibn Mūwānd Amīr (Ṭihrān MS.).
- Tārikh-i-Sulṭānī, Sayyid Ḥusayn ibn Sayyid al-Murtaḍā al-Ḥusaynī (E. G. Browne's Lib., MS., No. H. 16 (15)).
- Tuḥfa-i-Sāmī, Sām Mirzā Şafawī, Part V (ed. Iqbāl Ḥusayn), (Patna, 1934).
- Zafar Nāma, Sharafu'd-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī (Calcutta, 1887-88).
- Zubdatu't-Tawārikh, Kamāl Khān ibn Jalāl Mumajjim (B.M.MS., Or. 2060).



INDEX

- Abarqūh, 43, 46, 49, 50, 51n.
 'Abbās-Nāma, 17;—Shāh, the great, 6, 7, 12;—Shāh II, 13, 14, 17n.
 Abdāl Zāhidī, Shaykh, 7.
 'Abd-i-Munāf, 5.
 'Abdī Beg Shāmlū, 35, 38, 45, 46, 48, 50, 52.
 'Abdu'l-Bāqī, 93;—Nizāmu'd-Dīn (Yazdī), 66, 70, 71, 79, 81, 104.
 'Abdu'l-Fattaḥ Fūmani, 91n.
 'Abdu'l-Karīm, Nizāmu'd-Dīn, 48, 64, 65, 89, 91.
 'Abdullāh, Amīr, 20;—Beg, 54; Abū ————Khafīf, Shaykh, 20;—Marwī, 62; ————, Shāṭir, 93.
 'Abdu'l-Qādir, Nizāmu'd-Dīn, 70;—Wahhāb, Nūru'd-Dīn, 83.
 'Abdu'r-Raḥīm (ibn Bayraḥ Khān), 13;—Samarqandī, 3.
 'Abdu'r-Razzāq Beg, 84;—Kamālū'd-Dīn Samarqandī, 11.
 Abīward, 71.
 Āchā Sulṭān Qājār, 54, 83, 86.
 Adam, 59.
 Adham, 71.
 Ādharbāyjān, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 33, 36, 37, 38, 43, 51, 61, 74, 76, 95, 99, 105, 106, 107, 108.
 Ādi Bahādur. See 'Azīz Āqā.
 Adrianoplo, 74.
 Afḍalu't-Tawārīkh, 6.
 Afrāsiyāb, 75.
 Afshār (tribe), 35.
 Aḥmad, Amīr, 77;—al-A' rābī, Sayyid, 17;—Beg (ibn 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr), 53;—Beg (Dhu'l-Qadr Commander), 54;—Beg Qarāja Pāshā, 76;—Beg Sārū'i, Sulṭān, 46, 47, 49, 51;—Beg Sūfī Ūghlī, 67, 69;—Beg (ibn Sulṭān Khalīl), 106;—Beg (ibn Ughūrlū Muḥammad), 32, 107, 108;—Jān, 75;—Kākuli, 30;—, Kārkiyā Sulṭān, 52;—Kasrawī Tabrizī, Sayyid 17n;—(ibn Muḥammad al-Qāḍī al-Ghaffārī), 11, 12;—Pāshā, 75;—Pāshā Dūqa-Kin, 80, 82;—Pāshā Harsak, 80;—Pāshā Qarāyichin Ūghlī, 83, 85;—Qunqurāt, 60, 64;—, Sayyid, 23;—(ibn Sharafu'd-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī al-Qummī), Qāḍī, better known as Mīr Munshī al-Qummī, 11;—, Sulṭān, 18;—Sulṭān Afshār, 93;—(ibn Sulṭān Bāyazīd II) 73;—Sulṭān (of Dārghān), 60.
 Aḥmadī Beg, 31, 32.
 Āhar, 27.
 Aḥsan-Ābād, 35.
 Aḥsanu't-Tawārīkh, 7, 11, 12, 35n, 60n.
 Akhī Beg, 56.
 Akhlāt, 53.
 Alāja Ḥīṣār, 80, 82.
 Ālam Shāhī Begum. See Ḥalīma Begī
 Āghā.
 Alanjuq, 107.
 Āla-Qūlūqī, 44n
 'Alā'u'd-Dawla Dhu'l-Qadr, 15, 44n, 46, 52, 53, 54, 76, 83, 84, 86, 109.
 'Alā'u'd-Dīn 'Atā Malik Juwaynī, 53;—(ibn Shaykh Ṣafṣyū'd-Dīn I-shūq), 21.
 Albistān, 52, 84n.
 Alburz (Mountain), 57.
 Aleppo, 46, 54.
 Alexander, 75.
 'Alī (ibn Abī Ṭālib), 21n, 55, 99, 103;—A'jamī, Tomb of, Sayyid, 23;—Beg Bāyandar, 43n;—Beg Chūkarlū, Sulṭān, 33;—Beg Dhu'l-Qadr, 83;—Beg (ibn Kūr Shāh Rukh), 54;—Beg (ibn Qarā 'Uthmān), 23, 105;—Beg Rūmlū alias Dīw Sulṭān, 38;—Beg, Shāh (alias 'Awaḍ Sulṭān), 90;—Beg ibn Shāh Suwār Beg Dhu'l-Qadr, 78, 80, 84, 93;—Beg Turkinān, 45;—Jabal Amulī, 50;—Jūn Karāh-rūdī, 92, 93;—Ḳārkiyā Mirzā, 31, 32, 33, 51, 52;—, Kiyū. 47, 48, 49;—Mirzā Afshār, Sulṭān, 79, 81;—Mirzā, Sulṭān (better known as Sulṭān 'Alī Pādīshāh), 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 104, 106;—Naqī, 55;—Parnāk,

- Shāh, 107;—ar-Riḍa (Imam), 59, 60, 61;—Sahl, 51;—Sahl Iṣfahānī, Shaykh, 73;—Shaykh Khwāja, 17, 22, 23;—, Sulṭān (of Qandahār) 71n.
- ‘Aligarh, x.
- Allāh Wirmish Āqā, 31.
- Alp Arslān Saljūqī, 14.
- Alqā-p Mirzā, 86, 94.
- Ālqūj Ūghlī. See Atak Beg.
- Alwand Mirzā, 33, 37, 43, 44, 52, 72, 100, 108, 109;—Mount, 45, 46.
- Amāsiya, 83, 84.
- Amīnu’-d-Dīn Jibra’īl, 17, 18, 19, 20.
- Amir Beg (Sulṭān—Khān) Mawṣūlū, 8, 44n, 52, 53, 61, 62, 70, 71, 79, 86, 90, 91, 92, 93;—Samarqandī, 91, 92.
- Anatolia, 76, 80, 84.
- Andijān, 59.
- Andkhwud, 65, 71.
- Angora, 77, 78.
- Anūshirwān Khān, 22n.
- Āq-Dih, 76;—Fūlād Sulṭān, 68;—Quyūnlū, x, 8, 11, 23, 32, 36, 72, 105, 109.
- Arabian ‘Irāq, 43, 54, 55, 80, 90.
