MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

RULERS OF LAHIJAN AND FUMAN, IN GILAN, PERSIA

This account of the local dynasties of Gilán is culled from the following sources:—

- 1. Ta'ríkh-i-Gílán wa Daylamistán (750–894 = 1349–1488) of Mír Zahíru'd-Dín Mar'ashí, published at Rasht in 1330 A.H., by H. L. Rabino, from the only known manuscript which is in the Bodleian Library.
- 2. Ta'ríkh-i-Khání (880–920 = 1475–1514) of 'Alí ibn Shamsu'd-Dín ibn Ḥájjí Ḥusayn Láhijí, edited by B. Dorn, St. Pet., 1857.
- 3. Ta'ríkh-i-Gílán of 'Abdu'l-Fattáh Fúmaní (923–1038 = 1517–1628), edited by B. Dorn, St. Pet., 1858.
- 4. Majálisu'l-Mú'minín of Qází Núru'lláh Tustarí, in which appears the genealogy of Amír Kiyá, and a brief account of his successors.

Other Persian works, such as the Aḥsanu't-Tawáríkh of Ḥasan Beg Rúmlú, the Sharaf-náma of Sharafu'd Dín of Bitlís, etc., have also been consulted.

Lähijän

The district of Lāhijān, one of the largest and most important of the province of Gīlān, lies eastward of the Safīd Rūd, and is nearly all plain, having but few mountains to the south. It is bordered on the north by the Caspian, on the east by Langarūd and Rānikūh, on the south by Sumām and Daylamān, on the south-west by Siyāhkal, and on the west by the Safīd Rūd and the districts of Mawāzī and Lashtanishāh.

Its length from north to south, that is from the former mouth of the Safid Rūd to Sarlayl, is about 27 miles, and its width from east to west, or from Kīsum to Dizbun, about 15 miles.

Mustawfi in the eighth (fourteenth) century describes

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Centre Universitaire, on 04 May 2017 at 17:34:33, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00051121

Lāhijān as a fair-sized town. Much silk was manufactured here, and the district grew rice and corn, also oranges and shaddocks with other fruits of a hot region.

During the beginning of the third century of the Hijra, Lāhijān was part of the dominions of Wahsūdān, king of Daylam, who, by ceding Shamīrān to the Āl-i-Kangar family, i.e. to Muḥammad ibn Muzaffar, lost his supremacy over the whole of Gīlān, and thus confined his own dynasty to the possession of Lāhijān, that is to half only of his former kingdom.

When Uljāytū Sulṭān invaded Gīlān, the ruler of Lāhijān, Pādishāh Nū¹ and his relatives, came out to meet him with a sword and winding sheet, and made their submission. He was well received, and was given in marriage the daughter of one of the Mongol Amīrs. He was not only confirmed in his government, but the other rulers of Gīlān were made subordinate to him. Rashīdu'd-Dīn Fazlu'lláh describes him as the greatest ruler in Gīlān in wealth and in dignity. The ruler of Tamījān was at that time Amīra Muḥammad, who also submitted to the Mongols.

Half a century later, the rulers of Lāhijān and Rānikūh were two brothers of the Nāṣirwand clan. Amīra Sharafu'd-Dawla, son of Amīra Pahlawān, had relinquished the throne of Lāhijān to his son, Amīra Jihān, and started on a pilgrimage to Mecca, but, falling ill at Tabrīz, he returned to Lāhijān, where he died.

His brother, Amīra Muḥammad, was ruler of Rānikūh. He also abdicated in favour of his son, Nū Pāshā, and went to reside at Chahārda.

Nū Pāshā had first to contend with Sayyid 'Alī Kiyā. The latter, with the help of Sayyid Rikābzan Kiyā of Tunakābun, entered Rānikūh and surprised Chahārda, where he put Amīra Muḥammad to death. Nū Pāshā compelled Sayyid 'Alī Kiyā to retire to Āmul, and entered

