THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE LIVES OF SĀM MĪRZĀ (923–75/1517–67):

DYNASTIC STRIFE AND LITERARY WORLD-BUILDING IN EARLY SAFAVID IRAN

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF NEAR EASTERN LANGUAGES AND CIVILIZATIONS

BY

THEODORE SAMUEL BEERS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

AUGUST 2020

گوئیا فلک کج‌رفتار ناسازگار غیر از این کاری ندارد
که عاقل از او در رنج باشد و جاهل صاحب گنج

As they say, the crooked, unjust cosmos has no principle,
except that the wise will be aggrieved by it, and fools enriched

Sām Mīrzā Ṣafavī (d. 975/1567)

For Henry

Table of contents

Acknowledgments v
Notes on romanization and dating viii
A brief description of the dissertation xii
Abstracts for the body chapters xiv
Introduction 1
Chapter 1: Background and Sources for the Life of Sām Mīrzā 11
- 1.1: Survival and consolidation — A framework for the Ṭahmāsb era 12
- 1.2: Sām Mīrzā in Safavid narrative sources 46
- 1.3: Other sources on Sām Mīrzā 73

Chapter 2: The Career of Sām Mīrzā and Its Implications 106
- 2.1: Piecing together the princely career of Sām Mīrzā 107
- 2.2: Broader implications of Sām Mīrzā's biography 137

Chapter 3: A Comprehensive Study of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (*ca.* 957/1550) 145
- 3.1: An introduction to the Persian *taẕkirah*, and to the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* 146
- 3.2: From reference text to *adab* 188

Chapter 4: A Preliminary Typology and Periodization of the Persian *Taẕkirah* 254
- 4.1: How to read a *taẕkirah* of poets 255
- 4.2: The development of the Persian *taẕkirah* up to *ca.* 1038/1629 276

Conclusion 310
Bibliography 342
Appendices 359
- A note on the appendices 360
- 1: Timeline of early Safavid history 362
- 2: Timeline of the reign of Shah ʿAbbās I 365
- 3: Timeline of Ottoman history, 1453–1623 CE 368
- 4: Timeline of early Mughal history (birth of Bābur – death of Jahāngīr) 371
- 5: Mentions of Sām Mīrzā in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* (ed. Ishrāqī) 373
- 6: Annals in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* (ed. Ishrāqī) 375
- 7: Entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (ed. Humāyūn Farrukh) 378
- 8: Entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (ed. Humāyūn Farrukh) — Summary statistics 393
- 9: Selected noteworthy Persian (and Turkic) *taẕkirah*s 394
- 10: Selected narrative sources for early Safavid history 396
- 11: Selected influential poets, late fifteenth – early seventeenth century 397

Acknowledgments

Many people helped me to bring this project to fruition. Without their assistance, encouragement, and guidance, I do not think that I would have made it to the finish line. The dissertation that resulted is not free of imperfections—far from it—but those are on my account, whereas the positive aspects of the document (and its existence) owe much to the generosity of others.

I would like, first of all, to thank my professors at the University of Chicago. Franklin Lewis taught me that the study of classical Persian literature, at its best, can be practiced with both philological rigor and sensitivity to the æsthetic dimension and philosophical questions. John Woods has been the greatest influence on my approach to the history of past societies—especially with regard to the fundamental problem of what we can, and cannot know based on the source materials available to us. Cornell Fleischer has consistently challenged me to adopt a holistic perspective on the social and cultural shifts that took place across the Near East from the late medieval into the early modern era, and in particular to avoid studying Persian literature as though it can be siloed. Rising to this challenge, and to those set forth by Profs. Lewis and Woods, will be a long-term endeavor. But I am lucky to have been shown first-rate models.

Other faculty members whom I view as significant influences include Tahera Qutbuddin, in classical Arabic poetry; Fred Donner, in early Islamic history (a long-ago course on eschatological *ḥadīth* collections is still occasionally on my mind); and Kay Heikkinen and the late Farouk Mustafa, in Arabic language and literature in a broad sense. While the dissertation itself was always focused on Persian sources—histories, poetry, anthologies—the training that I received as a “part-time Arabist”

came to reshape my entire perspective as a philologist, and I continue to work with Arabic texts for other projects. The famously high demands that our department makes of its doctoral students had a transformative impact on me.

Not long after I started working on this dissertation, I had the opportunity to join a group called the Holberg Seminar in Islamic History, which would meet annually at Princeton between 2015 and 2018. The seminar was started by Michael Cook—after he was awarded the Holberg Prize—and he ran it in partnership with Khaled El-Rouayheb, Antoine Borrut, and Jack Tannous. The idea was to gather a small group of doctoral students (initially eight) in various fields of premodern Islamicate/Near Eastern history, and to offer them mentorship and camaraderie by way of intensive workshops held on the Princeton campus each June. Over the course of four years, this evolved into the most inspiring, memorable, and rewarding academic experience of my life. I cannot thank Michael, Khaled, Antoine, and Jack enough for their generosity toward me and the other student members. Several of those erstwhile students remain good friends and collaborators, and I am certain that the relationships that we built through the seminar will continue for decades. I can say of the Holberg group what I have said more generally of the people who aided me in my growth as a researcher in recent years: that I would not have succeeded in writing a dissertation without them.

In the winter of 2016, I was able to visit London and Cambridge to consult a number of sources in manuscript, including copies of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, and of the *Afẓal al-tavārīkh* (1049/1639) of Faẓlī Khūzānī Iṣfahānī, due in large part to support from the Nicholson Center for British Studies at the University of Chicago. This research trip led directly to an article focusing on the biography of Ṣā’ib Tabrīzī (d. *ca.* 1087/1676) and the *Khayr al-bayān* (1036/1627) of Shāh Ḥusayn Sīstānī—in which I have

thanked the Nicholson Center—but my dissertation work was also benefited, and it is important for me to acknowledge the Center's support once again.

After the body of the dissertation was written, but before it could be defended, I had the good fortune to move to Germany to begin a research fellowship through AnonymClassic, an ERC-funded project directed by Beatrice Gründler at the Freie Universität Berlin. It took somewhat longer than anticipated for me to schedule a defense, for various reasons (including a pandemic). I am grateful to Prof. Gründler and my colleagues in the AnonymClassic project for their patience and support during the months when I still had one foot in Chicago.

Last, and most importantly, I need to thank my family, who have sacrificed beyond measure for me to be able to earn a PhD, and who represent the reason that I would pursue this or anything else in life. My mother, Sarah Russell, passed away just as I was embarking on the dissertation process. I have often said in the intervening years that I would chuck every page into the fireplace for another day with her. My father and stepmother, John and Susan Beers, have supported me in more ways than I can count, and continue to do so. My older brother and oldest friend, John Beers, Jr., has always been able to remind me where I came from, when I feel like a fish out of water—which I have found to be a frequent occurrence in the academy.

My wife, Bonni Brodsky, and our children, Henry and Clara, are asleep elsewhere in the house as I write this. It staggers me to think of what it has cost them—and cost us, as a family unit—for me to go down this path. I still have difficulty imagining that it will have been worthwhile. My hope is that the memory of this period in our lives will soften as it grows more distant.

Notes on romanization and dating

Romanization

Throughout the dissertation, when romanizing Persian and Arabic words, I have followed the Library of Congress (LOC) system, with a few modifications to be explained below. LOC romanization is broadly similar to the guidelines set by the *International Journal of Middle East Studies* (IJMES)—the latter being probably the most popular standard used today in English-language scholarship in our field. Among the most noticeable differences in LOC are the use of *-ah* to represent both the Arabic *tāʾ marbūṭah* (when not in construct) and the Persian word-final “silent *hāʾ*” (these being *-a* and *-ih*, respectively, in IJMES); the use of *īy* (rather than *iyy*) when there is a *shaddah* on the vowel *yāʾ* (producing, for example, *-īyah* rather than *-iyya* for the feminine *nisbah* ending); and the use of *-á* to represent the *alif maqṣūrah*, allowing it to be distinguished from the regular *alif* in word-final position. There are other differences between the two systems, but these are three of the clearest. LOC is used mainly by library cataloguers, while IJMES is dominant in scholarship. I chose the former essentially because I developed a personal preference for it over the years.

My use of LOC for Arabic is in full compliance with the standard (to the best of my knowledge). It is in the case of Persian that I have made a few customizations, in two areas: the representation of certain letters, and the treatment of *iżāfah* and affixes. First, the Persian version of the Arabic letter *ḍād* is rendered in this dissertation as *ż*, *i.e.*, with a dot above. It causes some complication that Persian has effectively four variations of Z—corresponding to the Arabic *dhāl*, *zāy*, *ḍād*, and *ẓāʾ*. Three of these will need to be distinguished with a diacritical mark. In the LOC standard, *dhāl* becomes *z̲āl*, and *ḍād*

becomes *z̤ād*, while *zāy* (called *zih* in Persian) and *ẓāʾ* remain the same. My problem is with z̤, since the combination of the letter Z and the “two dots below” diacritic is not defined in Unicode as a precomposed character. It can be typed only as a sequence of Z and a “combining diacritic” character; and it is far from guaranteed that this will be displayed correctly outside of an advanced typesetting program. Perhaps for this reason, some other Persian romanization systems—including both IJMES and that of *Encyclopædia Iranica*—use ż instead. (This *does* exist as its own character in the Unicode standard.) I have decided to follow the same practice. There is a similar problem with the Persian version of the Arabic letter *thāʾ*, which becomes effectively a third variation of S (after *sīn* and *ṣād*). LOC and IJMES both stipulate the use of s̱, *i.e.*, with a macron below. As with z̤, this is not defined as a standalone character. My understanding is that many authors circumvent this difficulty by *underlining* the letter S (*i.e.*, s̲) when they intend for it to represent the Persian *thāʾ*. I would prefer to rely neither on a combining diacritic, nor on rich text formatting, for the letter to be distinguished. So I have taken a different approach, employing ṡ, *i.e.*, with a dot above. Again, this character is easily available. My use of it may be idiosyncratic, but it is not devoid of rationale.

The second area in which I break from LOC is the treatment of *iżāfah* and affixes. The standard rules strike me as unhelpfully complex for academic writing (as opposed to library cataloguing), and so I have simplified them. *Iżāfah* is represented as *-i*, except when it follows the long vowel *ā* or *ū*, in which case it becomes *-yi*. (Hence the spelling of *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* throughout the dissertation.) LOC includes a third option, for cases in which *iżāfah* is marked in Persian script by the addition of a *hamzah* (most often above the “silent *hāʾ*”); this would be rendered as *-ʾi*. My preference is not to attempt to indicate such a *hamzah* in romanization. Again, the only two representations of Persian

iżāfah in this work are *-i* and *-yi*. Finally, there is the matter of affixes and compound words, which are ubiquitous in Persian. The LOC system has intricate rules, involving the use of the prime character (') for a morphological breakpoint where there is no space. This is difficult to implement, and I find the result off-putting. I have chosen a more pragmatic approach, in which *hyphens* are used, where necessary, to indicate the separate parts of a word. While I understand and respect the technical goals of LOC romanization, it can become more of a distraction than an asset in a context such as this.

To put it concisely, I have used *ż* in place of *z̤*, *ṡ* in place of *s̱*, and simplified the treatment of both *iżāfah* and affixes and compound words in Persian. One might notice that the modifications that I have applied have the effect, in some instances, of bringing my romanization closer to the IJMES style. This is true. What I have realized, through arduous experience, is that my ideal system would fall somewhere between the two standards.

Dating

My standard practice is, with few exceptions, to give dates according to both the Islamic (AH) and the Julian/Gregorian (CE) calendars. The only problem is how to address the discrepancy between Julian and Gregorian. I considered three possible approaches for the dissertation. First, I could make all conversions from Hijri to Gregorian, including for the period before the papal calendar reform went into effect. (This would be *proleptic* use of the Gregorian calendar.) But this would be a bad decision, since there are famous events from the earlier period whose dates are conventionally given according to Julian conversion in published scholarship. The Treaty of Amasya, for instance, was concluded on 8 Rajab 962, or 29 May 1555 (Julian). These are the dates that are always cited. If we used proleptic

Gregorian conversion, it would instead be *8 June* 1555, which might lead to confusion. There are many similar examples of notable events with fixed dates. It is clear that scholars have tended to convert to Julian for anything that took place before the calendar reform.

A second option would be to use *Julian* conversion in all cases. This appealed to me at first, on historical grounds. Although the Gregorian calendar first went into effect in October 1582 (Ramaḍān 990) on the basis of a decree by Pope Gregory XIII, its use did not spread beyond Catholic domains until the eighteenth century. That is, for the entire period of concern of this dissertation, the Julian calendar remained *at least* as relevant as the Gregorian on an international level. There was a point at which my plan was to convert solely between Hijri and Julian. I realized, however, that this would lead to another problem vis-à-vis scholarly convention. If we consider, for example, the death date of Shah ʿAbbās I, what we find universally is 19 January 1629—the *Gregorian* equivalent of 24 Jumādá I 1038. It seems to be the case that historians of the Near East convert to Julian up to 1582, and to Gregorian therafter. This third approach is convenient enough, if somewhat arbitrary, and I eventually decided to follow it. There is no sense making a distraction of the matter.

A brief description of the dissertation

This dissertation is titled *The Lives of Sām Mīrzā (923–75/1517–67): Dynastic Strife and Literary World-Building in Early Safavid Iran*. It utilizes the career of a prince of the Safavid dynasty (conventionally, 907–1135/1501–1722) as a window on developments in both the political history of Greater Iran and Persian literary history around the tenth/sixteenth century. Such an approach is possible because Sām Mīrzā, who was born in 923/1517 and eventually executed in 975/1567, was an important political figure by virtue of his status as a son of the dynasty's founder; and he also wrote an anthology of poets (*taẕkirah*) that documents a great deal of the literary activity that took place during his lifetime. In the dissertation I explore both sides of this figure and their implications for our understanding of the Safavid era. Hence the "lives" mentioned in the title: one is the story of Sām Mīrzā himself, while the others refer to his *taẕkirah*, a work titled *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (*ca.* 957/1550).

The body of the dissertation is divided into two main parts to reflect these different, though certainly connected, lines of inquiry. The first section, comprising Chapters 1 and 2, is concerned with collating all available primary sources on Sām Mīrzā's biography. This process offers new insight into the fluid, extraordinarily challenging political situation faced by the Safavids in their first few generations of rule. As it turns out, researching Sām Mīrzā's life also raises historiographical questions, since most of our information about him comes from Safavid chronicles, and it appears there was an attempt to scrub the story of his imprisonment and execution from the "official record" (insofar as such a thing existed). The second chapter investigates these broader issues.

After this exploration of the details and significance of Sām Mīrzā's life, the second half of the dissertation turns to focus on his one major literary work: the aforementioned *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. Several questions relating to this anthology are addressed, and they are organized into two further chapters. Chapter 3 consists of a comprehensive overview of the *Tuḥfah* and interpretation of some of its key characteristics. Chapter 4 looks more broadly at the Persian (and, to an extent, Turkic) "*taẕkirah* of poets" genre, whose crucial period of development took place between the late ninth/fifteenth and early eleventh/seventeenth centuries. Sām Mīrzā worked in the middle of this period, and his *Tuḥfah* stands as an important contribution to the evolving ideas of what forms a *taẕkirah* might take, what narratives it might advance, and what role it might play in the Persian literary tradition.

Abstracts for the body chapters

Chapter 1

The goal of this chapter is to provide context for examining Sām Mīrzā's career as a Safavid prince. For a number of reasons, it seemed logical to use the reign of Shah Ṭahmāsb (930–84/1524–76) as a backdrop. And so the first part of the chapter is devoted to sketching a periodization of this long rule. Sām Mīrzā was just six years old when Shah Ismāʿīl died and Ṭahmāsb (himself only ten, or eleven by the lunar calendar) was placed on the throne. The better part of Sām's upbringing, and all of his adult life, would take place in the shadow of his older brother's struggle to consolidate power.

Another kind of background that we need in order to piece together the story of Sām's life is a review of the primary sources in which he is mentioned. These consist, mostly, of Safavid chronicles. I discuss about a dozen such texts authored between the middle of the tenth/sixteenth century and 1049/1639, and give an indication of what each has to say about Sām Mīrzā. There is no other substantial category of sources on his biography, but entries on him are found in a few later *taẕkirah*s, and I cover those, as well. The travelogue of Michele Membré, who visited the Safavid court in 946–7/1539–40 as a Venetian emissary, also contains a few cursory mentions of Sām Mīrzā—which are important, since the Persian chronicles tell us almost nothing about the prince's activities during this period. Finally, I describe the search for further information on Sām Mīrzā in Ottoman, Uzbek, and Mughal sources, which yielded little.

Chapter 2

Having set the stage and surveyed the available sources, I devote the first part of this chapter to assembling the narrative of Sām Mīrzā's biography. The most important result here is to draw attention to the execution in 975/1567 of several Safavid princes—namely, Sām Mīrzā and his two sons, plus the two surviving sons of Alqāṣ Mīrzā, all of whom were imprisoned at Qahqahah. This event has been noted in a few works of Persian-language scholarship, but it is hardly well known and has yet to be recognized as an important turning point in Safavid dynastic politics. Shah Ṭahmāsb ordered a mass execution of the sort that would soon become a problem for the Ottomans, leading them to develop the "*kafes* system."

The second part of the chapter discusses some of the implications of Sām Mīrzā's career for Safavid history, and for the context of the early modern Near East more broadly. As it turns out, there is something of a historiographical problem, in that Safavid chronicles tend to have *unusually* little to say when it comes to Sām Mīrzā's later years, let alone his final period of imprisonment and execution. He was one of the four sons of Shah Ismāʿīl who survived into adulthood, and yet his death is not even recorded in a cursory manner in several major texts, including the *ʿĀlam-ārā-yi ʿAbbāsī*. Even more strangely, we have one chronicle—the *Takmilat al-akhbār* of ʿAbdī Beg Shīrāzī—in which it is claimed that Sām Mīrzā and his sons and nephews perished in an *earthquake*. It appears that Shah Ṭahmasb did not want to acknowledge the reality of what took place in 975/1567, and so an alternate story was disseminated. (This, at least, is the allegation made in a slightly later source, the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* of Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī.)

Chapter 3

At this point, the dissertation turns from Sām Mīrzā's life to his *lives*, *i.e.*, the biographical anthology of poets that he wrote around 957/1550, which stands as his primary claim to fame. The first part of this chapter addresses a few preliminary matters: a brief introduction to the *tażkirah* genre in Persian (and Turkic), and an overview of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, including what we know of the time and process of its composition, its codicology, the editions that have been published, the structure of the text, *etc*. All of this is fairly elementary, but, as was the case with the first half of the dissertation, it is important to establish context.

The second part of this chapter is a "deep dive" into several aspects of the *Tuḥfah*, designed around the following question: What might we find if we read an entire Persian anthology as a coherent work in its own right, rather than using it as a reference source and consulting a few entries at a time? As part of carrying out this study, I built a spreadsheet to record key data from each of the roughly seven hundred notices in the *tażkirah*. (It is included as an appendix.) I argue here that there are various dimensions of Sām Mīrzā's work that would be difficult or impossible to notice without taking such a holistic approach. One example of a new insight that I found, from looking at which figures are most often mentioned or quoted in the *Tuḥfah*, is that Umīdī Tihrānī (d. 925/1519) seems to have been among the important poets of the early tenth/sixteenth century. Umīdī is not well known today, even in the field of Safavid-era literature, but he is invoked throughout this *tażkirah* more than any other poet save Jāmī. (It is probably relevant that Umīdī was a *qaṣīdah* specialist who composed panegyrics for Shah Ismāʿīl and other high-ranking Safavids, as well as praise poetry for the Ahl al-Bayt. This

would have endeared him to Sām Mīrzā.) I also argue that a *taẕkirah* like the *Tuḥfah*, taken on its own terms, displays many characteristics that we would associate with *adab* literature.

Chapter 4

The idea in the final chapter is to broaden the focus again, to look at the Persian *taẕkirah* tradition in general, based in part on what we have learned from the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. Since the second section of the third chapter is essentially an experiment to see what results from a full and open-minded reading of the *Tuḥfah*, the fourth chapter begins with an articulation of several "best practices" for the use of *taẕkirah* sources. I do not suggest, of course, that anyone who wishes to cite any *taẕkirah* should first read it from cover to cover. Rather, having gone through that painstaking exercise with the *Tuḥfah*, we are in a position to set a baseline of more modest goals—aspects of a given anthology that really ought to be checked and kept in mind if it is to be treated as a source. This includes points as simple as the background of the author, the time and place of the work's composition, and its patronage circumstances (if any). On a slightly more complicated level, one should be aware of the structure of a *taẕkirah*, which may provide important context for a given entry therein. While researchers in Persian literary history cannot be expected to give a full and sensitive reading to every *taẕkirah* that they cite—the reality is that anthologies will mostly be used for reference—there ought still to be certain standards.

In the second part of this chapter, I attempt to make a different sort of contribution to the study of Persian *taẕkirah*s, by sketching a partial history and periodization of the genre. Special attention is paid to the period between 883/1478 and 1036/1627—or, to put it more simply, between the last few

decades of Timurid Harāt and the midpoint of the Safavid-Mughal era, around the deaths of ʿAbbās and Jahāngīr. (The aforementioned specific years refer to the composition of Jāmī's *Nafaḥāt al-uns* and Shāh Ḥusayn Sīstānī's *Khayr al-bayān*, respectively.) It was in Harāt, during the reign of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Bāyqarā, that the Persian (and Turkic) *taẕkirah* finally exploded in popularity, thanks to the efforts of Jāmī, ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī, and Dawlatshāh Samarqandī. And the great vogue in anthological writing that followed saw the production of texts that varied increasingly in their structure, scope of content, style, *etc*. By the early eleventh/seventeenth century, the *taẕkirah* genre was more or less mature. I identify this period as the crucial phase of development for the Persian biographical anthology—with the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* falling directly in the middle. Sām Mīrzā made a number of innovative authorial decisions, for example, by restricting the entries in his *taẕkirah* to recent and contemporary poets, and by organizing the work on the basis of a descending social hierarchy.

Introduction

To put it concisely, this is a dissertation that endeavors to generate new insights into both the political history of the early Safavid era (and the historiography of that dynasty), and Persian literary history of the same period, through a multifaceted study of the life and work of the prince Sām Mīrzā (923–75/1517–67). The body of the dissertation consists of four chapters (each with two or more parts), which establish the context for Sām Mīrzā's life in the long reign of his brother, Shah Ṭahmāsb I (r. 930–84/1524–76); collate all available sources that contain some information about the prince; stitch together his biography, and consider the ramifications of this narrative for Safavid and regional history; carry out a thorough study of Sām's literary work, an anthology of poets (*taẕkirah*) titled *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (*ca.* 957/1550); and build from the example of the *Tuḥfah* to address broader issues relating to the *taẕkirah* genre.

While this represents a fairly wide range of topics, several of which are individually large and complex, my feeling is that the current dissertation manages to add something useful in each case. It should also be noted that, setting aside the analytical work in the chapters, there is a series of appendices that may benefit future researchers. These include, among other things, timelines of key events in Safavid, Ottoman, and Mughal history around the tenth/sixteenth century, and a spreadsheet that collects information from each of the roughly seven hundred entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. Still, what I have managed to put together remains preliminary in certain areas (a few of which are highlighted below). There will be opportunities to expand this work for a book project, as well as for an article or two.

A fairly detailed review of the methods and findings of each chapter—as compared to the brief, general comments given in the frontmatter—can be found in the Conclusion. Rather than replicating that discussion here, what I would like to add are reflections on a few of the important themes in the dissertation, on the difficulties of tying together the studies of Sām Mīrzā's princely career and of his literary work, and on the motivations that led me to investigate this combination of questions.

It is the problem of the circumstances of Sām Mīrzā's death that becomes the linchpin of the first half of the dissertation. After an examination of the sources, it is clear, in a basic sense, what took place. In 975/1567, after several years of imprisonment at the fortress of Qahqahah in northwestern Iran, Sām was executed, along with his young sons and the surviving sons of his rebellious brother, Alqāṣ Mīrzā (d. 957/1550). This was apparently done at the order of Shah Ṭahmāsb, who was concerned about possible plotting against him by inmates at Qahqahah—particularly involving his own son, Ismāʿīl Mīrzā (future Shah Ismāʿīl II, r. 984–5/1576–7). The name of the individual dispatched to carry out the execution, as reported in two chronicles from later in the tenth/sixteenth century, was Muḥammad Beg Quyūnchī-ughlī. These simple data points represent the easy part of the story, but problems arise from seemingly every other perspective.

Why, for example, has it been uncommon in the scholarly literature on early Safavid history for the killing of Sām Mīrzā and his sons and nephews to be mentioned? The event is of clear importance, given that it represents the first true *purge* in the Safavid dynasty—presaging the bloodshed under Ismāʿīl II, not to mention the connection to similar occurrences at the Ottoman court. And the mass execution of 975/1567 is not exactly a secret: the most detailed account of what took place is in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* (999/1591) of Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, a well-known chronicle. Furthermore, there is

scholarship in Persian in which the event is discussed. Two examples are Manūchihr Pārsādūst's monumental study, *Shāh Ṭahmāsb-i Avval*, and ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn Navāʾī's edition of the *Takmilat al-akhbār* (978/1570) of ʿAbdī Beg Shīrāzī (in the endnotes). But it should be noted that, of the two most recent editors of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, Rukn al-Dīn Humāyun Farrukh and Aḥmad Mudaqqiq Yazdī, neither has mentioned the killing of Sām Mīrzā at Qahqahah. (Both discuss the prince's biography at length in their introductions.) Even in Persian, therefore, there is something of a problem. It seems to be more severe in English-language scholarship. The 975/1567 execution does not come up in the entry on Sām Mīrzā in the *Encyclopædia of Islam* (second ed.), by Benedikt Reinert. And in general overviews of Safavid history—for example, the monographs of Roger Savory and Andrew Newman—there is, of course, occasional discussion of Sām, given his activities as a prince and his authorship of the *Tuḥfah*; but the manner of his death is not addressed.

This dilemma in scholarship leads us to a problem in the sources. It is, as it turns out, entirely understandable that historians have tended to be unaware of the execution at Qahqahah. The major chronicles that provide us with most of our information about early Safavid history are themselves strangely quiet on Sām Mīrzā's final years. The *ʿĀlam-ārā-yi ʿAbbāsī* (1038/1629) of Iskandar Munshī and the *Aḥsan al-tavārīkh* (985/1577) of Ḥasan Rūmlū—probably the two most dominant sources on the period in question—give no account of how Sām died. It is even difficult to find clear mention of the prince's imprisonment in 969/1562. A lack of data in the texts on which scholars rely is bad enough. This situation, however, is exacerbated by the presence of a *contradictory* narrative of Sām Mīrzā's passing in another influential chronicle, the *Takmilat al-akhbār*. According to ʿAbdī Beg Shīrāzī, the prince died in the year of the rabbit, 974–5/1567–8—so far, so good—but he reports that

the cause was an *earthquake*. So there is the possibility for a historian who is working on this period, but not focusing closely on Sām Mīrzā's biography, either to come across no mention of his death, or to accept ʿAbdī Beg's account. (Both Reinert and Mudaqqiq Yazdī have done the latter.)

How is it that we have a disagreement in the Safavid chronicles about the circumstances of Sām's death? This issue is explored at some length in Chapters 1 and 2. Put simply, ʿAbdī Beg Shīrāzī was a poet, bureaucrat, and historian closely aligned with the court of Shah Ṭahmāsb. He dedicated the *Takmilat al-akhbār* to the king's influential daughter, Parī Khān Khānum. And it seems possible that he deliberately gave an inaccurate explanation for Sām Mīrzā's passing, due to the political sensitivity of the event. This might seem to be an extraordinary claim, but it is suggested in the later account of Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī. He reports, in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, that Shah Ṭahmāsb endeavored to conceal the reality of what had taken place at Qahqahah, and he mentions the circulation of a false story that an earthquake had struck the fortress and killed Sām and the other princes.

In the end, the question of Sām's death forces us to consider the possibility of a disinformation campaign that left a mark on Safavid historiography and has continued to influence scholarship into the present day. Again, all of this is treated in greater depth in the body of the dissertation. What I mean to emphasize here is the degree to which pursuing the truth of a single controversial event has influenced this study. If we are faced with the possibility that Sām Mīrzā's story has been hushed in several of our key sources, and distorted in the *Takmilat al-akhbār*, then what are the implications for early Safavid history? How did the rule of Shah Ṭahmāsb reach such a point by the 1560s? And how much more, exactly, can we piece together about Sām's life, stretching back to his early years in Harāt? This is, to a large extent, what impels the "historical" portion of the dissertation.

Much of the second half of the project can also be traced to a single problem; namely, what is a Persian *taẕkirah*? There are many ways of responding to this question. Some are simple, others quite complex; and the appropriate answers would vary according to a number of factors, including the time period and geographic region of focus. I have limited the terms of my inquiry somewhat, by explaining that my work with *taẕkirah*s centers on texts written between the late ninth/fifteenth and the early eleventh/seventeenth century. And so the later Indo-Persian anthologies, for example, may stand apart from the conclusions that I reach. In order to achieve a base-level understanding of the *taẕkirah* as a type of writing, one might trace the etymology of the word *taẕkirah* itself; draw an analogy to the "lives of the poets" genre in European languages (and in Classical Latin); and explain the contents of one of these texts in straightforward terms, *e.g.*, as a collection of *entries* or *notices* (*tarjamah*, pl. *tarājim*), each consisting of a biographical sketch and selected lines of verse. All of these approaches are pursued, to a greater or lesser extent, in Chapters 3 and 4. It is certainly useful to cover the fundamentals. For a non-specialist to gain an appreciation for the importance of the *taẕkirah* in Persian, we would need only to add that a large body of these texts was produced, especially in the early modern period; and that biographical anthologies represent probably the foremost "companion genre" to classical poetry, and key sources for investigating the historical context of literature (despite concerns about their reliability).

But what have really absorbed me are other, perhaps less obvious ways of asking about the nature of *taẕkirah*s. We can put together a working description of this category of texts quickly enough—and Persian literary historians have certainly had an easy time consulting anthologies as reference sources, mining them for useful information on the lives, works, and reception of specific poets. For years,

however, I have felt a nagging sense that there are dimensions of *taẕkirah*s that have gone unexplored. And I have attempted to develop two such perspectives in the latter part of the dissertation. First, what might we find if we read a *taẕkirah* from start to finish—in this case, of course, the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*—and let it speak on its own terms? Second, how did this genre become so vital to the Persian literary tradition; and, in particular, how might anthologies relate to the process of canon formation? My efforts to engage with these questions are found, respectively, in Chapters 3 and 4.

After a full examination of the *Tuḥfah*, I have argued that the work becomes increasingly difficult to categorize as more of it is digested, up to a point at which the best frame of analysis that I could find is *adab* literature. This is, admittedly, an idiosyncratic approach to a single text that is unusual in its own right. It is not even clear that there is much precedent for a cover-to-cover reading of a *taẕkirah*. But the "anthology as *adab*" analysis functions, at minimum, as a worthwhile experiment that demonstrates the degree to which our sense of a literary genre may be contingent upon our ways of using texts that belong to it. On the topic of the *taẕkirah*'s rise to prominence, I have highlighted a period of about a century and a half, from the 1480s through the 1620s, which saw the beginning of frequent authorship of anthologies in Persian (as well as in Turkic). Special emphasis is placed on the near-immediate, widespread influence of the *Bahāristān* (892/1487) of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī, the *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarā*ʾ (892/1487) of Dawlatshāh Samarqandī, and the Turkic *Majālis al-nafāʾis* (896/1491) of ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī.

These works effectively set the model for writing about the great poets of the first five centuries of classical Persian literature. In the following generations, there was strong demand for new *taẕkirah*s, and authors found ways of differentiating their contributions to the evolving genre. The *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*,

for instance, is devoted almost entirely to discussion of figures who flourished in the tenth/sixteenth century, with Sām Mīrzā having made an explicit decision to leave the poets of past eras as they were recorded in existing anthologies. (This is far from the only noteworthy characteristic of the *Tuḥfah*.) In the same period, *taẕkirah*s began to appear that focused on specific categories of individuals. Here we can cite as examples two works by Fakhrī Haravī: the *Javāhir al-ʿajāʾib* (963/1556), on women poets, and the *Rawżat al-salāṭīn* (960/1553), on poets who belonged to various ruling families. Later in the tenth/sixteenth century, the first truly enormous Persian anthology was written: the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār va zubdat al-afkār* of Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī, compiled between *ca*. 975/1567 and 1016/1607.