- Arabic (language), 3f.
- Aras (river), 32, 38, 107.
- Ardabil, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 37, 57, 71, 72, 86, 94, 106.
- Ārd-Sanad, 49.
- Ardū’i, 33.
- Arjīsh, 53.
- Arjuwān, 33, 34.
- Arrān, 108.
- Arslān, Malik, 84n.
- Arzinjān, 34, 35, 38, 43, 52, 66, 73, 76, 78, 79, 84.
- Ashraf Beg, 46n;—Kiyā, 47;—, Malik-i-, 22;—Qānṣū Ghūrī. See Qānṣū, Sulṭān.
- Asia, 78, 88.
- Asia Minor, 34, 65, 72, 87.
- Askī-Dih, 78, 106.
- Askinja Khānī, 76.
- Aslamash Beg, 44, 45.
- Āstārā, 33.
- Astarābād, 6, 48, 60, 64, 86.
- Atak Beg alias Ālqūj Ūghlī, 80, 82.
- ‘Awaḍ al-Khawaṣṣ, 17, 18;—Sulṭān (title of Shāh ‘Alī Beg), 90.
- Awjān, 44, 91, 93.
- Ayanda, 1 n.
- Ayās Beg, 82.
- Ayba Khwāja, 59;—Sulṭān, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 45, 46, 107, 108.
- Ayriwān, 83.
- ‘Aziz Āqā, 54;—(alias Ādi Bahādur), 63.
- ‘Aziz Kanīti, 108.
- Bābā Khākī, 70.
- Bābil, 21n.
- Bābur (ibn Ḥasan), 17n;—Zahīru’-d-Dīn Muḥammad, 13, 14, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71n, 86, 90, 92, 93.
- Bābur’s Memoirs, 13.
- Badakshān, 59, 66.
- Bādghīs, 7.
- Bādīnjān Sulṭān Rūmlū, 61, 62, 67.
- Badr’uz-Zamān Mirzā, 64, 82, 83.
- Baghdād, 44, 46, 54, 55, 90, 91.
- Bahrām Mirzā, 87, 94.
- Bahru’l-Ansab, 7.
- Abū Bakr Ṭīhrānī, 3.
- Bākū, 36n, 37, 57.
- Balbi, John, 89.
- Bālī Āghā, 85.
- Balkh, 63, 65, 67, 68, 69, 71, 86, 90, 95.
- Baqlān, 59.
- Bardī Beg Khān, 22.
- Bārik Beg Parnāk, 43, 46, 54, 55.
- Bāruq, 19.
- Bārūq, 28n.
- Bashārat Beg, 46.
- Bāyandar Beg, 106.
- Bāyazīd Beg Ustājū, 94;—(fort), 78;—, Sayyid, 23;—I, Sulṭān, 77, 78;—II, Sulṭān, 50, 63, 65, 66, 72, 73, 75, 84n, 107.
- Bāyburd, 78.
- Bayrām Āghā, 83;—Beg (Khān) Qarāmānī, 33, 35, 38, 45, 48, 52, 55, 62, 65, 67, 68, 69.
- Bāysunqur Mirzā, 26, 27, 28n, 29n, 107, 108.
- Ibn Bazzāz. See Darwīsh Tawakkulī.
- Berlin, 7, 88n, 89n.
- Bighurd, 36, 57.
- Bijan (author of B.M. Or. 3248), 9, 10, 11, 81.
- Bistām, 60, 70.
- Bisutūn, Mount, 87, 90.
- Bitlīs, 53.
- Bombay, 7, 8.
- British Museum (London), ix.

- B.M. Or. 3248 (History of Shāh Ismā'īl), 4, 5, 6, 9, 81n.
- Browne, E. G., ix, 10, 78n, 105n, 106n.
- Bukhārā, 58, 61, 64, 67, 68, 70.
- Būdāq Sulṭān, 58.
- Bukrāt Khān, 18, 19.
- Bulaghtān, 58.
- Bundār, al-Kurdī as-Sanjānī, Shaykh, 21n.
- Būrūn Sulṭān Takkalū, 63, 86, 93.
- Cæsarea, 80.
- Calcutta, 11, 35n, 60n.
- Cambridge, 10n, 105n;—Modern History, 105n.
- Caspian Sea, 33, 57.
- Central Asia, 63n;—Asian (Uzbeks), x, 58.
- Chābuk, Mīrzā, 78.
- Chaghāniyān, 67.
- Chaghatāī Turkī, 13.
- Chakūrka Sulṭān, 93.
- Chakūr-Sa'd, 37, 87n.
- Chāldirān, x, 15, 78, 80, 82, 83, 86, 100, 104.
- Chingīz Khān, 58, 59n, 60.
- Charkas, 24, 25, 106;—Ḥasan Takkalū, 87.
- Chūbān, Amīr, 22n.
- Christians, 18.
- Chūha Sulṭān, 70n.
- Circassian, 24.
- Comneni, house of, 24n, 105.
- Constantinople, 15, 16, 74, 83n, 84.
- Creasy, S., ix, 77.
- Crimea, 82.
- Dada Beg Ṭālish, 27, 28, 29n, 31, 33, 38, 45, 51, 56, 62, 63, 68, 70.
- Dāghistān, 25, 57, 106.
- Ḥaḥḥāk, 75.
- Daljān, 44.
- Dāmghān, 60, 64, 86.
- Damūrī Beg, 94.
- Dānā Muḥammad Beg Afshār, 61.
- Dārā, 75.
- Dārāb, 75;—Jird, 56n.
- Darband, 25, 57, 58. (See also Timūr Qāpī);—i-Āhanīn, 68.
- Darguzīn, 27, 81, 83n, 107.
- Dāru'l-Jird, 56.
- Darwish Muḥammad Beg (ibn Ḥasan Beg) 94;—Muḥammad Beg Yasāwul, 6;—Tawakkulī ibn Ismā'īl (commonly known as Ibn Bazzāz), 6, 12.
- Dasht-i-Qipchāq, 22, 59.
- Dā'ūd, 17n;—Mīrzā, 26.
- David, 105.
- Dawlatī, 19.
- Dawlat Shaykh Ūghalān, 58.
- Daylam, 72.
- Daylamān, 33.
- Despina Caton, 24n, 105.
- Dhu'l-Qadr (tribe), 31, 35, 36, 46.
- Dhu'n-Nūn, 64.
- Dīwāns (of Shāh Ismā'īl in Turkish and Persian), 101.
- Dīw Sulṭān Rūmlū, 38, 61, 62, 71, 73, 79, 86, 87, 91, 94, 104.
- Diyār Bakr, 15, 23, 43, 44, 52, 53, 73, 76, 78, 79, 83, 84, 85, 86, 95, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109.
- Diyā'u'd-Dīn Nūrullāh, 58.
- Dizfūl, 56.
- Dubbāī, Amīra, 90, 91.
- Dūrmish Khān Shāmlū, 8, 46, 50, 56, 62, 79, 87, 89, 90, 92, 93, 104.