into an alliance with Sayyid Rikābzan. These two compassed the death of Amīra Jihān, and occupied Lähijan. On the approach of Amira Anuz Kühdumi to the help of Amīra Muḥammad and Amīra Pahlawān, the sons of the late ruler, the inhabitants of Lahijan rose against and slew Sayyid Rikābzan Kiyā, whilst Amīra Nū Pāshā fled to Rānikūh. The latter was soon compelled to leave the country by Sayyid 'Alī Kiyā, who in 769 A.H. = 1367-8 A.D., rendered himself master of the whole of Biyapish (that part of the plain of Gilan lying to the east of the Safid Rūd). After the defeat and death of Sayyid 'Alī at Rasht, Amīra Dubbāj of Fūman gave Lāhijān to Kūla Bahādur Nāsirwand, who had married the sister of Amīra Muḥammad Rashtī, Gūka to Fir'awn ibn Malik, Pāshījā to Amīra Jalālu'd-Dīn, and Rānikūh and Kīsum to Amira Mas'ūd. These governors belonged to the Nāṣirwand clan. Rānikūh was given to Salūk Mardāwij, a person formerly in the service of Sayyid 'Alī Kiyā, but who had left it out of spite, and was in command of the troops that had defeated the Sayvid at Rasht.

This second rule of the Nāṣirwand only lasted five months, from Ramaẓān, 791, to Ṣafar, 792 (Aug., 1389 to Jan.-Feb., 1390 A.D.), when Sayyid Hādī Kiyā again seized the whole of Biyapīsh.

The Amīr Kiyā'ī Sayyids ruled Biyapīsh from 769 to 1000 A.H (1367–1592 A.D.). The first person of this family to rebel was Amīr Kiyā, son of Ḥusayn ibn Ḥasan ibn 'Alī (who removed from Fashtām to Malāṭ) ibn Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Ghaznawī (so called because he was for some time a pupil of 'Abdu'l-Wahhāb Ghaznawī), ibn Muḥammad ibn Abū Zayd (who left Abhar for Gīlān, where he settled in the village of Fashtām in Kūhdum) ibn Abī Muḥammad Ḥusayn ibn Aḥmad al-Akbar (known as 'Aqīqī Kawkabī), ibn 'Īsā al-Kūfī (a very learned person who out of fear of the 'Abbāsīds fled from Kūfa

to Abhar), ibn 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn al-Asghar ibn 'Alī Zaynu'l-'Ābidīn

Savvid Amîr Kiyā was compelled to retire to Rustamdar, where he died about a year later, in 763 A.H. (1361-2). His son Sayyid 'Alī, with the help of the Mar'ashī Sayyids of Māzandarān, made himself master of Biyapish in 769 (1367-8), and gradually extended his rule to the mountains of Ashkawar and Daylaman, to Kuhdum, Lashtanishāh, and Kūchisfahān, and even to Tārum and Qazwin, which latter city he held for seven years. Tîmür summoned him to surrender Qazwin, Tārum, and the castle of Shamiran, a summons which had to be obeyed. The loss of prestige consequent upon this surrender emboldened the rulers of Rasht, Fuman, Shaft, and Gaskar to endeavour to wrest Kühdum and Küchisfahan from the Savvid's hands. Savvid 'Alī and many of his brothers and relatives were killed in 791 (1389), in a battle outside Rasht, and Biyapish, together with the mountainous country south of it, fell once more under the sway of its former rulers. Five months later Sayyid Hādī Kiyā, a brother of Sayyid 'Alī Kiyā, who had been appointed governor of Tunakābun, where he had remained unmolested after his retreat from Rasht, was invited by Amira Dubbāj of Fūman to bring Biyapīsh under his rule. This he succeeded in doing, but in 797 (1394-5) his nephews, Sayyid Husayn Kiyā, son of Sayyid 'Alī Kiyā, and Sayyid Muḥammad Kiyā (known as Amīra Sayyid Muḥammad), son of Sayvid Mahdī Kiyā, dissatisfied with their uncle because of his refusal to return to them the districts which had belonged to their father, compelled him to retire to Tunakābun. Sayyid Husayn Kiyā became ruler of Lāhijān, and Amīra Sayyid Muḥammad ruler of Rānikūh. Sayyid Husayn Kiyā was an incompetent governor who soon alienated the good will of the inhabitants, so that his brother, Sayyid Razī Kiyā, had no difficulty in ousting him. The new Wali turned his attention to the mountainous