It is interesting to trace the development of this genre as it comes into its own in the early Ottoman-Safavid-Mughal period. I have argued that most of the features that the Persian *taẕkirah* would ever acquire had appeared, in some form, by the early eleventh/seventeenth century. Of course, there were further transformations in anthological writing, notably in the later Mughal context; but nothing could match the dramatic rise of the genre that was catalyzed in Timurid Harāt. These developments are traced in greater detail in the body of the dissertation. Again, what I would like to emphasize is the centrality to this study of a single basic problem. What is a *taẕkirah*? How well do we actually understand these texts? And how did they become so entrenched in the literary tradition? Another level of analysis, which is touched on in Chapters 3 and 4 but deserves further attention, would be to connect the growth of the *taẕkirah* at the dawn of the early modern period to the changes that were taking place in the culture of Persian poetry itself at that time. What might it mean that the tenth/sixteenth century was a critical juncture for the evolution of lyric poetry, and anthologies—

which serve as a forum for debating past, present, and future literary trends—exploded in popularity? The *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, in any case, emerged in the thick of this transitional environment.

Finally, what is there to unite all of the disparate threads in the dissertation? I have no fully satisfying answer to this question. We move from an investigation of Sām Mīrzā's political biography, conducted primarily on the basis of chronicle sources, to a wide-ranging study of Persian literary anthologies centered on the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. It would not be possible to bring the whole range of material neatly into a single narrative. One unifying idea that I put forward is that Sām Mīrzā's career as a Safavid prince was characterized by a profound lack of control over his own circumstances, whereas he uses the *Tuḥfah* to create a sort of literary microcosm of society according to his priorities. Sām spent most of his life dependent upon the good will of his brother to determine both where he would live and what official work, if any, he would perform. With the exception of the period in which he was allowed to establish a household in Ardabīl and serve as custodian of the Safavid shrine, being at the mercy of Shah Ṭahmāsb meant long stretches of quasi-imprisonment in the royal encampment, or actual imprisonment at Qahqahah. The bleak story of Sām Mīrzā *qua* political actor is in marked contrast to the success of his anthology. The authorship of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* may be interpreted as an act of world-building—a perspective that functions especially well due to the top-down, social-class organizational scheme that Sām has chosen.

While this approach has at least some validity, and helps to connect the major themes of Sām's biography to his work as a biographer—hence the *lives* referenced in the dissertation title—there is still an issue of breadth and disconnect across the four chapters. A simpler way of explaining the overall structure of the project would be to acknowlegde that I deliberately chose a figure who had

both a conflict-ridden career in the political sphere of early Safavid Iran, and a literary career that produced a fascinating text and guaranteed his legacy. This study was intended to bring me into contact with sources of different kinds, most importantly historical chronicles and *taẕkirah*s. Some degree of scattering was likely to occur, if not inevitable. Beyond disclosing my motivations, it may be worth noting that different chapters—and subchapters, in fact—were written at different times, often in the form of stand-alone papers. An effort has been made to ensure that these sections flow from one to another with some harmony, but the peripatetic character of the project cannot be eliminated in its entirety.

Continuing on the topic of challenges, it may be helpful to point to a couple of areas in the dissertation that suggest a particularly clear need for further research in the months and years ahead. Two examples stand out. First, in Chapter 2, after all of the facts surrounding Sām Mīrzā's life have been arrayed, there is a question of the extent to which his story may have been suppressed in Safavid chronicles. There is a difference, of course, between a simple lack of surviving evidence—which historians of this period confront at all turns—and the idea that the chronicles are purposefully silent in regard to certain events, or even present false narratives. My judgment in the case of Sām Mīrzā is that the impression given by the sources is odd enough that we should consider the possibility of "foul play" owing to political sensitivities. Not only do we see a curious lack of discussion of Sām's adult life (including noteworthy but uncontroversial points, *e.g.*, his appointment to Ardabīl in 956/1549) by authors like Ḥasan Rūmlū and Iskandar Beg. We also have the claim about an earthquake at Qahqahah in 975/1567, advanced by ʿAbdī Beg Shīrāzī and then explicitly contradicted by Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī.

Still, the evaluation of this hypothesis should ideally be pursued in the context of a larger study of Safavid historiography and its ideological dimensions. This can be taken as a path forward.

Another part of the dissertation that has confounded me and calls for revisiting is the first section of Chapter 3. The question here is identifying the right approach to provide a general introduction to Persian *taẕkirah*s. For our purposes, it was important to set the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* in context before embarking on a detailed study of the work. But it is surprisingly difficult to find valid and productive ways of characterizing the *taẕkirah* as a genre. Can it, in fact, be considered a single genre, or is the complexity that lies beneath the name simply too great? Furthermore, the English term "anthology" (or "biographical anthology") is used throughout the dissertation, since I find it to be the most apt translation of *taẕkirah* in general. Specialists in Persian literature, however, are far from unanimous on the question of how best to refer to these texts. And the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, it must be admitted, is not the most *anthological* of *taẕkirah*s, given the brevity of its entries. (A whole section of the dissertation is devoted to arguing that the *Tuḥfah* comes across as a kind of *adab*.) Again, it would be helpful to reconsider this problem through an expanded investigation of the history of the *taẕkirah*. For the time being, my hope and conviction is that the work assembled in this dissertation represents a body of research that will be of use to other scholars.

Chapter 1:

Background and Sources for the Life of Sām Mīrzā

1.1: Survival and consolidation — A framework for the Ṭahmāsb era

Introduction

To sketch the outline of Sām Mīrzā's life is fairly straightforward. He was born in 923/1517 and spent much of his childhood and adolescence as nominal governor of Harāt, first on behalf of his father, Shah Ismāʿīl (r. 907–30/1501–24), and then of his older half-brother, Shah Ṭahmāsb (r. 930–84/1524–76). At a young age, Sām fell into political difficulty under pressure from multiple sides, including Qizilbāsh warlords of the Shāmlū tribe, who manipulated him to enhance their own standing; the Abū al-Khayrid Uzbeks, who repeatedly invaded Safavid Khurāsān during his residency in Harāt; and the Ottomans, who were at least casually interested in placing him on the throne as a puppet. When the young Shah Ṭahmāsb finally managed to repel his domestic and foreign enemies and secure his rule, around 942–3/1536–7, Sām Mīrzā's political activities were curtailed, and the prince would spend the rest of his life under close supervision. He was forced to live in the imperial army camp for twelve years, starting in 943/1537, and he apparently did little of note during that period. In 956/1549, as the rebellion of one of his other brothers, Alqāṣ Mīrzā, was being extinguished, Sām was at last permitted by the king to settle in Ardabīl, the ancestral home city of the Safavids. He was made local governor, at least in name, and custodian (*mutavallī*) of the family shrine.

During his first couple of years in Ardabīl, Sām Mīrzā wrote his only major literary work, an anthology of poets (*taẕkirah*) titled *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (*ca*. 957/1550). Later in the 1550s, he found himself yet again in a difficult political situation, this time due to conflict with a collateral branch of the Safavid family known as the Shaykhāvandān. Sām Mīrzā evidently grew worried for his safety, and in

969/1562, he pleaded with Ṭahmāsb to be allowed to move to the shrine city of Mashhad and live out his days in prayer. Instead, the king had him confined at the prison fortress of Qahqahah in the northwest. There he remained until December, 1567 (Jumādá al-Ākhirah, 975), when Shah Ṭahmāsb, increasingly concerned about threats to his rule, ordered the execution of Sām Mīrzā and four other jailed princes. In a surprising postscript to Sām's life, Ṭahmāsb apparently tried to suppress the story of his execution—at one point claiming that he and the others perished in an earthquake.

All of these junctures in Sām Mīrzā's biography will be explored in greater detail below; again, however, the facts are not terribly complicated, nor should they be in serious dispute following the research that forms the basis of this section of the dissertation. (Our real problem is that extant sources contain only so much information about Sām Mīrzā. Some of the potential reasons for this will be addressed later.) More importantly, the *implications* of Sām's ill-fated princely career—the broader insights that we can gain through studying him, his relationships, and his work—should also prove tractable. Much of the following discussion will point toward two lines of argument: one about the exceptionally fraught political situation during the reign of Ṭahmāsb, and what he and his advisors deemed necessary in order to preserve the kingdom; and another about the coalescing of early Safavid historiography through a series of court chronicles. But while these topics may not require extensive contextualization, the fact is that Sām Mīrzā's life is best analyzed within the framework of Shah Ṭahmāsb's rule and the challenges, both domestic and regional, facing the Safavid project in the tenth/sixteenth century. With this in mind, it will be helpful, if not essential, to begin the current part of the dissertation by setting the stage for Sām Mīrzā. At no point in his life was he able to choose where he resided, and, as far as can be determined from patchy sources, it was only during his first years in

Ardabīl, when he wrote the *Tuḥfah*, that he was in a position to dictate what work he performed. Thus the context behind his career is unusually pertinent.

It has seemed logical to organize this background discussion in two sections: first, a periodization of the reign of Shah Ṭahmāsb (which corresponds to the stages of Sām Mīrzā's life in a way that will sharpen our understanding of both); second, a brief overview of the major problems that were faced by the Safavid confederation in the early generations of its rule. Some readers may benefit from a reminder of these points. For those who are thoroughly acquainted with Safavid political history, it will still be worthwhile to set out the understanding of the period that governs the subsequent study of Sām Mīrzā's biography.[1]

Periodizing the reign of Ṭahmāsb

For all of the overviews of early Safavid history that have been published, none—in European languages, at least—seems to offer an explicit, comprehensive periodization of the reign of Shah Ṭahmāsb.[2] It may be that establishing such a rubric would not be beneficial for the purposes of every study, and the approach does have its drawbacks. The career of a ruler as important and long-lived as Ṭahmāsb cannot be divided into separate phases in a way that accounts for all important factors at all times. This is always the problem with periodization: it risks concealing more than it reveals, in the

1. While the following pages contain a fair amount of general discussion of early Safavid history, and more background information is found in the appended timelines, no attempt is made here at a true narrative introduction to the Safavids, from their origins as a Sufi order, to their rise as a regional power, *etc.* For such a broad assessment, readers may consult Rudolph P. Matthee, "Safavid Dynasty," *Encyclopædia Iranica*; or Andrew J. Newman, *Safavid Iran: Rebirth of a Persian Empire* (London, 2009), 1–12.
2. One work that comes close is Colin P. Mitchell, "Ṭahmāsp I," *Encyclopædia Iranica.* Mitchell suggests a tripartite division of the reign: 1524–33, 1533–55, 1555–76. Also worthy of mention is Manūchihr Pārsādūst's enormous and comprehensive study, *Shāh Tahmāsb-i Avval* (Tehran, 1998), which includes discussion of seemingly every relevant topic, but is organized on a more thematic basis.

name of making past developments easily comprehensible and meaningful.[3] Nevertheless, there are instances in which it is helpful to think of a given span of time as composed of certain distinct stages, so long as caveats are in place to avoid reductionism.[4]

With regard to Shah Ṭahmāsb, one possible approach (and our approach) is to demarcate four phases in his reign, according to a single overarching criterion. In particular, there were periods in which a combination of domestic and foreign threats to Safavid central authority demanded the full attention of the king and his officials. And there were other times when a measure of security and stability allowed those leaders to focus on somewhat less exigent matters, such as cultural patronage, expansion into new territories, domestic political and economic reforms, and relocating the capital city. We might, with a bit of simplification, refer to these as *periods of survival* and *periods of consolidation*; and there were two of each in Ṭahmāsb's career. From his accession in 930/1524 up to 943/1537, the young king and several Qizilbāsh factions fought existential battles against one another, the Abū al-Khayrid Uzbeks, and the Ottomans. At multiple points in this period—which is described exhaustively by Martin Dickson in his 1958 dissertation—the entire Safavid project was potentially just one more stroke of bad luck away from being liquidated.[5] Not only did the kingdom survive, however, but Ṭahmāsb managed to assert himself as the supreme figure who would keep the Safavid

3. My approach to this issue is indebted to Fred M. Donner, "Periodization as a Tool of the Historian with Special Reference to Islamic History," *Der Islam* 91, no. 1 (2014): 20–36.
4. Most importantly, the periodization offered here is just one option, which was chosen to add clarity to the current project. It should not be taken as absolute, and should be relied upon only insofar as it is useful. The same years (930–84/1524–76) could be mapped differently to facilitate a focus on different themes.
5. Martin B. Dickson, "Sháh Ṭahmásb and the Úzbeks: The Duel for Khurásán with 'Ubayd Khán, 930–946/1524–1540" (PhD diss., Princeton University, 1958).

constituent groups in balance with one another. In Dickson's words, he was at last able to follow his father, Shah Ismāʿīl, in pursuing "a genuinely 'national' (*i.e.*, Safavid-Qizilbāsh) policy."[6]

Therefore, in the period that followed—from 943/1537 through the beginning of Alqāṣ Mīrzā's rebellion in 953/1546—Ṭahmāsb and his advisors could focus on such issues as reëstablishing control in outlying provinces, new invasions of the Caucasus, and offering refuge (with some strings attached) to the embattled Mughal ruler Humāyūn.[7] It was also during the mid-1540s that plans were set in motion to establish a new capital at Qazvīn.[8] This second stage was a time to put the Safavid polity back on firm footing, after the relative inactivity of Shah Ismāʿīl's court during the final decade of his reign, and the extraordinarily destructive twelve years that followed Ṭahmāsb's accession.

The opening of a third period can be identified in 953/1546, with the start of Alqāṣ Mīrzā's Ottoman-backed rebellion, and it would last until the Peace of Amasya in 962/1555. These years were marked above all by the return of outright hostilities between the Safavids and the Ottomans under Sultan Süleyman I (r. 926–74/1520–66). The latter sought to solidify earlier gains and capture new territories in the Caucasus and Mesopotamia. Toward that end, the Ottomans first granted military support to Alqāṣ Mīrzā, a refractory younger brother of Ṭahmāsb who, it was hoped, might seize power in Iran and repay his foreign sponsors through territorial concessions. Despite carrying out a few successful raids within Safavid borders, Alqāṣ made little progress in his efforts to rally Qizilbāsh factions to his side. He eventually surrendered to Ṭahmāsb's forces in October 1549 (Ramaḍān 956) and was put to death in the spring of 957/1550.[9]

---

6. Ibid., 295.
7. A few of these developments are covered in Roger Savory, *Iran under the Safavids* (Cambridge, 1980), 64–7.
8. ʿAbdī Beg Shīrāzī dates the beginning of this process to the winter of 951/1544–5. See his *Takmilat al-akhbār,* ed. ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn Navāʾī (Tehran, 1990), 94.
9. See Cornell H. Fleischer, "Alqās Mirzā," *Encyclopædia Iranica*; and Walter Posch, *Osmanisch-safavidische Beziehungen*

The failure of this rebellion, however, was not sufficient to deter Ottoman ambitions in the region. Süleyman himself launched a new Iranian campaign in 960/1553. Although the Ottomans always enjoyed superiority in the field, they found it prohibitively difficult to take *and hold* the Safavids' northwestern territories, for a number of reasons. Supply lines from the center would be stretched thin. Weather was often a problem in the colder seasons. The Ottomans had multiple frontiers, any of which could become a point of crisis at any time, and so they were often unable to direct the bulk of their forces to Iran.[10] Perhaps most importantly, Ṭahmāsb never repeated the mistake that his father had made at Chāldirān in 920/1514. Not once in a reign of more than five decades would he risk a pitched battle against the Ottomans. Instead, the Safavids grew adept at scorched-earth tactics that made it impossible for enemy forces to live off of the land while on campaign.[11]

For all of these reasons, the Ottomans were unlikely to do much better than to secure for themselves Eastern Anatolia, parts of Georgia and Armenia, and most of Mesopotamia. This "reality on the ground" was acknowledged by both powers in May 1555 (Rajab 962), in a treaty concluded at Amasya near the Black Sea coast.[12] The result was not fully satisfying to either party—though it was surely more embarrassing for Ṭahmāsb, who, among other things, was forced to accept the

(*1545–1550*)*: Der Fall Alḳâs Mîrzâ* (2 vols., Vienna, 2013).

10. In 941/1535, for example, Süleyman was on campaign in Safavid territory, but then the Habsburgs under Charles V defeated the Ottoman fleet and captured Tunis. Decades later, the "Long Turkish War" in the Balkans (1001–15/1593–1606) would make it easier for the Safavids to reconquer lands that they lost between 986/1578 and 998/1590.
11. This strategy, however, came at a price. See, for example, Rudolph P. Matthee, *Persia in Crisis: Safavid Decline and the Fall of Isfahan* (London, 2012), 114. Matthee describes the northwestern provinces in the eleventh/seventeenth century as "scarred, desolate landscapes filled with destroyed villages, ruined bridges, poisoned wells, and burned crops."
12. See Adel Allouche, "Amasya, Treaty of," *Encyclopædia of Islam, THREE*. (Note that the date customarily provided for this treaty in Western scholarship—29 May 1555—is the *Julian* equivalent of 8 Rajab 962. As has been explained in the frontmatter, the practice followed throughout this dissertation is to convert Islamic dates to Julian before the calendar reform of 1582, and to Gregorian thereafter. The Peace of Amasya is an example of a well-dated event that demonstrates the importance of this approach. Conversion to Julian before 990/1582 has clearly been the scholarly convention in our field.)

permanency of territorial losses that he must have preferred to view as temporary. (Baghdad, taken by Süleyman in 941/1534, is the clearest example.) On the other hand, the Peace of Amasya would keep the Safavids and the Ottomans out of direct military conflict for the remainder of Ṭahmāsb's reign.

This détente, combined with disarray among the Uzbeks that would prevent them from threatening Safavid territories again until the 1580s, and generally cordial relations with the Mughals to the southeast, gave Ṭahmāsb the last twenty-one years of his reign to focus primarily on domestic consolidation and reforms.[13] And so the fourth and longest period of his rule runs from 962/1555 until his death in 984/1576. A few years after Amasya, in the winter of 966/1558–9, the move of the Safavid capital to Qazvīn was finalized with the opening of a new palace and royal gardens.[14] The court had earlier been based at Tabrīz—as much as it was based anywhere, given the seasonal movement of the army—but with political conditions having changed substantially since the beginning of the century, Shah Ṭahmāsb and his officials saw it in their best interest to relocate to the southeast. The Safavids' "center of gravity" had shifted, and Tabrīz would henceforth be closer to the frontier.

Around the same time, the king carried out the second public "repentance" or "reconsecration" (*tawbah*) of his career,[15] whereby he pushed for stricter enforcement of religious law and apparently withheld courtly patronage of certain arts that were deemed too secular, among them panegyric

---

13. On the Uzbeks in this period, see Yuri Bregel, "Abu'l-Khayrids," *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Leaders of different appanages were mostly absorbed in fighting one another between 957/1550 and the early 1580s.
14. As was mentioned above, the relocation of the capital had been planned at least as far back as 951/1544–5.
15. The first *tawbah* was proclaimed (as best we can determine) in 941/1534, while Ṭahmāsb was struggling to fend off both the Ottomans and the Uzbeks, and dealing with a fractious, insubordinate Qizilbāsh confederation. While *tawbah* has commonly been translated as "repentance," it is a rich concept in Islamic history, including in Sufism. It may be more appropriate, in some contexts, to refer to it as "reconsecration." In Arabic, the word can denote turning toward God and renewing one's religious commitment. See Atif Khalil, *Repentance and the Return to God: Tawba in Early Sufism* (Albany, NY, 2018).

poetry.[16] This fits in the broader context of Ṭahmāsb's attempts, in the later years of his reign, to centralize authority in various ways. Another part of this effort entailed showing less leniency and indulgence toward members of the royal family. For example, Ṭahmāsb appointed his son, Ismāʿīl Mīrzā—future Shah Ismāʿīl II—to the governorship of Harāt in 963/1556. The following year, however, the prince was recalled from his post and eventually sent to the prison fortress of Qahqahah, where he would remain for almost two decades. He had done something in Harāt (the details of which remain unclear) to arouse the displeasure of his father.[17] We can view the imprisonment of Sām Mīrzā and his own sons in 969/1562, and the mass execution in 975/1567, as part of the same larger trend.

Although the post-Amasya years gave Shah Ṭahmāsb an extended reprieve from foreign military conflict, he did face one of the greatest tests of his diplomatic acumen during this period: the rebellion and flight to the Safavid court of Şehzade Bayezid, son of Sultan Süleyman. The Ottoman prince was engaged in a succession struggle with his brother, Selim. In 966/1559, after losing a battle, and realizing that he was running out of options, Bayezid fled into Safavid lands with a small group of his men. He sought both refuge and material support of his cause at the Iranian court. This was an astonishing reversal of circumstances for Ṭahmāsb, who had seen the Ottomans bankroll the rebellion of his own brother, Alqāṣ, a decade earlier. He gave Bayezid a lavish welcome and provided him with lodging, but he would not risk supporting the prince in any way that might trigger a new war. Instead, a fairly lengthy period of stalling and negotiations followed, during which Ṭahmāsb received a series of Ottoman embassies but took no action to end the crisis. It was not until the fall of 969/1561, after

16. The question of Shah Ṭahmāsb's literary patronage is addressed below.

17. This sequence of events is narrated, albeit vaguely, in ʿAbdī Beg Shīrāzī, *Takmilat al-akhbār*, ed. Navāʾī, 110–11. See also Walther Hinz, "Schah Esmaʿil II. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Safawiden," *Mitteilungen des Seminars für orientalische Sprachen* 36 (1933): 19–100.

numerous gifts and payments were sent to the Safavids, that Şehzade Bayezid was released into Ottoman custody (and subsequently executed).[18]

Ṭahmāsb may not have managed to extract any major concessions from Süleyman, but this was still an important episode in establishing the strength of the Safavids' position, and in setting the tone for an extended period in which the Peace of Amasya would be respected by both sides. As has been noted above, the final years of Ṭahmāsb's rule were dominated by domestic issues. Foreign relations remained active and important, but they were not as urgent a matter as they had been at various points in the preceding decades. In the early 1570s, when Ṭahmāsb's health began seriously to falter, a different kind of instability crept back into the Safavid court.[19] But we may set aside these last developments for now, since they would have little bearing on our large-scale periodization—and they took place after the death of Sām Mīrzā, in any case.

This four-part division of the age of Shah Ṭahmāsb, into alternating *periods of survival* and *periods of consolidation*, is useful on a few levels. First, it gives us a coherent way (though not the only way possible) of organizing an exceptionally long reign that appears to have gone through various phases.[20] Second, the endeavors of Ṭahmāsb and his court were usually the single most important factor in determining where Sām Mīrzā, as a lower-ranking and closely monitored member of the royal family, would reside, and how he would be permitted to spend his time. Later, when we construct our prince's biography in detail, we will see a degree of correspondence between the important changes in his circumstances, and the inflection points that have been identified in Ṭahmāsb's reign.[21] For example,

---

18. For a succinct account of the Şehzade Bayezid affair, see Kaya Şahin, *Empire and Power in the Reign of Süleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World* (Cambridge, 2013), 146–7.
19. See Savory, *Iran under the Safavids*, 67–9.
20. Another option, for a simpler periodization, would be to divide Ṭahmāsb's reign in half at the Treaty of Amasya.
21. One could object that I have designed both the broader periodization and the structure of Sām Mīrzā's biography. Of

in 943/1537, when the Safavid political situation finally stabilized after more than a decade of turmoil, the king ordered that Sām Mīrzā be confined under guard within the itinerant army camp. The latter would not be able to secure an improvement in his living conditions, or a formal post in the government, until 956/1549, when the rebellion of Alqāṣ Mīrzā was just being crushed and further war with the Ottomans was on the horizon. And when Sām Mīrzā was sent back to prison, in 969/1562, the Şehzade Bayezid affair had recently been resolved, leaving Ṭahmāsb in possibly the strongest position of his reign.

The sharp vicissitudes of Sām's career point to a third benefit of the periodization outlined above: it reveals a ruler who tended to seize the opportunity of calmer times in order to reinforce his authority. The Peace of Amasya, tellingly, was followed by a strict *tawbah*, not by an amnesty or loosening of rules. (An alternative explanation that has appeared in scholarship is that Ṭahmāsb pushed for stricter enforcement of religious law as a way of *compensating* for the humiliating terms of Amasya. This is certainly possible, but it does less to elucidate the larger trends toward consolidation of domestic power that continued through the 1560s.)[22] As is discussed elsewhere, one of the more widely applicable arguments of this part of the dissertation is that Shah Ṭahmāsb carried out such severe crackdowns during the final, superficially stable period of his rule, that he may have rendered inevitable the chaos that followed his death.

---

course they fit each other! But this is in keeping with Donner's idea of periodization as "a tool of the historian."

22. See, for example, Newman, *Safavid Iran*, 32.

Challenges of building the Safavid project

At any rate, we have a rough periodization that should serve us well in analyzing Sām Mīrzā's biography. But it will also help, in the interest of comprehensiveness, to provide a brief inventory of the different kinds of challenges faced by Ṭahmāsb, and by the Safavid project generally, in the middle decades of the tenth/sixteenth century. These may be organized among the following categories: diplomatic and military conflict with neighboring polities (especially the Ottomans and the Uzbeks); insubordination on the domestic front, whether it came from members of the royal family or from provincial leaders; economic policy; managing the religious ideology that gave the Safavid house its legitimacy; and issues of cultural patronage. All of these challenges had some impact, whether direct or indirect, on Sām Mīrzā's life.

Conflicts between the Safavids and foreign powers will form a major component of any discussion of the reign of Ṭahmāsb. This is partly because wars, treaties, and the like are better documented in our narrative sources than events of most other types. For the career of Sām Mīrzā in particular, Safavid interactions with the Ottomans, Uzbeks, and Mughals are of manifest concern. In his youth, Sām and his Shāmlū garrison struggled to defend Harāt against repeated Uzbek incursions. A few years later, he was named as a candidate to replace Shah Ṭahmāsb, in the event that the Ottomans were able to force a régime change and install a puppet ruler. Finally, in 941/1535, just as their position in Harāt was coming undone, Sām Mīrzā and his then-guardian, Aghzīvār Khān Shāmlū, embarked on an ill-fated campaign to seize the fortress city of Qandahār from the Mughals. This means that our prince, within the span of less than a decade, was involved in dealings with all three of the Safavids'

rival empires—if only notionally in the case of the Ottomans.[23] (The details of these events will be set out later as part of Sām Mīrzā's biography, and so, to save space and avoid repetition, only a cursory summary has been provided here.)

In general, it should go without saying that the challenge of articulating Safavid power vis-à-vis neighboring polities was one of the defining features of the period. The Uzbeks threatened Khurāsān almost constantly between 930/1524 and 946/1540.[24] The Ottomans and the Safavids fought two direct wars, from 940/1534 to 942/1536 and then from 960/1553 to 962/1555, in addition to Ottoman support of Alqāṣ Mīrzā's rebellion in the late 1540s. Relations with the Mughals were seldom problematic, but they and the Safavids did occasionally capture Qandahār from one another.[25] When we examine the career of Shah Ṭahmāsb, we should bear in mind that he took the throne at a time of vulnerability for the Safavids, whereas both the Ottomans under Sultan Süleyman and the Uzbeks under ʿUbayd Allāh Khān were arguably at the zenith of their power. It seems almost miraculous that Ṭahmāsb survived his first few wars, especially since various Qizilbāsh factions were engaged in a violent struggle for influence at the same time (to be discussed below). Did the early difficulties encountered by Ṭahmāsb color the remainder of his reign? Without resorting to speculation, we can at least say that the king never placed much confidence in Sām Mīrzā after his failures and suspicious activities in the 1530s. It is also noteworthy that Ṭahmāsb kept subordinate members of the Safavid family under increasingly

---

23. As is discussed later in this chapter, extant sources give no indication that Sām Mīrzā or those in his immediate orbit were aware of scheming to place him on the throne. And the idea, insofar as it existed, was never acted upon.
24. Here I follow Dickson's beginning and end points for the period. To be fair, the "almost constant" threat subsided considerably after 943/1537.
25. See Rudolph P. Matthee and Hiroyuki Mashita, "Kandahar iv. From the Mongol Invasion through the Safavid Era," *Encyclopædia Iranica.*

tight control in his later years, finally having several of them executed—though there was no clear threat to his power on the level that he had faced between 930/1524 and 943/1537.

In addition to the difficulties of foreign relations, the Safavid Empire in its early generations was plagued by internal instability. And in this regard, the first decade or so of Ṭahmāsb's reign represents one of the most volatile situations faced by any ruler in the period. There was a range of problems. For one, while it seems as though all Qizilbāsh factions accepted the legitimacy of the Safavid family, and therefore expected to see a son of Shah Ismāʿīl on the throne, it may not have struck them as imperative that the ruler be Ṭahmāsb. Ismāʿīl had left three other sons—Alqāṣ (b. 922/1516), Sām (b. 923/1517), and Bahrām (b. 923/1517)—two of whom would eventually be entangled in plots to depose the king.[26] The possibility of such a reconfiguration, however remote, must have been perceived from the outset.

Beyond the general question of succession, which the Safavids were negotiating for the first time since becoming a ruling dynasty, there was a more immediate problem relating to the balance of power among the major Qizilbāsh tribes. Ṭahmāsb was only ten (solar) years old at his enthronement, and so there could be no doubt that true authority would remain, for a time, in the hands of military leaders. This resulted in a decade of brutal competition for influence at court. Of the seven leading tribes in the Qizilbāsh confederation, four are known to have made serious efforts to achieve dominance in the 1520s and '30s: the Rūmlū, Takkalū, Shāmlū, and Ustājlū. (Other groups, such as the Afshār and Dhū al-Qadr, were involved at high levels, but they did not take the lead in vying to monopolize Ṭahmāsb.)

---

26. See the following section for more detail on the birth and death dates of Shah Ismāʿīl's four sons. Interestingly, Sām and Bahrām were born just one week apart (to different mothers, of course).

One of the most prominent victims of this power struggle was Sām Mīrzā, who, at the time of Shah Ismāʿīl's death, had not yet reached the age of seven and was living in Harāt as puppet governor, under the protection of a tutor (*lalah*) and a cohort of soldiers from the Shāmlū tribe. Sām was ultimately left in Harāt for the majority of his upbringing, during which years his ties to the Shāmlū were cemented through a series of related *lalah*s. He was eventually married to a daughter of one of them, an influential leader named Ḥusayn Khān. This process of establishing control over a young member of the royal family was one of the ways in which Qizilbāsh factions endeavored to gain leverage in the early Safavid period.[27] Later, in 941/1534, when Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū was executed on charges of attempting to poison Shah Ṭahmāsb, the tribe was stripped of most of its power, and Sām Mīrzā fell with them.

The fluid political situation during these years will be covered in somewhat greater detail below.[28] For the moment, the point to be emphasized is that the circumstances under which Ṭahmāsb succeeded Ismāʿīl raised questions of who would actually wield power, with far-reaching, destructive ramifications. The young king was in no position to mediate such disputes among the Qizilbāsh and his own family members until his maturation in the early 1530s. Further problems were caused by the perennial difficulty, even in good times, of keeping frontier areas under some degree of control by the

---

27. In this connection, see also the hectic period leading up to the accession of ʿAbbās I in 995/1587. He was essentially abducted by Murshid Qulī Khān Ustājlū in 993/1585. Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, ed. Iḥsān Ishrāqī (2 vols., Tehran, 1980–), vol. 2, pp. 793–6.
28. One issue that I have not addressed here—or elsewhere, with any depth—is the ever-controversial "Turk vs. Tajik" dynamic in medieval and early modern Iranian history. I would have little to add beyond the customary ideas that military power tended to be held by "Turks," who were tribally organized and followed a semi-nomadic lifestyle; that administrative and scholarly work was more the domain of "Tajiks," *i.e.*, settled populations of ethnic Persians; that there was some degree of tension between the two groups, particularly when the former felt that the latter was gaining undue power; and that elevating "Tajiks" to positions of authority was one way for the Safavid court to reduce its vulnerability to the turbulence of the Qizilbāsh tribes. These points have come up frequently in scholarship on the period. Given the nature of our sources, much of the argumentation is speculative.

court. In periods of turmoil, there was all the more incentive for leaders in the provinces—be they from the military class or from local notable families—to claim authority over as much land as possible, and little reason for them to remit tax revenues to the center.[29] All of these problems would stay with Ṭahmāsb, and indeed with his successors, in subsequent decades. It was never easy to maintain stable relations and hierarchies within the royal family, nor to manage the often unruly Qizilbāsh confederation, nor to bring outlying provinces meaningfully under Safavid administrative and fiscal control. But while such challenges were not unique to the first period of Ṭahmāsb's reign, they were unusually severe during those years, when he was still a child and his father's death had left a political vacuum.