- Durnā, Mount, 52.
- Egypt, 46, 66, 74n, 78n, 84, 103.
- Elia, N., 14.
- Erskine, W., ix, 14.
- Ethē, H. E. (author of Catalogue of Persian MSS. in the India Office Lib.), 7n.
- Euphrates, 55, 106.
- Europe, 82, 88.
- Fakhru'd-Dīn, 20.
- Fārāb, 93.
- Farāhān, 66.
- Farhād Pāshā, 80.
- Farḥshād Beg, 77-78.
- Farīdūn, 75;—Bey, 15, 82;—, Kiyā, 32, 51.
- Farangīs Khānum, 94.
- Farrukh Āqā, 15;—Ardabīlī, Shaykh, 20;—Yasār (the Shirwān Shāh), 4, 5, 25, 27, 30, 34, 35, 36, 37, 56, 90, 106, 107;—Zād Gūrgānī, 31.
- Fārs, 26, 29n, 30, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 50, 73, 79, 81, 83, 93, 95, 99, 106, 107, 108.
- Fāryāb, 18.
- Abu'l Faṭḥ al-Ḥusaynī, 7;—Beg Bāyandar, 43, 46.
- Fāṭima, 21.
- Fāyīq Pāshā, 73.
- Fayyād, Sulṭān, 55.
- Abu'l-Faḍl (ibn Ḥakīm u'd-Dīn Idrīs), 15.

- Firūz Abād, 46;—Abād (gate of Hirāt), 69, 92;—Kūh, 43, 45, 47, 49, 70, 91;—Shāh-i-Zarrīn Kulāh, 7, 17, 18.
- France, 89.
- Francis I, 89.
- Fūlād Ūghalān, 58.
- Fūman, 31, 90.
- Fūshanj, 70.
- Futūhāt-i-Amīnī (or Futūhāt-i-Shāhī), 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.
- Garmārūd, 32n.
- Gawhar Sulṭān Khānum, 44, 107;—Sulṭānum, 44n.
- Georgia, 18, 34, 35, 78, 108.
- Georgians, 18, 19.
- Germany, x, 87, 89.
- Gharjistān, 58, 65n, 70, 86, 90.
- Ghaybī, Ra'īs, 50, 51n.
- Ghazālī Arabs, 93.
- Ghāzī Beg, 37;—Beg, Sayyid-i-, 38;—, Sayyid-i-, 75.
- Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn, 31;—ibn Humāmu'd-Dīn (better known as Khwānd Amīr), 3, 4, 8, 9, 101;—Muḥammad, 8, 64,² 68, 69, 70, 86, 91, 92,² 93.
- Ghujduwān, 68, 70, 71n.
- Ghūr, 58.
- Gilān, 18, 21, 22, 30, 31, 36
- Gilkhwārūn, 18, 19, 20, 21
- Gilūya (mountains), 56
- Golden Horde, 22n. •
- Gūkaja Tangīz, 34.
- Gulābī Beg, 38;—(Mawsilū), 52.
- Gulistān, 36, 37.
- Gulkhandān, 47.
- Gūr Sulaymān, 83.
- Gū-wa-Chawgān. See Kār Nāma.
- Gyuk Chāy, 66n.
- Ḥabībullāh, Karīmu'd-Dīn, 8, 9, 93.
- Ḥabību's-Siyar (fi Akhbār-i-Afrādi'l-Bashar), 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 101.
- Ḥabla (river), 48.
- Hādī, Sayyid, 63.
- Ḥāfīz, 57n.
- Ḥakīmu'd-Dīn Idrīs ibn Ḥusāmu'd-Dīn 'Alī al-Bitlīsī, 15, 79, 82, 84, 85.
- Hakluyt Society (London), 16, 24n, 44n, 106n.
- Hūlākū Khān (the Mongol), 20.
- Ḥalīma Begī Āghā (better known as 'Ālam Shāh Begum), 24, 26, 106.
- Hamadān, 44, 45, 51, 54, 56, 71, 78, 91, 100, 105, 107.
- Hamdam Pāshā, 77.
- Hamzā, Abu'l-Qāsim, 17;—(Imām-zāda), 7;—Sulṭān, 59, 66, 67.
- Ḥasan al-'Askarī, 55;—(ibn Muḥammad), 17;—(ibn Sulṭān Murād), 109; •—'Alī (ibn Jahān Shāh), 105;—Beg, Amīr (or Ūzūn Ḥasan), 3, 23, 24, 25, 26, 32, 33, 43, 59, 87, 94, 105, 106, 107, 108;—(of Moria), 82;—Beg Rūmlū, 11, 12, 35n, 60;—(Ṣafawī Commander), 87;—Beg (of Shakī), 94;—Beg Shikār Ūghlī, 37;—Beg (ibn Ya'qūb Mirzā), 107;—Māqī, Khwāja, 108;—Mirzā, 26;—Pāshā, 76, 80, 82;—Takkalū, Bābā, 65.
- Hāshim, Mirzā, 32.
- Hasht Bilisht, 106.
- Hātifi, 'Abdullāh, 9, 101.
- Ḥaydar 'Alī, Muḥammad, 90;—Mirzā (ibn Muḥammad Ḥusayn Gūrgānī), 14;—, Sulṭān, x, 4, 5, 9, 17, 24, 25, 26, 30, 57, 65, 72, 103, 106, 108.
- Hazāra, 60;—(tribe), 58, 60.
- Hidāyat Beg, 92, 93.
- Hiḷya Karān, 21.
- Hirāt, 3, 6, 8, 9, 13, 60, 61, 64, 68, 69, 70, 79, 86, 90, 91, 92, 93;—Rūd, 92, 93
- Ḥiṣār-i-Shādmān, 59, 66, 67, 68, 69n.
- Ḥiṣn Kayf, 23, 105.
- Howorth, H. (author of History of the Mongols), ix, 22n, 58n, 68n.
- Hungary, 78, 88.
- Hurmuz, 56.
- Ḥusāmu'd-Dīn, 31, 90.
- Ḥusayn ibn Aḥmad, 17n;—ibn 'Alī, 55;—Beg 'Alī Khānī, 28, 30, 107;—Beg Lala (or Shāmlū), 5, 25, 27, 28, 29n, 31, 33, 36, 38, 39, 45, 46, 50, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57n, 62, 64, 68, 69, 81, 104; Beg (Turkish Commander), 73;—Iṣfahānī, Shāh, 46, 83, 87, 93, 94, 99, 104;—, Kārkiyā Sulṭān, 32, 48, 51, 52;—Khuyābānī, Shāh, 70;—Kiyā Chalāwī, 43, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 108;—Maybudī, Mir, 49;—, Shaykh, ibn Shaykh Abdāl Zāhidī, 7;—ibn Sayyid al-Murtadā Ḥusaynī, 13.
- Ḥuwayza, 55.