region south of Lähijan, from which he expelled the Hazāraspi, Kūshayi, and Isma'ili (Assassin) rulers, and brought the whole of that country, including Alamut, under his sway. His authority once firmly established, he began rebuilding and embellishing Ranikuh, Rudisar, Malāt, Daylamān, Sumām, and other villages. He died on the 1st Jumāda i, 829 (March 11, 1426), and was succeeded by his brother, Sayyid Husayn Kiyā, the former Wālī. The last-named seized the Pusht-i-Küh district of Rustamdar, but was ordered by Timur to return it to its rightful owner, Malik Kayumarth. In consequence of a private quarrel with Amīra Sayyid Muḥammad of Rānikūh, the latter in Safar, 833 (November, 1429), came with his troops to Lāhijān, where he installed his son, Sayyid Nāsir Kiyā, as ruler. Sayvid Husayn Kiyā having collected reinforcements marched on Lāhijān, and Sayyid Nāṣir Kiyā was compelled to retire to Malāț. Amīra Sayyid Muhammad expelled Sayyid Husayn Kiyā a second time, and appointed governor the latter's nephew, Sultan Husayn Kiya. Shortly afterwards Kārgiyā Nāṣir Kiyā and Kārgiyā Sayyid Ahmad rebelled against their father, Amīra Sayyid Muhammad, and confined him in the castle of Alamut, where he died on the 8th Jumāda i,837 (December 21,1433).

Kārgiyā Nāṣir Kiyā then became ruler of Lāhijān, and his brother that of Rānikūh, but the latter, dissatisfied with his share, openly took up arms against his brother in 845 (1441-2). He was defeated and finally sought refuge with Amīra Muḥammad at Rasht, where he died on the 28th Rajab, 853 (September 17, 1449).

Kārgiyā Nāṣir Kiyā died on the 12th of Dhu'l-Qa'da, 851 (January 19, 1448), and was succeeded, as ruler of Biyapīsh, by his son, Sultān Muḥammad, who, at one time, was overlord of the whole borderland, "dāru'l-marz," from Astārā to Astarābād, by appointment of the Court of Persia. Sultān Muḥammad sent many expeditions to Rustamdār, and in 872 (1467-8) occupied Qazwīn, which he held for

some time. Later, on agreeing to pay to the Royal Treasury of Ḥasan Beg 40 *kharwārs* of 60 *mans* of Tabrīz of silk, he was given full control of Biyapas (that part of the plain of Gīlān lying to the west of the Safīd Rūd), and in 882 (1477-8) proclaimed Amīra Is-ḥāq ruler of that district.

Sulṭān Muḥammad died on the last day of Rabī' i, 883 (July 1, 1478), and was succeeded by his eldest son, Mīrzā 'Alī, who abolished the "zana-zar" and "murdashūrāna" taxes (on weddings and funerals) and allowed daughters of parents who had no male heir to inherit. During the zenith of his power his rule extended to Qazwīn, Shahriyār, Tihrān, the district of Ray and Warāmīn, Fīrūzkūh, Tārum, Sāwa, Zanjān, and Sulṭāniyya, and he sent numerous expeditions to Māzandarān.

His relations with the rulers of Biyapas, however, became very strained, and his brother Sultān Ḥasan, taking advantage of the invasion of Lāhijān and Daylamān by the troops of Biyapas, deposed him and proclaimed himself Wālī. Eighteen months later, on the 4th Ramazān, 911 (January 29, 1506), Sultān Ḥasan was murdered by his brother, Mīrzā ʿAlī, who himself was killed the next day by the followers of his victim.

Sulṭān Aḥmad Khān succeeded his father, Sulṭān Ḥasan. His barber, Warsar Qāsim, had been appointed by him Wakīl of Biyapīsh, and had been given full control of the affairs of that province, so that nothing but the name of sovereignty remained to his master, by whom he was eventually put to death in 936 (1529–30). Sulṭān Aḥmad Khān, after a visit to the court of Persia, gave up the Zaydī tenets for the Shī'a doctrine, and, on his return to Gīlān, made the inhabitants follow his example. He died in 940 (1533–4), having reigned 30 years and 2 months. His son, Kārgiyā Sayyid 'Alī, was of a quiet and mild disposition, which alienated from him the military officers, who joined his brother, Kārgiyā Sulṭān Ḥasan. The latter seized Kārgiyā Sayyid 'Alī and put him to death in 941

(1534-5). The new ruler died of plague in 943 (1536-7) whilst on an expedition to Biyapas.