The topic of the economic pressures faced by the Safavids can be overwhelming, since it hovers behind everything else that successive generations of kings and officials attempted.[30] After all, little action would be possible for any center of power unless it could identify and manage sources of revenue. In principle, there were four main ways for the Safavids, like any other polity in the early modern world, to fund their projects: the conquest of new lands, and the spoils that it brought; exploiting natural resources (especially precious metal deposits); taxes on trade and commerce; and capturing part of the regular agricultural surplus in the areas under control. In practice, however, not all of these options were open to the Safavids for much of their period of rule, including the reign of Ṭahmāsb. The subjugation of new territories as a source of wealth tended to be more of an important

29. Sīstān and Māzandarān are two examples of areas that repeatedly proved difficult for the Safavids to administer. See H. R. Roemer, "The Safavid Period," in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 6, *The Timurid and Safavid Periods*, ed. Peter Jackson and Laurence Lockhart (Cambridge, 1986), 245.

30. It does not help that Safavid economic history has been a niche subfield dominated by just a few researchers. In fact, Willem Floor alone has written several of the most-cited works. See especially his comprehensive survey, *The Economy of Safavid Persia* (Wiesbaden, 2000).

factor at the beginning of a dynasty. Shah Ismāʿīl had been able to conquer a number of provinces, before reaching a point at which further expansion was prohibitively difficult. For his successors, capturing additional lands was less of a concern than struggling to defend existing holdings against adversaries such as the Uzbeks and the Ottomans. And when the Safavids did find opportunities to go on the offensive, they were more likely to direct their efforts toward recapturing areas that had previously been under their control. With few exceptions, revenue from conquest was not to be a major consideration after the initial expansion under Ismāʿīl.

Moving to the question of natural resource wealth (and of geographic assets in general), the situation was no easier. The Safavids had the distinction of controlling a swath of land that would appear, at first glance, to represent a large and prosperous empire, while in fact it gave them few advantages. The country did not have much in the way of precious metal deposits that were exploitable at that time, and so the availability of silver currency (let alone gold) was dependent upon the balance of trade between Safavid Iran and neighboring economies, most importantly Mughal India. Given the much greater quantities of Indian-produced goods that were imported and sold in Iran throughout the tenth/sixteenth and eleventh/seventeenth centuries, as opposed to Iranian exports to India, the Safavids continually faced currency shortages.[31] Their problem might have been less severe if they had ready access to multiple foreign markets. But most overland trade with the Mediterranean region would need to pass through Ottoman territory, which was often complicated, if not impracticable, as a result of high-level conflict between the two empires.[32]

---

31. By the early eleventh/seventeenth century, there was also a large and growing number of Indian (largely Punjabi Khatri) merchants working in Safavid cities. This surely contributed to the trade imbalance. For more on this topic, see Scott C. Levi, *The Indian Diaspora in Central Asia and Its Trade* (Leiden, 2002).
32. The Ottomans apparently tried on multiple occasions, starting in the reign of Selim I (918–26/1512–20), to impose embargoes on the transfer of goods and precious metals into Safavid lands. It is unclear how strictly or for how long

Looking at a map, it might seem as though the Safavids should have been able to gain a foothold on the Indian Ocean trade with Western Europe, via the Persian Gulf. But the goods that could be exported from Iran during this period (chiefly silk) were produced far to the north, in the areas surrounding the Caspian Sea. Several hundred miles of arid land stood between this productive region—which was also where the Safavids' political and military power were concentrated—and the ports around the Strait of Hormuz. It would have been a complex, expensive administrative challenge to integrate the Safavid market into the ocean trade system that was then becoming increasingly central to the world economy.[33] And would such an investment, assuming it were feasible for a polity often struggling to survive other crises, have been worthwhile? Iran was a source of particularly high-quality silk, but textiles of various kinds were more easily available through India. The one large trade opportunity that the Safavids were able to exploit, though not until later in the period, was their connection to the Tsardom of Russia by way of the Volga River. This northern route, through which the Safavids could trade silk for silver (to paraphrase the title of Matthee's book), would prove an indispensable source of revenue to the court in the eleventh/seventeenth century.[34] It was not enough on its own to carry a large economy.

In the end, given the unavailability of conquest as a generator of wealth under most circumstances, the lack of exploitable precious metal deposits, and commercial opportunities that were at least somewhat limited by factors beyond the control of the government, the Safavids would

---

these policies were enforced. But even if we assume that Ottoman economic warfare was toothless and inconsistent, the Safavids definitely did not enjoy much coöperation in accessing Mediterranean markets. See Jean-Louis Bacqué-Grammont, "Études turco-safavides I: Notes sur le blocus du commerce iranien par Selîm Ier," *Turcica* 6 (1975): 68–88.

33. This is not to suggest a total absence of trade with Iran via the Gulf. See Floor, *Economy of Safavid Persia*, 210–16. But the use of the southern maritime route to export goods produced in the Safavid heartland is a different question.

34. Rudolph P. Matthee, *The Politics of Trade in Safavid Iran: Silk for Silver, 1600–1730* (Cambridge, 1999).

have needed to do an extraordinarily good job of managing the modest resources available to them—including efficiently taxing the agricultural surplus—in order to ensure the funding of priorities such as the military, the maintenance of roads and caravanserais, and architectural projects in the cities. But here we find another problem: much of the land controlled by the Safavids was not agriculturally productive. Even on this point, they were disadvantaged as compared to the Mughals and the Ottomans.[35] This is not to say that the Safavid economy was the only one in the region to face serious challenges throughout the early modern period. The Ottoman government, notably, went through multiple currency crises of its own.[36]

And we need not stray into geographic determinism. The relative lack of resources at the disposal of the Safavids did not make it impossible for them to defeat rival powers in battle, or to fill their capital cities with splendid architecture, or to sponsor various types of artistic and intellectual activity (especially where the development of Shiʿi thought was concerned).[37] The reign of Shah ʿAbbās I (995–1038/1587–1629) stands as an example of how much could be achieved through energetic and effective administration. Then again, even in his time, there was often (or nearly always?) insufficient silver in the treasury to pay the army, which meant that soldiers were compensated partly in textiles,

---

35. While it is obviously not possible to use modern country data to draw strong conclusions about conditions several centuries ago, it might still be illustrative to mention a couple of figures. According to the CIA World Factbook, about twelve percent of the land area of Iran is under cultivation (as of 2011). For modern India, this number jumps to fifty-seven percent. The difference in fertility between the Iranian Plateau and South Asia (with its tropical areas and the Indus River valley) is wide enough that we can allow for significant changes in territorial holdings between the Safavid period and the present day. As for the Ottomans, they controlled the Eastern Mediterranean, the Black Sea region, the Nile Delta, and beyond. Even today, Turkey by itself has around thirty-one percent of its land under cultivation. The Safavids would appear disadvantaged in any geographic comparison. Perhaps worst of all, some of their most fertile lands were precisely those threatened by Ottoman and Uzbek invasions.
36. One example is the dramatic debasement of the silver *akçe* in 993/1585, at a time when the Ottomans were at war with the Safavids and were struggling to pay the army. See Şevket Pamuk, *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge, 2000), 131*ff*.
37. The amount that the Safavids were able to accomplish given their constraints is a repeated theme in Savory, *Iran under the Safavids*. See in particular the later, thematic chapters of the book.

or, on at least one occasion, issued fiat currency printed on leather.[38] What the structural disadvantages of the Safavid economy meant was that the central government was especially prone to find itself in fiscal distress, which in turn could be especially severe. Again, the lack of easy revenue sources only raised the stakes for the effective treatment of issues such as oversight of the provinces, land tenure, and taxation. As far as we know, the Safavids struggled on these fronts at least as much as other powers throughout the region—which is to say, acutely.[39]

The connection between these economic problems and the career of Sām Mīrzā is indirect, but not necessarily insignificant. On a basic level, an environment of frequent currency shortages and difficulty generating tax revenue must have exacerbated political conflicts, which were enough by themselves to threaten the destruction of the Safavid project several times in the tenth/sixteenth century. And it should not go unmentioned that Shah Ṭahmāsb pursued an idiosyncratic fiscal policy in the later years of his reign, with his decision in 972/1565—allegedly after a dream in which he saw the Twelfth Imam—that a range of taxes should no longer be collected by the government, since they lacked an explicit basis in Islamic law.[40]

These taxes included the *tamghāvāt* (s. *tamghā*), a category of levies on urban commercial activity that dated back, in some form, to the Mongol period.[41] (Of course, it is difficult to establish the precise

---

38. Matthee, *Persia in Crisis*, 115–16.
39. It should be acknowledged that the Mughals, until the late eleventh/seventeenth century, apparently had less difficulty than the Safavids or the Ottomans in maintaining their economic policies. This was despite occasional bouts of fierce political and military conflict. See Stephen F. Dale, “India under Mughal Rule,” in *The New Cambridge History of Islam*, vol. 3, *The Eastern Islamic World, Eleventh to Eighteenth Centuries*, ed. David O. Morgan and Anthony Reid (Cambridge, 2010), 287–93.
40. See Bert G. Fragner, “Social and Internal Economic Affairs,” in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 6, *The Timurid and Safavid Periods*, ed. Peter Jackson and Laurence Lockhart (Cambridge, 1986), 539–41.
41. The classic etymological study of the term *tamghā* is found in Gerhard Doerfer, *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen* (4 vols., Wiesbaden, 1963–75), vol. 2, pp. 554–65.

definition, if any, of *tamghā*. The word was originally used in Turkic to denote livestock brands, and it later took on the meaning of a seal affixed to official documents. From this point, it seems natural that *tamghā* came to refer to revenue stamps, and then, through metonymy, to certain taxes themselves. But this is speculative, and it is doubtful in any case that the meaning of the term was stable across time periods or in different places. Nor is it clear whether the *tamghāvāt* should be considered new taxes that were collected following Mongol/Turkic influence, or whether our sources are using a new word to describe practices that were longstanding throughout the region.) Ṭahmāsb's decision to deprive the government of these revenue sources, which were of significant value and relatively easy to collect (due to their urban setting), can only have added further pressure to a difficult situation. Perhaps significantly, this took place during the same period that witnessed the imprisonment of Sām Mīrzā and several other Safavid princes, the inauguration of the capital at Qazvīn, and an apparent campaign to strengthen the enforcement of religious law, with Shah Ṭahmāsb's second *tawbah* after the Peace of Amasya. The abrogation of non-qur'anic taxes was one peculiar development among several in the 1550s and '60s.

If the economic challenges faced by the Safavids seem to have colored all aspects of their domestic and foreign policy, the same is *at least* as true of their religio-ideological program. Nothing about this dynasty has given rise to more debate than its efforts to make Iran the axis of Shi'i Islam. How did a Sufi order based in Ardabīl become affiliated with the Shi'ah (having apparently been Sunni at its inception in the early eighth/fourteenth century); gradually turn militant and expansionist in the fluid environment of the Caucasus and Eastern Anatolia, at the margins of the territories ruled by the Āqquyūnlū and Qarāquyūnlū Turkmen confederations; and launch an imperial project that would

convert the people of Iran to Shiʿism, set in motion a sectarian conflict (whose importance can scarcely be overstated) against the Sunni Ottomans, and reshape the political and social fabric of the region in ways that are still felt today?[42]

This is the defining narrative arc of the Safavids, in large part due to its undeniable distinctiveness. Seldom are we able to point to a social, intellectual, or cultural development in premodern history and be confident that we have identified something truly different from what took place before or elsewhere; but such is the case with the Safavids' promotion of Twelver Shiʿism. In any event, the topic of the religious policies of Shah Ismāʿīl and his successors is daunting, with a number of questions remaining actively contested. One example is the debate over the importance (or not) of Arab Shiʿi scholars from Jabal ʿĀmil in Lebanon, many of whom migrated to Iran and (according to the majority view) were instrumental in the formalization of the Safavid clerical establishment.[43]

This is hardly the place to attempt a comprehensive treatment of such a weighty, controversial set of issues. For our purposes, focusing on the reign of Shah Ṭahmāsb and the princely career of Sām Mīrzā, there are two points that deserve emphasis. First, as was discussed above, the death of Shah Ismāʿīl, and the transition to the second generation of Safavid rule, gave rise to serious questions of political legitimacy and the balance of power among Qizilbāsh officers and members of the royal family. But all of this was bound up in religion as much as in any other factor. Ismāʿīl was the head of

---

42. Some of the most thought-provoking works in the field of Safavid history have confronted the question of how such a movement could even have been imagined, in the context of the ninth/fifteenth and tenth/sixteenth centuries. See, for example, Michel M. Mazzaoui, *The Origins of the Ṣafawids: Šīʿism, Ṣūfism, and the Ġulāt* (Wiesbaden, 1972); Kathryn Babayan, *Mystics, Monarchs, and Messiahs: Cultural Landscapes of Early Modern Iran* (Cambridge, MA, 2002); and Saïd Amir Arjomand, *The Shadow of God and the Hidden Imam: Religion, Political Order, and Societal Change in Shiʿite Iran from the Beginning to 1890* (Chicago, 1984).
43. The two sides in this debate (or perhaps the two extremes) are represented by Rula Jurdi Abisaab, *Converting Persia: Religion and Power in the Safavid Empire* (London, 2004); and Andrew J. Newman, "The Myth of the Clerical Migration to Safawid Iran: Arab Shiite Opposition to ʿAlī al-Karakī and Safawid Shiism," *Die Welt des Islams* 33 (1993): 66–112.

the Safavid order at a crucial moment, and the leader of a military campaign that achieved startling successes in its first decade. He and his men, who evidently viewed him as a more-than-mortal figure and engaged in extreme behaviors in their devotion, built the beginnings of an empire on the strength of charisma and conquest.[44] The dream of this messianic crusade was greatly dimmed, if not broken, after the Safavids' defeat at the Battle of Chāldirān in 920/1514, ten years before Ismāʿīl's death.[45]

For Ṭahmāsb, who never had a chance at rivaling his father in the field (if only due to circumstance), the future of the Safavid enterprise would need to be pursued through more regular means. In the narrowly political realm, this included measures such as managing the distribution of military power among the Qizilbāsh, gradually placing more "Tajiks" (as opposed to "Turks") in senior administrative positions, and contracting marriage alliances with Georgian and Circassian families. There was also a substantial religious dimension to strengthening the authority of the Safavids, especially as they moved away from Shah Ismāʿīl's eschatological cult of personality and tied the legitimacy of their rule to their status as representatives of the Hidden Imam and protectors of the Shiʿi community at large.[46] This entailed, among many other things, emphasizing the Safavid family's purported descent from the seventh imam, Mūsá al-Kāẓim; supporting the shrine complexes of other members of the house of the Prophet, most importantly that of the eighth imam, ʿAlī al-Riżā, in Mashhad; granting honors to influential Shiʿi scholars, such as Nūr al-Dīn ʿAlī al-Karakī (d. 940/1533–

44. See Shahzad Bashir, "Shah Ismaʿil and the Qizilbash: Cannibalism in the Religious History of Early Safavid Iran," *History of Religions* 45, no. 3 (February 2006): 234–56.
45. Chāldirān has been viewed as the great turning point, but the Safavids did suffer one earlier military defeat, at the hands of the Uzbeks, at Ghujduvān in 918/1512. See Habib Borjian, "Ḡojdovān," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.
46. This process is described in Arjomand, *Shadow of God*, ch. 6 (starting on p. 160).

4), a visitor to Iran from the aforementioned region in Southern Lebanon; and, of course, the *tawbah*s of Shah Ṭahmāsb, which signaled a commitment to Islamic law.[47]

The religious element of the Safavid project became an important part of Sām Mīrzā's life. In 956/1549, when he prevailed upon the king to grant him a stable position, rather than compelling him to stay with the army as it moved between its summer and winter encampments—*yaylāq* and *qishlāq*, respectively—what he received was the (nominal) governorship of Ardabīl, and custodianship of the Safavid family shrine in that city.[48] (It is unclear just how much practical authority Sām Mīrzā wielded during this period; the sources are too vague. As we will see later, however, the prince's position in Ardabīl eventually fell apart due to conflict with a prominent local family, to the point of threatening his safety. There is reason to suspect that he was installed as something of a figurehead.)

This brings us to the second of the two points indicated above. Not only was it necessary for Ṭahmāsb and his officials to pursue various policies to consolidate authority and buttress the dynasty's legitimacy; but this may also have produced a new dynamic within the royal family, at least for a time. Sām Mīrzā, distrusted though he may have been, was permitted to stay in Ardabīl for more than a decade, and to play some role in the administration of the shrine that centered on the tomb of Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn (d. 735/1334), founder of the Safavid order.[49] It may have been perceived as a symbolic benefit to have one of his direct descendants affiliated with the site. In a somewhat similar vein, the governorship of Mashhad was granted in 963/1556 to Ibrāhīm Mīrzā,[50] a son of Bahrām Mīrzā—

47. For a summary of al-Karakī's career, see Abisaab, *Converting Persia*, 15–20. On the question of tracing the line of the Safavids to Mūsá al-Kāẓim, see Sholeh A. Quinn, *Historical Writing during the Reign of Shah ʿAbbas: Ideology, Imitation, and Legitimacy in Safavid Chronicles* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2000), 44, 57–8, 83–6.
48. The most detailed account of this appointment is found in Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, vol. 1, pp. 550–51.
49. See Kishwar Rizvi, *The Safavid Dynastic Shrine: Architecture, Religion and Power in Early Modern Iran* (London, 2010). Sām Mīrzā's tenure is mentioned on pp. 108–9.
50. There may be some confusion over the timing of this event. ʿAbdī Beg Shīrāzī has Ibrāhīm Mīrzā leaving for Mashhad

Ṭahmāsb's only full brother, who had apparently remained in the king's good graces until his death (of uncertain cause) in 956/1549. Part of the story of Ibrāhīm's appointment to Mashhad, which was a highly valuable post, must relate to the special favor shown to the descendants of Bahrām by Shah Ṭahmāsb, and indeed by later Safavid rulers.[51] (The "Bahrāmī line" survived into the twelfth/eighteenth century, against all odds of dynastic politics.) But the distinctiveness of Mashhad itself, as the location of a pilgrimage site that was receiving ever more attention and financial backing from the court, may have contributed to the decision to install a governor who belonged to the core Safavid family. Ibrāhīm Mīrzā held this office until 974/1566–7, at a stage of Ṭahmāsb's reign in which other princes were being recalled from the provinces and, in several cases, imprisoned.

In the appointment of Sām and Ibrāhīm to Ardabīl and Mashhad, there seems to be an idea that members of the Safavid house served as representatives of moral and religious authority, and not just of the power of the center. This is supported by an example of how Shah Ṭahmāsb dealt with moral *failure* among his relatives: the case of his own son, Ismāʿīl Mīrzā. While it is unclear precisely what Ismāʿīl did that led to his being moved repeatedly after 962/1555, and eventually sent to Qahqahah, chronicles of the period suggest there was scandal surrounding his sexual practices, with at least one author habitually referring to him as *lavand-pīshah* ("libertine").[52] It would be difficult, in any case, to do more than speculate on this topic. Were Safavid princes expected to display virtue in accordance with their family's claim to the mantle of Shiʿi Islam? If so, then it can only have been relevant for a

in February 1556 (Rabīʿ al-Ākhir 963), while Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī describes the *arrival* of the prince as taking place a full year later, in March 1557 (Jumādá al-Ūlá 964). See, respectively, *Takmilat al-akhbār*, 110; *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, 1:384.

51. For a fascinating study of this branch of the family, see Liesbeth Geevers, "Safavid Cousins on the Verge of Extinction: Dynastic Centralization in Central Asia and the Bahrāmī Collateral Line (1517–1593)," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 58 (2015): 293–326.
52. Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*. See, for example, vol. 1, p. 379.

short time, since, as we know, broader changes were on the horizon for the management of power struggles in dynasties across the region. Both the Safavids and the Ottomans would later establish systems whereby possible successors to the throne were confined in palaces, rather than being sent through the ranks of military command.[53] Whatever factors may have been at play in the provincial appointments of princes like Sām and Ibrāhīm, this was the last period in which a Safavid king would feel comfortable delegating authority of *any* kind to his immediate relatives. The key point with regard to Sām Mīrzā is that the special religious status of the Safavids seems to have allowed him new opportunities, years after his disgrace with the Shāmlū garrison at Harāt.

Last but certainly not least—considering Sām Mīrzā's legacy as author of the *Tuḥfah*—is the problem of cultural patronage. This is another sprawling topic.[54] For present purposes, however, it is enough to ask which kinds of artistic and intellectual activity were given the most sponsorship under the early Safavid rulers, and, conversely, which areas seem not to have been prioritized. One could imagine a number of potential motivations for royal patronage of literature, painting, architecture, and the like, but probably the most obvious consideration is that commissioning grand works was a way of articulating power and wealth. (This connection to dynastic prestige is one reason that we are addressing cultural programs under the rubric of challenges faced by the Safavids.)

And so it is not difficult to interpret Shah Ṭahmāsb's decision to build a new palace and garden complex in Qazvīn—plans which were set in motion by 951/1544–5 and officially completed in

53. The Ottoman version of this policy is often referred to as *kafes* ("cage," from Arabic/Persian *qafaṣ*). See G. Veinstein, "Ḳafes," *Encyclopædia of Islam, Second Edition*.

54. Researchers focusing on visual arts and material culture in the Safavid period make up a substantial field of their own. There has not been quite the same concentration of interest among scholars of Persian literature, who have paid more attention to earlier periods; but this is changing quickly.

966/1558.[55] The same goes for the renovation and expansion projects that were carried out at shrines throughout Iran during Ṭahmāsb's reign, including in Ardabīl, Mashhad, Iṣfahān, and again in Qazvīn, where several members of the royal family left charitable endowments (s. *vaqf*).[56] Architecture would become a major focus of all three empires in the region, reaching its peak, at least in the Safavid and Mughal contexts, in the first half of the eleventh/seventeenth century. The splendor of Shah ʿAbbās' capital at Iṣfahān is one of the most recognizable features of Iran to this day, just as Shāh Jahān's Delhi and Agra provide some of the best-known symbols of India. It may appear doubtful whether building projects should qualify as a type of cultural patronage, given that palaces, for example, also served important administrative and military functions, while renovating shrines could encourage popular support for the government and strengthen ties with the clerical establishment.

Another, perhaps more purely artistic pursuit that received generous funding under the early Safavids was the production of illustrated manuscripts.[57] In fact, it could be argued in this case that the reign of Ṭahmāsb represents the high point of the entire tradition. Famous works dating to this period include the so-called "Houghton *Shāhnāmah*," which was commissioned under Ismāʿīl but not

55. These dates are provided by ʿAbdī Beg Shīrāzī, a court chronicler who had firsthand knowledge of the events (and whose literary career is mentioned below). See his *Takmilat al-akhbār*, 94, 113. The formal opening of the new *dawlat-khānah* is dated to 17 Rabīʿ al-Awwal 966 (28 December 1558). (Again, throughout this dissertation, dates are generally given in both the Islamic and the Julian/Gregorian calendars, with conversion to Julian up to 990/1582, and to Gregorian thereafter. It rarely makes much difference, since the gap between the Julian and Gregorian calendars was only nine or ten days in the sixteenth century. The case of the inauguration of the capital at Qazvīn is an exception. If we chose instead to convert the date proleptically to Gregorian, it would be 7 January 1559—a different year! Sadly, the question of Julian vs. Gregorian conversion is not the only calendrical complication affecting the history of early modern Iran. As will be discussed in a later section, a number of Safavid chronicles also make use of the Sino-Turco-Mongol twelve-animal cycle—and not always accurately.)
56. Several of these projects are listed in Newman, *Safavid Iran*, 36.
57. Of course, the commissioning and use of royal manuscripts could hold political significance. Shah Ṭahmāsb sent his priceless illustrated *Shāhnāmah* to the Ottoman court in 975/1568, nominally as a gift in honor of the recent accession of Sultan Selim II (r. 974–82/1566–74). This act of good will has been interpreted as part of Ṭahmāsb's efforts to ensure the continuation of the Peace of Amasya under a new generation of Ottoman rule.

completed until (probably) some time in the 1530s; a copy of the *Khamsah* of Niẓāmī Ganjavī (d. *ca.* 605/1209), containing paintings by the master Sulṭān Muḥammad and his son, Mīrzā ʿAlī (d. *ca.* 983/1575); and a lavish edition of the *Haft awrang* of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (d. 898/1492), produced in Mashhad during the governorship of Ibrāhīm Mīrzā.[58] Although there seems to have been less central court patronage of the book arts in the later decades of Ṭahmāsb's rule, as the king placed increasing emphasis on religious propriety, his support of ateliers through the 1540s may still be contrasted with his relative lack of enthusiasm for *belles lettres*.

It is this last, controversial point that bears most directly on the career of Sām Mīrzā. Much has been written about the status of Persian literature, and poetry in particular, in Safavid Iran.[59] The key point of debate is whether the Safavids, unlike prior dynasties for which Persian was the dominant literary language—and unlike their Mughal contemporaries—did not consistently foster circles of poets around the court. This is complicated and far from agreed-upon; but the allegation is that in previous eras, the Samanids, Ghaznavids, Saljuqs, and Timurids (in Harāt), among other ruling houses in the Persianate world, placed considerable emphasis on the patronage of poetry. In return, authors of panegyric odes (*qaṣīdah*s) and, in some cases, of longer works of narrative verse (in the *maṡnavī* form), would enhance the perceived greatness of the rulers who supported them. The Safavid dynasty,

58. The "Houghton" or "Shah Ṭahmāsb" *Shāhnāmah* was split apart for sale in the mid twentieth century; several dozen of its paintings were donated to the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City. The illustrated *Khamsah* has been in the collections of the British Museum/Library since 1880, as MS Or. 2265. Finally, the Mashhad *Haft awrang* is held at the Freer and Sackler Galleries of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, DC. Detailed studies of all three codices have been published. See, for example, Marianna Shreve Simpson (with Massumeh Farhad), *Sultan Ibrahim Mirza's "Haft awrang": A Princely Manuscript from Sixteenth-Century Iran* (New Haven, CT, 1997).

59. To cite just a few important works: E. G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, vol. 4 (1924; repr., Cambridge, 1969), 24*ff.*; Jan Rypka, *History of Iranian Literature* (Dordrecht, 1968), 292*ff.*; Muḥammad Riżā Shafīʿī Kadkanī, "Persian Literature (Belles-Lettres) from the Time of Jāmī to the Present Day," in *History of Persian Literature from the Beginning of the Islamic Period to the Present Day*, ed. George Morrison (Leiden, 1981), 145*ff.*; Ehsan Yarshater, "The Indian Style: Progress or Decline?" in *Persian Literature*, ed. Ehsan Yarshater (Albany, NY, 1988), 249–88; and Ẕabīḥ Allāh Ṣafā, *Tārīkh-i adabīyāt dar Īrān*, vol. 5, pt. 1 (Tehran, 1985), 491*ff.*

especially in the first few generations of its rule, has struck some historians of Persian literature as less committed to this longstanding model.[60]

A number of factors have been discussed as contributing to this development. Perhaps most importantly, the contemporaneous rise of the Safavid and Mughal (or "Indian Timurid") empires, both of which were emphatically part of the Persianate cultural sphere, created a dynamic whereby the demand for poets and other artists and intellectuals became more widespread geographically, and arguably greater in aggregate, than it had been in earlier periods. Not only did the tenth/sixteenth century give rise to a variety of courts where a Persian poet might try to make his name, but Mughal India was a source of tremendous wealth, and relations with the Safavids were generally calm enough to allow free movement of people from, say, Iṣfahān to Delhi and *vice versa*. The one relevant resource lacking on the subcontinent was a large native persophone population. And so it should come as no surprise that some Iranian poets migrated to the central and subsidiary Mughal courts. This phenomenon, which reached its peak in the late 1500s, has been treated extensively in scholarship.[61]

It remains a matter of polemic whether anything apart from the economic realities of Persian as a quasi "world language" contributed to the poets' migration.[62] Were conditions under the Safavids discouraging in their own right? Again, the idea does exist that some of the Safavid rulers were uninterested in patronizing traditional forms of poetry. The prime example is Shah Ṭahmāsb, who is

---

60. Rypka, Ṣafā, and Browne (to an extent) fall in this category. See also Vladimir Minorsky, "Iran: Opposition, Martyrdom and Revolt," in *Unity and Variety in Muslim Civilization*, ed. G. E. von Grünebaum (Chicago, 1955), 183–206.

61. Two classic works on this subject are Shiblī Nuʿmānī, *Shiʿr al-ʿajam* (originally published in Urdu, 5 vols., Aligaṛh, 1909–21); and Aḥmad Gulchīn-i Maʿānī, *Kārvān-i Hind: dar aḥvāl va āṡār-i shāʿirān-i ʿaṣr-i Ṣafavī kih bih Hindūstān raftah-and* (2 vols., Mashhad, 1990/91).

62. For more on the general idea of "Persian as *koiné*," see the introductory chapter of *Literacy in the Persianate World*, ed. Brian Spooner and William L. Hanaway (Philadelphia, 2012). Two recent publications are also relevant here. See Nile Green, ed., *The Persianate World: The Frontiers of a Eurasian Lingua Franca* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2019); and Richard M. Eaton, *India in the Persianate Age, 1000–1765* (London: Allen Lane, 2019).

reported to have expressed a preference, in the later decades of his reign, for panegyrics in veneration of the Twelve Imams rather than of any earthly king.[63] On a broader level, some historians have attempted to draw a connection between the Safavids' treatment of Persian poetry, and the dynasty's occasionally hostile stance vis-à-vis popular Sufi movements.[64] The conjecture here is that a literary tradition following such figures as Saʿdī, Mawlānā, Ḥāfiẓ, and Jāmī, with deep connections to Islamic mysticism, was not fully at home in a political context that promoted a kind of orthodox Twelver Shiʿism to the exclusion of many other beliefs and practices. Finally, and less controversially, we might observe that some of the heaviest literary "brain drain" from Iran to India took place in the 1580s and '90s, while the Safavids went through stretches of chaos and interregnum, followed by an arduous project to restore stability after the rise of Shah ʿAbbās.[65] If there was inconsistency in patronage at the Safavid court, then a good part of the problem could be attributed to material difficulties.

Few would dispute the observation that Mughal India became a disproportionately influential center for Persian poetry in the tenth/sixteenth and eleventh/seventeenth centuries—in particular during the consecutive reigns of Akbar, Jahāngīr, and Shāh Jahān, *i.e.*, 963–1068/1556–1658. And there seems to be little resistance to the more economically oriented explanations for the movement of artists and intellectuals across borders. What probably will never be resolved is the question of an ideological shift on the Safavid side that rendered the central Iranian lands temporarily less fertile for

---

63. This story can be traced to a well-known passage in Iskandar Beg's chronicle, *ʿĀlam-ārā-yi ʿAbbāsī* (comp. 1038/1629). For a translation and analysis of the relevant paragraphs, see Savory, *Iran under the Safavids*, 206–7.
64. See, for example, Rypka, *History of Iranian Literature*, 294. This theory has been refuted, if not derided, on multiple occasions. For trenchant criticism of several approaches to Safavid-era Persian literature, see Yarshater, "The Indian Style," 278*ff.*
65. The most famous of the Iranian émigré poets of this period is ʿUrfī Shīrāzī (d. 999/1591), who moved to India in 992/1584. As a young man in his native Shīrāz, ʿUrfī was involved in a literary circle that met regularly at the shop of one Mīr Maḥmūd Ṭarḥī, an architect (*ṭarrāḥ*; hence his pen name). This coterie seems to have died through attrition by the late 1580s, with several members leaving to seek their fortune in Mughal lands.

belles lettres. For one thing, it is easy to cite counterexamples. Shah Ismāʿīl was (and remains) famous for his own poetry, which is mostly in Turkic,[66] and he cared enough for Persian literature to commission a work from ʿAbd Allāh Hātifī (d. 927/1521), a nephew of Jāmī and a key representative of the Timurid period that was then drawing to a close.

Ṭahmāsb, for his part, developed close affiliations with two prominent poets: Muḥtasham Kāshānī (d. 996/1588) and ʿAbdī Beg Shīrāzī (d. 988/1580). The former composed a stanzaic elegy (*marṡiyah*) on the killing of Imam Ḥusayn that is still recited throughout Iran during the annual Muḥarram mourning rituals.[67] The latter served in a number of roles at Ṭahmāsb's court; his literary works include the *Takmilat al-akhbār*, an important chronicle whose final section covers the history of the Safavids up to 978/1570, and the *Jannāt-i ʿadn*, a sequence of poems written in the late 1550s to commemorate the establishment of the new capital at Qazvīn.[68] (It could then be argued that Muḥtasham and ʿAbdī Beg, who ingratiated themselves with Ṭahmāsb and his family in particular ways, are the exceptions that prove the rule of the king's disinclination to promote literature. But this back-and-forth debate risks losing its value at a certain point.)