- Ibrāhīm-al-Adham, 18;—(ibn Dānā Khalīl alias Ayba Sulṭān), 107. (See

- also Ayba Sultān);—(ibn Ja'far). 17;
—Jālūq, 90;—Khawājāgī, 23;—
Mirzā, 25, 29n, 30, 32, 104, 106;—
Shaykh (better known as Shaykh Shāh),
17, 22, 23;—, Shaykh (of Shabistar),
66;—Sultān, 90, 91, 92.
- Ikhtiyāru'd-Dīn (fort). 61, 64, 65, 71,
92.
- Ilak Khānī, 22n.
- Ilatī Ūghalān, 58.
- Ilyās Beg Ayghūr Ūghlī, 28, 33, 35, 37,
38, 45, 47, 49;—Dhu'l-Qadr alias
Kajal Beg, 47, 50, 99n;—Ḥalwāji
Ūghlī, 37, 38.
- Imāmu'd-Dīn Muḥammad, 69.
- 'Ināyatullāh, 93.
- Incomplete History, 4n, 10.
- India. ix. 64;—Office Library, ix. 7n,
13.
- Indus, 93.
- Irān, x.
- 'Irāq, 23, 24, 45, 59, 61, 64, 65, 70, 71,
81, 83n, 99, 100, 105, 108;—(gate of
Hīrāt), 69, 92.
- 'Isā, Qāqī, 83.
- Iṣfahān, 27, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51, 56, 66, 70,
71, 72, 73, 89, 90, 100, 101, 104, 106,
107, 108.
- Iṣfahānīs, 99.
- Iṣfaranjān, 18.
- Iṣfarāyin, 93.
- Abū Iṣhāq, 54.
- Iṣhāq, Amīrā, 31, 35;—Beg, 92.
- Iskandar better known as Munshī, 12.
- Islām, x, 18.
- Isroā il (Mirzā—Shāh), ix, x, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8,
9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 25, 26,
28, 29n, 30, 31n, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37,
38, 39, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50,
51, 52, 54, 55, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62,
63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 72, 73, 75,
76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87,
88, 89, 93, 94, 99, 100, 101, 102, 104,
106, 108, 109;—(ibn Muḥammad),
17;—(ibn Quṭbu'd-Dīn), 20;—(real
name of 'Awad al-Khawass), 18;—,
Shāh II, 7, 11, 12, 13.
- Istakhr, 26, 29, 50, 106.
- Italian (travellers), x, 16, 103
- Ja'far Beg, 31;—Bey, 81n;—(ibn
Muḥammad), 17;—, Shaykh, 24;—
(ibn Shaykh Ibrāhīm), 23.
- Jahān Ārā, Bāgh-i-, 64;—gīr Beg, 43,
44;—Shāh. 23, 24, 34, 105.
- Jājarin, 60.
- Jalālu'd-Dīn Maḥmūd, 62;—Mas'ūd
(Kāshānī), 43, 47;—Muḥammad
(Tabrizī), 93, 104;—Qāsim Farnakl-
wudī, 70;—Rūmī. 20.
- Jām, 101.
- Jamālu'd-Dīn, 22;—'Alī, 21;—
Gīlānī, Sayyid. 21n;—Muḥammad
Astarābādī, 83, 87, 94.
- Jamshīd, 72.
- Jān, Mir, 69;—Mirzā, Khwāja, 23;—
Wafā Mirzā, 61, 62.
- Jānī Beg Khān, 22;—Sultān, 64, 68,
69.
- Janissaries, 76, 77, 80, 82, 84.
- Jawād, 37, 56, 57.
- Jāyān Sultān (title of Muḥammad Beg
Ustājīlū), 57, 61, 62, 71, 83n, 94.
- Jazīra, 54.
- Jījaktī, 65, 90.
- Jiyānī, 36, 99.
- J.R.A.S. (for 1896), 8n, 9n, 10n, 32n, 33n,
34n;—(for 1924), 17n.
- Jūha Sultān, 70, 90, 91.
- Jūjī, 58.
- Julbān Beg, 31, 55, 99.
- Junayd Baghdādī, Abu'l-Qāsim, 21n;—
Sultān, 9, 17, 23, 24, 30, 37, 65, 105, 106.
- Jurjān, 48, 93.
- Jūslī Mirzā, 36, 37. (See also Qulī Beg).
- Kabūd-Gunbad, 49.
- Kābul, 90, 93.
- Kajuchī, Khwāja Shaykh, 22.
- Kajal Beg. See Ilyās Beg Dhu'l-Qadr.
- Kaldī Āqā, Shāh, 56, 57n.
- Kalīs, 89.
- Kalkhorān, 18n.
- Kalo Joannes (or Calo Johannes), 24n,
105.
- Kālpūsh, 70.
- Karnākh, 76, 79, 83, 84n, 85.
- Kamāl Khān ibn Jalāl Munajjim, 13.
- Kamālu'd-Dīn 'Arab Shāh Aradabīlī,
Khwāja, 19;—Beg, 83;—Ḥusayn
Abīwardī, 58;—Maḥmūd, Khwāja,
62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71n;—
Ṣadr, 50.
- Karbalā, 55.
- Kargān, 31.
- Karkh, 70, 85.

- Karl V (Emperor of Germany), x, 87, 88, 89.
- Karmīna, 64, 69.
- Karniyān, 65.
- Kār Nāma (or Gū-wa-Chawgān), 101.
- Kāshghar, 14, 59.
- Kaskar, 31.
- Kasrawī. See Aḥmad Kasrawī Tabrizī; Sayyid.
- Kāwa, 88, 89n.
- Kay-Khusraw, 72, 75.
- Kāzarūn, 108.
- Khadija Begum, 23, 105.
- Khādīm 'Alī Pāshā, 65;—Beg Khalifa, 27, 31, 33, 38, 52, 54, 55, 80.
- Khalīl Beg (Āq-Quyūnlū Commander), 38;—Beg (Shāh Ismā'il's envoy), 54;—, Sūfī, 106, 107;—, Sulṭān, 106
- Sulṭān Dhu'l-Qadr (title of Ummat Beg Sārū Dhu'l-Qadr), 50, 79, 81, 83;—Sulṭān (of Shirwān), 91, 94;—ullāh (the Shirwān Shāh), 24, 37.
- Khalkhāl, 31, 33.
- Khān (of Crimea), 82.
- Khānish Khānum, 91, 94.
- Khān Jān, 30;—Mirzā, 64, 66, 67;—Zāda Begum, 63, 64, 66;—Zāda Pāshā, 22.
- Khāqān, 74.
- Kharput, 53.
- Khatā'i, 101n.
- Abu'l-Khayr Khān, 58, 59, 64.
- Khayrullāh, Bābā, 108.
- Khayru'n-Nisā Begum, 91n.
- Khiḍar Beg, 93.
- Khiyālī Tabrizī, 6, 12.
- Khudā Banda, Muḥammad, 7, 12.
- Khui, 78n.
- Khujand, 64.
- Khulāṣa-i-Maqāl, 13.
- Khulāṣatu't-Tawārīkh, 4, 6, 11.
- Khuld-i-Barīn, 13.
- Khulfa Beg, 33, 35, 36, 37, 45, 79, 81.