Kārgiyā Sultān Hasan left a son a year old named Khān Ahmad Khān; Shāh Tahmāsp profited by this circumstance to appoint a prince of the royal family governor of Biyapīsh. Khān Ahmad Khān's rights, however, were soon recognized, and he extended his rule to Biyapas, but, by refusing to obey the royal mandates, he incurred the Shāh's wrath, and was obliged to seek refuge in the mountains of Ashkawar, where, after many months of wandering, he was surprised, and interned first in the castle of Qahqaha, and, later, in that of Istakhr in Fars, where he remained for twelve years, until the accession of Sultan Muhammad Khudabanda. 984 (1576-7) he was released, married a daughter of Shāh Tahmāsp, and returned to Gilān. During the war between Turkey and Persia he offered to surrender Lāhijān to the Turks, and invited the Sultan to send troops from Shīrwān to Lāhijān, whence it was but a short distance to Qazwin. After the conclusion of peace with Turkey, Shāh 'Abbās summoned his vassal to appear at his Court, but this Khān Ahmad Khān refused to do. The Shah, thereupon, invaded Gilan at the head of a large army, and Khān Aḥmad Khān sailed in Shawwāl, 1000 (July-August, 1592), for Shīrwān, whence he fled to Constantinople, and remained there until his death.

The Shāh then appointed a governor of Biyapīsh to reside at Lāhijān, and a governor of Biyapas to reside at Fūman. I am unable to say when the whole of Gīlān was entrusted for the first time to a governor residing at Rasht, but this was probably towards the end of the reign of Nādir.

Gmelin, who was in Gīlān in 1772, mentions that it was only seven years since Lāhijān had submitted to the authority of Hidāyat Khān of Fūman. A few years prior to his visit the $n\bar{a}'ib$ of Lāhijān, summoned to Rasht by Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Centre Universitaire, on 04 May 2017 at 17:34:33, subject

Hidāyat Khān, was shot on the road. Karīm Khān-i-Zand, on hearing of this, sent strict orders for the apprehension of the assassin, but the latter was never found, and Karīm Khān imposed a yearly contribution of 500 mans of silk on Gīlān so that the crime should not remain unpunished. It was generally believed that Hidāyat Khān had instigated the murder of the nā'ib, as he had doubts of his fidelity. This nā'ib is said to have been Āqā Ma'ṣūm, Ṣāḥib Ikhtiyār, whose sister had married Hidāyat Khān. Āqā Ma'ṣūm left a son, Mīrzā Ṣādiq, and his great-grandchildren, Mīrzā Ṣādiq, Mīrzā Muḥammad 'Alī, and Mīrzā 'Abdu'r-Raḥīm, sons of Hājjī Abū Ṭālib ibn Ṣādiq, are now in Lāhijān.

The last hereditary governor of Lāhijān was Mīrzā Ahmad Khān, Sālār - i - Mu'ayyad (dismissed by the Nationalist Government in 1907), ibn Mīrzā Ḥusayn Khān, Mu'azzamu's-Salṭana ibn Ḥājjī Mīrzā Muḥammad 'Alī Khān Amīn-i-Dīwān ibn Mīrzā Kāzim (who died in 1842) ibn Ḥājjī Abū'l-Qásim (brother of 'Ali Akbar Khān, who was governor in 1831 and built the Akbariyya mosque) ibn Ḥājjī Ṣādiq (presumably a brother of Āqā Ma'ṣūm, Ṣāḥib Ikhtiyār) ibn Ḥājjī Mahdī ibn Ḥājjī Mīrzā ibn Ḥājjī Hasan.

FUMAN

Fūman lies west-south-west of Rasht. It is mostly in the plain, with only a few mountains belonging to it to the south-east. It is bounded on the north by Gaskar, the Murdāb, and Tūlam; on the east by Shaft and the Pasī Khān River; on the south by Pusht-i-Kūh-i-Tārum and the mountains of Shaft and of Māsūla; and on the west by Māsāl. Its greatest length, from north to south, is about 24 miles, and its width, from east to west, about 16 miles.

The following is the description of Fūman given in the Masāliku'l-Abṣār fī Mamāliki'l-Amṣār: "Le souverain de Foumen, seul entre tous les princes de Djil, suit les

dogmes de Schafei, car les rois de cette province sont élevés dans les principes de cette secte. Les troupes qu'il a sur pied montent à plus de 1,000 cavaliers. Lui et le souverain de Lahidjan rêgnent sur un territoire de peu d'étendue. La plus grande partie de leur revenu provient du commerce. La soie s'y recueille en abondance; aussi les Tatars entretiennent avec les deux princes des relations d'amitié et d'alliance, afin que les marchands puissent entrer librement dans les deux provinces, et en exporter la soie: de leur côté, ces princes ont besoin des droits qu'ils lèvent sur ceux qui viennent faire le commerce dans leurs états.