In the same period, at least two regional courts under the Safavids carried out noteworthy literary patronage of their own. The governor of Yazd, Ghiyāṡ al-Dīn "Mīr-i Mīrān" (d. 998/1589–90), generously supported Vaḥshī Bāfqī (d. 991/1583), whose style in the *ghazal* form would serve as a key model for later poets in the movement of "fresh speech" (*tāzah-gūʾī*; this has also been referred to by

---

66. The latest in-depth study of Shah Ismāʿīl's poetry is provided by Ferenc P. Csirkés, "'Chaghatay Oration, Ottoman Eloquence, Qizilbash Rhetoric': Turkic Literature in Ṣafavid Persia" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2016).
67. For more on Muḥtasham and his *marṡiyah*, see Paul E. Losensky, "Moḥtašam Kāšāni," *Encyclopædia Iranica*; Karen G. Ruffle, "Verses Dripping Blood: A Study of the Religious Elements in Muhtasham Kashani's *Karbala-nameh*" (MA thesis, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 2001); and Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, vol. 4, p. 172*ff.*
68. On the latter work, see Paul E. Losensky, "The Palace of Praise and the Melons of Time: Descriptive Patterns in ʿAbdī Bayk Šīrāzī's *Garden of Eden*," *Eurasian Studies* 2, no. 1 (2003): 1–29.

some modern critics as *sabk-i Hindī*, or “the Indian style”).[69] And the prince Ibrāhīm Mīrzā, son of Bahrām, whose support of manuscript artists was mentioned above, also hosted a number of poets at Mashhad. The most famous of these was Ṡanāʾī (d. *ca*. 995/1587), who, in a perfect illustration of the problems under discussion, later felt compelled to move to India after running afoul of Shah Ismāʿīl II (r. 984–5/1576–7).[70]

If it can be said that Ṭahmāsb had an increasingly complicated relationship with the arts over the course of his reign, and that the first couple decades after his death grew chaotic enough that poets had little choice but to seek Mughal patronage, then it should also be acknowledged that Safavid rulers of subsequent generations returned to a more conventional mode of showing favor to men of letters. Ṣāʾib Tabrīzī (d. *ca*. 1087/1676), for example, was given the formal title of poet laureate (*malik al-shuʿarāʾ*) by Shah ʿAbbās II (r. 1052–77/1642–66).[71] Here it bears mentioning that Ṣāʾib, one of the most prolific and gifted Persian poets of any era, spent the majority of his career in Iṣfahān, where his family had sufficient wealth that he required no court patronage. His *dīvān* contains only about fifty panegyrics, which pale in comparison to the roughly seven thousand *ghazal*s for which he is famous. The reality is that the early modern period saw a diversification of the social and economic contexts in which Persian poetry was produced. The court and the *qaṣīdah* were not as relevant as in centuries past, with the *ghazal* and the literary salon reaching dominance.[72] This is yet another reason not to make harsh claims about the impact of “Safavid puritanism” on the fine arts.

---

69. See Theodore S. Beers, “The Biography of Vahshi Bāfqi (d. 991/1583) and the *Tazkera* Tradition,” *Journal of Persianate Studies* 8 (2015): 195–222.
70. See Ẕabīḥ Allāh Ṣafā, *Tārīkh-i adabīyāt dar Īrān*, vol. 5, pt. 2 (Tehran, 1985), 777*ff.*
71. Ṣāʾib’s biography is addressed in Paul E. Losensky, “Ṣāʾeb Tabrizi,” *Encyclopædia Iranica*; and Theodore S. Beers, “*Taẕkirah-i Khayr al-bayān*: The Earliest Source on the Career and Poetry of Ṣāʾib Tabrīzī (d. *ca.* 1087/1676),” *Al-ʿUṣūr al-Wusṭā* 24 (2016): 114–38.
72. For a vivid illustration of this cultural environment, see Paul E. Losensky, *Welcoming Fighānī* (Costa Mesa, CA, 1998).

What difference does any of this make for Sām Mīrzā? Relatively little, it must be admitted. When he was writing his *Tuḥfah* in Ardabīl around 956–7/1549–50, collecting information on a wide variety of poets active in the region since the end of the ninth/fifteenth century, he seems not to have been supported *or* hindered by Shah Ṭahmāsb. But it may be meaningful that Sām Mīrzā does not include a biographical notice on the current king, whereas there are dedicated entries for Shah Ismāʿīl, as well as for Bahrām Mīrzā and Sulṭān Muḥammad Mīrzā—a son of Ṭahmāsb who would later rule as Muḥammad "Khudābandah" from 985/1578 to 995/1587. More pointedly, the introduction of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* ends with a disclaimer emphasizing that nothing in the work should be interpreted as an offense to religion or imperial fortune (*dīn va dawlat*), and that any discussion of figures inimical to the Safavids is for purposes of history, not endorsement.[73] (These points in the text will be explored in greater depth in Chapter 3.) Sām Mīrzā betrays some anxiety about the way that his *taẕkirah* will be received at court. This is hardly surprising, given the problems between him and Shah Ṭahmāsb dating to the 1530s. Still, it appears odd, in this light, that scholars have occasionally pointed to the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* as evidence that the Safavids really did support Persian poetry.[74] The broader claim is valid, but in the case of Sām Mīrzā, it would be closer to the truth to hold that he completed his work *despite* the influence of Ṭahmāsb.

On a final note, it should be reiterated that we stand to gain valuable insight into these questions of cultural patronage by addressing them within the larger, holistic framework of the challenges of

73. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Rukn al-Dīn Humāyūn Farrukh (Tehran: ʿIlmī, n.d.), 4–5.

74. See, for example, Mitchell, "Ṭahmāsp I." It is understandable that historians providing broad appraisals of a period tend to list works produced in that span, without focusing on their specific circumstances. A similar case is that of Vaḥshī Bāfqī (d. 991/1583), often mentioned in scholarship as one of the great poets of the reign of Ṭahmāsb, despite the fact that he had little to do with the central court and relied instead upon the patronage of the local ruler of Yazd. Nuance is helpful in discussing these issues.

institution-building. The early Safavids may not have distinguished themselves through championing *belles lettres*. They had limited resources; faced critical political and military challenges; were attempting something unusual and highly ambitious with the religious side of their project; and yet managed, among numerous other achievements, to sponsor the production of several renowned illustrated manuscripts.[75] All this with the rise of a wealthier empire to the southeast, which had its own claim on the Persian tradition. There is ample room to discuss these issues without indulging in moral judgment of the dynasties involved.

Looking ahead

In the section that follows, we will begin to piece together the finer details of Sām Mīrzā's biography, as far as extant source materials permit. The purpose of this introductory discussion has been to set some context behind the political and literary career of our prince. Now we have a four-part periodization of the reign of Shah Ṭahmāsb, with alternating phases of *survival* and *consolidation*, which should aid us in examining the ways in which conflict among Safavid princes and military leaders was managed at different times; and at least a cursory overview of the types of challenges that arose during the development of this new polity. In case it might be helpful to refer to even broader and more rudimentary background information, four timelines are included as appendices.[76] The first pertains to the history of the Safavids between 892/1487 and 999/1591; the second, to the reign of Shah

---

75. In the following sections, we will explore one of the other hallmarks of the early Safavids: the staggeringly rich historiographical tradition that they fostered. In this area of cultural and intellectual patronage, few dynasties of any period could claim comparable distinction.
76. I would have liked to cover more. If material from the dissertation can be revisited for a book project, then I may add timelines for the late Mamluks and the Abū al-Khayrid Uzbeks. As was noted above, however, neither the appendices nor this exploration of the context surrounding Sām Mīrzā's life can take the place of a general introduction to the Safavid period, of the sort offered by Savory, Newman, Roemer, and others.

ʿAbbās (995–1038/1587–1629); the third, to developments in the Ottoman Empire from the conquest of Constantinople (857/1453) to the accession of Sultan Murad IV (1032/1623); and the fourth, to the Mughals, from the birth of Ẓahīr al-Dīn Bābur (887/1483) to the death of Jahāngīr (1037/1627). Certain important events from beyond the Near East and South Asia, such as the opening of the Council of Trent in 952/1545, are also listed. Although little of this impacted Sām Mīrzā, a part of our project—as with any such historical inquiry—is to try to gain a sense of the world that he inhabited.

1.2: Sām Mīrzā in Safavid narrative sources

Introduction

The preceding section was concerned with establishing the broader context behind Sām Mīrzā's life, with a particular focus on the challenges faced by the nascent Safavid polity during the reign of Shah Ṭahmāsb. Now, as we move closer to Sām Mīrzā himself, another important preliminary concern is to assess the primary sources that contain information about the prince. These sources can be separated into four categories: Safavid narrative texts (mainly court chronicles); non-Safavid narrative texts; the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*; and other *taẕkirah*s written in the decades following Sām Mīrzā's death. Of these groups, the first is by far the most significant. The great majority of the "hard data" that can be pieced together about when and where Sām Mīrzā lived, the nature of his interactions with Shah Ṭahmāsb and other contemporaries, *etc.*, occurs in Safavid court chronicles.[77] This is perhaps to be expected, since Sām was a member of the ruling family.

Non-Safavid narrative sources—by which I mostly mean Ottoman or Mughal histories,[78] such as the *Tārīkh-i Alfī* (1001/1593)—offer a limited amount of discussion of the first decades of Sām Mīrzā's life, when he was the nominal governor of Harāt and may have been considered a potential candidate for the throne in the event of a change in power. But these early controversies of the 1520s and '30s are covered at least as closely by Safavid authors. To the extent that a different perspective on the same

77. Major works of scholarship on this body of sources include Jahānbakhsh Ṡavāqib, *Tārīkh-nigārī-i ʿaṣr-i Ṣafavīyah va shinākht-i manābiʿ va maʾākhiẕ* (Shīrāz: Navīd-i Shīrāz, 2001); Sholeh A. Quinn, *Historical Writing during the Reign of Shah ʿAbbas: Ideology, Imitation, and Legitimacy in Safavid Chronicles* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2000); and Tilmann Trausch, *Formen höfischer Historiographie im 16. Jahrhundert: Geschichtsschreibung unter den frühen Safaviden, 1501–1578* (Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2015).
78. The key exception here is the travel narrative of Michele Membré, which will be discussed later.

events may be provided by an "outside" chronicler, such as the Ottoman İbrahim Peçevi (d. *ca*. 1061/1650), this has already been incorporated into Martin Dickson's in-depth study of the Safavid-Uzbek "duel for Khurāsān" between 930/1524 and 946/1540. What we require for a thorough understanding of Sām Mīrzā's biography are sources that describe his circumstances in the years *after* his tenure in Harāt. On this level, I have yet to find a single material anecdote in any of the Mughal, Ottoman, or Uzbek histories that I have consulted. (A brief inventory of these texts will be given in a subsequent section, in the name of thoroughness.) Non-Safavid chronicles are therefore of limited use for our purposes.

As for the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* itself, the insight that it provides into Sām Mīrzā's life is subtler and more qualitative. There is, for example, the "disclaimer" (*tanbīh*) in the introduction to the *taẕkirah*, in which the author explains that none of what he has written should be viewed as an endorsement of persons or ideas inimical to the Safavid project. In context, this is clear evidence of Sām's concern about the political sensitivity of his position and his work. There are at least a few cases in which the *Tuḥfah* offers more concrete historical information. The biographical sketch of the Mughal Humāyūn, for instance, mentions a couple of dates relating to that ruler's flight to Iran (during which time he met Sām Mīrzā) and subsequent reconquest of Indian territories. In general, however, the *Tuḥfah* is not a heavily autobiographical text.

Finally, the portrayal of Sām Mīrzā in later *taẕkirah*s—he merited inclusion as a notable poet-prince—is of rather limited value. For one thing, none of the texts in this category is particularly early. The two oldest *taẕkirah* notices on Sām that I have found are in the *Majmaʿ al-khavāṣṣ* (1016/1607) of Ṣādiqī Beg Afshār and the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn* (1024/1615) of Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī. Both were written

some decades after the prince's death, and the latter was completed at a geographic remove, in India. (To be fair, the *Majmaʿ al-khavāṣṣ* could be an excellent source, if Ṣādiqī Beg chose to discuss Sām in a meaningful way; but he does not. We will return to this point later.) A more important fault of literary anthologies *qua* biographical sources, at least in the early Safavid-Mughal period, is their tendency to describe subjects with vague praise and no actual information. For example, neither Ṣādiqī nor Awḥadī lists a year of death for Sām Mīrzā. In this case, *taẕkirah* notices are useful only insofar as they demonstrate that Sām had some literary legacy, that a few lines of his own poetry were remembered, and that the *Tuḥfah* was well known. Again for the sake of thoroughness, the following subchapter will cover the discussion of Sām Mīrzā by anthologists of succeeding generations, thin though it may be. And of course we will have occasion to review those passages in the *Tuḥfah* that are relevant to the author's biography.

For the time being, it should be emphasized that Safavid narrative histories represent the key sources on Sām Mīrzā's life, and that his adult years are particularly in need of examination, since the period of conflict against the Uzbeks has been scrutinized by Dickson and, to a lesser extent, by other researchers. What follows is a brief description of the sources in this category, treated individually and in chronological order. Amīr Maḥmūd's history, dating to 957/1550 (the same year as the *Tuḥfah*), is the earliest I have found that mentions Sām Mīrzā in connection with any event after 943/1537. The *Afżal al-tavārīkh* (1049/1639), on the other hand, seems to be the latest chronicle that introduces new material about the prince. It is on the basis of the texts described below that several of the significant insights of this part of the dissertation—regarding, among other things, the suppression of the story of Sām Mīrzā's imprisonment and execution, and the violence of Safavid dynastic politics toward the

end of Shah Ṭahmāsb's reign—will be made. Finally, it is worth noting that a few of the works surveyed do *not* provide information about the later years of Sām Mīrzā's life, but they are included because their silence on these matters is remarkable in itself. Ḥasan Rūmlū's history (985/1577), for example, is a well-recognized source on events in Safavid Iran during precisely our period of focus, yet Sām Mīrzā is not mentioned anywhere after the annal for 951/1544–5. This problem in the chronicle tradition will need to be addressed, at least speculatively.

Sources

1. **The history of Amīr Maḥmūd b. Khwāndamīr (957/1550).** This work has been known under several titles, including *Īrān dar rūzgār-i Shāh Ismāʿīl va Shāh Ṭahmāsb* and, perhaps more accurately, *Ẕayl-i Ḥabīb al-siyar*—*i.e.*, a continuation of Khwāndamīr's renowned chronicle.[79] Amīr Maḥmūd follows his father's history of Greater Iran up to his own time, with a marked focus on Harāt (where he lived) and its environs. This is the basic source on all of the struggles over Khurāsān in the 1520s and '30s. Amīr Maḥmūd was an eyewitness to many of those events, and it appears that later historians relied upon him heavily for their narratives. By extension, this work provides our best documentation of the consequential first twenty years of Sām Mīrzā's life. Martin Dickson makes clear in his dissertation—a careful study of the Safavid-Uzbek conflict in Khurāsān and the figures involved therein—that Amīr Maḥmūd is the fountainhead of our knowledge of the period.[80]

79. I have consulted two apparently similar editions: one by Ghulām Riżā Ṭabāṭabāʾī (Tehran: Bunyād-i Mawqūfāt-i Duktur Maḥmūd Afshār Yazdī, 1991), and another by Muḥammad ʿAlī Jarrāḥī (Tehran: Nashr-i Gustarah, 1991).
80. Martin Dickson, "Sháh Ṭahmásb and the Úzbeks: The Duel for Khurásán with ʿUbayd Khán, 930–946/1524–1540," (PhD diss., Princeton University, 1958). Dickson includes a guide to his sources in the appendices, starting on p. xlv.

The early part of Sām Mīrzā's biography has already been established conclusively and in detail by Dickson, partly on the basis of this chronicle. But Amīr Maḥmūd covers events through the end of the 1540s, and so he is also the earliest historian who *could* have offered some perspective on later milestones in Sām Mīrzā's life. Indeed he does mention one: the participation of Sām and his brother, Bahrām Mīrzā, in welcoming the Mughal emperor Humāyūn to Iran in 951/1544–5. In 947/1540, Humāyūn had been forced to flee India under attack by Afghan warlords and his own brothers. He initially went to Lahore, but a series of mishaps and disappointments led him to withdraw progressively further, to Kabul, then to Qandahār, and finally to seek refuge with the Safavids in 951/1544–5. Humāyūn was welcomed on arrival by Sām and Bahrām, who escorted him to meet Shah Ṭahmāsb. The Safavids ultimately offered Humāyūn significant military support that he could use to reconquer his lost territories, if only he would convert to Shiʿism (at least outwardly) and promise to cede Qandahār to Iran. These concessions having been promised, the ousted Mughal was granted an army, and he quickly reëstablished himself in Kabul. (It would take somewhat longer for him to return to India proper.) Sām Mīrzā's role in receiving Humāyūn, however minor, seems to have been the first noteworthy act that he was permitted to carry out after his disgraced return to court in 943/1537. And this is the only passage in the later sections of Amīr Maḥmūd's chronicle that even mentions the prince's name—which may speak to the extent of his marginalization during the 1540s.

2. **The history of Ḥayātī Tabrīzī (961/1554).** This valuable source was discovered fairly recently—it survives in a multiple-text manuscript and was incorrectly catalogued as one of the anonymous

histories of Shah Ismāʿīl's reign from the eleventh/seventeenth century—and it has since been edited and studied by Kioumars Ghereghlou.[81] Little is known about the life of the author, Qāsim Beg Ḥayātī Tabrīzī. This history of the Safavid order and dynasty is currently the only work attributed to him. It is clear that Ḥayātī was a court official of some kind, and he shows detailed knowledge of the administration of the Safavid shrine at Ardabīl, which suggests that he may have spent time in that city. (As we will see, it is mainly the Ardabīl connection that accounts for the relevance of Ḥayātī's text to Sām Mīrzā.) In this work, Ḥayātī discusses the origins of the Safavid Sufi order, its transformation into a military and political movement, and finally the rise to power and conquests of Shah Ismāʿīl, up to the year 914/1508. There is a section that focuses specifically on the shrine in Ardabīl and its custodians. Here, in contrast to the main narrative of the history, Ḥayātī's commentary continues up to the time of the work's composition, *i.e.*, 961/1554.

Sām Mīrzā is mentioned in two passages. First, he is included in a description of the progeny of Shah Ismāʿīl. Ḥayātī refers to Sām as the *second* of the ruler's four sons, rather than the third; but this is simply because he places Alqāṣ Mīrzā last.[82] (By 961/1554, Alqāṣ had been killed after the failure of his revolt, and he was obviously a disliked figure.) The characterization of Sām Mīrzā by Ḥayātī, however, is resoundingly positive. The author prefaces the prince's name with a series of honorifics, and he goes on to mention several of his exemplary traits. According to Ḥayātī, artists and intellectuals were always shown "limitless favor" (*ʿavāṭif-i bī-karān*) by Sām Mīrzā.[83] Later in

81. See Qāsim Beg Ḥayātī Tabrīzī, *A Chronicle of the Early Safavids and the Reign of Shah Ismāʿīl* (*907–930/1501–1524*), ed. Kioumars Ghereghlou (New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society, 2018). Ghereghlou also has an article about this source, and an encyclopædia entry on Ḥayātī: "Chronicling a Dynasty on the Make: New Light on the Early Ṣafavids in Ḥayātī Tabrīzī's *Tārīkh* (961/1554)," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 137, no. 4 (2017): 805–32; "Ḥayāti Tabrizi, Qāsem Beg," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.
82. The sons of Ismāʿīl—ordered Ṭahmāsb, Sām, Bahrām, Alqāṣ—are discussed on pp. 115–18 in Ghereghlou's edition.
83. Ḥayātī, *Chronicle of the Early Safavids*, ed. Ghereghlou, 116.

the same section, Ḥayātī notes that Sām was born in ʿIrāq—a vague but unique datum.[84] He also cites a chronogram for the year of the prince's birth, 923/1517: *kawkab-i burj-i shahanshahī* ("star of the constellation of kingship").

This description of Sām Mīrzā leads into a fairly lengthy discussion of his own son, Rustam Mīrzā.[85] Ḥayātī lingers on the topic because of a tragic series of events that took place in 961/1554. Sām had arranged for the sixteen-year-old Rustam to marry a girl from another leading family in Ardabīl. After extravagant wedding celebrations, the time came for the bride to move into her husband's household. But Rustam soon fell ill and passed away. This personal catastrophe for Sām Mīrzā, which may have contributed to his later political difficulties in Ardabīl, is also discussed in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* (999/1591) of Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī (as noted below). It seems that Ḥayātī was affected by the young prince's death. He offers a vivid description of the mourning.

The other part of this history in which Sām Mīrzā is mentioned concerns the administration of the shrine. Ḥayātī specifies that Sām was appointed custodian (*mutavallī*) in the year of the monkey, probably in early 956/1549,[86] after Maʿṣūm Beg (later an influential figure at Ṭahmāsb's court; d. 977/1570) left that position.[87] Finally, Sām Mīrzā is credited with the construction of a hospital (*dār al-shifāʾ*) in Ardabīl, and with the completion of a couple of other projects, including a *madrasah*, which had been started during the tenure of Maʿṣūm Beg.[88]

84. Ibid., 120.
85. Ibid., 120–22.
86. A later author, Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, places this event in *both* the year of the monkey (*pīchīn yıl*) and 956 AH (1549–50 CE). But there were only a couple of months of overlap between the two. The beginning of 956/1549 aligns with the end of the year of the monkey, to be followed by the year of the rooster (*takhāqūy yıl*). If Qāżī Aḥmad is correct, then it must have been early in the year, *ca*. Muḥarram–Ṣafar 956 (February–March 1549), when Sām Mīrzā was appointed to Ardabīl. See *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, ed. Iḥsān Ishrāqī, vol. 1, p. 550.
87. Ḥayātī, *Chronicle of the Early Safavids*, ed. Ghereghlou, 90.
88. Ibid., 88.

This is an important source for Sām Mīrzā's biography. In a few short passages, we are given a number of useful pieces of information. Perhaps most notably, Ḥayātī was writing at a particular time in Sām's adult life, when he was evidently in the good graces of Shah Ṭahmāsb. There seems to be no hint of controversy in the discussion of the prince in this history. Ḥayātī's perspective reflects an interlude in Sām Mīrzā's career, between his youthful humiliation in Khurāsān and his later imprisonment after the unraveling of his situation in Ardabīl. Also significant is the mention of ʿIrāq as Sām's birthplace. I have not seen this detail in any other source.[89]

3. **The so-called memoirs (*taẕkirah*) of Shah Ṭahmāsb.**[90] This work was completed in 969/1562 or shortly thereafter. In it, Ṭahmāsb discusses twelve key episodes in his reign and how he navigated each of them. He also describes several quasi-prophetic (for lack of a better word) dreams that he experienced over the years, which illuminated the correct path for him to follow. This is not a text that Shah Ṭahmāsb intended to keep private—we know that he had copies disseminated in Iran and abroad—and so his account of events may be taken with a grain of salt. Nevertheless, there is clearly value in knowing how he thought about a variety of events, or what he wanted others to believe about his inward process.

It should come as little surprise that Ṭahmāsb's memoirs are silent regarding Sām Mīrzā's activities after the early problems in Khurāsān. The king could hardly benefit from advertising the ways in which he managed his troublesome younger brother: placing him under a military

---

89. It should be added that Ḥayātī is given a brief notice (no. 338) in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. See p. 242 in the edition of Rukn al-Dīn Humāyūn Farrukh (Tehran: ʿIlmī, n.d.). The two men clearly became acquainted on some level.

90. This text was first edited by Paul Horn and published in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. 44, no. 4 (1890): 563–649; and vol. 45, no. 2 (1891): 245–91. A more user-friendly version, which includes an index, is the 2004 printing issued in Qum by Maṭbūʿāt-i Dīnī (albeit with no editor specified).

retainer for a dozen years, then in a situation approaching house arrest in Ardabīl for another dozen, and finally imprisoning him—not long before these memoirs were finished, in fact—at the fortress of Qahqahah. The best that we could do with this text would be to note the significance of events that Ṭahmāsb leaves unmentioned. He was writing at a time of conflict and reorganization for the Safavid dynasty, yet he clearly has no interest in discussing such processes. In any case, the memoirs cannot help us with the later chapters of Sām Mīrzā's life as such.

4. ***Nusakh-i jahān-ārā*, by Qāżī Aḥmad Ghaffārī.** A general history covering a number of dynasties from the course of Islamic history, culminating with the Safavids. This work was completed in 972/1565, or not long thereafter, in India, where the author lived after emigrating from Iran around 970/1562–3.[91]

Ghaffārī was apparently with Sām Mīrzā in Ardabīl at the time that the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* was being written, and he is mentioned briefly in the *tażkirah*.[92] While we have little real information about the relationship between these two, it is curious that Ghaffārī moved to India just after Sām Mīrzā was dismissed from his post in Ardabīl and imprisoned at Qahqahah. Might the historian have emigrated because he was associated with the disfavored prince? This theory cannot be substantiated, but it is mentioned by ʻAbd al-Ḥusayn Navāʼī in the introduction to his edition of a slightly later chronicle, the *Takmilat al-akhbār*.[93] What may be more puzzling—and has not been remarked upon thus far—is that Ghaffārī's own chronicle makes no mention of Sām Mīrzā's life

91. Edited by Ḥasan Narāqī and published in Tehran by Kitāb-furūshī-i Ḥāfiẓ, 1964.
92. See p. 121 in Rukn al-Dīn Humāyūn Farrukh's edition (Tehran: ʻIlmī, n.d.).
93. ʻAbdī Beg Shīrāzī, *Takmilat al-akhbār*, ed. ʻAbd al-Ḥusayn Navāʼī (Tehran: Nashr-i Nay, 1990), 11–12.

after the early events in Khurāsān. Why would he not include more up-to-date information about his friend? Had their relationship soured? Or were the recent developments in Sām Mīrzā's career too sensitive to address? This is another case of silence in a contemporary source that is difficult to rationalize. Then again, the *Nusakh-i jahān'ārā* is a wide-ranging work, in which only the last section deals with the Safavids. In this condensed account of the dynasty up to 972/1565, Sām Mīrzā is mentioned just twice, in connection to the wars against the Uzbeks. The circumstances surrounding Ghaffārī's departure from Iran are more intriguing than his history is useful for our purposes.

5. ***Takmilat al-akhbār*, by ʿAbdī Beg "Navīdī" of Shīrāz (978/1570).** This is another general history, covering events from the creation of Adam up to the time of its composition. The author was a prolific poet and intellectual closely aligned with the inner circle of Shah Ṭahmāsb—and in particular with his daughter, Parī Khān Khānum. It was she who commissioned the *Takmilat al-akhbār.* Only the later sections of this work, which address recent history, have been edited and published.[94] In these chapters, at least, ʿAbdī Beg's format is basically annalistic. He uses the animal-cycle solar calendar as his primary framework, while providing corresponding Islamic dates. Other than Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, ʿAbdī Beg is seemingly the only historian of this period who employs a hybrid dating system *and* manages to keep it accurate. (See below for further discussion of this peculiar aspect of Persian historiography.)

94. Ibid.

As is the case with all chronicles of early Safavid history, most of the references to Sām Mīrzā in the *Takmilat al-akhbār* relate to events in Khurāsān in the 1520s and ’30s. But there is one later and highly important anecdote included by ʿAbdī Beg: a story of how Sām died. According to this text, the prince was killed by an earthquake at the fortress of Qahqahah, where he was a prisoner, in 975/1567.[95] ʿAbdī Beg also provides our only chronogram for the occasion of Sām Mīrzā's death: *dawlat-i Ṭahmāsb-shah bāqī* ("may the imperial fortune of Shah Ṭahmāsb live on"). This phrase yields the expected *abjad* value of 975.

There will be more to say about ʿAbdī Beg's account below, but a few basic comments are in order. First, the story about the earthquake appears to be some form of "official narrative" of Sām Mīrzā's death. It is contradicted by two later sources, which indicate that the prince was murdered at Qahqahah. Second, based on everything that we know about ʿAbdī Beg,[96] he was as closely affiliated with Ṭahmāsb's court as a scholar could be, and so it would not come as a surprise for his chronicle to be the one that offers a propagandistic account of events. After all, Ṭahmāsb was still in power when the *Takmilat al-akhbār* was written. Finally, it is odd that ʿAbdī Beg includes a story about Sām Mīrzā's death, but has nothing to say about when the prince was jailed, or why. A puzzle is already appearing in the chronicle tradition: with the single exception of Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, who finished his work in 999/1591 (see below), even the few Safavid authors who deign to mention the death of Sām Mīrzā decline to elaborate on the events leading to it.

95. Ibid., 130.
96. See Ẕabīḥ Allāh Ṣafā, *Tārīkh-i adabīyāt dar Īrān*, vol. 5, pt. 2, 746*ff*.

6. ***Javāhir al-akhbār* (984/1576), by Būdāq Munshī Qazvīnī,** a work dedicated to Shah Ismāʿīl II. This is yet another general history from the creation of Adam up to the time of its composition, surviving in a single manuscript held at the National Library of Russia in St. Petersburg. Only the last few sections of the work, dealing with the Turkmen and Safavid dynasties, have been edited and published.[97] The arrangement of material is roughly chronological, but organized by theme or episode rather than in annals.

Given that only a small portion of the *Javāhir al-akhbār* addresses the Safavid period, there is not space for great detail; and since the narrative does not proceed consistently year by year, any number of events go unmentioned. Thus it is not surprising that the great majority of passages involving Sām Mīrzā relate to the consequential incidents that took place while he was "governor" of Harāt. There is, however, one later mention of his name.[98] In describing the chaotic situation in Qazvīn and elsewhere following the death of Shah Ṭahmāsb and the murder of his son (and potential successor) Ḥaydar Mīrzā in 984/1576, Būdāq Munshī mentions a number of individuals who were arrested and killed. This seems to have been a time of opportunism and settling of old grudges. One of the men who was imprisoned at this juncture was Muḥammad Beg Qūyunchī-ughlī,[99] identified by Būdāq Munshī as the killer of Sām Mīrzā and of the son of Alqāṣ Mīrzā. The author indicates that Muḥammad Beg was still in prison at the time of writing, which was only shortly after these events. Then, remarkably, Būdāq Munshī interrupts his narrative to state that he had a dream in which he saw Qūyunchī-ughlī and Shimr ibn Dhī al-Jawshan—the murderer of

---

97. Būdāq Munshī Qazvīnī, *Javāhir al-akhbār*, ed. Muḥsin Bahrām-nizhād (Tehran, 2000).
98. Ibid., 238.
99. It is difficult to be sure of the correct form and voweling of this name. Could it, for example, be Qūnīchī-ughlī, rather than Qūyunchī-ughlī? I have followed the reading of the editors of these texts.

al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib at the Battle of Karbala in 61/680, and one of the most reviled figures in Shiʿi Islam—as one and the same person. He goes on to mention a few other men who have recently been granted their comeuppance, and he expresses his faith that all evildoers will eventually be punished.

This is a surprising anecdote, and one of only three allusions to Sām Mīrzā's death that I have been able to locate. (There should be a fourth, except that the relevant folios in our manuscript of the *Afżal al-tavārīkh*—see below—are missing.) Several questions arise. If Būdāq Munshī was so scandalized by the killing of Sām Mīrzā and his sons and nephews, then why does he not discuss the event itself? Why wait until describing the turmoil after Ṭahmāsb's death to mention that Sām Mīrzā's killer was arrested? An otherwise ignorant reader of the *Javāhir al-akhbār* would not even know until this point that Sām is dead, and yet here Būdāq Munshī is comparing Muḥammad Beg's deed to that of Shimr. The simplest way of rationalizing this inconsistency is that Ṭahmāsb ordered the execution of Sām Mīrzā and the other princes at Qahqahah (with the exception of his own son, Ismāʿīl) in 975/1567, and that people were generally aware of this, but no one wanted to acknowledge it in writing. The implications for Ṭahmāsb's character may have been too grave, or perhaps it was considered politically unacceptable to address the issue.