- Khurāsān, x, 3, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 43, 46, 50, 57, 58, 60, 61, 65, 66, 68n, 69, 70, 71, 86, 91, 92, 93, 95, 100, 105.
- Khurūl, Khwāja, 61, 64.
- Khurram Ābād, 53;—Shāh Sulṭān, 63.
- Khusraw Āqā Yūz Bāshī, 10;—Pāshā, 85.
- Khūy, 28, 29n, 52, 53, 54, 56, 78, 82.
- Khuzār, 68.
- Khuzistān, 95.
- Khwānd Amīr. See Ghiyāthu'd-Dīn ibn Humānu'd-Dīn;—, Qāsim, 70.
- Khwār, 43, 45, 56.
- Khwārazm, 59, 71.
- Khwush (gate of Hirāt), 69, 92.
- King, Sir Lucus, 14.
- Kirmān, 43, 46, 58, 59, 95, 107, 108.
- Kishm, 71n.
- Kū'i, 33.
- Kūk 'Alī Beg, 31;—Khāni, 66.
- Kur (river), 24, 27, 35, 37, 56, 57, 94.
- Kurd Beg, 84.
- Kurdish (Chiefs), 82, 84.
- Kurdistān, 15, 51.
- Kurds, 53, 54.
- Kūr Shāh Rukh, 53, 54.
- Kūsa 'Abbās, 35;—Ḥājji Bayandar, 27, 106.
- Kūzil Aḥmad, 45, 108.
- Kyāni, 60.
- Langar-i-Ghiyāthiyya, 93.
- Lāhijān, 31, 32, 33n, 39, 49, 51, 55.
- Lār, 56.
- Latakia, 82.
- Latif Beg, 38.
- Latin, 88.
- Lawand Khān, 91, 94.
- Leyden, 55n;—, Dr. John, 14.
- Lodwick II (King of Hungary), 88.
- London, ix, 14, 16.
- Lubbu't-Tawārīkh, 12.
- Lucknow, 9, 101.
- Luri (dialect), 56.
- Luristān, 55, 56, 82.
- Lytton Library ('Aligarh), 17n.
- Mahdi, 17n;—Sulṭān, 59, 66, 67.
- Mahmīn Bānu Sulṭānum, 94.
- Mahmūd Ābād, 36;—, Amīr (ibn Khwānd Amīr), 9, 10, 11, 12;—Āqā Chāwūshbāshī, 72;—Beg (the Āq-Quyūnlū), 107;—Beg Bāyandar, 46;—Beg Qājār, 47;—, Khwāja. See Kamālu'd-Dīn Mahmūd, Khwāja;—, Sulṭān, 58;—Sulṭān (of Hirāt), 61, 69, 70.
- Mahmūdī, 61, 62.
- Majāl Ūghli, 80.
- Majdu'd-Dīn Muḥammad, 91.
- Malātiya, 44n, 73, 106.
- Malcolm, Sir John, ix.
- Malik (gate of Hirāt), 69, 92.

- Mameluke (dynasty), 74n.
Mamelukes, 103.
Māmūshī, 62.
Mansūr Beg (of Darband), 57;—Parnāk, 26, 107;—Qipchāqī, 31, Qāḍī, 62.
Mantash, 34, 35.
Mantashā Ili, 65;—Sultān (title of Muṣṭafā Beg Ustājilū), 71, 79.
Maqṣūd Beg (the Āq-Quyūnlū), —(of Hirāt), 92.
Marand, 105, 106.
Mara'sh, 46, 52, 83, 84, 109.
Mārdīn, 54, 84, 85.
Marjūmak Sultān, 92.
Markham, Sir Clements, ix.
Martha, 24n.
Marw, 61, 62, 63, 64, 68, 70, 95, 100.
Mashhad, 18, 48n, 59, 60, 61, 69, 70, 93.
Masīh Mirzā, 106, 107.
Mastūn, 71n.
Abu'l-Ma'sūm Khān, 24, 25.
Maṭla'u's-Sa'dayn, 11.
Mawṣil, 46, 85.
Maydān (of Iṣfahān), 49, 56, 101.
Maymana, 64, 65.
Māzandarān, 48, 64, 65, 89, 91.
Mecca, 22, 59, 61.
Mīnūchīhr, 87.
Mirzā Beg ibn Ḥasan Ḥusaynī Junābādī, 13;—Ustājilū, 36, 53.
Mishkīn, 27.
Miyāna, 105.
Morea, 82.
Mughān, 18, 108.
Mughūl Khānum, 64.
Mughūlistān, 14.
Muhammad 'Alī, 64;—(ibn Aminu'd-Dīn Jibra'īl), 20;—, Āqā, 64, 65, 89, 91;—Beg (the Āq-Quyūnlū), 75;—Beg ibn 'Aziz Āqā, 54;—Beg (of Gharjīstān), 90;—Beg (of Kamākh), 83;—Beg (ibn Kūr Shāh Rukh), 54;—Beg (Ottoman envoy), 74;—Beg (Turkish General), 78;—Beg Ustājilū. See Jāyān Sultān;—Beg (Khān) Ustājilū, 35, 36, 37, 38, 45, 46, 53, 54, 73, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83;—al-Ḥāfīz, 17, 18;—Ḥaydar, 14. (See also Ḥaydar, Mirzā);—Ḥusayn Mirzā, 48;—Ibrāhīm, 21;—Kamūna (Sayyid), 54, 55, 79, 81;—Kāshānī, Qāḍī, 43, 47, 50, 56;—Khalīfa, Shaykh, 37, 58;—Khān Shaybānī. See Shaybānī Khān;—Khawāja, 24;—Khawāja (ibn Abu'l-Khayr Khān), 64;—Karrā, 43, 46, 49, 50, 51;—Lakūra, 64;—Mirzā (of Qazwīn), 55n;—Mirzā (ibn Sultān Junayd), 26;—Muḥsin Mirzā, 48n;—Qarāja, 37, 38;—Qulī, 13;—Sayfu'l-Mulūk, Shāh, 90;—Shaffī al-Ḥusaynī, 7;—Shaykh, 58;—II, Sultān, 75, 105, 106;—Sultān Ṭalīsh, 33, 61, 62;—Ṭāhīr (ibn Muḥammad Yūsuf) Qazwīnī, 13;—Ṭaqī, 55;—Walī Beg, 50;—Yūsuf, 13;—Zakariyā, 36, 39;—Zamān Mirzā, 10, 64, 86, 90.
Muhammadī Beg (Turkmān), 31, 32, 33;—(ibn Jahān Shāh), 105;—Mirzā, 108.
Abu'l-Muḥsin Mirzā, 71n.
Muḥsin, Sultān, 55.
Muḥyi'd-Dīn Barda'i, Qāḍī, 22;—Ibnu'l-Arabī, 20;—, Shaykh, 21;—(alias Shaykh Zāda Lāhijī), 58;—Yāhyā, 69.
Mu'īnu'd-Dīn 'Alī Tabṭīzī (better known as Qāsim-i-Anwār), 22.