"Les autres province de la contrée de Djil ont besoin de celles de Foumen et de Lahidjan pour le même objet; mais surtout de celle de Foumen, où l'on trouve des étoffes et autres articles manufacturés. Dans le même territoire, au voisinage des montagnes, est une mine de fer.

"Le prince de Foumen prétend être allié à la famille du Prophête. Il protêge avec zêle les gens de lettres et tous les hommes de mérite. Le costume des rois et des gens de guerre resemble à celui d'une partie des Tatars. Celui des hommes de lettres à de l'analogie avec celui des marchands. Les uns et les autres laissent, comme les Sofis, pendre par devant les bouts de leurs turbans. Toute la masse du peuple est vêtue comme le peuple des nations voisines."

Fūman was the seat of Dābū son of Gīl Gāwbāra. Nothing is known of the rulers of Fūman before the time of Sultān Shāh Gīl. He gave refuge to 'Alā'u'd-Dawla, son of Shāh Ghāzī Rustam of Māzandarān [whom he succeeded in 558 (1163)], when 'Alā'u'd-Dawla was defeated by the Ustundār Kay-kā'ūs, against whom he had been sent by his father. Iskandar Munshī mentions that the Is-ḥāqī dynasty of Fūman claimed descent from the prophet Is-hāq. Rashīdu'd-Dīn Fazlu'llāh, however, asserts that they are descended from Sāsān.

The genealogical tree of Amīra Dubbāj, who was reigning in Fuman when the Amīr Kiyā'ī Sayyids seized the government of Lāhijān, is as follows: Dubbāj ibn 'Alā'u'd-Dīn ibn Rustam ibn Dubbāj (who at the time of the Mongol invasion opposed Qutlugh Shah and after the latter's death was defeated by the other Mongol chiefs and compelled to submit to Uljāytū; he is described as the most influential amongst the numerous rulers of Gīlān) ibn Fīlān Shāh ibn Rustam ibn Dubbāj ibn Khīlū ibn Sharafu'd - Dawla ibn Sultān Shāh ibn Dubbāj ibn Arkân ibn Jayhūn ibn Fanākhusraw ibn Abi'n-nasr ibn Is-haq (whence the dynasty derives its name of Saḥāqī, Is-ḥāqī, or Is-ḥāqwand) ibn Salm ibn Qābūs ibn Īraj ibn Habash ibn Shahriyār ibn Fīrūz ibn Balāsh ibn Bahrām ibn Balāsh ibn Ardashīr ibn Fīrūz ibn Narsī ibn Gūdarz ibn Balāsh ibn Bahrām ibn Shāpūr ibn Ashk, the founder of the Ashkāniān (Parthian) dynasty. This genealogical tree slightly differs from that given in the Durratu't-Tāj li ghurreti Dubbāj. Its author Qutbu'd-Dīn Mahmūd ibn Mas'û'd Shīrāzī mentions that Habash, grandfather of Arkân ibn Dubbāj, was the son of Balash ibn Narsi ibn Hurmuz ibn Ardashir ibn Fīrūz ibn Narsī ibn Gūdarz ibn Víhan ibn Balāsh ibn Bahrām ibn Shāpūr ibn Ashk.

The dominions of Amīra Dubbāj, ruler of Fūman towards 766 (1364-5), included Māsūla, Fūman, and Tūlam. He helped the other Amīrs of Biyapas to expel the Amīr Kiyā'ī Sayyids from Gīlān, and his troops defeated and slew Sayyid 'Alī at Rasht, in Ramazān, 791 (August-September, 1389). Five or six months later, he quarrelled with Amīra Muḥammad Rashtī, and invited the Sayyids to take possession of Biyapīsh. He died about 812 (1409-10) and was succeeded by his son, 'Alā'u'd-Dīn. Amīra Dubbāj, the latter's son, ascended the throne in 837 (1433-4). His son and successor, 'Alā'u'd-Dīn, died in 844 (1440-1) on his return from an expedition against