This brief passage from Būdāq Munshī makes it easier for us to weigh the competing stories of how Sām Mīrzā died. As we have seen, according to the *Takmilat al-akhbār*, he and his sons and nephews perished in an earthquake at Qahqahah. In the more detailed, and notably candid account in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*—to be described shortly—the story goes that Ṭahmāsb sent Muḥammad Beg Qūyunchī-ughlī (the very same) with a group of men to execute the princes. The

author of the latter history, Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, claims that two alternate explanations for the event were disseminated by Ṭahmāsb and his inner circle. One was the earthquake tale, which had already been transmitted as fact by ʿAbdī Beg Shīrāzī. The second was that a band of armed men went to Qahqahah, without the king's knowledge or approval, and murdered Sām Mīrzā and the others. Būdāq Munshī casts further doubt on these two accounts. The earthquake story is already suspect. If Sām Mīrzā perished in a tragic accident, then there would be no reason for contemporary chroniclers to avoid mentioning his death. If, on the other hand, a group of men took it upon themselves to murder the king's last surviving brother, in addition to four of his nephews, then why would the chief offender, Muḥammad Beg Qūyunchī-ughlī, not be punished until after Ṭahmāsb's own death nearly a decade later? Again, the one interpretation that seems to make sense is that the king ordered the execution of Sām Mīrzā and the other princes, then acted to conceal the truth—after which most court historians either did not want to touch the issue or felt it would be unwise to do so.

7. ***Aḥsan al-tavārīkh* (985/1577), by Ḥasan Rūmlū.** This history of Iran covers the ninth/fifteenth century and most of the tenth/sixteenth, up to the time of its composition. It is one of the most famous Persian chronicles of the period and was edited and translated into English by C. N. Seddon in the early 1930s.[100] Rūmlū worked in the service of Shah Ṭahmāsb at Qazvīn, where he wrote the *Aḥsan al-tavārīkh*. The format, unusually for an early Safavid chronicle, is annalistic by *Islamic* year.

---

100. *A chronicle of the early Ṣafawīs, being the Aḥsanu't-tawārīkh of Ḥasan-i-Rūmlū*, 2 vols., ed. and tr. C. N. Seddon (Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1931–34).

This is the earliest example of a history that clearly ought to include substantial information on Sām Mīrzā's later years, and yet does not—with the exception of listing the prince among the dignitaries who welcomed Humāyūn in 951/1544–5. We know that the relevant data existed: some of it had already been reported by ʿAbdī Beg, and a good deal more would be provided by Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī in 999/1591. Even Fażlī Khūzānī, working in the 1630s, would be able to find further details on Sām Mīrzā's adult life. And so Ḥasan Rūmlū's silence on these matters is mystifying. The most frustrating point is that Rūmlū tends to close each annal with a separate heading for noteworthy individuals who died in that year. The reader learns of the deaths of numerous men less important (one would think) than Sām Mīrzā, a son of Shah Ismāʿīl.

8. ***Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*** **(999/1591), by Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī.**[101] This is a history of the Safavid order and dynasty up to the time of its composition, organized annalistically—for the most part by animal-cycle solar year. It is a fascinating work and by far our best source on Sām Mīrzā's adult life. A few general comments about this chronicle should be made here, before we delve into its contents in piecing together Sām's biography.

First, relative to most other historians of the period, Qāżī Aḥmad takes unusual care to be precise regarding the dates of events. For a given episode, he often provides the animal-cycle year, the Islamic year, month, and date, and the day of the week. If the reader checks these data points against one another, they will usually agree. Of the Safavid chronicles that I have read, the only other one that does a satisfactory job of keeping the animal-cycle and Islamic years correctly

101. Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, ed. Iḥsan Ishrāqī (2 vols., Tehran, 1980–).

synchronized is ʿAbdī Beg's *Takmilat al-akhbār*.[102] Some of the historians, like Ḥasan Rūmlū, do not even attempt to use a hybrid dating system and instead rely solely on the Islamic calendar. Iskandar Munshī uses both conventions, at least in certain parts of his *ʿĀlam-ārā-yi ʿAbbāsī*; and while I have not seen a case in which he has the animal-cycle and Islamic calendars out of step by more than one year, even this degree of error has caused significant problems for modern scholars. (The most famous example is the accession of Shah ʿAbbās I, which took place in late 995/1587, but is often dated to 996/1588 based on the *ʿĀlam-ārā*.) Fażlī Khūzānī, for his part, working some years after Iskandar Munshī, made a true mess of the hybrid system.

To return to Qāżī Aḥmad, the important point here is that he provides an unusual measure of detail in dating events, and those details agree with one another to an impressive degree. In my judgment, the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* should be considered *the* basic source on the period 984–99/1576–91, and one of a few key sources on the second half of Ṭahmāsb's reign. Qāżī Aḥmad's work, unfortunately, has yet to attain this status in scholarship. Heavy reliance on the *ʿĀlam-ārā-yi ʿAbbāsī* for the years immediately following Ṭahmāsb's death, which are better covered by the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, will hold back the field of Safavid history. Another noteworthy characteristic of Qāżī Aḥmad's chronicle is that he appears to have written it on his own initiative, without a specific commission or dedicatee. He did so early in the reign of Shah ʿAbbās, who was still focused on stabilizing his kingdom and rooting out provincial insubordination, and was several years away from commissioning his first court histories. The Safavid realm had been in shambles

102. One other exceptional author in this regard is Jalāl al-Dīn Munajjim, whose *Tārīkh-i ʿAbbāsī* (*ca*. 1020/1611) includes occasional, and accurate, use of animal years. This should not come as a surprise, given that he worked as an astral scientist (*munajjim*) at the Safavid court. See Jalāl al-Dīn Munajjim, *Tārīkh-i ʿAbbāsī, yā, rūz-nāmah-i Mullā Jalāl*, ed. Sayf Allāh Vaḥīdniyā (Tehran: Vaḥīd, 1366 SH / 1987 CE).

for over a decade. Given this political situation, Qāżī Aḥmad may have been able to afford more candor than other Safavid historians.

Regardless of the reasons behind the unusual openness of the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*—which are destined to remain somewhat mysterious—what is clear is that Qāżī Aḥmad gives us our only substantial account of Sām Mīrzā's final years. Most of the unique information comes in a single extended passage, a sort of obituary for the prince, which Qāżī Aḥmad includes while narrating the story of his death in 975/1567. Sām Mīrzā is mentioned, however, in more than twenty other anecdotes throughout the chronicle. All of this will be explained below in greater detail. For the moment, it may suffice to note that I use the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* to provide the "frame story" of Sām Mīrzā's life, since this chronicle pays unusually close attention to the prince and offers the only sustained record of his downfall and death.

9. ***Naqāvat al-āṡār fī ẕikr al-akhyār* (1007/1598), by Afūshtah'ī Naṭanzī.**[103] A focused history of the Safavid dynasty from the end of Ṭahmāsb's reign up to the time of composition. According to Robert D. McChesney, Afūshtah'ī probably worked at court, since he seems to have had access to government documents.[104]

This chronicle is not a particularly important source on Sām Mīrzā's life, given that its years of coverage do not begin until nearly a decade after the prince's death. In fact, Afūshtah'ī mentions Sām's name only once; but the context is interesting enough to merit attention here.[105] According

103. *Naqāvat al-āṡār fī ẕikr al-akhyār*, ed. Iḥsān Ishrāqī (Tehran, 1971).
104. "Four Sources on Shah ʿAbbas's Building of Isfahan," *Muqarnas* 5 (1988): 104*f*.
105. Afūshtah'ī Naṭanzī, *Naqāvat al-āṡār*, 63.

to this text, shortly after Shah Ismāʿīl II died in late 985/1577, news of his passing was delivered to his older brother, Sulṭān Muḥammad "Khudābandah" (shortly to accede to the throne), who initially did not believe that it was true. Sulṭān Muḥammad thought that Ismāʿīl had sent a false report of his own death in order to lure him to Qazvīn, where he could be arrested and killed—as had happened to several other princes over the preceding year.

This is where Sām Mīrzā's name appears. Sulṭān Muḥammad compares his predicament to an earlier controversy involving Sām. At one point, we read, Shah Ṭahmāsb had fallen ill. He soon recovered, but a rumor spread that Sām Mīrzā had begun traveling from Ardabīl to the capital in Qazvīn upon hearing of Ṭahmāsb's illness, in anticipation of the king's death. Instead, news came of his recovery, and Sām, who still had not made it far *en route* to Qazvīn, stopped and returned to Ardabīl. In Afūshtah'ī's account, Sulṭān Muḥammad remembers this event as the cause of Sām Mīrzā's imprisonment at Qahqahah, and he intends to avoid suffering a similar fate. (As we will see below, Qāżī Aḥmad tells a different version of this story, which he dates to 967/1560.) While the *Naqāvat al-āṡār* has almost nothing to say about Sām Mīrzā—who, again, was not alive during the years covered—we do learn that our unfortunate prince could be invoked as an example of how *not* to behave as a member of the Safavid family.

10. ***Futūḥāt-i humāyūn* (1007/1598–9), by Siyāqī Niẓām.** According to the author, this work was supposed to be a relatively broad history, but only a brief preface and the section dealing with Shah ʿAbbās' conquests in Khurāsān (which also took place in 1007/1598–9) are extant. A facsimile of one of the manuscripts of this history, with commentary by ʿAbbās Zaryāb Khuʾī, was published

in the Iranian periodical *Bar-rasī-hā-yi tārīkhī* in 1973.[106] Later, Chahryar Adle apparently edited the work as part of his 1976 Sorbonne dissertation, which I have not been able to obtain.[107] A more recent edition by Ḥasan Zandīyah was published in 2014.[108] At my urging, and after some time, the library at the University of Chicago managed to acquire a copy. Now it can be confirmed definitively that Sām Mīrzā's name does *not* appear in Siyāqī Niẓām's text. This is unsurprising, given the rather narrow focus of the surviving parts of the work, but it was important to check as a matter of diligence. Any Safavid chronicle from the decades after Sām Mīrzā's death could, in principle, include some comment about him. There are other sources covered in this chapter in which Sām is mentioned, despite his not having a direct connection to the events in question.

11. ***Tārīkh-i Qizilbāshān*, by an anonymous author, written between 1007/1598 and 1013/1605.**

Neither a court history nor a sustained narrative of any kind, this work is more like a brief encyclopædia of the Qizilbāsh tribes and subtribes, their leaders over the course of Safavid history up to the turn of the eleventh/seventeenth century, and important events in which they were implicated. The text was edited by Mīr Hāshim Muḥaddis̤ and runs to about fifty pages, plus frontmatter and indices.[109]

Tārīkh-i Qizilbāshān is another work in which Sām Mīrzā's name appears only once, and indirectly (p. 10). In discussing prominent members of the Shāmlū tribe, the author comes to Aghzīvār Khān, who was Sām's guardian (*lalah*) during his final stint as governor of Harāt. The

---

106. See vol. 8, nos. 1–2, pp. 207–77. This journal was published in Tehran by Sitād-i Buzurg-i Artishtārān.
107. The title of the dissertation is "*Fotuhât-e Homâyun*, 'Les Victoires augustes,' 1007/1598, relation des évènements de la Perse et du Turkestan à l'extrême fin du XVIe s."
108. *Futūḥāt-i humāyūn*, ed. Ḥasan Zandīyah (Qum: Pizhūhishgāh-i Ḥawzah va Dānishgāh, 2014).
109. *Tārīkh-i Qizilbāshān*, ed. Mīr Hāshim Muḥaddis̤ (Tehran: Bihnām, 1982).

short version of their story begins around 940/1533–4, when Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū, then the most powerful of Ṭahmāsb's *amīr*s, reappointed Sām Mīrzā to Harāt under the guardianship of Aghzīvār Khān. Later, around the end of 1534 (mid 941), Ṭahmāsb had Ḥusayn Khān executed in a major assertion of his authority as king. News of this development reached Harāt in February 1535 (Shaʿbān 941), and Aghzīvār Khān grew worried that other Shāmlū leaders would be purged. He and Sām Mīrzā subsequently abandoned their post, took most of the men under their command, and marched south to Qandahār in an unauthorized, ill-fated attempt to capture that city from the Mughals. Since Ḥusayn Khān's execution spurred this bizarre act of insubordination from other Shāmlū in Khurāsān, which in turn coincided with the Ottoman Süleyman's first campaign into Safavid territory—along with a few other factors—the situation aroused considerable suspicion at court. By early 1536 (mid 942), the siege of Qandahār had failed, and Aghzīvār Khān was killed in battle against the Mughals. Sām Mīrzā sent an apology to Ṭahmāsb and was eventually brought back to court, where he was pardoned. As has been explained above, however, his political and military career was effectively finished. He still was not twenty years old, and he had little to look forward to for the rest of his adult life.

The key point with Aghzīvār Khān is that he was Sām Mīrzā's guardian at the time when the prince's career went irreversibly in the wrong direction. Whose idea was it to abandon Harāt and besiege Qandahār? To what extent was young Sām Mīrzā issuing orders? This is one of the central, frustrating questions in his biography. The anonymous author of the *Tārīkh-i Qizilbāshān*, for his part, does not dwell on the matter. He writes that Aghzīvār Khān grew suspicious after hearing of Ḥusayn Khān's execution, and so he *took* Sām Mīrzā and went to Qandahār. (*Baʿd az qatl-i Ḥusayn*

Khān, tavahhum bih khud rāh dād, va Sām Mīrzā rā bar-dāshtah *mutavajjih-i Qandahār gardīd*.) The author does not elaborate, but this account gives the impression that Sām Mīrzā had little say in the matter. We may take it as a bit of evidence of the way that contemporary observers viewed the power dynamic among Qizilbāsh tribal leaders and the members of the Safavid dynasty whom they nominally served.

12. ***Tārīkh-i ʿAbbāsī* (*ca.* 1020/1611), by Jalal al-Dīn Munajjim.**[110] The author worked as an astral scientist (*munajjim*) at the court of Shah ʿAbbās. This history covers the reigns of Ismāʿīl II, Sulṭān Muḥammad Khudābandah, and ʿAbbās up to the time of its composition. The early part of the chronicle is arranged thematically—or perhaps we could say episodically—and then the format becomes largely annalistic, by Islamic year, with the start of ʿAbbās' reign. Occasionally the corresponding animal-cycle year is indicated.

    As with the *Naqāvat al-āṡār* (and the *Futūḥāt-i humāyūn*), it should be unsurprising in this case that there is no real discussion of Sām Mīrzā, who was not alive during the period covered. Again, however, there is one indirect and noteworthy mention of the prince's name (p. 43). In the aftermath of Ismāʿīl II's death, Sulṭān Muḥammad traveled from Shīrāz to Qazvīn to claim the throne, arriving in early 1578 (late 985). One of the actions that needed to be taken immediately in order to bring some stability to the political situation, was to release tribal leaders who had been imprisoned unjustly (or unpopularly) during Ismāʿīl's brief reign, and to restore their status. This meant granting them positions and, in a few cases, arranging marriages. A certain ʿĪsá Khān, son of

110. *Tārīkh-i ʿAbbāsī, yā, rūz-nāmah-i Mullā Jalāl*, ed. Sayf Allāh Vaḥīdniyā (Tehran: Vaḥīd, 1987).

Alvand Gurjī, was released from the fortress of Alamūt, given Sām Mīrzā's daughter in marriage, and made governor of Shakī in Shirvān.

Three brief comments should be made about this anecdote. First, this is the only indication I have seen in the Safavid histories that Sām Mīrzā's bloodline continued past 975/1567, albeit not through a son.[111] Second, this seems not to have been a particularly high-status marriage. Sām Mīrzā's daughter must have been considered a minor princess, though Ismāʿīl I was her paternal grandfather. Third, and perhaps most importantly for our historiographical questions, we have a reminder of how little was ordinarily required for members of the Safavid family to be mentioned in chronicles. Their births, marriages, political and military appointments, and deaths were considered worthy of at least a cursory note. How strange is it, then, that so many sources covering the years of Sām Mīrzā's adulthood fail to report what became of him? This is the most difficult problem that I have encountered in my research for the first half of the dissertation, and I do not expect that a clear answer is attainable.

13. ***Tārīkh-i ʿālam-ārā-yi ʿAbbāsī* (1038/1629), by Iskandar Beg Munshī.** This is probably the most famous of all Safavid chronicles, and it has long been used by scholars as the basic source on the first half of the dynasty's period of rule. Significantly, Roger Savory's English translation-cum-edition of the work has made it easily accessible to researchers irrespective of their facility with

111. There is, however, a reference in the *Akbarnāmah* to an alleged son of Sām Mīrzā, named Mīr ʿĀrif Ardabīlī, who died at Agra in 1007/1598–9. This is discussed further in the following section. See also Aḥmad Gulchīn-i Maʿānī, *Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā-yi Fārsī* (2 vols., Tehran, 1969–71), vol. 1, p. 157.

Persian.[112] There are likely several other reasons behind the enduring popularity of the *ʿĀlam-ārā*, which need not be explored here.

What should be emphasized, in connection to Sām Mīrzā's biography, is that the preëminence of Iskandar Munshī's work has left modern historians with certain blind spots. When an event is reported inaccurately in the *ʿĀlam-ārā*, it tends to be transmitted as such in scholarship. The most obvious example of this is the story of Shah ʿAbbās' accession, an event that Iskandar Munshī dates to 996/1588. In fact, when a variety of sources is consulted, it becomes clear that ʿAbbās took power in Qazvīn in the fall of 995/1587. The *ʿĀlam-ārā* is off by one year, apparently because of an error in concordance between the Islamic and animal-cycle calendars. Robert D. McChesney published an article about this problem in 1980,[113] but to this day, much scholarship continues to date the beginning of ʿAbbās' reign to 996/1588. So dominant is Iskandar Beg's narrative that it can be difficult to induce historians to depart from his version of events, even when it is demonstrably incorrect.

On a related note, one could hypothesize that the lack of attention paid to Sām Mīrzā in English-language scholarship is due at least in part to his absence in the pages of the *ʿĀlam-ārā-yi ʿAbbāsī*. This chronicle mentions nothing about Sām after his downfall in 943/1537: nothing on his reception of Humāyūn in 951/1544–5; nothing on his appointment to the governorship of Ardabīl and custodianship of the Safavid shrine in 956/1549; nothing on his authorship of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* while living in Ardabīl; nothing on his pilgrimage to Mashhad in 964/1557; nothing on his second bout of political difficulties and eventual imprisonment in the early 1560s; and nothing on

112. *The History of Shah ʿAbbas the Great*, ed. and tr. Roger Savory (3 vols. in 2, Boulder, CO, 1978–86).
113. "A Note on Iskandar Beg's Chronology," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 39 (1980): 53–63.

his death in 975/1567. Iskandar Beg's silence is just as strange as Ḥasan Rūmlū's—that is, if one is willing to assign importance to a *lack* of evidence. (In fact, it is somewhat easier to explain the omissions by Rūmlū, who spent decades working at the court of Shah Ṭahmāsb and was not far removed from the politically sensitive events involving Sām Mīrzā.)

14. ***Afżal al-tavārīkh* (1049/1639), by Fażlī Khūzānī Iṣfahānī.** This was conceived as a three-volume history of the Safavid dynasty, with the first volume to narrate the reign of Ismāʿīl I; the second to cover Ṭahmāsb, Ismāʿīl II, and Muḥammad Khudābandah; and the third reserved for ʿAbbās I. Fażlī began writing his chronicle around 1025/1616, and he was still revising it in 1049/1639—by which point he was living in India, having left Iran some time after Shah ʿAbbās' death. Both the incomplete status of the *Afżal al-tavārīkh*, and the fact that its author had withdrawn from court service and emigrated, led to the work's remaining unknown in subsequent generations and apparently having no impact on later chroniclers. So far, only one manuscript of each volume has been identified. The first and third volumes are located at Cambridge, while the second is at the British Library.[114] Recently, the volume covering the reign of ʿAbbās, which is by far the largest of the three, has been edited by Kioumars Ghereghlou and Charles Melville and published by the Gibb Memorial Trust.[115] Parts of the second volume (*i.e.*, the British Library manuscript) were also translated by Simin Abrahams in her 1999 dissertation.[116] Once the entirety of the *Afżal al-tavārīkh* has been published, with tables of contents, indices, *etc.*, it will certainly rank among our most

114. Melville provides more detail about all of this in his *Encyclopædia Iranica* article, "Afżal al-tawāriḵ."
115. The title is *A Chronicle of the Reign of Shah ʿAbbas* (2 vols., Cambridge, 2015).
116. Simin Abrahams, "A Historiographical Study and Annotated Translation of Volume 2 of the *Afżal al-Tavārīkh* by Fażlī Khūzānī al-Iṣfahānī" (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 1999).

important narrative sources on Safavid history up to 1038/1629. Fażlī writes with a scope similar to that of Iskandar Beg, but he often presents matters differently; offers more detail for certain events, such as ʿAbbās' campaigns in the Caucasus; and has a habit of quoting official documents, such as royal decrees (*farmān*s), in his narrative.

When I received a scanned microfilm copy of the British Library manuscript of the second volume, I was intrigued to see what new light it might shed on Sām Mīrzā's biography. It is always difficult to know where to look in an unedited source of substantial length, but two factors make this codex relatively navigable. First is Fażlī's annalistic format, in which he attempts to use a hybrid system of the Islamic and animal-cycle solar calendars. (Regrettably, he does a worse job of this than any other historian of the period, with his concordance between the two systems frequently being off by three years.) Knowing from other sources the years in which important events in Sām Mīrzā's life took place, one may check the relevant annals in the *Afżal al-tavārīkh* and look for commentary. The second helpful factor is Fażlī's inclusion, at the beginning of this volume, of a list of major events that took place in each of the years covered. In my initial review of the text, I found two promising mentions of Sām Mīrzā. Fażlī's "table of contents" indicates that Sām was named governor of Ardabīl and custodian of the Safavid shrine in 956/1549, and that he died in 972/1564–5 [*sic*]. (In both cases, the animal-cycle year provided by Fażlī is sufficiently out of proper concordance that it should probably be disregarded. Indeed, as far as I have been able to determine, the safest way to read this volume of the *Afżal al-tavārīkh* would be to note the Islamic years and ignore the animal signs, since the former are often correct, while the latter are usually, if

not always, wrong.) The report of Sām Mīrzā's death would be of special interest, since the other two sources that describe the event both place it in 975/1567.

Sadly, there is a lacuna in the microfilm of this manuscript between folio 243, which ends in the middle of 969/1561–2, and folio 244, which begins in the middle of 973/1565–6. (This is the foliation applied by a modern cataloguer; the number of missing leaves is unclear.) Out of an abundance of caution, I consulted the manuscript in person at the British Library. The lacuna is genuine, and so Fażlī's narration of the death of Sām Mīrzā is likely lost forever. As for the prince's appointment to Ardabīl in 956/1549, the account in this chronicle matches that of the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*. Both texts indicate that Sām Mīrzā felt nervous around the time that Alqāṣ Mīrzā's rebellion was being resolved (throughout 956/1549), and that he asked Ṭahmāsb whether he could be settled somewhere, rather than continuing to live in the encampment. Thus he was sent to Ardabīl and given a post of considerable symbolic but little political or military importance. The only new perspective offered by Fażlī is in his specific emphasis that Sām and Alqāṣ were full brothers, borne by the same harem woman—whereas Ṭahmāsb and Bahrām (d. 956/1549) were both carried by Ismāʿīl's favorite wife, Tājlū Khānum of the Mawṣillū tribe. According to Fażlī, Sām Mīrzā's direct relation to Alqāṣ left him worried about his own safety. There appears to be no mention of Sām's 969/1562 imprisonment in the *Afżal al-tavārīkh*. Again, it would be useful to study this text further for the history of the Ṭahmāsb era in general. It remains an underutilized source. Fażlī's discussion of Sām Mīrzā has already been worth examining, though the loss of his commentary on the prince's death is a true disappointment.

Conclusion

The goal of this section has been to provide an overview of the most important category of sources for the study of Sām Mīrzā's career, addressing at least their general characteristics. As was noted at the outset, this survey is only a first step. We have so far considered Persian narrative works by authors from within the Safavid realm (even if a couple of them had migrated to India by the time that they completed their histories), but there is a modest degree of additional perspective on Sām Mīrzā that can be gained from other types of sources, such as *taẕkirah*s. These groups of texts will be treated collectively in the following subchapter. Furthermore, the discussion above is restricted to works that were written late enough to have the possibility of commenting on Sām Mīrzā's adult years. If we intended to cover *all* contemporary sources that mention the prince (from his birth in 923/1517), then we would need to begin with the *Ḥabīb al-siyar* (930/1524) of Khwāndamīr. The finer points of Sām's biography will, of course, be laid out in the next chapter. For now, some of the larger historical and historiographical issues are already coming into focus.

1.3: Other sources on Sām Mīrzā

Introduction

The great majority of the available information on Sām Mīrzā's life is found in Safavid chronicles, but there are bits and pieces that occur in sources of other kinds. We will review those briefly here. It will, furthermore, be worth discussing categories of texts in which one might *hope* to find some discussion of Sām Mīrzā's adult years, and yet there is little or effectively none. Our goal is to demonstrate a measure of thoroughness, and to collect the modest amount of additional data to which we have access.

The sources under review will be organized into three categories: first, *non*-Safavid chronicles, which is to say, narrative histories from the Ottoman, Mughal, and Uzbek realms; second, later *taẕkirah*s of poets in which Sām Mīrzā and his *Tuḥfah* are mentioned; and third, from a different perspective entirely, the travel narrative of Michele Membré, a Cypriot who visited the court of Shah Ṭahmāsb as an emissary of Venice in 946–7/1539–40. His cursory remarks about Sām Mīrzā serve as corroboration of the prince's low status during the years immediately following his recall from Khurāsān. In regard to *taẕkirah* sources, please note that we still have not reviewed the snippets of autobiographical material that appear in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, and we will not do so thoroughly until the second half of the dissertation. There are only a few points of clearly relevant information about Sām Mīrzā's life that emerge from his own writing; those will be incorporated as we piece together his story in the following chapter. And of course, an in-depth treatment of the *Tuḥfah* will be carried out later, for separate purposes.

Ottoman, Mughal, and Uzbek histories

Regrettably, there is not much for us to say about any of the sources that fall under this umbrella. *None* of them, as far as I have found, includes meaningful discussion of Sām Mīrzā's activities after the 1530s. It is, frankly, difficult to gauge whether this general lack of comment on the prince's adult years should be considered noteworthy in itself. There is an obvious rationale for non-Safavid historians to have mentioned Sām Mīrzā in connection with the conflicts in the first decade of Shah Ṭahmāsb's reign: he was *involved* in those conflicts in ways that were relevant to the other powers in the region. It was Sām who, on paper, held Harāt at the time of frequent Uzbek invasions. His name was brought up by Qizilbāsh defectors in Ottoman territory, in their fanciful plotting of a régime change. And when all was crashing down for the Shāmlū who accompanied Sām Mīrzā in Harāt, they took him on an ill-fated campaign to capture Qandahār from the Mughals. Sām was "in the mix" at a high level until the mid-1530s. He participated in the 935/1528 Battle of Jām, which would be remembered as Ṭahmāsb's greatest military victory. (Was it Ṭahmāsb's *only* major battle? It is, at least, the one mentioned in Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī's summary of the key points of the five-decade reign.)[117] Thus, a chronicle that covers events from the Ottoman, Mughal, or Uzbek perspective in that same period would have occasion to discuss Sām Mīrzā, at least briefly.

117. There is a peculiar passage in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, after the account of Shah Ṭahmāsb's death, where Qāżī Aḥmad recites a number of basic facts about the king, including the provinces over which he ruled, the mosques and shrines that he renovated, and the names of his children. According to this summary, Ṭahmāsb fought two battles (s. *jang*), the first of which was against Ustājlū *amīr*s in 933/1527, and the second against ʿUbayd Khān and the Uzbeks, at Jām. (My general practice is to cite Iḥsān Ishrāqī's edition of the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, but, at the time of writing this section, I could not access a copy. In checking this reference, I found a facsimile of a manuscript at the Kitāb-khānah-i Majlis-i Shūrā, no. 336, dated 1050/1640. The passage in question begins on fol. 370r.)

The same is not true of the vicissitudes of the second half of his life. One gets the impression that the internal affairs of the Safavid polity could be ignored by the historians of their neighbors, except insofar as there was something that gave them wider relevance. The marginalization, imprisonment, and execution of Sām Mīrzā would not have cleared the bar. At least, this is a seemingly reasonable way of explaining his presence in *some* foreign chronicles with reference to the conflicts of the 1520s and ’30s, and his absence in *almost all* such texts in their treatment of later decades. It might be worth studying in a more general manner the question of just how interested chroniclers of other dynasties were in Safavid affairs. A logical starting point, pertinent to Sām Mīrzā’s biography, would be to ask to what extent Ottoman sources pay attention to Shah Ṭahmāsb’s rule after the Şehzade Bayezid affair. Ṭahmāsb was a major adversary for over a generation; were his activities in the last fifteen years of his life—an impactful period within Iran, but a lull in regional conflict—worthy of commentary? This question will need to be left to a later project.

For our immediate purposes, what is most important is that the available narrative sources from the Ottoman, Mughal, and Uzbek realms appear to have virtually nothing to add regarding Sām Mīrzā’s adult years. (In the following chapter, when we collate the story of the prince’s life, we will rely to a large extent on the work of Martin Dickson for the events of Sām Mīrzā’s upbringing, since he provides a thorough account of the entire Safavid-Uzbek “duel for Khurāsān.” I have not found any discussion of Sām in the sources in relation to the 1520s and ’30s that would add significantly to Dickson’s coverage. As is stated elsewhere in the dissertation, our goal is to carry out a more complete study of Sām Mīrzā, by finding information on his activities after 943/1537—the part of his life not addressed elsewhere—as well as reading the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, and attempting a holistic analysis.)

On the Ottoman side, the two major sources that I searched most hopefully for mention of Sām Mīrzā are the *Künhü'l-ahbar* of Mustafa Âli (d. 1008/1600) and the eponymous history of İbrahim Peçevi (d. *ca*. 1061/1650–51). The interest in Mustafa Âli's work is on account of its enormity, its authorship at an appropriate time (a few decades after Sām Mīrzā's death) and coverage of the relevant period, and its inclusion of a large amount of biographical material.[118] Peçevi, on the other hand, has been viewed as a basic source on the history of the tenth/sixteenth century, and he discusses events involving Sām Mīrzā, at least in regard to the turbulent early years of Ṭahmāsb's reign.[119] (Dickson, accordingly, cites Peçevi on a number of occasions.) I have not been able to find anything of direct relevance in either of these texts. Admittedly, it has not been easy for me to comb through them, since—as far as I can tell—the *Künhü'l-ahbar* still has not been edited for publication in its entirety,[120] and the edition of Peçevi that I consulted (Istanbul: Matbaa-yi Âmire, 1283/1866) has no index and little in the way of apparatus.

These inconveniences, combined with my limited facility with Turkic, have made it difficult for me to be confident of what may or may not be included in such large sources. My method of last resort (in searching both Persian and Turkic histories) has been to focus on points in the text at which it seems particularly likely that Sām Mīrzā's name would arise. In annalistic works, for example, one can start by locating the accounts of years (after 943/1537) in which we know that the prince was involved in a

118. My understanding of Mustafa Âli is basically indebted to the books of Cornell Fleischer and Jan Schmidt. See Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Âli* (*1541–1600*) (Princeton, 1986); Schmidt, *Pure Water for Thirsty Muslims: A Study of Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī of Gallipoli's "Künhü'l-aḫbār"* (Leiden, 1991). Especially helpful for our purposes is Schmidt's inclusion of an appendix that lists the contents of the entire history.

119. İbrahim Peçevi, *Tarih-i Peçevi* (2 vols., Istanbul, 1283/1866). He mentions, for example, the consequential defection of Ghāzī Khān Takkalū to the Ottomans at Baghdad in 941/1534–5. See vol. 1, p. 186.

120. Or is the issue that the *Künhü'l-ahbar* was still a work in progress at the time of Mustafa Âli's death? In any event, the most tractable edition that I have found was carried out by Ahmet Uğur, Mustafa Çuhadar, Ahmet Gül, and İbrahim Hakkı Çuhadar, and published in Kayseri in 1997.

significant event: the welcoming of the Mughal Humāyūn to Iran in 951/1544; the appointment of Sām Mīrzā to Ardabil around the end of Alqāṣ Mīrzā's revolt in 956/1549; his imprisonment at Qahqahah in 969/1562; and, of course, the mass execution of 975/1567. There are other Ottoman narrative sources that I checked, including the *Tevarih-i Âl-i Osman* of Lütfi Paşa (d. 971/1564), which covers events up to 961/1553–4.[121] But Mustafa Âli and Peçevi were what I considered the strongest leads, and even there, I saw no mention of Sām Mīrzā in the later decades.