Mu'izzu'd-Dīn Ḥusayn, 62.
Munqāt, 59.
Munsha'at-i-Salāṭīn, 15.
Munshī. See Iskandar.
Murād (Ottoman Prince), 73;—Beg Bāyandar, 43, 46, 108;—Beg (Dhu'l-Qadr Commander), 54;—Beg Jahān Shāhī, 48;—Beg (Sultān Murād's Commander), 45;—Khan, Sultan, 75;—, Sultān (the Āq-Quyūnlū), 9, 43, 44, 45, 46, 52, 54, 82, 86, 100, 107, 108.
Murghāb, 65, 69.
Murtaḍā, Sayyid, 13.
Mūsā Beg, 38;—(ibn Ibrāhīm), 17;—al-Kāẓim, 7, 17, 18, 55.
Musha'sha' (tribe), 55.
Muṣṭafā Beg (Turkish General), 78;—Beg Ustājilū, 71. (See also Mantashā Sultān);—Pūshā, 80, 84, 85.
Mūsh (desert), 105.
Muzaffar, Amīra, 31;—Beg Parnāk, 107;—Bitikchi, Khawāja, 5, 6, 60, 64, 65, 66, 86, 91, 92;—Ḥusayn Mirzā, 3;—, Malik (known as Khulfā Beg), 33;—Sultān (title of Amīra Dubbāī), 91.

- Nabāb-i-Marāgha, 91.
 Nafahatu'l-Uns, 7, 12.
 Najaf, 54, 55, 79.
 Najibu'd-Dīn Buzghūs Shirāzi, Shaykh, 20, 21n.
 Najm, Amīra, 31, 32, 35, 48. (See also Najmu'd-Dīn Mas'ūd;—i-Awwal (title of Najmu'd-Dīn Mas'ūd), 56, 106; —i-Thāni (title of Yār Ahmad Isfahāni), 56, 62, 64, 68, 69, 99, 104; —u'd-Dīn Kubrā, Shaykh, 20; —u'd-Dīn Mas'ūd, 51, 54, 55, 56, 104.
 Najūmi Harawī, 6.
 Nakhwud Beg, 92.
 Nakhjuwān, 37, 38, 83, 87, 91, 94.
 Naqsh-i-Jahān, 50.
 Narrative of Italian Travels in Persia, 16, 106.
 Nāzin Beg Qājār, 87n.
 Nasab Nūma-i-Ṣafawīyya, 3, 4, 7.
 Nāsir Mansūr Turkmān, 45.
 Nāsiru'd-Dīn, 84n.
 Nāw, 31.
 Nāzin Beg Qājār, 87
 Nikūdari, 58
 Nisā, 71.
 Nishāpūr, 71, 93.
 Nizāmu'd-Dīn Ṭabaṭai, 93.
 Nūdhar, Bābā, 60.
 Nūr 'Alī Beg, 107; —Khalīfa Rūmlū, 73, 78, 79, 83, 84.
 Nusakh-i-Jahān Ārā, 7, 11, 12; —i-Jāmi'a-i-Marūsīlāt-i-Ulu'l-al-Bāb, 14.
 Othoman, ix, 15, 50, 62, 72, 74, 76, 78, 79, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 105.
 Oxford, 7n, 14.
 Oxus, 58, 59, 65, 68, 69, 92.
 Pahlawān, 64n.
 Palestine, 23.
 Parazdīn, 80, 82.
 Pari Chalapi, 82; —Khān Khānum, 94.
 Pāshā Khātūn, 30, 31.
 Pāyanda Khān, 13.
 Pericles, 78.
 Persia, ix, x, 14, 15, 16, 20, 22n, 23n, 43, 58, 59, 62, 64, 66, 69, 72, 73, 74, 75, 81, 84, 89, 95, 102; —Lit. History of (by E. G. Browne), ix, 105n, 106n.
 Persian 'Irāq, 43, 44, 73, 95, 108; —(language), 32, 76; —(soldiers), 101.
 Peshdādi, 60.
 Petres, Frère, 88.
 Pharaohs, 74.
 Pīl Chirāgh, 71.
 Pīr Ahmad Beg, 92, 93.
 Pīrā Beg (Chāwūshlū), 79, 81.
 Pīri Sulṭān, 70, 92.
 Pishbārmāq, 73.
 Pool, R. S. (author of Persian Coins), 39n, 67n.
 Pul-i-Chirāgh, 71n.
 Qādī-i-Jahān Ḥusaynī, 55.
 Qājār (tribe), 35.
 Qalmāq, 59.
 Qanānj, 35.
 Qanbar Aqā, 10, 44; —Bey, 62.
 Qandahār, 64, 65, 71, 86, 92, 93, 95.
 Qānsū, Sulṭān (or Ashraf Qānsū Ghūri), 46, 66, 84.
 Qār Jabarī, 73.
 Qarā-Bāgh, 37, 57, 107; —Baqqāl, 71: —Beg (Khān), 53, 54, 83, 84, 85; —Dada, 32; —Ḥamid, 53, 54, 84, 85; —Kūz Pāshā, 65; —Muḥammad, 23; —Pīri Beg Qājār, 25, 27, 28, 33, 37, 38, 45, 67; —Quyūnlū (dynasty), 23; —'Uthmān, 23, 105; —Yūsuf, 23.
 Qarāja-Dāgh, 37; —Ilvās (Bāyburdlū), 34, 38; —Pāshā, 80.
 Qarāmān, 65, 74, 77, 85.
 Qarchaghāt Beg, 37, 38.
 Qarshī, 68.
 Qarūyāl, 24n.
 Qāsīm, Abū Muḥammad, 17; —i-Anwār. See Mu'īnu'd-Dīn 'Alī Tabrizī; Abū'l— Bakhshī, 70; —Beg, 46; —Beg Bāyandar, 44; —Beg (of Hirāt), 92, 93; —Beg (ibn Jahāngīr Beg), 43, 44, 108; —Beg Parnāk, 108; —Beg alias Sārū Qapalān, 53; —Beg Turkmān, 32; al—Iwūghlī, 14; —Qāsīmī Gunābādī, 9, 101; —, Shaykh, 33.
 Qawj Ḥiṣār, 85.
 Qāyin, 70, 71, 79, 86.
 Qaysariyya, 52, 72.
 Qāytmas Beg, 53; —(Dhu'l-Qadr Commander), 54.
 Qāzān Beg Rūmlū, 87.
 Qāzāq Beg Rūmlū, 87n.
 Qazwin, 56, 108.
 Qibla (fort), 35; —Ḥiṣār, 73.
 Qiwām Beg, 90.

- Qizil Ahmad Ughli, 87;—Bashes (or Red-Heads), 25, 36, 45, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 61, 63, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 84, 85, 87;—Üzün, 51, 108.
- Qudürmish Sultân (title of Acha Sultân' Qâjâr), 86.
- Quli Beg alias Jûsh Mirzâ, 35-36;—Jân Beg, 64, 107;—Jân Khânüm, 107.