Biyapīsh. Amīra Dubbāj ibn 'Alā'u'd-Dīn followed and after him his son, 'Alā'u'd-Dīn. For the space of two years, however, Amīra Husāmu'd-Dīn, cousin of 'Alā'u'd-Dîn, had possession of Fuman; he died in Tarum. Meanwhile Amīra 'Alā'u'd-Dīn, out of fear of Amīra Muḥammad Tijāspī Rashtī, was hiding in the mountains. He re-ascended the throne in Jumada ii, 863 (May, 1459), and after some time put Amīra Muḥammad Tijāspī to death and annexed Rasht. He died about 880 (1475-6). His eldest son, Amīra Dubbāj, refused to ascend the throne, and the people tendered their allegiance to another Amīra Dubbāj, son of that Amīra Husāmu'd-Dīn, who, as already mentioned, had ruled over Füman for two years. With the help of Sultan Muhammad of Biyapish, Amīra Is-ḥāq, the younger son of the late ruler, rendered himself master of Fuman in 882 (1477-8). He subsequently quarrelled with Mirzä 'Ali, son and successor of Sultan Muhammad of Biyapish, and this led to much bloodshed. At length peace was signed and Küchisfahan ceded to Amīra Is-ḥāq, who died three months later. His eldest son, 'Alā'u'd-Din, was assassinated soon afterwards, and the second son, Amīra Husāmu'd-Dīn. succeeded him. He was as bitter an enemy of the rulers of Biyapish as his father had been and refused to accede to the wishes of Shah Isma'il I Safawi, who had sent envoys to request him to make peace with Sultan Ahmad Khān. The Shāh, angered at this refusal, came with his army to Gilan, but relented, and it was arranged through Shaykh Najm Rashti, who was Amiru'l-Umarā of the Shāh's court, that Amīra Husāmu'd-Dīn should receive Kūchisfahān as the price of peace. Sultān Ahmad Khān of Biyapīsh refused to surrender that district and Ḥusāmu'd-Din advanced to the Pülirüd, sacking Lāhijān, Rānikūh, and Rudisar on the way. In 917 (1511-12) he again incurred the Shāh's displeasure, but sent his wife and child to court to intercede for him. In 920 (1514) Shāh Isma'il decided to march a second time upon Gilān and bring this unruly vassal to order, but the war that broke out with Sultan Selim of Turkey compelled him to postpone the execution of this project. Husāmu'd-Dīn died about 922 (1516) and was succeeded by his son Amīra Dubbāj, who proceeded to the Shāh's court to make his submission. He was given the title of Muzaffar Sultan and received the hand of one of the Shah's daughters in marriage. When Sultan Sulayman of Turkey invaded Persia, Muzaffar Sultān joined him at Khūy with 8,000 men. On his return to Gīlān Muzaffar Sultān found the way barred by his former vassal, Amīra Hātim Kūhdumi. He fled to Shīrwān, where he was seized by the Shāh's officers and brought to Tabrīz. There he was placed in a cage and set on fire; this happened in 942 (1535-6). Biyapas was then entrusted to Khān Ahmad Khān of Biyapīsh, who, however, was unable to establish his authority over the district, and a certain Amīra Shāhrukh, related to the Is-ḥāqī dynasty, was invited by the inhabitants in 950 (1543-4) to rule over Fuman. He governed peacefully for seven years and was then summoned to the court of Shah Tahmasp. Unable to offer the presents claimed by the officers of the court he left without permission for Gīlān. He was brought back to Tabriz and put to death by order of the Shāh.

In 965 (1557) Shāh Ṭahmāsp gave Biyapas to Sulṭān Maḥmūd, son of Muzaffar Sulṭān, and appointed Kārgiyā Sulṭān Aḥmad regent and guardian of the prince. Five years later the regent fell into disgrace, and, by order of the Shāh, Maḥmūd Khān was brought to Shīrāz, where he was poisoned by his tutor at the instigation of Khān Aḥmad Khān. His posthumous son, Jamshīd Khān, a lad 10 years of age, was given Biyapas in 975 (1567–8), and Kārgiyā Aḥmad Sulṭān was named regent and appointed his guardian. In 977 (1569–70) Jamshīd Sulṭān married