Another suggestion that discussion of Sām from the Ottoman perspective is genuinely scarce is provided by the recent, comprehensive work of Walter Posch on the rebellion of Alqāṣ Mīrzā.[122] Posch includes a brief overview of Sām Mīrzā's situation during the same period, and he does not cite any new details from the Ottoman sources, over which he clearly has command. Again, if the reality is that authors outside of Iran were, by default, relatively unconcerned with the inner workings of the Safavid polity, then it is straightforward to explain their silence on matters such as Sām Mīrzā's imprisonment and death. This is not the same type of dilemma that we encountered with chronicles from *within* the Safavid realm—works that pay special attention to members of the ruling family, written by historians who had access to the relevant information—in which there often seems to be a reluctance to address what happened to Sām after 943/1537. Only in the latter case is there an obvious need to contemplate factors such as political sensitivities.

The Mughal case, in regard to Sām Mīrzā, is not much different from the Ottoman—except that the sources are in Persian, and sometimes even available in English translation, which has made it

121. Lütfi Paşa, *Tevarih-i Âl-i Osman* (Istanbul, 1341/1922–3). This is an important contemporary source on the Alqāṣ Mīrzā affair, but it seems not to have any comment on the impact of those events on Sām Mīrzā.

122. Walter Posch, *Osmanisch-safavidische Beziehungen* (*1545–1550*)*: der Fall Alkas Mîrzâ* (2 vols., Vienna, 2013). On Sām Mīrzā, see especially vol. 2, pp. 594–9.

easier to scrutinize them. But the result is nearly the same. There is, unsurprisingly, occasional mention of Sām from his birth in 923/1517 through the end of his titular governorship of Harāt in the 1530s; then nothing (with slight exceptions to be described shortly). At one point in the *Tārīkh-i alfī* (1000/1592), whose final section summarizes events up to 984/1576–7, I saw mention of Sām Mīrzā's detention at Qahqahah.[123] This turned out to be simply a note from the editors, adding background information about the prison fortress. The several references to Qahqahah in the text itself concern other inmates during these years, notably Ismāʿīl Mīrzā and Khān Aḥmad Khān of the Kārkiyā.[124] Perhaps the most dominant of the Mughal histories of the period coinciding with Sām Mīrzā's life is the *Akbarnāmah* of Abū al-Fażl ʿAllāmī (d. 1011/1602).[125] The first of its three volumes covers the careers of Bābur and Humāyūn, and the second offers a detailed account of the events of Akbar's reign (*i.e.*, starting at 963/1556). (The third volume of the *Akbarnāmah* is the *Āʾīn-i Akbarī*, an exhaustive review of the Mughal administration as it stood around the end of the tenth/sixteenth century. It can be considered effectively a separate work and is not of immediate relevance here. Perhaps confusingly, Beveridge's translation of the historical portions of the *Akbarnāmah* was published in three parts, but

123. *Tārīkh-i alfī: tārīkh-i hazār-sālah-i Islām*, ed. Aḥmad Tattavī, Āṣaf Khān Qazvīnī, Ghulām Riżā Ṭabāṭabāʾī Majd (8 vols., Tehran, 1382 SH / 2003–4 CE). Only the last part of this massive work addresses the tenth/sixteenth century. For the editors' note about Sām Mīrzā's imprisonment at Qahqahah, see vol. 8, p. 5711.

124. See, for example, vol. 8, p. 5849. The issue of Khān Aḥmad's brief stay at Qahqahah is interesting in itself, and may merit further scrutiny as it relates to Sām Mīrzā's situation. Khān Aḥmad was sent to Qahqahah in 975/1567–8—the same year in which Sām and his sons and nephews were executed. Shah Ṭahmāsb grew concerned that Khān Aḥmad was developing a rapport with fellow inmate Ismāʿīl Mīrzā, and so he had the former moved to Iṣṭakhr after a period of several months. What exactly is the chronology of these different events? I hope to return to this question. Khān Aḥmad's imprisonment is also described in the *Sharafnāmah* of Sharaf Khān Bidlīsī (d. *ca.* 1012/1603–4). See vol. 2, pt. 1, pp. 622–6 in the translation of Charmoy (2 vols. in 4, Saint Petersburg, 1868–75).

125. Here, for the time being, I have relied on the translation of Henry Beveridge, originally published between 1902 and 1939 (the last volume posthumously).

this is because the second volume—far larger than the first—is divided in two. The English translation of the *Āʾīn-i Akbarī*, by Blochmann and Jarrett, runs to several volumes in itself.)

We find nothing directly about Sām Mīrzā in the second section of the *Akbarnāmah*, which is understandable, given that he died just over a decade into Akbar's reign. There is, however, an intriguing occurrence of his name in Abū al-Fażl's description of the events of the year 1007/1598–9. We are told that on the third day of the month of Bahman, corresponding to 25 Jumādá al-Ākhirah 1007, or 23 January 1599 (Gregorian), a man called Mīr ʿĀrif Ardabīlī passed away in Agra. Abū al-Fażl adds the following comments: "They said he was the son of Sām Mīrzā Ṣafavī. He was an ascetic and a solitary. Wonderful tales are told of him."[126] The idea that Sām had a son who survived the 1560s and was able to migrate to India is certainly interesting. This goes against what is suggested in Safavid sources, namely, that the male heirs of Alqāṣ and Sām were preëmptively eliminated. Then again, members of the ruling family tended to have large households, and it is not inconceivable that there was another son of Sām Mīrzā who escaped. The use of the *nisbah* Ardabīlī could also be an indication that this Mīr ʿĀrif was born during the period when Sām was custodian of the Safavid shrine—in which case, he might have been young enough to be left alone in 969/1562. We probably will never know for sure. This is reminiscent of the passage in the *Tārīkh-i ʿAbbāsī* (*ca*. 1020/1611) of Jalāl al-Dīn Munajjim that notes the marriage of a daughter of Sām Mīrzā, around the beginning of the reign of Sulṭān Muḥammad Khudābandah.[127]

As for the first volume of the *Akbarnāmah*, it offers one small, pertinent detail: mention of both Sām Mīrzā and Bahrām Mīrzā as participants in the welcoming of Humāyūn upon his arrival at Shah

---

126. *Akbarnāmah*, tr. Beveridge, vol. 3, p. 1120. The name is written "ʿĀtrif," which must be a typographical error.
127. This is discussed in our previous review of Safavid chronicles.

Ṭahmāsb's encampment, near Sulṭānīyah, in the summer of 951/1544.[128] This serves as corroboration of reports to the same effect in Safavid sources (described above), including the history of Amīr Maḥmūd and the *Aḥsan al-tavārīkh* of Ḥasan Rūmlū.

It should be reiterated that scant discussion of Sām Mīrzā from the Mughal perspective is not difficult to explain. With the exception of a short visit to Mashhad in the mid-1550s, Sām was never allowed to set foot in the eastern provinces after his disgrace at Harāt and Qandahār.[129] To the extent that he returned to public life in the 1550s, it was in Ardabīl, at the opposite end of the Safavid realm. And he had no further involvement in issues that were of concern to the Mughals. It is not even clear whether Akbar's court made an effort to stay apprised of major political changes in Iran. If Abū al-Fażl's account is to be believed, the Mughals were informed of the death of Shah Ṭahmāsb and the subsequent drama involving Ḥaydar Mīrzā, Ismāʿīl Mīrzā, Parī Khān Khānum, *et al.* by travelers in a caravan around the beginning of November 1577 (late Shaʿbān 985)![130] This was nearly a year and a half after Ṭahmāsb's passing. The update that the Mughal officials were given was that Ismāʿīl Mīrzā had taken the throne and was having his male relatives killed. They could not have known, at that moment, that Ismāʿīl's own reign would come to an abrupt end within the next few *weeks*. In context, it is plausible that no further updates on Sām Mīrzā's situation reached India after his interactions with Humāyūn in 951/1544. (Safavid officials certainly would not have gone out of their way to spread word of the deaths of several princes at Qahqahah in 975/1567.)

---

128. *Akbarnāmah*, tr. Beveridge, vol. 1, p. 436*ff.*

129. The purpose of Sām Mīrzā's final trip to Khurāsān, *ca.* 964/1557, was to visit the grave of his son, Rustam Mīrzā, whose untimely death had occurred in 961/1554. Later, in 969/1562, when Sām asked for Shah Ṭahmāsb's blessing to retire to Mashhad, the request was denied, and he was sent to Qahqahah. These details are covered in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* of Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī. We will discuss the issue further in the following chapter.

130. *Akbarnāmah*, tr. Beveridge, vol. 3, p. 316*ff.*

What of Uzbek sources? I have found nothing of use for Sām Mīrzā's biography, and this is even less surprising than the silence of Ottoman or Mughal authors. Dickson already indicates that most of the available historical texts from the Uzbek side offer little information on the conflict in Khurāsān in the 1520s and '30s.[131] With this in mind, it would be unreasonable to expect such works—which include the *Taẕkirah-i Muqīm Khānī* and the *Tārīkh-i Subḥān Qulī Khān*—to provide much comment on Sām Mīrzā.[132] The one Uzbek source that I studied at length is the *Tārīkh-nāmah-i Rāqim* (1113/1701–2), by Mīr Sayyid Sharīf Rāqim Samarqandī. This text can be characterized as a kind of *taẕkirah* of notable individuals, some of whom are political figures, and others known for scholarly or artistic pursuits. It is available in print, having been edited by Manūchihr Sutūdah.[133] As it turns out, Rāqim is quite focused on Central Asia, and there seems to be no entry in this work for any member of the Safavid family. Searching a few Uzbek histories was, for the most part, an exercise in due diligence.

Few things would please me more than to be proven wrong in my assessment of historical texts from the Safavids' neighbor polities. There is still the possibility, in particular, that an Ottoman source exists—perhaps in document rather than narrative form—in which the later events of Sām Mīrzā's life are noted. Did Ottoman officials catch wind of the harsh measures that Shah Ṭahmāsb took against his own family members after the 962/1555 Peace of Amasya?[134] Did word somehow reach them of the mass execution at Qahqahah? Finding answers to these questions would be useful. (The Ottoman

---

131. In Dickson's appendix in which he describes the wide array of primary texts that he consulted (starting on page XLV), he repeatedly makes note of the Uzbek sources' paucity of information on his period of study.

132. I did look briefly at a copy of a manuscript of the *Taẕkirah-i Muqīm Khānī*, from the Kitāb-khānah-i Majlis-i Sinā, no. 1651, dated 1236/1821 (if I have deciphered the colophon correctly).

133. Mīr Sayyid Sharīf Rāqim Samarqandī, *Tārīkh-i Rāqim*, ed. Manūchihr Sutūdah (Tehran, 1380 SH / 2001 CE).

134. They must have known, at least, of the imprisonment of Ismāʿīl Mīrzā. As was suggested earlier, a better question is whether the Ottomans continued to follow Safavid domestic affairs between the resolution of the Şehzade Bayezid controversy in 969/1562 and Shah Ṭahmāsb's death in 984/1576.

dynasty was soon to be rocked by similar bouts of "preëmptive killing.") Alas, no such evidence has surfaced thus far. We are left to wonder whether the absence of Sām Mīrzā in these sources holds any significance in itself.

Later taẕkirah*s*

While the process of searching through narrative histories from the Ottomans, Mughals, and Uzbeks (not to mention the Safavids) involved both frustration and uncertainty, I found it easier to conduct a similar review of *taẕkirah* sources. And the result carries greater confidence, if not much more in the way of useful information. This is for three reasons. First, literary anthologies tend to be organized such that they are well suited to investigating the lives and works of individuals. It is mostly the case that a given figure is either included in a *taẕkirah* by way of a dedicated notice, or he or she is discussed little, if at all. There are exceptions to this tendency, especially where the most famous poets are concerned: Ḥāfiẓ or Jāmī could become a major presence in an anthology simply through mention of later *imitatio* (*javāb*) of his works. But we can generally say that someone is part of the ranks of a *taẕkirah*, or not. The differences between this and the chronological or thematic organization of a historical text should be obvious. (I should pause here to note that the narrow use of anthological sources as references has been a problem in the field of Persian literary history. This is addressed at greater length in the second half of the dissertation. My comment here on the convenient format of many *taẕkirah*s is not an endorsement of a research approach that disregards their depth and value as full-fledged works of literature.)

Second, in the world of early modern Persian poetry—and, by extension, that of *taẕkirah*s of the period—there is a kind of default internationalism that simplifies some matters. It would rarely make sense to refer to a literary anthology as Safavid or Mughal, other than when discussing the circumstances of its composition. We have, rather, a certain body of *taẕkirah*s written in Sām Mīrzā's lifetime and in the generations following his death, and any of them might, in theory, contain an entry on him. This includes works written across the region, in either Persian or (in some circumstances) Turkic. Of course, *taẕkirah*s vary widely in their content, and part of that variation is related to factors such as the background of the author and the *locus scribendi*. An anthologist with strong connections to literary circles within Iran would likely be in a better position to comment on Sām Mīrzā. But there is little sense of boundaries. Third, speaking of the corpus of *taẕkirah*s from this period, it appears somehow more coherent and manageable than the constellation of historical works produced in various political contexts. Or perhaps the true distinction is that I have greater command over the anthological sources. In any event, it was a relatively straightforward matter to assemble a list of *taẕkirah*s to check for mention of Sām.

I examined the following nine sources in this category that were written between the mid tenth/sixteenth century and the early eleventh/seventeenth: the *Rawżat al-salāṭīn* (960/1553) of Fakhrī Haravī; the *Haft iqlīm* (1002/1594) of Amīn ibn Aḥmad Rāzī; the *Majālis al-muʾminīn* (1010/1602) of Qāżī Nūr Allāh Shūshtarī ("Shahīd-i S̱āliṡ"); the fifth chapter of the *Sullam al-samāvāt* (*ca*. 1014/1605–6) of Abū al-Qāsim Kāzarūnī; the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār va zubdat al-afkār* (1016/1607) of Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī; the *Majmaʿ al-khavāṣṣ* (1016/1607, in Turkic) of Ṣādiqī Beg Afshār;[135] the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn va*

135. I remain confused about the proper dating of the *Majmaʿ al-khavāṣṣ*. Khayyāmpūr gives 1016/1607 in his edition-cum-translation, and that date has been repeated in much other scholarship—including in Aḥmad Gulchīn-i Maʿānī's

ʿaraṣāt al-ʿārifīn (1024/1615) of Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī Balyānī; the *Maykhānah* (1028/1619) of Fakhr al-Zamānī Qazvīnī; and the *Khayr al-bayān* (1036/1627) of Malik Shāh Ḥusayn Sīstānī. It would be reasonable to ask why none of these *taẕkirah*s dates to the first couple of decades after Sām Mīrzā's death. In fact, one of them does, in a way: the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār* of Kāshānī was a work in progress starting around 975/1567–8. It went through several intermediate drafts—at least one of which survives in manuscript—before 1016/1607.[136] Another reasonable question would be about setting an arbirtrary cutoff point in the early eleventh/seventeenth century. Again, in reality, I have not done so. As will become clear below, the results of surveying these "near-contemporary" sources for data on Sām Mīrzā were disappointing enough that I turned to increasingly late texts in hopes of finding more. If there were something original and significant to learn about the prince in the *taẕkirah* tradition, however, it would most probably appear in a source within decades of his passing.

Two of the nine aforementioned anthologies have dedicated entries for Sām Mīrzā: the *Majmāʿ al-khavāṣṣ* of Ṣādiqī Beg and the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn* of Awḥadī. It is not necessary here to spend a great deal of time discussing the texts that yielded no new information. Most of them are described in the second half of the dissertation, and key details relating to all of them can be found in the appendices. It will be enough to offer a brief comment on each of those seven *taẕkirah*s. The *Rawżat al-salāṭīn* is an anthology focusing on members of ruling houses (*i.e.*, *salāṭīn*), both throughout history and at the time of the work's composition.[137] The author, Fakhrī Haravī, had migrated from Khurāsān to Mughal

Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā-yi Fārsī (2 vols., Tehran, 1969–71). See vol. 2, pp. 132–40. On the other hand, Ferenc Csirkés dates the *Majmaʿ al-khavāṣṣ* to shortly before 998/1590–91, and his knowledge of Ṣādiqī's career is exhaustive. See pp. 312–13 in his dissertation.

136. See, for example, MS 3112 of the India Office Library, dated 993/1585. I discuss this copy in detail in my article, "The Biography of Vahshi Bāfqi (d. 991/1583) and the *Tazkera* Tradition" (*Journal of Persianate Studies* 8: 195–222).

137. Sulṭān Muḥammad Fakhrī ibn Muḥammad Amīrī Haravī, *Taẕkirah-i Rawżat al-salāṭīn, va Javāhir al-ʿajāʾib, maʿa dīvān-i Fakhrī Haravī*, ed. Sayyid Ḥusām al-Dīn Rāshidī (Hyderabad, 1968).

India by this point, and his emphasis, accordingly, is on the different branches of the Timurids.[138] Still, one would hope to find some discussion of members of the Safavid family in a text of this kind. No such luck—they have been omitted entirely. This is all the more disappointing because Fakhrī, a few decades earlier, carried out a Persian translation and update of ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī's *Majālis al-nafāʾis*, and among his dedicatees was none other than Sām Mīrzā—then child governor of Harāt.[139] Fakhrī knew a fair amount about Sām, but the scope of the *Rawżat al-salāṭīn* does not provide for his inclusion.

The next *taẕkirah*, chronologically, is the *Haft iqlīm* of Amīn Rāzī.[140] This famous text, which takes the form of a kind of geographical encyclopædia that includes a large number of biographies, was apparently completed in Iran, though the author had family connections at the Mughal court and may have visited there during the reign of Akbar.[141] As far as I can determine, Rāzī does not provide notices on any members of the Safavid dynasty. It may have been deemed safer to refrain from discussing them, given the tumultuous political situation in the late tenth/sixteenth century. There is, at any rate, no mention of Sām Mīrzā in the portions of the work that I have searched. (It is worth acknowledging that one of these *taẕkirah*s could easily include a passing reference to Sām or the *Tuḥfah*, outside of the context of an entry on the prince, and it would be difficult to find without recourse to a printed edition with a good index.)

---

138. Fakhrī's own biography is addressed in the second half of the dissertation. He had one of the longest and most varied careers among all *taẕkirah* authors, pushing the genre forward on multiple occasions.

139. See *Taẕkirah-i Majālis al-nafāʾis*, ed. ʿAlī Aṣghar Ḥikmat (Tehran, 1984), 2–3.

140. The standard edition of the *Haft iqlīm* is by Javād Fāżil (3 vols., Tehran, 1340 SH / 1961 CE). Also useful is Hermann Ethé's description of the text in his *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office* (Oxford, 1903), no. 724, pp. 380–499. Ethé lists the full contents of his manuscript.

141. For a brief summary of Rāzī's biography, see M. U. Memon, "Amin Aḥmad Rāzi," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

Next is the *Majālis al-muʾminīn* of Nūr Allāh Shūshtarī, a prolific Shiʿi scholar who migrated to India in the mid-1580s and became a high-ranking judge under Akbar, despite their confessional differences.[142] (The fact that Nūr Allāh left Mashhad for India is a testament to just how badly the situation in Khurāsān deteriorated between the death of Shah Ṭahmāsb and the rise of Shah ʿAbbās, and to how safe the Mughal court must have appeared at the height of Akbar's reign.) Shūshtarī is a fascinating historical figure in various ways. After the death of Akbar, certain officials at the Mughal court were able to persuade the new emperor, Jahāngīr (r. 1014–37/1605–27), that Shūshtarī held unnaceptable Shiʿi beliefs and deserved the *ḥadd* punishment. He was put to death in 1019/1610 and came to be known in the Shiʿi community in India as "the Third Martyr" (*shahīd-i s̱ālis̱*). The *Majālis al-muʾminīn* is one of his best-known works. It takes the form of a biographical anthology of notable Shiʿi individuals throughout history, including the Imams themselves, scholars, poets, and so forth. The eighth of its twelve chapters (*i.e.*, *majlis*, pl. *majālis*) is devoted to Shiʿi rulers of various dynasties (*dar ẕikr-i mulūk va salāṭīn-i Shīʿah*). Unfortunately, the Safavids are not included. This might seem to be a natural context in which to discuss Sām Mīrzā and his family, but in fact, Shūshtarī's focus is primarily on more distant history. And so, as we saw with the *Rawżat al-salāṭīn*, this source represents a "near miss."

The next *taẕkirah* (of a sort) in our list is the *Sullam al-samāvāt* of Abū al-Qāsim Kāzarūnī, a scholar who served at the Safavid court for some time, after which he moved to Shīrāz, and then, in 992/1584, to Kāshān.[143] This work of his covers a range of topics, in a format that seems designed for

---

142. The only edition to which I currently have access is that of Aḥmad ʿAbd Manāfī (2 vols., Tehran, 1377 SH / 1998–9 CE). See also M. Hidayet Hosain, "Nūr Allāh," *Encyclopædia of Islam, Second Edition*.

143. Abū al-Qāsim ibn Abī Ḥāmid Kāzarūnī, *Sullam al-samāvāt*, ed. ʿAbd Allāh Nūrānī (Tehran, 1386 SH / 2008 CE). Very little has been written in English about this author or his work. See Aḥmad Gulchīn-i Maʿānī, *Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā-yi*

educational use. (It is reminiscent of the *Bahāristān* of Jāmī.) The fifth of seven chapters in the *Sullam* focuses on poets, and it can be treated as a concise *taẕkirah*—though it contains a respectable 252 notices. I did not expect to find discussion of Sām Mīrzā in Kāzarūnī's text, given its limited scope. Indeed there is none. But the source was worth checking, since it dates to the relevant period, and it is readily available in a published edition. (I previously made reference to the *Sullam al-samāvāt* for an article on the biography of Vaḥshī Bāfqī, who *is* given a brief notice in the fifth chapter.)[144]

In reviewing these anthologies, the greatest hope became the biggest disappointment. If there was one author who was ideally situated to provide an informative notice on Sām Mīrzā, it was Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī. He spent the last few decades of the tenth/sixteenth century continually updating his collection of biographical data and excerpted verse from a wide range of poets, including those who lived in earlier centuries and his own contemporaries. Kāshānī was, as his *nisbah* suggests, based in Kāshān, which was one of the key centers of literary activity in early Safavid Iran. And he was extremely well connected. After the death of Muḥtasham Kāshānī (996/1588), the most successful poet associated with the reign of Shah Ṭahmāsb, Taqī al-Dīn took a leading role in managing his written legacy.[145] There can be no question of his access to the necessary information to write about Sām Mīrzā in an authoritative manner. Finally, the work that he gradually produced, the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār*, is thought to be the largest *taẕkirah* ever written in Persian, in terms of sheer volume.[146] Kāshānī quotes a total of around 350,000 lines from the 650 poets that he covers.

Fārsī, vol. 2, pp. 653–60.

144. Beers, "The Biography of Vahshi Bāfqi (d. 991/1583) and the *Tazkera* Tradition," 206–7.

145. See Paul E. Losensky, "Moḥtašam Kāšāni," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

146. This is according to the calculations of Gulchīn-i Maʿānī. See *Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā*, vol. 1, p. 524*ff*.

And yet, despite investing considerable effort in the search, I have not been able to find an entry on Sām Mīrzā in the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār*. It is difficult to be sure, since this *taẕkirah* has never been published in its entirety; chapters have been appearing in print one or two at a time.[147] The organizational scheme of the work is also somewhat complicated. (This is described in greater detail in the aforementioned article about Vaḥshī.) In any event, I have examined both the volumes that have been published, and a manuscript from the India Office Library (in microfilm), which represents an early and exemplary copy of the relevant sections of the anthology. Sām Mīrzā seems to be absent. This is truly frustrating. In studying any Iranian poet who died in the second half of the tenth/sixteenth century, the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār* would be among the first and most important biographical sources to consult. A lack of data here means moving on to works that are not only later, but also tend to devote less space than Kāshānī to each of the individuals that they discuss.

The next source to cover is the *Majmaʿ al-khavāṣṣ* of Ṣādiqī Beg Afshār, written in Chaghatāʾī Turkic. I have made use of this *taẕkirah* before, and my preference is to cite the edition and Persian translation of ʿAbd al-Rasūl Khayyāmpūr.[148] Unfortunately, I do not currently have access to a copy, so I will refer here to the romanized Turkic edition carried out by M. Oğuzhan Kuşoğlu as part of his 2012 dissertation.[149] There is, as it turns out, a brief notice on Sām Mīrzā in this text. Ṣādiqī states that Sām spent some years as governor (*farmān-farmāy*) of Khurāsān, and that the prince later assumed

---

147. The bibliography of my article on Ṣāʾib Tabrīzī lists the volumes of the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār* that were available as of 2016. See Theodore S. Beers, "*Taẕkirah-i Khayr al-bayān*: The Earliest Source on the Career and Poetry of Ṣāʾib Tabrīzī (d. *ca*. 1087/1676)," *Al-ʿUṣūr al-Wusṭā* 24 (2016): 120–21, 137.

148. Ṣādiqī Kitābdār, *Taẕkirah-i Majmaʿ al-khavāṣṣ, bi-zabān-i Turkī-i Chaghatāʾī*, ed. and tr. ʿAbd al-Rasūl Khayyāmpūr (Tabrīz, 1327 SH / 1948 CE).

149. M. Oğuzhan Kuşoğlu, "Sâdıkî-i Kitâbdâr'ın *Mecmaʿü'l-havâs* adlı eseri" (PhD diss., Marmara Üniversitesi, 2012).

custodianship of the shrine of Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn in Ardabīl and devoted himself to literary pursuits.[150] No mention is made of any of the negative events in Sām Mīrzā's life, let alone his death at Qahqahah. This is interesting, given Ṣādiqī's high status and obviously extensive familiarity with the affairs of the Safavid family. He must have known exactly what befell Sām Mīrzā, and yet he chose not to discuss any of it. If we look at the preceding notice in the *Majmaʿ al-khavāṣṣ*, on Alqāṣ Mīrzā, we find a matter-of-fact description of his capture and killing, down to the detail that he was thrown from the ramparts of Qahqahah.[151] The rebellion of Alqāṣ Mīrzā was, of course, a very public matter—an international scandal whose resolution was a victory for Shah Ṭahmāsb. The "management" of Sām Mīrzā was something different.

In reviewing the available sources and searching for data on Sām's biography, we have repeatedly come up against a barrier. The impression is that there was a reticence on the part of most authors within the Safavid realm to broach this subject. It is as if the problems involving Sām Mīrzā represented a kind of "dirty laundry" for the Safavids, which was better not to air in a text that might be read by a wider audience. This phenomenon is not as clear in *taẕkirah*s of the period as it is in Safavid chronicles. Most anthologists are not focused on the activities of kings, princes, and officials in the first place, so it is unremarkable for them to ignore Sām Mīrzā or to offer minimal comment on him. In the case of Ṣādiqī Beg, however, we find more or less the same puzzle that has confounded us in the chronicle tradition. There is no apparent reason for him to provide such a vague, sanitized summary of the prince's life—other than political considerations.

---

150. Ibid., 173.
151. Ibid., 172.

The *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn* is the second largest Persian *taẕkirah* of this era (*i.e.*, roughly the first half of the Safavid-Mughal period).[152] In terms of overall size, it is outdone only by the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār*. By another metric, however—the number of poets included—Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī has gone to greater lengths than any Persian anthologist before him. There are around 3,500 notices in the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn*. (With such extensive breadth, the entries tend to be of modest length. Recent published editions of this text run to seven or eight volumes, so it is not small in any sense, but an average notice takes up perhaps a couple of pages.)[153] Taqī al-Dīn covers poets from all eras, and he divides them into three temporal cohorts: early (*mutaqaddimīn*), middle (*mutavassiṭīn*), and recent (*mutaʾakhkhirīn*). In addition to the chronological sorting, the entries in this *taẕkirah* are organized alphabetically, usually (if not always?) according to the pen names (s. *takhalluṣ*) of the poets. Awḥadī manages this dual organizational scheme by setting aside one chapter for each letter in the alphabet. Then, within each letter-chapter, there is a section for each of the temporal cohorts. The *mutaʾakhkhirīn* are, of course, most relevant for our purposes. If we turn to the final section in the chapter for the letter *sīn*, the very first notice is given to Sām Mīrzā. This is a most pleasant surprise!

Awḥadī's discussion of Sām Mīrzā is not particularly long. In the edition of Muḥsin Nājī Naṣrābādī, it consists of just ten lines of biographical description—most of which is formulaic praise—and sixteen lines of excerpted poetry.[154] And none of what is presented here would really change our sense of the prince or his work. Still, something is better than nothing. After introducing Sām Mīrzā with a

152. For a general description of this work, see Gulchīn-i Maʿānī, *Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā*, vol. 2, pp. 3–24; or my articles on Vaḥshī and Ṣāʾib (cited above).

153. The edition that I cite here is by Muḥsin Nājī Naṣrābādī (7 vols., Tehran: Asāṭīr, 2009). Another, and perhaps a superior edition, has been carried out by Ẕabīḥ Allāh Ṣāḥibkārī and Āminah Fakhr Aḥmad (8 vols., Tehran: Mīrāṡ-i Maktūb, 2010).

154. *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn*, ed. Naṣrābādī, vol. 3, pp. 1877–8.

series of honorifics—*e.g.*, "the sun of the zenith of kingship, the Jamshīd of the throne of grandeur and royalty" (*khurshīd-i awj-i salṭanat va shahriyārī, Jamshīd-i takht-i ubbahat va tāj-dārī*)—Awḥadī offers just a few specific remarks. He claims that Sām "was distinguished from his brothers by the extent of his [artistic] pursuit and intelligence" (*az barādarān bi-mazīd-i tatabbuʿ va idrāk mumtāz āmadah*). A bit later, Awḥadī adds that Sām Mīrzā's *taẕkirah* of poets is famous (*taẕkirah-i shuʿarāʾ-i ū mashhūr ast*).

The latter is an interesting statement, which corresponds nicely, in two ways, to what we have seen in the chronicle of Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*.[155] First, there is the fact that the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* was well known and widely distributed by the late tenth/sixteenth century. We have several pieces of evidence for this—including the existence of a 972/1565 manuscript of the *Tuḥfah* copied in Istanbul, which demonstrates the quick transmission of the work—but it is helpful to see acknowledgment of the same from Awḥadī.[156] Second, the terminology is worth highlighting. Instead of referring to Sām Mīrzā's anthology by its title, Awḥadī employs the generic term *taẕkirah-i shuʿarāʾ*, drawn from Dawlatshāh Samarqandī. This is another reminder, if one were necessary, of the sense of a strongly coherent genre of biographical anthology, centered on poetry, in the wake of the influential texts produced in Timurid Harāt. (It is perhaps even more obvious in the Ottoman *tezkire* tradition, where it was common to *reuse* Dawlatshāh's title verbatim for a new work, rather than simply applying it as the name of a category.) Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, writing a couple of decades earlier, does much the same as Awḥadī; he points to the fame of Sām Mīrzā's *taẕkirah*, not his *Tuḥfah*.

---

155. Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, ed. Iḥsān Ishrāqī, vol. 1, p. 551. In fact, Sām Mīrzā's work is described here as "a *taẕkirah* of poets called *Taẕkirah-i Sāmī*" (*taẕkirah-i shuʿarāʾ kih mawsūm ast bi-Taẕkirah-i Sāmī*)! But this could be a peculiarity of Ishrāqī's edition or of the manuscripts that he used.