- Qum, 44, 45n, 47, 66, 73, 87, 89, 90, 107, 108.
- Qümîn Ulamî, 35.
- Qunduz, 59, 66.
- Qûniya (or Iconium), 75.
- Qur'an, 18, 20, 32, 55.
- Qûrj, 35.
- Qurq Sidi 'Alî, 31.
- Qurqura, Malik, 87.
- Quţbu'd-Dîn Ahmad, 17, 18, 19.
- Rađiu'd-Dîn, 20.
- Rafi', Sayyid, 60.
- Rangîn, 18.
- Rânkûh, 51, 52.
- Rasht, 31, 32, 35, 51, 90, 104.
- Rawđlatu's-Şafawîyya, 13.
- Rawshan Amîr, 21n.
- Ray, 45, 47, 49, 56, 65, 108.
- Red-Heads. See Qizil-Bashes.
- Rieu, Dr. C. (author of Catalogue of Persian MSS. in the British Museum, London), 7n, 9, 11n, 101n.
- Riyâdî, 101.
- Ross, Sir E. D., ix, 8n, 9, 10, 14, 32n, 33n, 34n.
- Royal Victories, History of the, 3.
- Rû'n Dizh, 108.
- Rümlü (tribe), 35, 36.
- Rumelia, 76, 80, 82.
- Rustam Äqâ, 48;—Beg Qarâmânî, 27, 31, 33;—, Malik Shâh, 55, 56, 82;—Mirzâ, 26, 27, 28, 29n, 30, 32, 33, 87, 107;—Rûz-Afzûn, 64, 65.
- Sabzawâr (now in Afghânistân), 93;—(in Persia), 93.
- Sa'dî Shirâzi, Shaykh Muşlihu'd-Dîn, 20.
- Şadru'd-Dîn Mûsâ, Shaykh, 6, 17, 21, 22;—Sultân Ibrâhîm Amîni Harawî, 3, 5, 6, 12.
- Şafawî (dynasty), ix, 14, 19, 25.
- Şafawîs, 11, 13, 17n, 35, 61, 62, 65.
- Safi I, Shâh, 14.
- Safid, Fort, 46.
- Şafîyyu'd-Dîn Ishâq, Shaykh, 7, 17, 19, 20, 21, 24, 30, 33.
- Şafwatu's-Şafâ, 6, 7, 8, 12.
- Abû Sa'id İsfahânî, 92, 105;—, Shaykh, 21, 22, 23;—(ibn Shaykh Ibrâhîm), 23;—(ibn Shaykh Şafîyyu'd-Dîn Ishâq), 21;—Sultân, 105.
- Şâ'in Kadûki, 94;—Qala', 108.
- St. Petersburg, 91n.
- Şalâhu'd-Dîn (ibn Amînu'd-Dîn Jibra'îl), 20;—Rashîd, 17, 18;—(ibn Shaykh Şadru'd-Dîn Mûsâ), 22.
- Şâlih, Shaykh, 17, 18n, 19.
- Salîm, Malik, 27;—Nâma, 15, 82;—I, Sultân, 15, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 86, 90, 100;—II, Sultân, 15.
- Saljûq Shâh Begum, 24.
- Sâm Mirzâ, 8, 87, 92, 93, 94.
- Samarqand, 58, 61, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68n, 70.
- Sang-i-Kul, 34.
- Sarâ-i-Barga, 22.
- Sarakhs, 61.
- Sârû 'Alî Beg Takkalû, 38, 45, 52;—Ptrâ, 79, 80, 81;—Qapalân. See Qâsim Beg.
- Sârûqâya, 34, 44, 100.
- Sâsânian, 95.
- Sâwâ, 66, 70, 91.
- Sâwuj Bulâgh, 49, 56.
- Sâyaltamash Beg, 48.
- Seddon, C. N., 11, 35n, 60n.
- Shâbirân, 36, 57.
- Shahistar, 66.
- Shâdî Pâshâ, 84.
- Shâh-Âbâd, 70;—Dâghî, Mount, 94;—Kaldî Äqâ, 36;—Nâma-i-Mâđî (or Shâh Nâma-i-Qâsimî), 9, 101;—Quli, Bâbâ, 65, 66;—Quli Mihtar, 93, 104;—Rukh Beg Afshâr, 67, 71;—Rukh, Kûr, 53, 54;—rukhîyya, 59;—Suwâr Beg Dhu'l-Qadr, 78, 80, 84, 93;—zâda Sultânüm, 94n.
- Shahr-i-Naw, 36;—Sabz, 59.
- Shakî, 25, 94.
- Shamâkhî, 35, 36, 57.
- Shamâsi, 30.
- Shâmlü (tribe), 35, 36.
- Shamsu'd-Dîn Lâhijî, 32, 39, 47, Muhammad Şahib Diwân, Khwâja, 55;—(ibn Shaykh Zâhid), 21;—Tabrizî, Shaykh, 20.

- Sharaf Shāh, 17;— u'd-Din, 21;—u'd-Din Beg, 53.
- Sharifu'd-Din 'Alī Astarābādī, 56, 66, 70, 79, 81;—Jurjānī, 56;—Shirāzi, 50.
- Sharūr, 37, 38, 100.
- Shaybān, 58.
- Shaybānī Khān Uzbek, 3, 15, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 73-74, 100.
- Shaykh Shāh (the Shirwān Shāh), 27, 36, 56, 57, 87, 91, 94.
- Shaykhum Mīrzā, 68.
- Shaykh Zāda Lāhijī, 56. (See also Muhyi'd-Din).
- Shibarghān, 65, 71.
- Shihābu'd-Dīn Ghūrī, 70;—Maḥmūd Āharī, Shaykh, 20.
- Shirāz, 19, 20, 22, 45, 46, 51n, 56, 83, 103, 104, 106, 108.
- Shir Sārim, 51, 52.
- Shirwān, 23n, 24, 25, 27, 35, 36n, 37, 56n, 57, 87, 91, 94, 100, 107, 108.
- Shuayb Āqā, 47, 49.
- Shujā' Beg, 64, 65, 71, 93.
- Shukrullāh Mughānī, 83.
- Shulistān, 46.
- Shunb-i-Ghāzān, 64, 71.
- Shūra Gil, 34.
- Shūshtar, 56.
- Sihand, 86, 91.
- Silsilatū'n-Nasab-i-Şafawīyya, 7, 20.
- Simnān, 43, 45, 65.
- Sinān Āghā, 85;—Pāshā, 73, 76, 80, 84.
- Sind (or Indus), 93.
- Sipāh Sālār Lib. (Ṭīhrān), 13.
- Sirān, 59.
- Siyāh Āb, 62.
- Siyāward, 21.
- Siyāwūsh, Amīra, 31.
- Subḥānullāh Khān Section (Lytton Lib., Altgerh), 17n.
- Şūfiyān Khalīfa Rūnlū, 65, 66, 92, 93.
- Suhrāb Beg Chalāwī, 49.