a daughter of Shāh Tahmāsp and in 980 (1572-3) transferred his capital from Fuman to Rasht. He was put to death in 989 (1581-2) by his Prime Minister, Kāmrān Mīrzā Kūhdumī, who had succeeded Kārgiyā Ahmad Sultān. Kāmrān Mīrzā remained for some time ruler of Biyapas, but was eventually slain, and the two sons of Jamshid Sultan, Ibrāhim Khān and Muhammad Amin Khān, bid in turn for the rule of their hereditary possessions. Ibrāhīm Khān was at first supported by Khān Ahmad Khān of Biyapīsh, who, however, abandoned his cause for that of Muhammad Amin Khan. Malik Fümani, whom Khan Ahmad Khan appointed guardian of the latter, brought eastern Biyapas up to the Pasi Khān River under the rule of the young prince, but, two years later, in 999 (1590-1), 'Alī Beg Sultān, guardian of Ibrāhīm Khān, who was at Füman, expelled Muḥammad Amin Khān from Khushkbijār, where the latter resided, and compelled him to retire to Lashtanishāh. Finally, when in 1000 (1591-2) Khān Ahmad Khān fled from Gīlān to Constantinople, he took with him Muḥammad Amīn Khān, who died of smallpox at Ganja.

Shāh 'Abbās sent Ibrāhīm Khān to Kirmān, and thus came to an end the rule of the Is-ḥāqiyya dynasty of Fūman. After the rebellion of Shāh Malik in Biyapas in 1002 (1593-4) the Shāh summoned Ibrāhīm Khān from Kirmān with the intention of appointing him governor of Biyapas. He was, however, dissuaded from doing this, and Ibrāhīm died of grief at Isfahān.

At the death of Shāh 'Abbās and on the accession of Shāh Ṣafī, the natives of Lashtanishāh revolted, in 1038 (1628-9) elected king of the province a certain Kālānjār Sulṭān, who claimed to be a son of Jamshīd Sulṭān, and proclaimed him ruler under the title of 'Âdil Ṣhāh. His followers sacked Fūman and Rasht, but Qālānjār, or Gharīb Shāh, as he was nicknamed by the Qizilbāsh, was taken prisoner by the royal troops after a fruitless defence

and carried to Qazwin, where he suffered a very remarkable death. The Shāh, with his customary cruelty and in derision of his captive, ordered iron horse-shoes to be nailed to his feet, alleging that as he had been used to the soft rich soil of Gīlān, he could not walk unshod on the harder earth of 'Irāq. After lingering some days in this torture, Kālānjār was shot to death with arrows, the Shāh discharging the first, and his courtiers following his example.

There is no more remarkable instance of the fierce feuds prevalent in olden times than that which existed between the chiefs of Shaft and those of Fuman. "In the time of Shāh Sultān Husayn, Kāzim Khān Shaftī slew Āgā Kamāl (Fümanī), governor of Rasht; his son, Āqā Jamāl (connected on his mother's side with the Is-haqi dynasty), slew Karim, the son of Kāzim. Rafī' Āgā, the brother of Kāzim, slew Āgā Jamāl (1753-4)1 and revenged his nephew. Hidāyat Khān, the son of Āgā Jamāl, slew Rafī' Āgā and five of his brothers and nephews; a child, called Aga 'Alī, the son of Kāzim, was the only person of the family of Shaft that was preserved. Hidayat Khan, desiring to employ the tribe of Shaft, was compelled to put this child at their head, as they refused to serve except under one of the blood of their chiefs. Āgā 'Alī made his escape, and when he attained his sixteenth year was aided by Aga Muhammad Khān in an attempt to revenge his father, uncle, and brothers. He succeeded in taking Hidayat Khan, whom he slew.2 Two of that chief's sons, Husayn 'Alī and Fath 'Alī, were sent to the Persian Court, and when Fath 'Alī

¹ Gmelin says that Hājjī [Rafi' Āqā of] Shaft slew Hājjī Jamāl in 1167 (1753-4) in Shaft, and afterwards, together with Mīrzā Zakī of Gaskar, ruled over Gīlān. Four months later Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān Qājār suddenly arrived in Gīlān, put them both to death, and entrusted Gīlān to Hājjī Taqī Nā'ib, of Kasmā, whom he appointed guardian and deputy of Hidāyat Khān, the son of Ḥājjī Jamāl, then too young to rule.

² Hidāyat Khān was shot when trying to escape by boat from Anzalí to Lankurān.