156. The codicology of the *Tuḥfah* is addressed in the second half of the dissertation.

The poetry selections that Awḥadī provides in this notice consist of a five-line *ghazal*, five *rubāʿīyāt*, and a single line that appears to be a *maṭlaʿ* (*i.e.*, the opening of a *ghazal*). There is nothing immediately remarkable here about Sām Mīrzā's style—assuming the attribution to him is legitimate, which is impossible to determine in most cases. One of the *rubāʿīyāt*, however, is found in the closing pages of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* itself, and there is no reason to doubt that the others also represent the prince's work.[157] Near the end of this entry, after quoting most of the poetry, Awḥadī adds one more thought-provoking comment of his own. He reports an anecdote that Sām Mīrzā, at the time of his passing, asked that a certain verse from the Qur'an be inscribed on his tombstone: "Indeed, God forgives all sins" (*inna Allāh yaghfir al-dhunūb jamīʿan*).[158]

This should probably be considered an apocryphal tale. What we know of Sām Mīrzā's death, after all, is that he and his sons and nephews were killed by a group of soldiers that had been dispatched quietly to the fortress at Qahqahah. Would he have had an opportunity to state his final wishes? And to whom would he have conveyed them? Still, the story is somehow intriguing. If Sām Mīrzā actually recited this verse shortly before his death, which sins might he have had in mind? His own youthful missteps? Or his ill treatment at the hands of Shah Ṭahmāsb and his retinue in more recent years, leading up to the execution? There is a degree of ambiguity, which calls to mind a curious moment in the preface of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. After going through the motions of praising his older brother, Sām Mīrzā inserts the following supplication in the form of a line of poetry: "I will not say to give him this or that; give him what will be good for him" (*mī-na-gūyam kih īn u ānash dih; gūyam ānash bi-dih kih*

157. See *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Rukn al-Dīn Humāyūn Farrukh (Tehran: ʿIlmī, n.d.), 378. The *rubāʿī* in question has *tust* (*i.e.*, the contraction of *tu ast*) as its *radīf*.

158. This is from verse 53 in Sūrat al-Zumar.

ānash bih).[159] This can be read as nearly passive-aggressive. In any case, Awḥadī's entry closes with the last two *rubāʿīyāt* (of five), which, the anthologist notes, were intended to be written on Sām Mīrzā's tombstone, on either side of the aforementioned qur'anic verse.

In the end, the discussion of Sām Mīrzā in the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn* is puzzling. There is not much to work with, and Awḥadī makes no mention of the difficult aspects of the prince's life. But there are points at which a subtext might be detected. Sām is described as superior to his brothers. We are then presented with a vague anecdote about a passage from the Qur'an relating to God's forgiveness. Does this mean something, or are we merely tempted to fill the gaps with our imagination, given the dark story of Sām's adult years that we have pieced together from other sources? The latter is a safer, if less satisfying, explanation.

Our next *taẕkirah* is the *Maykhānah* of Fakhr al-Zamānī Qazvīnī.[160] This work is somewhat different from the others, in that it focuses on poets who composed works in a specific genre: the *sāqī-nāmah*, or "ode to the cupbearer."[161] There is a great deal that can be said about the *Maykhānah* and the diverse, but formally and thematically linked poems that it anthologizes. For our purposes, however, it is enough to note that we should not expect to find any dedicated discussion of Sām Mīrzā in this *taẕkirah*, given its relatively well-defined scope. (Sām did not produce a *sāqī-nāmah*, as far as anyone knows.) As was the case with the *Sullam al-samāvāt*, the *Maykhānah* is worth investigating because it was written during the appropriate period, and it is always possible that mention of Sām Mīrzā or his *Tuḥfah* will occur in connection with other poets of the tenth/sixteenth century. In fact,

---

159. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 6.

160. *Taẕkirah-i Maykhānah*, ed. Aḥmad Gulchīn-i Maʿānī (Tehran, 1961).

161. On this genre, see Paul E. Losensky, "Sāqi-nāma," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

there is one reference to him here. In the entry on Qāsim Gunābādī (d. 982/1574–5), Qazvīnī reports that the poet composed a version of *Khusraw va Shīrīn* and dedicated it to Sām Mīrzā.[162] (There is, in turn, a notice on Qāsim Gunābādī in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*—no. 30 in the edition of Humāyūn Farrukh. See the spreadsheet in the appendices.) This is not particularly useful in itself, but Qāsim's *Khusraw va Shīrīn* is dated with a chronogram, *fayż-i jānhā*, which yields the year 950/1543–4. Apparently it was still possible for Sām Mīrzā to have a work dedicated to him, and perhaps to engage in some level of patronage, during the period between 943/1537 and 956/1549, when he was confined in the imperial encampment. We have little information about his activities in those years, and any new detail is to be appreciated.

Finally, there is the *Khayr al-bayān* of Malik Shāh Ḥusayn Sīstānī.[163] This *taẕkirah* was written in a few drafts between 1017/1608–9 and 1036/1627. It is general in scope, covering poets from all historical periods and a range of backgrounds, but its greatest value for researchers is probably its discussion of a large number of Iranian literati who migrated to Mughal India in the late tenth/sixteenth century. In this connection, the *Khayr al-bayān* is one of the major sources used by Aḥmad Gulchīn-i Maʿānī in his *Kārvān-i Hind*.[164] The text still has not been edited for publication, though it has been known to scholars for many decades (at least) and a number of good copies have survived.[165] Perhaps the finest extant manuscript is MS Or. 3397 at the British Library, which is also available in microfilm. I spent a

162. *Maykhānah*, ed. Gulchīn-i Maʿānī, 172.

163. As is noted later in the paragraph, the *Khayr al-bayān* is not available in print (to my knowledge); so I have relied on a facsimile of an excellent manuscript, Or. 3397 at the British Library, dated 1041/1631.

164. Aḥmad Gulchīn-i Maʿānī, *Kārvān-i Hind: dar aḥvāl va ās̱ār-i shāʿirān-i ʿaṣr-i Ṣafavī kih bi-Hindūstān raftah-and* (2 vols., Mashhad, 1369 SH / 1990–91 CE).

165. I have, on several occasions, heard rumors that someone was working on an edition, or that one has already been published. If this is true, I have not been able to find a trace of it.

significant amount of time with this source—I have a whole article on Sīstānī's treatment of Ṣā'ib Tabrīzī (d. *ca*. 1087/1676)—and I have not found a notice on Sām Mīrzā. Again, when working with anthologies that are unedited, or those that have been published without indices, it is difficult to determine whether a given individual is mentioned at *any* point in the text. There is no dedicated entry for the prince in the *Khayr al-bayān*, but his name could occur somewhere. A detail such as the momentary appearance of Sām Mīrzā in the *Maykhānah* will resemble a needle in a haystack, if one does not have recourse to an index.

Of the nine candidate *taẕkirah*s, then, we have found two that provide actual notices on Sām Mīrzā—the *Majmaʿ al-khavāṣṣ* of Ṣādiqī Beg Afshār, and the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn va ʿaraṣāt al-ʿārifīn* of Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī Balyānī—in addition to an indirect reference to the prince in the *Maykhānah* of Fakhr al-Zamānī Qazvīnī. And the amount of new information offered by these sources is hardly impressive. In the case of Ṣādiqī, we are left to wonder whether his brevity and vagueness in discussing Sām Mīrzā is significant in its own right. Awḥadī is able to confirm the strong reputation of the *Tuḥfah* around the turn of the eleventh/seventeenth century, and he relates a curious, but most likely fanciful anecdote about Sām's dying wishes. The *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn* also transmits several snippets of poetry by Sām Mīrzā, which have undeniable value. As for the relevant passage in the *Maykhānah*, it suggests that the prince could still act as a literary patron or dedicatee during a period of his life in which he had little public profile. This is not nothing, but it is sparse enough that I felt compelled to search for discussion of Sām Mīrzā in later *taẕkirah*s. The idea at this point is not to uncover further details about his life—it is unlikely that such data would emerge in sources written after the early eleventh/seventeenth century—but there may be more to learn about his legacy.

A review of progressively later anthologies did lead to one more finding: a notice on Sām Mīrzā in the *Riyāż al-shuʿarāʾ* (1161/1748) of ʿAlī Qulī Khān "Vālih" Dāghistānī.[166] This massive *taẕkirah*—it includes some 2,500 notices, covering poets of all kinds—was completed in India, where the author managed to find a position at the Mughal court during the reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad Shah (1131–61/1719–48). Vālih had grown up in Iṣfahān and witnessed the collapse of the Safavid kingdom and the rise of Nādir Shah Afshār (r. 1148–60/1736–47). Apart from its formidable size, the *Riyāż al-shuʿarāʾ* is characterized by a liberality in transmitting biographical anecdata about poets. The stories found in this anthology are often far from legitimate—though their usefulness with regard to reception history is a different question.

Vālih's discussion of Sām Mīrzā's biography can be divided into two parts, each consisting of a paragraph. First, we find effusive praise for the prince, with reference to his high status, support of the arts, generosity, intellect, eloquence, and other personal traits. Vālih notes that Sām Mīrzā authored an excellent work in his *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. (Here, for a change, the proper title is used.) He goes so far as to claim that no other *taẕkirah* compares to the *Tuḥfah*, and that seeing it was what inspired him to write the *Riyāż al-shuʿarāʾ*.[167] The second half of the biographical sketch addresses the issue of Sām Mīrzā's imprisonment and death. According to Vālih, the repeated defiance and rebellion of Alqāṣ Mīrzā caused Shah Ṭahmāsb to grow suspicious of his brothers and other Safavid princes generally, and so the king had all of them imprisoned (*har yak rā dar jāʾī ḥabs farmūdah*). Then, after Ṭahmāsb's death, Qizilbāsh *amīr*s freed Ismāʿīl Mīrzā and seated him on the throne, and the unfortunate new ruler

166. *Taẕkirah-i Riyāż al-shuʿarāʾ*, ed. Muḥsin Nājī Naṣrābādī (5 vols., Tehran, 1384 SH / 2005–6 CE), vol. 2, pp. 975–6.

167. Ibid., 975: *al-Ḥaqq kih bi-naẓar-i aḥqar hīch taẕkirah-ī bi-ān khūbī na-rasīdah. Rāqim-i ḥurūf rā az muṭālaʿah-i ān kitāb fayż-hā ḥāṣil shud, bal-kih bāʿiṡ-i taḥrīr-i īn kitāb dīdan-i ān taẕkirah ast.*

(*Ismāʿīl Mīrzā-yi bad-bakht*) killed off his remaining male relatives. Sām Mīrzā, we are told, perished in the same purge.

This is fascinating, despite its multiple inaccuracies. Alqāṣ Mīrzā was captured in 956/1549, and it was not until 969/1562 that Sām Mīrzā was sent to Qahqahah, after spending more than a decade in a respectable post in Ardabīl. His death, of course, took place in 975/1567, and it was at the order of Ṭahmāsb, not Ismāʿīl. Vālih has found a way—or inherited it from his sources—of smoothing out the problems of a complicated period in Safavid dynastic politics. In this narrative, the repressive actions of Shah Ṭahmāsb in the later part of his reign are cast as a reverberation of Alqāṣ Mīrzā's treachery. (There is, it should be acknowledged, probably some truth to the idea.) And *all* of the other killing of princes, rather than *most* of it, is attributed to Ismāʿīl II. As for Sām Mīrzā, he can be described in positive terms, and his passing lamented, with less controversy than might be engendered by the truth. Did Vālih concoct his own story, or is it borrowed from elsewhere? He claims at two points in this notice that the details of Sām Mīrzā's life are recorded in books of history (*sharḥ-i īn aḥvāl dar tavārīkh-i mufaṣṣal maẕkūr shudah*), but he does not name any of them. It would be worth pursuing this question further, perhaps by carrying out a closer study of historical texts from the late Safavid period. At minimum, the entry on Sām Mīrzā in the *Riyāż al-shuʿarāʾ* speaks to the ongoing relevance and high esteem of the *Tuḥfah*, two centuries after the fact. Vālih closes this discussion by quoting twelve lines of Sām's poetry, all of which belong to the selections given earlier by Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī.

Ultimately, the information that can be gleaned from descriptions of Sām Mīrzā in *taẕkirah*s may be disappointing, but we should not be surprised by this result. We noted earlier, in assessing narrative histories from the Ottoman, Mughal, and Uzbek realms, that it would be unreasonable to expect those

sources to pay much attention to Sām Mīrzā after 943/1537. Whatever happened to him in his adult years, it was not of immediate international relevance. It is similarly the case that Persian literary anthologies should not be considered the most promising sources for the biography of a Safavid prince. In fact, they are often maddeningly poor sources on the lives of the poets that they discuss. An anthologist will tend to introduce a figure with a smattering of conventional praise, and then offer a few biographical details (or not), after which the greater focus is on selections of verse. Readers ought to consider themselves lucky to find mention of a datum as basic as a year of death. (This aspect of the *taẕkirah* tradition is addressed at some length in the second half of the dissertation.) Why would Sām Mīrzā be an exception? It was with realistic hopes that I delved into these texts. The exercise was not completely fruitless.

The travel narrative of Michele Membré

One of the sources in which Sām Mīrzā's name occurs should be placed in a category of its own: the account by Michele Membré of his visit to the Safavid court in 946–7/1539–40. Before describing this work, however, it is worth noting that we have extant memoirs from a few foreigners who traveled through Iran during Sām Mīrzā's life. The most famous of these individuals is the English merchant Anthony Jenkinson, who spent the winter of 970/1562–3 in Qazvīn in an unsuccessful attempt to establish a trading relationship with the Safavids. By the time that Jenkinson entered Iran, Sām had been removed from Ardabīl and sent to Qahqahah, making it less likely that a naïve visitor would hear anything about him. Still, it was worth checking Jenkinson's narrative.[168] There is a point at which

168. See Richard Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques, and Discoveries of the English Nation* (3 vols., London, 1598–1600). I found a searchable version of this text through the Perseus Digital Library of Tufts University.

reference is made to Ismāʿīl Mīrzā, albeit not by name. Jenkinson says of Shah Ṭahmāsb, “His eldest sonne he keepeth captive in prison, for that he feareth him for his vialiantnesse and activitie.”[169] But, unsurprisingly, Sām Mīrzā makes no appearance.

Another interesting travel account from this period is the Turkic *Mirʾāt al-mamālik* of Sīdī ʿAlī Raʾīs, an Ottoman admiral who found himself marooned in India in the mid-1550s and was compelled to return to Anatolia overland.[170] He spent some time at the Mughal court, since the Ottomans were then at war with the Safavids, and it was not possible for Sīdī ʿAlī and his men to cross through Iran until after the conclusion of the Treaty of Amasya in 962/1555. Eventually, on his path westward, Sīdī ʿAlī encountered the prince Ibrāhīm Mīrzā (son of Bahrām Mīrzā) in Mashhad.[171] He also met Sulṭān Muḥammad Khudābandah and heard news of the recent trouble involving Ismāʿīl Mīrzā’s appointment to the governorship of Harāt and subsequent recall to Qazvīn. It is slightly disappointing that Sām Mīrzā, of all the princes, goes unmentioned in the *Mirʾāt al-mamālik*. This can perhaps be explained by the fact that Sīdī ʿAlī never ventured as far north as Ardabīl. The Ottoman group went from Qazvīn to Baghdād before continuing to Mawṣil, then Diyār Bakr, and so forth.

In any event, there are a few travel narratives that represented plausible sources for our purposes, but the one that yields new information is the *relazione* of Membré. It is a delightful little book, written originally in Italian and lately available in an English translation by A. H. Morton.[172] Membré

The relevant chapter for us is titled “A compendious and briefe declaration of the journey of M. Anth. Jenkinson, from the famous citie of London into the land of Persia, passing in this same journey thorow Russia, Moscovia, and Mare Caspium, alias Hircanum…”

169. Ibid.

170. This work was translated into English by Ármin Vámbéry, under the title *The Travels and Adventures of the Turkish Admiral Sidi Ali Reïs* (London, 1899).

171. In fact, Sīdī ʿAlī reports that he and his men were arrested and briefly imprisoned by Ibrāhīm Mīrzā, and that all of their papers were confiscated and sent ahead to Shah Ṭahmāsb.

172. Michele Membré, *Mission to the Lord Sophy of Persia* (*1539–1542*), tr. A. H. Morton (London, 1993). The introduction by

was a Cypriot (though apparently from a family with roots in Venice) who, as of the late 1530s, was working as a small-time merchant throughout the Mediterranean region. Due to his fluency in Turkic, and at least basic knowledge of Arabic, he was recruited by the governor of Cyprus to carry out a mission for the Venetian Republic. The doge wanted a letter delivered to Shah Ṭahmāsb, to explore the possibility of coöperation between Venice (and other European allies) and the Safavids, against the Ottomans. This idea should be familiar to any student of Iranian and Central Asian history of the late medieval or early modern period. There was, over the course of centuries, a persistent dream on the part of Christian European powers to gain leverage against their enemies in the Mediterranean by making common cause with a Muslim kingdom further to the east.[173] While this dream was never realized and may appear fanciful in hindsight, the potential was sufficiently enticing to the Venetians in the 1530s that they went to great lengths to recruit covert emissaries. Michele Membré was one of the suitable candidates that they found. He began the journey from Cyprus to Iran in March 1539 (Shawwāl 945).

Almost everything that Membré relates about his mission is fascinating. To avoid devoting an inordinate amount of space to the topic, however, we will restrict ourselves here to the most relevant details. After a complicated and dangerous passage through Ottoman lands—he traveled across much of Anatolia, realized that it would be impossible to reach the Iranian frontier directly, and at last took the Black Sea route to Georgia—Membré entered Safavid territory *ca*. August 1539 (Rabīʿ al-Awwal 946).[174] He declared his intentions to the captain of the border fortress, and a week later he was at

Morton is also informative.

173. The defeat of the Ottomans by the Timurids in 804/1402, including the capture of Sultan Bayezid I, was a key event that demonstrated the possible benefits to European powers of having a strong empire in Iran or Central Asia.

174. Membré, *Mission to the Lord Sophy*, 17*ff*.

Shah Ṭahmāsb's encampment near Marand. In the end, Membré would spend about a year as an honored guest of the king and the Qizilbāsh leaders that surrounded him. His level of access was unparalleled. He stayed at the houses of various high-ranking men and was treated almost as a member of the family. (It is significant that he traveled incognito, with just one or two servants rather than an ambassador's entourage, and that he was comfortable conversing with his hosts in Turkic. This was an atypical situation.) Membré's descriptions of the practices that he witnessed, and of some of the events that he attended, are of significant historical value. Perhaps most memorable is his account of taking part in a Qizilbāsh wedding. At one point, he reports, the leader of the celebration took a large wooden stick and used it to give "a most mighty blow on the behind" to each of the guests—Membré included.[175] Moving in the inner circles of Ṭahmāsb's court also meant socializing with the king's brothers, Bahrām and Sām. (Alqāṣ Mīrzā is mentioned, since he had recently been appointed to the governorship of Shirvān, but it seems that Membré did not meet him in person.) We will address the Venetian emissary's impressions of Sām Mīrzā momentarily. First, it is worth finishing the overall story of his visit.

After months of sporadic conversation with Shah Ṭahmāsb, who was vaguely interested in the proposed alliance, Membré was humiliated when news arrived that Venice was in the process of negotiating peace with the Ottomans. This took place around the beginning of summer, 947/1540. Membré needed to make a fairly quick exit from Iran.[176] (It seems clear, however, that Safavid officials meant him no harm on his departure. They could have easily imprisoned or killed him.) For the return

175. Ibid., 42–3.

176. Or perhaps it was not so hasty? The chronology is difficult to parse. Membré's description of events suggests that he left Ṭahmāsb's court as soon as it was practical to do so, in August or September of 1540. Does this mean that he stayed another two months after the fateful news came from Istanbul? See *Mission to the Lord Sophy*, 45–6.

trip to Europe, Membré took a different route. He went first to Hurmuz, where he was barely able to convince the Portuguese authorities to allow him passage by sea to India, thence to Europe. The latter leg of the journey, of course, involved sailing around the Cape of Good Hope. Membré recounts his horrifying experience on the ship from Cochin to Lisbon; at one point he was on the verge of dying from scurvy. But he reached Portugal, continued on to Venice, and delivered his report to the Council of Ten. Having impressed everyone with his courage and resourcefulness, Membré began a lucrative career as a diplomat, and he lived well into his eighties. It is no exaggeration to say that Membré's *relazione* is among the most captivating sources on the early years of the Safavid Empire.

Sām Mīrzā is mentioned in this text on three occasions. First, in Membré's description of the royal encampment, he notes that Bahrām Mīrzā and Sām Mīrzā are, by virtue of their high status, among those whose tents are closest to Shah Ṭahmāsb's.[177] This comes as no surprise, but it should be acknowledged that Membré's confirmation of Sām's living situation at this time is helpful. Our only other source that comments on the issue specifically, the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* of Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, reports that Sām Mīrzā was forced to stay in the encampment (*urdū-yi humāyūn*) between *ca*. 943/1537 and 956/1549.[178] Membré visited toward the beginning of that period. The second comment on Sām occurs in a description of the leisure activities of members of the ruling family.[179] Ṭahmāsb, we are told, does not take pleasure in hunting, but he likes to go into the mountains and catch small fish from their streams. Bahrām and Sām, by contrast, are avid falconers. Of the former, Membré writes, "Bahrām is a magnificent man who takes much enjoyment and is always making festival in his house."

---

177. Membré, *Mission to the Lord Sophy*, 20.
178. See *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, ed. Ishrāqī, vol. 1, p. 550.
179. Membré, *Mission to the Lord Sophy*, 25.

And then he offers the following comment: "The other brother too, Sām Mīrzā, only enjoys himself with his falcons; for the King does not give power to the said Sām Mīrzā; he only has the title, that they call him Emperor of Constantinople; and he has no beard. He is a young man of twenty eight years, stout and short."[180]

This more or less speaks for itself. We have a report, from a foreign visitor with no prior context, that Sām Mīrzā was indeed disfavored by Shah Ṭahmāsb in the years following his fall from grace in Khurāsān. Membré also provides, to my knowledge, the only surviving physical description of the prince. Finally, there is the point about Sām Mīrzā's mock title—which is explained further in the third passage that mentions him. While discussing the devotional practices of Safavid subjects in Tabrīz, whom he calls "Sophians," Membré describes the activities of men known as *tabarrāʾī*s.[181] This word, derived from the Arabic *tabarruʾ*, means "to declare one's innocence," or "to disclaim association with another." The latter sense is closer to the Persian usage, which apparently refers to an expression of abhorrence. According to Membré, it was the job of these *tabarrāʾī*s to shout curses against the first three caliphs and the Ottomans. This was done, for example, every time that the king entered or left his audience chamber. The *tabarrāʾī*s also performed songs about the plan of Shah Ṭahmāsb to lay siege to Constantinople and install his brother, Sām Mīrzā, as ruler of that land. Hence the peculiar title that Membré heard applied to the prince.

Based on our study of the other sources for Sām Mīrzā's biography, in particular the Safavid chronicles, the context of these "Emperor of Constantinople" anecdotes is immediately clear. They relate to the rumors, earlier in the 1530s, that Qizilbāsh defectors to the Ottoman side were plotting to

180. The age given by Membré is incorrect. Sām Mīrzā would have been in his early twenties.
181. Ibid., 52.

overthrow Ṭahmāsb and have him replaced with Sām as a puppet. As we discuss elsewhere, it is obvious that this scheming never progressed far; doubtful whether Sām Mīrzā and his minders, all the way in Khurāsān, were aware of it; and almost inconceivable that they were collaborating.[182] What mattered, however, was that Ṭahmāsb heard about the notional plot, and he was understandably upset. This was one of the factors behind Sām's marginalization from 943/1537. Membré adds an entirely new chapter to the story, by detailing some of the humiliation endured by the prince during the years that he was semi-confined to the royal encampment. It may be, of course, that Shah Ṭahmāsb hoped someday to defeat the Ottomans at their own capital; and in that distant scenario, *perhaps* he would grant authority to his younger half-brother. But the tone of referring to Sām as "Emperor of Constantinople" in 946–7/1539–40 is unmistakable.

Most of the works reviewed in the preceding pages have offered less insight into the life of Sām Mīrzā than one might hope. The opposite is true of Michele Membré's account. This is a reminder of the impact that can be made by just a few sentences in a single, well-placed source.

Conclusions

In sum, we have no new information about Sām's adult life from Ottoman narrative sources (though my feeling is that further investigation, including a search of archival documents, could turn up something); nothing from the Uzbek side; and just a couple of details from Mughal chronicles. As for the *taẕkirah* literature, the story is slightly better, but still dissatisfying. What ought to be the best anthological source on Sām Mīrzā, the *Khulāṣat al-ash'ār* of Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī, appears not to

182. This issue is discussed in the following chapter.

include an entry for him. The notices in the *Majmaʿ al-khavāṣṣ* and the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn* are vague enough that we must wonder whether the authors are showing discretion around a sensitive topic. Then again, it should be repeated that the greatest problem with *taẕkirah*s as biographical sources is not *paucity* of entries, but their lack of *data* (or their uninterest in what we would consider useful data). A fuller version of Sām Mīrzā's story is given in the *Riyāż al-shuʿarāʾ* of Vālih Dāghistānī, but it is a very late source and conflates a number of historical details. Surprisingly, after such frustration, we find a fresh, informative perspective on some of the events affecting Sām's life, in the travel narrative of a Venetian guest at the Safavid court.

The next chapter will be devoted to piecing together Sām Mīrzā's biography, collating all that we have gathered from the available sources. The overall structure will, of course, come from the Safavid chronicles, which have more to say about him than these other texts. With regard to the early part of Sām's life—his childhood and adolescence in Khurāsān—we will draw on the thorough synthesis of the sources already carried out by Martin Dickson. For the period after 943/1537, the frame will instead be provided by the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*. But it was methodologically important, and, in a few cases, beneficial to conduct this broader review of extant materials.

Chapter 2:

The Career of Sām Mīrzā and Its Implications

2.1: Piecing together the princely career of Sām Mīrzā

Introduction

Over the course of the previous chapter (in three sections), we have gradually come closer to examining Sām Mīrzā himself, from an initially wide perspective. First we established the broad context of early Safavid history, with particular attention to the reign of Shah Ṭahmāsb (930–84/1524–76) and the numerous challenges that needed to be overcome for the still-nascent polity to survive. This was important for our purposes because, among other things, the story of Sām Mīrzā *is* the story of the evolution of the Safavid movement from a loose confederation surrounding Shah Ismāʿīl and driven by his charisma (at times resembling a messianic cult), to a more permanent political entity that would need to assert its place among the "gunpowder empires." Sām Mīrzā's life was impacted, if not dictated, by many aspects of this process.

He was nominally governor of Harāt at a time, in the 1520s and '30s, when the Abū al-Khayrid Uzbeks mounted a series of campaigns into Safavid Khurāsān. Sām and the Qizilbāsh garrison that accompanied him were not always able to defend Harāt on their own. During the invasion of 935–6/1529, they were compelled to abandon the city, and while they were gone, one of Sām Mīrzā's early literary mentors, the famous poet Hilālī of Astarābād, was put to death by the occupying Uzbeks. The prince was still only an adolescent at this time. Later, in the mid 1530s, members of a Qizilbāsh faction that had defected to the Ottoman court suggested to Sultan Süleyman I (r. 926–74/1520–66) that Sām Mīrzā might be installed as a new Safavid ruler, in the event that Shah Ṭahmāsb could be overthrown. The latter was, understandably, perturbed when rumors of the conspiracy reached him. All this is to

say that Sām Mīrzā's experiences as a core member of the Safavid family were strongly influenced by the political climate, starting in his childhood. Even in subsequent decades, when he was kept under close supervision (if not in prison) and prevented from wielding military authority, Sām's living situation and the work that he was capable of carrying out changed according to the needs and priorities of the court. There is no other frame of analysis in which a productive study of Sām Mīrzā's princely career may be undertaken. (His literary legacy is a rather different matter, and the portion of the dissertation that focuses on the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* is governed by the perspective of the development of the "*taẕkirah* of poets" genre.)

At the same time, as we have already seen and will continue to explore in the sections that follow, Sām Mīrzā's story can contribute to our understanding of the period. Looking at the ways in which our prince was marginalized, and eventually imprisoned and executed, affords us a new perspective on the evolution of Safavid dynastic politics. It becomes difficult, at a certain point, not to view the later decades of Shah Ṭahmāsb's reign as a progression of increasingly harsh domestic policies aimed at monopolizing power in various arenas. By the early 1560s, Ṭahmāsb had a majority of his close male relatives confined at the prison fortress of Qahqahah. Five of them, including Sām Mīrzā and his two adolescent sons, were put to death in 975/1567 under murky circumstances. This was the first true purge in the Safavid dynasty, and, surprisingly, it has scarcely been addressed in scholarship on the period (with certain exceptions in Persian and German). Within the context of Safavid historiography, it is meaningful simply to recognize that Shah Ṭahmāsb ordered the killing of several male relatives, among them youths, because this belies the idea that there was anything unprecedented or singularly shocking about the violence carried out under Ismāʿīl II (r. 984–5/1576–7). In broader terms, we come

to appreciate that the Safavids by no means lagged behind, or needed to emulate, the Ottomans in the destructive trend of murdering rival princes outside of armed conflict. (The earliest such incident in the Ottoman context seems to have taken place upon the accession of Murad III in 982/1574.) This is just one of a few areas in which our overall narrative of early Safavid history may need to be revised as a consequence of investigating the career of Sām Mīrzā.

After establishing the main historical context behind Sām's life, we began to confront the practical challenges of assembling information about the prince. This is a difficult case, since it is affected both by general problems in the study of the Safavid era, and by the peculiar circumstances surrounding Sām Mīrzā—not least the way that he died. As any specialist on early modern Iran could attest, one of the defining contradictions of Safavid historiography is that we have no central administrative archive and a relative paucity of documentary sources, and yet there is a daunting number of chronicles and other narrative works, mostly written by authors close to the court. The limitations of sources in the second category, from their subjective or propagandistic standpoint to their tendency to focus on certain topics to the exclusion of most others, are well understood and need not be discussed here at length. The important point for our purposes is that a good part of the difficulty of reconstructing Sām Mīrzā's biography is a result of this general problem with the sources. One would find it frustrating to conduct an in-depth study of almost any figure in Safavid history, with the exception of kings and the most prominent members of their inner circles, and certain groups of artists and intellectuals whose legacies are preserved in their own textual traditions. It is probably best to think of what we *do* find covered in detail in the chronicles as the exception, rather than the inverse.

There are, however, particular factors that make the case of Sām Mīrzā more opaque than it ought to be, considering his undeniably high status as a son of Shah Ismāʿīl. For one, he seems not to have had a role in any of the Safavid military campaigns after the mid 1530s. If, for example, Sām had taken part in the war against the Ottomans that began in 960/1553, then court historians would have had more to say about his activities around that time. It is also worth noting, by way of comparison, that much of our understanding of Alqāṣ Mīrzā (d. 957/1550) and his rebellion against Shah Ṭahmāsb in the late 1540s is derived from Ottoman sources, since he traveled to Istanbul and petitioned Sultan Süleyman for assistance. Sām Mīrzā never left Safavid territory—with the debatable exception of a raid on Mughal-held Qandahār—and he did not develop a prominent enough profile throughout the region for his name to appear more than a few times in "outside sources."[1] Of course, as we have already seen, there was a more exceptional reason for Sām's story to be consigned to the margins: an apparent effort on the part of Shah Ṭahmāsb or his advisors to conceal the truth of the mass execution in 975/1567, leading most chroniclers of the period to avoid the subject altogether.

Faced with such a combination of general and specific challenges in the sources, we took the approach of gathering all of the texts that have something valuable to say about Sām Mīrzā—with a focus on his adult life—and explaining their contributions one at a time. This measure of care was necessary in order to bring together sufficient evidence to sustain a biographical study of the prince, as well as to avoid engaging in undue speculation surrounding his imprisonment and killing and the coverage of these events (or lack thereof) in the burgeoning Safavid historiographical tradition. It is

1. The account of Michele Membré, discussed earlier, is an exception. But Membré was an outsider who actually visited the Safavid court and happened to encounter Sām Mīrzā. When we examined historical texts from beyond the Safavid realm, we found very little, other than mention of Sām in connection to the conflicts of the 1520s and '30s.

always perilous to develop arguments that are based, even in part, on what is *not* found in the sources. In this instance, hopefully, we have just enough surviving material at our disposal to support the idea of something more than benign silence.

The time has come for us to assemble Sām Mīrzā's biography in a unified format. Before we begin, though, it may help to discuss a few points of methodology.

Preliminary notes

First, for reasons that should be clear, the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* will be used as the fundamental account of Sām Mīrzā's life.[2] It is the only source that contains effectively the whole story, and none of the information that it provides is contradicted by what other chronicles have to say about our prince—with the exception of the circumstances surrounding his death. Of course, different research projects will, given their own corpora of sources, demand different approaches. If we were looking at a set of Safavid chronicles that contained roughly equal amounts of material on a given subject, then we might stitch them together as a mosaic, assigning comparable weight to each source. In the case of Sām Mīrzā, however, the available evidence is clearly dominated by Qāżī Aḥmad's account, in particular by the detailed "obituary" that he includes upon telling the story of the prince's death. Thus we let the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* provide the frame of Sām Mīrzā's biography, while other sources enter at various points to add detail and depth, and to allow us to sharpen our interpretation of events. The *Tārīkh-i Ḥayātī* and the *Afżal al-tavārīkh*, for example, corroborate the appointment of Sām Mīrzā to Ardabīl in 956/1549. The *Takmilat al-akhbār* confirms that his death took place in 975/1567, and that

2. As in the previous chapter, I use Iḥsān Ishrāqī's edition, published by the University of Tehran, in two volumes with continuous pagination. All citations refer to this edition.