- Sulaymān Beg, 25;—Beg (of Diyār Bakr), 107;—Beg (of Parazdīn), 80, 82;—Bījan Ūghlī, 25n;—(Dhu'l-Qadr), 84n;—Mīrzā, 26, 32n, 71;—, Shāh, 7, 13;—, Sultān, 15, 72, 74, 82.
- Sultān Aḥmad Mīrza, Tower of, 92;—Bakht, 22;—Būd, 107;—Bulāghī, 60;—Ḥusayn Bārānī, 34;—Ḥusayn Mīrzā (of Hirāt), 3, 13, 43, 48n, 50, 58, 64, 71n;—Maydān, 70;—Muḥammad Mīrzā, 71;—Muḥammad Shirāzi, 67.
- Sultāniyya, 52, 57, 90, 108.
- Sūnjuk Khān, 59.
- Şürlüç, 49, 51, 52, 66, 67, 87.
- Süykān, 78.
- Switzerland, 88.
- Sykes, Sir Percy, ix.
- Syria, 22, 34, 46, 103.
- Tabarner, 88.
- Ṭabarsarān, 24, 25, 26, 30, 51, 57.
- Ṭabas, 50.
- Ṭabriz, 15, 16, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28n, 30, 32, 38, 39, 43, 44, 45, 47, 56, 57, 64, 66, 71, 73, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 86, 87, 90n, 91, 93, 94, 100, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108.
- Ṭaghtāi, 58.
- Ṭāhirābād, 61, 62n.
- Ṭāhir Wahīd, Mīrzā, 17n.
- Ṭahmāsp (Mīrzā—Shāh), 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 70, 86, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 104.
- Ṭāju'd-Dīn Beg, 73;—Ḥasan Chalapī, 93;—Ibrāhīm (real name of Shaykh Zāhid Gilānī), 21n.
- Takka İli, 65.
- Takkalū (tribe), 35, 36.
- Talakhtān, 61, 62.
- Tang-i-Jukjuk (or Darband-i-Āhanīn), 68.
- Ṭāq-i-Kisrā, 55.
- Ṭaqīyyu'd-Dīn Işfahānī, 47, 51.
- Tardhī Bābā, 50.
- Tārīkh-i-Aḥwāl-i-Salāṭīn-i-Turkmān, 3, 7, 12;—Ālam Ārā-i-'Abbāsī, 3, 4, 5, 7, 12, 23n;—Gilān, 91;—Ismā'il, 13;—Jahān Gushāy-i-Juwaynī, 20, 55;—Rashīdī, 14, 59;—Shāh Ismā'il-wa-Shāh Ṭahmāsp, 11, 12;—Sultānī, 13.
- Tarjān, 77.
- Ṭārum, 33, 51, 52, 99.
- Ṭāshqand, 59.
- Ṭawālīsh, 33.
- Ṭifis, 106.
- Ṭīhrān, 5, 8, 13, 17n, 49.
- Ṭīmūr, 77, 78;—Qāpī (or Darband), 25;—Sultān, Muḥammad, 58-59, 61, 64, 69, 70;—Ṭāsh, 22.
- Ṭīmūrid (dynasty), 58.
- Tirmidh, 68.

- Toledo, 88, 89.
 Transoxiana, 7, 11, 13, 61, 62, 64, 65, 92, 99, 104.
 Travels of a Merchant, 44n;—in Persia (by Caterino Zenro), 24n;—to Tanta and Persia, 16;—of Venetians in Persia, 16, 24n, 44n.
 Trebizond, 24, 77, 84, 105.
 Tughluq Timūr Khān, 14, 58.
 Tuḥfa-i-Sāmī, 101n.
 Tūl, 31.
 Tūqājī Gate, 73.
 Tūqāt, 73.
 Turbat, 66, 93.
 Turkey, ix, x, 8, 11, 13, 72, 73, 77, 91, 107.
 Turkistān, 59, 67.
 Turks, 79.
 Tūs, 48n, 69, 93.
 Tūtāk (fort), 87.
 Ūba-i-Jarrāḥa, 31, 32.
 'Ubaydullāh Khān Uzbek, 58, 61, 64, 68, 69, 70, 74, 86, 92, 104.
 Ūghalān Ummat (Chāwūshlū), 34, 52.
 Ūghūrlū Muḥammad, 32, 105, 106, 107.
 Ulang-i-Kaniz, 51, 56n, 107, 108;—Kharqān, 57, 58;—Rādikān, 70, 90.
 Ūlama Qūlāghī, 44, 100.
 'Umar ibn Jamāl, 19.
 Ummat Beg Sārū Dhu'l-Qadr, 50. (See also Khalīl Sulṭān.)
 Urdūnā Beg, 53.
 Urdū Shāh, 90.
 Ūrganj, 59.
 Urghūn Shāh, 22.
 Ūrkamaz Beg, 54.
 Ustā, 47, 48, 49.
 Ustājilū (tribe), 34, 35, 36.
 'Uthmān Beg Mawṣilū, 37.
 Utrār, 59.
 Uways Beg, 80, 82.
 Ūzbeg Khān, 22.
 Ūzbek-, ix, x, 15, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 74, 75, 80, 87, 91, 92, 100.
 Ūzūn Ḥasan. See Ḥasan Beg, Amīr.
 Vambery, A. ix.
 Van, 107.
 Venetian Republic, 106.
 Waḥid Mirzā Tāḥir, 17n.
 Walad Beg, 93.
 Waladislav II, 88.
 Waqūz-Alām, 34.
 Warāmīn, 47, 108.
 Warsāq (tribe), 35.
 Yādgar Muḥammad Mirzā, 105.
 Yaḥyā ibn 'Abdu'l-Laṭīf al-Ḥuṣayni al-Qazwīnī, Amīr, 12.
 Yakad Aḥmad, 84.
 Yaki Ḥiṣār, 83.
 Yakān Beg Takkalū, 45.
 Ya'qūb (ibn Amīnu'd-Dīn Jibra'īl), 20;—Jān Beg, 46;—Mirzā, 25, 26, 27n, 30, 33n, 43, 72, 106, 107, 108;—(ibn Sulṭān Murād), 109.
 Yār Aḥmad Iṣfahānī, 56, 104. (See also Najm-i-Thānī.)
 Yāsīn, 35.
 Yazd, 43, 46, 47, 49, 50, 104, 108.
 Yūsuf Beg (ibn Amīr Ḥasan Beg), 33;—(ibn Jahān Shāh), 105;—Warsāq, 79, 81.
 Zāghān, Bāgh-i-, 94.
 Zāhid Gūlānī Shaykh, 21.
 Zaynah Khānum, 94.
 Zaynal Beg (ibn Amīr Ḥasan Beg), 106;—Beg (Sulṭān—Khān) Shāmlū, 56, 61, 62, 67, 70, 79, 86, 90, 93;—Pāshā, 77.
 Zaynu'd-Dīn Khwāfī, Shaykh, 13;—Sulṭān, 93.
 Zaynu'l 'Abidīn Beg Ṣafawī, 67, 69.
 Zāwa, 101.
 Zubdatu't-Tawārikh, 13.