Shah obtained the throne he gave the former a small force to reconquer Gilan. This chief ordered two of his men to conceal themselves in a wood and assassinate Aqā 'Alī; they did so (near the bridge of Khatībān on the 26th Rabī' i, 1212 = September 18, 1797 A.D.), and the relations of that chief, alarmed at his fate, fled to the island of Lankuran, and claimed the protection of Mustafa Khan Talish. Fath 'Alī Shāh invited them to return to their family possessions of Shaft. On his sending a sealed Qur'an, as the most sacred of pledges, they came back, but they thought of nothing but revenge; day and night they watched the movements of Husayn 'Alī: at last one of the brothers of Aqa 'Ali succeeded in shooting him. $(10th Safar, 1215 = July 3, 1800 A.D.)^{1}$ as he was riding along the road. On the death of Husayn 'Alī, his brother, Fath 'Alī, fled to Tabrīz, where he became Begler-Begī. Husayn 'Alī left an infant grandson, but none of the descendants of Hidāyāt Khān proved themselves worthy of their family traditions," 2 and the feud, which in 1810 had continued about seventy years, was allowed to lapse.

At the death of Ḥusayn 'Alī Khān, Fath 'Alī Shāh had the farmán of governor of Fūman made in the name of Hidāyatu'llāh Khān (also known as Khānlar-Khān), the former governor's infant son, and Ḥājjī Muḥammad Khān³ was appointed deputy governor. Ḥājjī Muḥammad Khān soon won the affection of the inhabitants and became governor. Ḥājjī Ma'sūm Khān, his son, was appointed

¹ Another version is that he was shot near the Dūpurdān bridge at Lālam in Gaskar by a notable of that district with whose wife he had had an intrigue. Colonel Trézel mentions that the inhabitants of Gaskar refused to submit to a governor who was not of their tribe. A governor was appointed by Fath 'Alī Shāh, but was shot on the Gaskar border when trying forcibly to enter that district. The date of this incident is the same as that of the death of Ḥusayn 'Alī, who very probably was the governor in question.

² Sir John Malcolm, History of Persia.

³ His father, Āqā Moḥsin Fūmanī, was governor of Fūman in 1212 (1797-8). Some authors describe Āqā Muḥsin as the son of a Khalkhālī named Kas Ākhūnd, others as a descendant of Amīra Dubbāj.

governor of Fūman at the beginning of the reign of Nāṣiru'd-Dīn Shāh. He was waylaid on the way from Rasht to Fūman by Hasan Khān ibn Hidāyatu'llāh Khān, who was shot in the affray. On the 1st Ramazān, 1265 (July 29, 1848), Ḥājjī Ma'ṣūm Khān was shot from without whilst sitting in an upper room of his house on the Sabz Maydān (Commons) of Rasht. His nephew, Rizā-qulī Khān ibn Naṣīr, whose mother was a sister of Ḥasan Khān, was immediately accused of the deed. By order of the Prime Minister, Amīr Nizām, he was handed over to the relatives of the murdered Khān, who hacked him to pieces with their qamas (daggers) on the 13th Ramazān of the following year (July 23, 1850).

The next governor of Fūman, Hājjī Qāsim Khān¹ ibn Hājjī Muhammad Khān, was succeeded by his son, Mahmūd Khān Sartīp, Mudīru's-Sufarā, father of 'Abdu'l-Husayn Khān, Mudīru'l-Mulk, better known under the title of Sardār-i-Humāyūn. The Sardār-i-Humāyūn died in 1912 after having ruled Fūman for close on twenty years.

H. L. RABINO.

THE DIWANS OF AN-NU'MAN IBN BASHIR AND BAKR IBN 'ABD AL-'AZIZ AL-'IJLI

Early in 1914 I obtained from Constantinople, through the kind offices of Dr. O. Rescher, photographs of the unique manuscript Sultân Fâtih, No. 5303, which contains, in addition to the Dîwâns referred to in the title, those of 'Amr b. Qamî'a, 'Amr b. Kulthûm, al-Hārith b. Hilliza, two poems of Muzâhim al-'Uqaili, and poems of several other little-known ancient Arabic poets. The poems of Muzâhim, together with verses of the same poet collected from various sources, I hope to publish at a later date. The above two Dîwâns are being printed in a lithographed edition in Ḥaidarâbâd at the expense of Syed Hosein

¹ Qāsim Khān married a daughter of Fath 'Alī Khān and a daughter of Ḥusayn 'Alī Khān, so that his sons were descendants of Ḥidāyat Khān.
Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Centre Universitaire, on 04 May 2017 at 17:34:33, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00051121