Ṭahmāsb's "official story" of the event was that his younger brother perished in an earthquake. The *Javāhir al-akhbār* emphasizes that Sām was murdered, and names the assassin (again matching Qāżī Aḥmad's account). And so on.

In case it might offer a better sense of how the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* functions as a source, and how I am working with it, I include here two appendices: a table of all of the mentions of Sām Mīrzā in the chronicle; and another table listing each point in the text at which Qāżī Aḥmad indicates the beginning of a new year (and annal), from the beginning of the reign of Ṭahmāsb until the end of the work. It is remarkable that Qāżī Aḥmad usually provides the regnal year, the animal-cycle year, the full Islamic date on which that year began—*i.e.*, the date of Nawrūz—and the relevant day of the week. In most cases, converting this date to Julian or Gregorian yields a matching, appropriate result, allowing for a one-day margin of error. (Please note that the question of date conversion is treated differently in this table from our general practice in the dissertation. A handful of Qāżī Aḥmad's annals are for years after the Gregorian calendar reform first went into effect in October 1582. To avoid the inconsistency of a sudden shift in converted Nawrūz dates, the Julian calendar is used throughout the table. Again, as has been explained above, our usual approach is to switch to Gregorian conversion after 990/1582.)

Second, we will refrain from comparing all of the accounts of Sām Mīrzā's early years in Harāt. The differences among the chronicles with regard to his role at that time are minor, if not cosmetic, largely because they all seem to draw on the firsthand narrative of Amīr Maḥmūd. We also have at our disposal Martin Dickson's dissertation, which methodically collates the available information on the Safavid-Uzbek "duel for Khurāsān." I have yet to find anything in the sources that adds meaningfully to Dickson's portrayal of Sām Mīrzā's (nominal) governorship of Harāt. There are points at which I take

issue with his interpretation, but the basic facts—as best they can be determined—appear sound. And so, for the time being at least, we may opt for a more straightforward presentation of Sām Mīrzā's early life, based jointly on the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* and Dickson.

Third, and finally, this is an overview of Sām's biography from a *political* or *dynastic* standpoint, sourced largely from historical chronicles. There are other points in the dissertation that examine his *literary* legacy, as the author of an influential *taẕkirah* and, to an extent, as a poet in his own right. (We have seen that a small amount of Sām Mīrzā's verse has survived, through the notices on him that are given in later anthologies.) Of course, a full account of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, to which a separate chapter is devoted, will afford us new a new angle on our prince's character. But it should be reiterated that later *taẕkirah* authors do not discuss Sām Mīrzā's biography in detail, and nowhere in the *Tuḥfah* are there significant revelations about the way that he led his life. Evaluating sources on the literary side is worthwhile, but we will not lose much here by setting them aside.

Biographical narrative

Sām Mīrzā was born on 21 Shaʿbān 923 (8 Sept. 1517), apparently somewhere in Persian ʿIrāq.[3] His mother was one of Shah Ismāʿīl's harem women. Andrew Newman refers to her as Georgian,[4] but without citing a source directly; and I have not been able to locate this detail in the texts that I have consulted. It seems clear, in any case, that Sām's mother was not one of Ismāʿīl's legitimate wives, nor was she a member of the Qizilbāsh tribal system. This is in contrast to Ṭahmāsb (b. 22 Feb. 1514) and

3. The birthplace is mentioned in Ḥayātī Tabrīzī, *Chronicle of the Early Safavids*, ed. Ghereghlou, 120. Ḥayāti also cites a chronogram for the year 923: *kawkab-i burj-i shahanshahī* ("star of the constellation of kingship").
4. *Safavid Iran: Rebirth of a Persian Empire* (London: I.B.Tauris, 2006), 21.

Bahrām (b. 15 Sept. 1517), both of whom were borne by Ismāʿīl's favorite wife, Tājlū Khānum of the Mawṣillū. And there was a fourth brother, Alqāṣ Mīrzā (b. 15 Mar. 1516). Fażlī Beg Khūzānī, author of the *Afżal al-tavārīkh*, is emphatic that Sām and Alqāṣ were uterine brothers; he cites this as one of the reasons that Sām was nervous about his own situation after Alqāṣ' rebellion.[5] If this was indeed the case, then it suggests an interesting dynamic, whereby Ṭahmāsb and Bahrām were full brothers at higher status than the analogous pair of Alqāṣ and Sām. This could be a factor in our interpretation of subsequent events. In the end, Bahrām (d. 19 Ramaḍān 956 / 11 Oct. 1549) was the only brother of Ṭahmāsb who managed to remain in the king's good graces through the end of his life. Even Bahrām's son, Ibrāhīm Mīrzā, was able to avoid conflict with the central court and to retain his governorship of Mashhad for an unusually long tenure.[6]

For the sake of clarity, and since I have yet to see these details collected in one place, the birth order of Shah Ismāʿīl's four surviving sons is as follows: Ṭahmāsb (26 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 919 / 22 Feb. 1514); Alqāṣ (10 Ṣafar 922 / 15 Mar. 1516); Sām (21 Shaʿbān 923 / 8 Sept. 1517); Bahrām (28 Shaʿbān 923 / 15 Sept. 1517). And their death order: Bahrām (19 Ramaḍān 956 / 11 Oct. 1549); Alqāṣ (21 Rabīʿ al-Awwal 957 / 9 Apr. 1550); Sām (Jumādá al-Ākhirah 975 / Dec. 1567); Ṭahmāsb (15 Ṣafar 984 / 14 May 1576).[7] The direct male line of Alqāṣ, perhaps along with that of Sām, was extinguished in the events at Qahqahah in 975/1567. The *Akbarnāmah* mentions the death of a certain Mīr ʿĀrif Ardabīlī, allegedly a

5. See fol. 140b in the British Library MS of the second volume. Fażlī states in the main column of text that Sām and Alqāṣ were of one mother (*az yak mādar būdand*), then he adds a marginal comment to the same effect.
6. For more on Bahrām Mīrzā and his descendants, see Liesbeth Geevers, "Safavid Cousins on the Verge of Extinction: Dynastic Centralization in Central Asia and the Bahrāmī Collateral Line (1517–1593)," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 58 (2015): 293–326.
7. Apart from the dates for Sām Mīrzā, all of this information may be found (among other places) in the *Encyclopædia Iranica* entries on Ismāʿīl I, Ṭahmāsb I, and Alqāṣ Mīrzā. Khwāndamīr's *Ḥabīb al-siyar* is probably the most important source on the births of Shah Ismāʿīl's children.

son of Sām Mīrzā, in India in 1007/1599; but I have found nothing about him in the Safavid sources. According to the *Tārīkh-i ʿAbbāsī* of Jalāl Munajjim, Sām Mīrzā had a daughter who survived and was later given in marriage to a minor Georgian official.[8] (If Alqāṣ had any daughters who were active after his death, then I have not seen reference to them.)[9] The line of Ṭahmāsb, of course, continued as the main branch of the Safavid dynasty. As for the descendants of Bahrām Mīrzā, their story is perhaps most remarkable of all: the male line survived in India until the early twelfth/eighteenth century.[10]

Sām Mīrzā's political career began around his fourth (lunar) birthday, in the summer of 927/1521, when he and his Qizilbāsh guardian (*lalah*), Dūrmīsh Khān Shāmlū, were appointed to the governorship of Harāt.[11] In particular, they were sent to recall Amīr Khān Mawṣillū, who had been serving as Ṭahmāsb's guardian in the same post since 922/1516. Ṭahmāsb was taken back to court, Amīr Khān was demoted, and "Dīv Sulṭān" Rūmlū was named *lalah* of the crown prince. Meanwhile, Sām Mīrzā and Dūrmīsh Khān would hold Harāt. There were worrisome Uzbek raids in Khurāsān in the early 1520s, but we have no record of Sām's involvement in such affairs; he was, after all, little more than a toddler.

In the spring of 930/1524, when Ismāʿīl died and the young Ṭahmāsb acceded to the throne, court officials apparently saw no need to alter the *status quo* in Harāt. Dūrmīsh Khān and Sām Mīrzā were confirmed in their existing positions. They were able to fend off an Uzbek invasion the following year, with Dūrmīsh Khān having put serious effort into the fortification of the city.[12] Unfortunately, at some

---

8. *Tārīkh-i ʿAbbāsī*, ed. Vaḥīdniyā, 43.
9. Such details may be addressed somewhere in Walter Posch, *Osmanisch-safavidische Beziehungen 1545–1550: Der Fall Alḳâs Mîrzâ* (2 vols., Vienna, 2013).
10. The fate of this part of the family is beyond the scope of the current study. It is covered in detail in Geevers, "Safavid Cousins on the Verge of Extinction."
11. *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, vol. 1, p. 148.
12. Per Dickson, this was the first of five Uzbek invasions of Khurāsān between 930/1524 and 946/1540.

point in 932/1526, Dūrmīsh died of natural causes, and his brother, Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū, became Sām Mīrzā's new guardian.[13] This change in power may, in hindsight, be considered the beginning of the end for the prince's political career. The basic problem is that Sām was becoming tightly affiliated with the Shāmlū tribe—and it should be remembered that he, still not ten years old, was being used by them, rather than the inverse. Why allow Dūrmīsh Khān's position to devolve to his own brother? Why not take the occasion of one *lalah*'s death or removal from office as an opportunity to appoint a replacement from a different faction, as Ismāʿīl had done when transferring the guardianship of Ṭahmāsb from Amīr Khān Mawṣillū to Dīv Sulṭān Rūmlū? Why, for that matter, was Sām Mīrzā left as titular governor of Harāt for so long, rather than being shifted to a different province or brought back to the center? Would such moves not have been safer, politically, than allowing the Shāmlū to make a pawn of one of Shah Ismāʿīl's sons in the east?

The answer is fairly clear: Ṭahmāsb himself was still just an adolescent, exerting a limited degree of direct authority (to put it mildly), and dealing with a chaotic political situation among the Qizilbāsh constituencies as they vied for power. All of this is a major focus of Dickson's study. In his words, it would take until the mid 1530s for Shah Ṭahmāsb, by then around twenty years old, to be able to pursue "a united and genuinely 'national' (*i.e.*, Safavid-Qizilbāsh) policy."[14] What Dickson does not consider is the price that Sām Mīrzā paid for the tumultuous first decade of his brother's reign, when the king was too weak to keep the Qizilbāsh factions in check and somewhat balanced against one another. During the crucial years of his youth, Sām was in Khurāsān—the Safavids' eastern frontier, and about as far as possible from the capital at Tabrīz—being tied progressively closer to the Shāmlū.

---

13. *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, vol. 1, p. 163.
14. Dickson, "Sháh Ṭahmásb and the Úzbeks," 295.

Notably, at some point in the late 1520s or early 1530s, Sām Mīrzā was married to a daughter of Ḥusayn Khān.[15] The damage, though it would not become apparent until a few years later, was done.

Before we proceed any further, it might be useful to summarize the repeated shifts in power that characterized the first few years of Ṭahmāsb's reign. At the time of his accession, the most powerful figure in the realm was Dīv Sulṭān Rūmlū, who had been his *lalah* since 927/1521. The latter attempted to stabilize power through an informal triumvirate consisting of himself, Köpek Sulṭān Ustājlū (who controlled Tabrīz), and Chūhah Sulṭān Takkalū (who held Iṣfahān and Hamadān). This did not persist for long. By the end of 1527 (early 934), both Dīv Sulṭān and Köpek Sulṭān were dead, and the Takkalū were the dominant faction at court—a status that they would maintain until 937/1531.[16] Meanwhile, through the end of the 1520s, Harāt was held by a Shāmlū garrison with young Sām Mīrzā in tow.

One of the high points of Sām's career came in September 1528 (Muḥarram 935), when he and Alqāṣ Mīrzā took part in the Battle of Jām.[17] This was the key event in the Safavid effort to fend off the second (per Dickson) Uzbek invasion of Khurāsān. It was also the first occasion on which Ṭahmāsb led an army in battle, in the end a resounding success that chroniclers of the period take care to celebrate. Following the Safavid victory, Sām Mīrzā was again confirmed as governor of Harāt, still with Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū as his *lalah*. Alas, the next year would bring the first serious *low* point of his princely career. After the Battle of Jām, Ṭahmāsb and his army were not able to remain in Khurāsān to ensure that Uzbek ambitions in the area were thoroughly checked. Instead, the king was compelled to return west, all the way to Baghdad on the opposite frontier, in order to subdue a Mawṣillū warlord who had

15. *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, vol. 1, p. 240.
16. See ch. 2 of Newman, *Safavid Iran*.
17. *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, vol. 1, p. 184; Dickson, "Sháh Ṭahmásb and the Úzbeks," 127*ff*.

seized control of the city and rejected Safavid suzerainty.[18] (There were at least rumors that this individual, Ẕū al-Faqār Mawṣillū, had espoused Sunni Islam and was prepared to become an Ottoman vassal.) Ṭahmāsb managed to retake Baghdad in the spring of 935/1529, but in the mean time, the Uzbeks had an opportunity to launch another attempt on Harāt. On this occasion they were successful in besieging the city. Sām Mīrzā and Ḥusayn Khān could do no more than negotiate their own safe passage out of Harāt, surrendering it to the Uzbeks under ʿUbayd Allāh Khān (d. 946/1540) in early autumn of that year.

This is where matters turned strange and worrisome for Sām Mīrzā and the Shāmlū tribe in which he was entrenched. Ḥusayn Khān, having taken his troops and the prince out of Harāt, did not return directly to court; rather, he led his men around Sīstān (near the border with Mughal territory in the southeast) for *a year and a half*, raiding various fortresses under the flimsy pretext of restoring Safavid control in that area.[19] Dickson infers that the wandering of the so-called "Shāmlū fugitives from Khurāsān" was due to mutual animosity between Ḥusayn Khān and Chūhah Sulṭān Takkalū, at that time the most powerful advisor to Shah Ṭahmāsb.[20] Apparently Ḥusayn Khān suspected that Chūhah Sulṭān would exploit the problems in Khurāsān to engineer the downfall of his faction, and so he, with custody of Sām, delayed his return to court as long as he could manage.

In the event, Ṭahmāsb and his army allowed the Uzbeks to hold Harāt for most of a year. Safavid forces returned east in the summer of 1530 (late 936 into early 937) and, as usual, retook the city in

---

18. This pattern of racing back and forth, east to west and *vice versa*, was a defining feature of the early years of the reign of Shah Ṭahmāsb. The Safavids faced continual threats from the Uzbeks and the Ottomans, not to mention refractory Qizilbāsh warlords; and, apparently, the king had only one large army to address one serious problem at a time.
19. *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, vol. 1, p. 192.
20. Dickson, "Sháh Ṭahmásb and the Úzbeks," 195*f.*

short order.[21] This time, with Sām Mīrzā and the Shāmlū still wandering and pillaging in the south, a new governor of Harāt needed to be appointed. Bahrām Mīrzā, the youngest of Shah Ismāʿīl's sons, was chosen for the position, with Ghāzī Khān Takkalū (of the same tribe as Chūhah Sulṭān) as his guardian. As for Ḥusayn Khān, he was finally persuaded to return to court in the spring of 937/1531. He and his men joined the royal summer encampment (*yaylāq*) near Iṣfahān. In mid June, tensions between the Shāmlū and the Takkalū finally boiled over, with the former group attacking the latter. Chūhah Sulṭān was killed in the fracas, and although Ḥusayn Khān and the Shāmlū were temporarily forced to flee in the direction of Shīrāz, leaders of other Qizilbāsh tribes sensed an opportunity to change the political balance. They banded together and undertook a general massacre of the Takkalū. Shortly thereafter, the Shāmlū were invited back to court, and Ḥusayn Khān became Shah Ṭahmāsb's most powerful *amīr*. These events are referred to collectively as the "Takkalū disaster" (*āfat-i Takkalū*), which also serves as a chronogram for the year 937/1531.[22]

For Sām Mīrzā, the spectacular rise of his father-in-law Ḥusayn Khān meant that he would eventually be reappointed, albeit briefly, to the governorship of Harāt. This would take place some time between the end of 1533 and mid 1534 (940 AH); a more precise date cannot be determined. In the meantime, however, the Safavids were encountering one threat after another, from so many directions that it is nearly impossible to keep track of the evolving situation from the fall of 938/1531 through the spring of 943/1537. This is where Dickson's book becomes difficult to follow. (In his defense, the real problem is that the chronicles themselves are far from clear.) For the time being, the best that we can piece together is a chronology of the most important events that took place during

21. See Dickson, "Sháh Ṭahmásb and the Úzbeks," ch. 3, pt. 2.
22. *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, vol. 1, pp. 213–14; Dickson, "Sháh Ṭahmásb and the Úzbeks," 197*ff*.

those years. Most of the information is provided by Dickson, but never in one place, and collating it is a challenge. No other scholarly overview of early Safavid history even makes a serious attempt to address the complexity of the situation in the early 1530s. (In the following section, dates are given in the Julian calendar alone, to avoid worsening the confusion.)

Second half of 1531: Ūlāmah Sulṭan Takkalū, governor of Āẕarbāyjān, goes to Istanbul and defects to the Ottomans in the wake of the "Takkalū disaster." He is given an army by Sultan Süleyman (r. 926–74/1520–66) in order to besiege Safavid-held Bitlis in eastern Anatolia.

Late 1531: Ṭahmāsb, wary of a possible Ottoman invasion, makes his winter encampment (*qishlāq*) at Tabrīz.

Spring 1532: The Uzbeks seize the opportunity for yet another siege of Harāt, leading to an occupation of all of Safavid Khurāsān. This invasion will last about a year and a half, before ʿUbayd Khān finally gives up in the fall of 1533, due to both the advance of the Safavid army and political difficulties back in Transoxiana.

Spring 1532: Meanwhile, the Safavids make the western frontier their priority for the time being, and they push toward Bitlis. Ūlāmah Sulṭān abandons his siege and returns to Istanbul. Ṭahmāsb and his army, however, stay in the west. They decide to wait for a full Ottoman invasion before addressing the Uzbek threat in Khurāsān.

Summer 1533: Finally the decision is made to drive out the Uzbeks. Alqāṣ Mīrzā and his guardian, Badr Khān Ustājlū, are sent with an advance force to Astarābād, while the main army gradually works its way east.

Fall 1533: As has been mentioned above, ʿUbayd Khān abandons his long siege of Harāt, and his armies withdraw to Transoxiana, at least in part to deal with political issues at home.

Spring into summer, 1534: Having reoccupied Harāt, the Safavid army is set to take the fight to the Uzbeks and crush them once and for all. These plans are cut short when news arrives of a full-scale Ottoman invasion in the west. Tabrīz is lost in July 1534. Ṭahmāsb obviously needs to leave Khurāsān to face this problem. At some point before his departure, he reappoints Sām Mīrzā as governor of Harāt, under the guardianship of Aghzīvār Khān Shāmlū.

Summer into fall, 1534: As best we can tell, several important events transpire while Ṭahmāsb is headed westward. There is an attempt to poison him, which is blamed on Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū. The latter is soon executed, marking the full emergence of Ṭahmāsb's authority.[23] From this point forward, there will be far less brinksmanship among Qizilbāsh factions trying to gain control over royal policy. Finally, around the same time—and perhaps while the king has stopped in Mashhad for a brief visit—he announces his first "repentance" or "reconsecration" (*tawbah*).[24]

Late 1534: The Safavid army, though weakened, is able to oppose the invading Ottomans effectively through scorched-earth and guerrilla tactics. Süleyman is driven out of northwestern Iran and eastern Anatolia. Instead he takes Baghdad—permanently, as it turns out—and settles there for the winter of 1534–5.

February 1535: Aghzīvār Khān and Sām Mīrzā receive news of Ḥusayn Khān's execution. Fearing for their own situation, they take their men, abandon Harāt, and head south for an unauthorized, ill-fated

23. Much published scholarship incorrectly cites the year 1533 for Ḥusayn Khān's execution. It took place some time in late 1534, *i.e.*, early to mid 941 AH.
24. On the issue of Ṭahmāsb's repentances, see Newman, *Safavid Iran*, 31–2. He cites a number of primary and secondary sources on the topic in note 40 on p. 168.

campaign on Mughal-held Qandahār. (No one has offered a convincing theory as to why the Shāmlū pursued this course of action, or what endgame they could possibly have had in mind.)

***Circa* early 1535:** Ghāzī Khān Takkalū—the former guardian of Bahrām Mīrzā during his governorship of Harāt, and a recent defector to the Ottomans in Baghdad—convinces Süleyman to accept Sām Mīrzā as the replacement Safavid king, in the event of Ṭahmāsb's overthrow. None of this ever comes close to fruition, and it is not clear that Sām Mīrzā, far to the east, is aware that such "negotiations" are taking place. (How could he defect to the Ottomans from across the country? How could any of these plans be carried out?) The rumors and threats, however, are enough to trouble Shah Ṭahmāsb, if his memoirs are to be believed.[25]

Late 1535: Several months after Harāt was left mostly defenseless by the Shāmlū, the Uzbeks begin a new invasion of Khurāsān, starting with a winter siege of Mashhad.

Early 1536: The siege of Qandahār fails, with Aghzīvār Khān killed in battle against the Mughals. Sām Mīrzā has several other Shāmlū conspirators executed, and he sends their heads to Ṭahmāsb with an apology. The prince is officially pardoned; for the time being, he travels to Ṭabas and lies low.

Summer 1536: The Safavid army begins marching east to liberate Khurāsān once again. This is a gradual campaign, and, as Dickson explains, the newly authoritative Shah Ṭahmāsb is simultaneously consolidating his domestic affairs.[26]

January 1537: With the Safavids approaching, ʿUbayd Khān abandons Harāt for the last time.

25. The relevant passage is quoted in Dickson, "Sháh Ṭahmásb and the Úzbeks," 282–5.
26. Ibid., ch. 6, pt. 2.

Early 1537: Sām Mīrzā returns remorsefully to the itinerant court. His political career is effectively over. Sulṭān Muḥammad Mīrzā (b. 1532), the eldest son of Ṭahmāsb, is made governor of Harāt—a position that he will hold for a long period—initially with a Takkalū *lalah*.

Spring 1537: Apparently for good measure, and to avenge the frustrations of his younger brother, Ṭahmāsb himself marches on Qandahār and easily takes the city from the Mughals.[27]

To summarize, the following are the key developments of these years: the rise to full authority of Shah Ṭahmāsb; the execution of Ḥusayn Khān and downfall of the Shāmlū, with Sām Mīrzā tied to them; the successful fending-off of a major Ottoman invasion, albeit with Baghdad lost; and the decisive expulsion from Khurāsān of the Uzbeks under ʿUbayd Khān. In the first half of the 1530s, the Safavid project seemingly came closer to falling apart than at any other point before the twilight of the dynasty. (The 1580s were another low point, but not, I would argue, as existentially threatening.) If the Ottomans and Uzbeks had managed to coördinate their efforts, then Ṭahmāsb and his confederation probably would have lost everything. As it happened, however, the king exited this tumultuous period in a position of strength. The Ottomans would not pose a threat again until the late 1540s (with the defection of Alqāṣ Mīrzā), and the Uzbeks would next cause difficulties in Khurāsān in the 1580s and ’90s, under ʿAbd Allāh Khān (d. 1006/1598).

We know that Sām Mīrzā’s career was irreparably damaged by the time that he returned to his brother’s court in 943/1537, but what was his actual role in the preceding events? Was he involved in the decision to leave Harāt and attack Qandahār in 941/1535? We cannot tell one way or the other—

---

27. *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, vol. 1, p. 270.

although the anonymous author of the *Tārīkh-i Qizilbāshān* summarizes the event in a way that suggests that Aghzīvār Khān was firmly in charge.[28] Would Sām Mīrzā have aligned himself with the Ottoman Süleyman in order to topple Shah Ṭahmāsb? Did he even know that Ghāzī Khān Takkalū, in Baghdad, was (vaguely) advocating such a course of action? Again, we will never know. Dickson, in surveying the almost inconceivable array of challenges to Ṭahmāsb's rule in the 1530s, saw evidence of a "Grand Sedition" whereby the Shāmlū and Takkalū—who, we should remember, were sworn enemies as of 937/1531—were engaged in a conspiracy with the Ottomans, and possibly even with the Uzbeks, to place Sām Mīrzā on the throne.[29]

I have never found the evidence sufficient to support such a theory. In any event, it hardly matters what we imagine about the motivations of these factions, for three reasons. First, they were all defeated or repelled by Shah Ṭahmāsb (though only in a qualified sense in the case of the Ottomans). Second, the king was left sufficiently suspicious of Sām Mīrzā that he would never again allow him to hold a position of real power. Third, Sām had been set up to fail from a very young age. He was in, or near, Khurāsān from the age of four (in 927/1521) until twenty (in 943/1537),[30] except from perhaps mid 1531 to late 1533. During this time, he was under the sole influence of part of the Shāmlū tribe, while different Qizilbāsh leaders struggled for a kind of influence over the king which, ideally speaking, none of them should have held. Ṭahmāsb was finally able to put these problems behind him, but Sām Mīrzā would always be associated with perfidious members of the Shāmlū. (As was noted above, he had also been joined to Ḥusayn Khān's family through marriage.) Neither Alqāṣ nor Bahrām

28. *Tārīkh-i Qizilbāshān*, ed. Muḥaddiṣ, 10.
29. See ch. 5, pt. 2.
30. Those are his ages in lunar years. His solar ages at the same points were three and nineteen, respectively.

shared Sām's difficult position. Those two brothers had spent the first decade of Ṭahmāsb's reign shifting from one governorship to the next, and accompanying the army on various campaigns, under different *lalah*s. They had a clean slate in 943/1537, while Sām Mīrzā could not.

What happened next? We have little idea. In all of the Safavid sources on this period, I have found not a single specific reference to anything involving Sām Mīrzā between 943/1537 and 951/1544–5.[31] Only Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī provides even a general idea about this period in the prince's life. According to the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, Sām Mīrzā was compelled to serve in the imperial army camp (*urdū-yi humāyūn*) under the guard of a thirty-person military retainer that included members of all of the Qizilbāsh tribes (*jamīʿ-i ūymāqāt*).[32] The next point at which his name appears, albeit perfunctorily, is in the list of dignitaries who took part in welcoming the Mughal Humāyūn to Iran in 951/1544–5.[33] Sām Mīrzā and Bahrām Mīrzā were part of a group that was sent to meet Humāyūn and his entourage when they were still a league or two from Ṭahmāsb's encampment, and then to escort the visitors to the king. As was summarized earlier in the section on sources, this encounter between Humāyūn and Ṭahmāsb was a success: the Mughal was given military support with which to begin reconquering his territories, and Qandahār was ceded to the Safavids for the foreseeable future. The impression about Sām Mīrzā's role in this affair is that he could still act as a dignitary, at least when it was convenient, given that he was living semi-permanently in the army encampment.

There are gaps in the remainder of Sām Mīrzā's biography, but none quite as long as the near-lacuna from 943/1537 to 951/1544–5. This is because he began to reassert himself, if only to a limited

---

31. The travel narrative of Michele Membré, however, confirms that Sām Mīrzā was living in the imperial encampment during these years, and that he did not enjoy the favor of Shah Ṭahmāsb. See the discussion of this source in the previous section.
32. *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, vol. 1, p. 550.
33. *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, vol. 1, pp. 307–08; Amīr Maḥmūd, ed. Ṭabāṭabā'ī, 390; *Aḥsan al-tavārīkh*, tr. Seddon, 140.

degree, beginning in the late 1540s. Those years brought the first major challenge to Shah Ṭahmāsb's rule since the mid 1530s: the Ottoman-sponsored rebellion of Alqāṣ Mīrzā. A full account of this revolt and the brief Ottoman invasion associated with it would require considerable space and take us far afield. But the basic chronology is as follows. In 953/1546, for reasons that are difficult to determine, Alqāṣ Mīrzā decided that he was no longer willing to do Ṭahmāsb's bidding. The king had ordered him to hold Darband (on the western shore of the Caspian Sea), and while there, Alqāṣ had coins minted and the Friday sermon (*khuṭbah*) read in his own name. This being clearly unacceptable, Ṭahmāsb led an army to the area. The Safavids reëstablished control over Darband by the spring of 954/1547, and Alqāṣ fled into Ottoman territory, eventually making his way to Istanbul. There he told Sultan Süleyman that he would like to conquer Iran as an Ottoman client, and he promised that there would be a groundswell of local support for his takeover.

In the following campaign season of 955/1548, Süleyman and his army joined Alqāṣ for an invasion of Safavid lands—their first since 941/1534–5. Again they were able to take Tabrīz in short order, but Ṭahmāsb employed his usual scorched-earth tactics, and the Ottomans were forced to withdraw to eastern Anatolia. Alqāṣ managed to convince Süleyman to grant him a small army, which he used to mount another invasion of Iran later in 955/1548, this time starting from Baghdad. While he succeeded in plundering a few cities—Hamadān, Qum, Kāshān—it was clear that his plan to topple his brother was gaining little momentum, and the troops that had been levied for him in Baghdad deserted him at the beginning of 1549. By this point, Ottoman officials wanted nothing more to do with Alqāṣ, and what remained was for his return to the Safavid court to be negotiated. This took most of the year. He finally surrendered in October 1549 (Ramaḍān 956) to forces led by Bahrām

Mīrzā. Later that month, Alqāṣ was sent to the prison fortress of Qahqahah, where he was killed under hazy circumstances in April 1550 (Rabīʿ al-Awwal 957).[34] (None of the sources expresses surprise or indignation at Alqāṣ' death. If anything, it seems remarkable that he survived so long.)

This series of events was apparently upsetting to Sām Mīrzā. The *Afżal al-tavārīkh* emphasizes that he and Alqāṣ were uterine brothers, and so he grew more worried than ever about his status within the Safavid house. Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī is less specific on this issue. According to him, Sām Mīrzā simply told Shah Ṭahmāsb that he could not live in purgatory any longer, as he had done since 943/1537.[35] Whatever the exact reasons may have been, Sām was finally allowed by Ṭahmāsb to settle in Ardabīl, and he was granted (at least nominally) the governorship of the city and custodianship of the Safavid family shrine therein. This took place some time in 956/1549.[36] Notably, Qāżī Aḥmad reports that it was during the beginning of his tenure in Ardabīl that Sām Mīrzā authored the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. This fits with the textual evidence in the *tażkirah*, which suggests a completion date of 957/1550 or not long thereafter.[37] We do not know precisely how or when Sām Mīrzā began compiling the information on contemporary poets that would be recorded in his *Tuḥfah*, but the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* claims that the prince was often visited at his home in Ardabīl by scholars and literati.[38] These were evidently the most productive and stable years of his life. He was in his mid thirties.

---

34. Further details on the Alqāṣ Mīrzā affair are given in Fleischer's *Encyclopædia Iranica* entry on the prince; J. R. Walsh, "The Revolt of Alqās Mīrzā," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 68 (1976): 61–78; and Walter Posch's relatively recent book, *Osmanisch-safavidische Beziehungen 1545–1550* (cited above).
35. *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, vol. 1, p. 550.
36. As has been discussed above, if the appointment of Sām Mīrzā to Ardabīl took place in both 956 AH and the year of the monkey (*pīchīn yıl*), then it must have been *early* 956/1549. We are fortunate to have the account of Ḥayātī Tabrīzī, who confirms that Sām Mīrzā held the custodianship of the shrine at this time and praises his work as a patron. See *Chronicle of the Early Safavids*, ed. Ghereghlou, 88, 90.
37. This evidence is discussed in the first section of Chapter 3.
38. *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, vol. 1, p. 551.

The following decade (*i.e.*, the 1550s) was an eventful time for Safavid Iran and for Ṭahmāsb's reign, though not as much for Sām Mīrzā. He seems not to have been involved in any of the major developments that one would cite from those years. The Ottomans invaded again in 960/1553; this time they were able to force the Safavids to sign a treaty acknowledging certain territorial losses. The Peace of Amasya (962/1555) was a bitter pill for Ṭahmāsb to swallow, but the positive side was that he would have no more serious conflict with the Ottomans for the remaining twenty-one years of his reign. He made use of this respite to focus on various aspects of domestic policy. Some time in the wake of Amasya, Ṭahmāsb announced his second "reconsecration" (*tawbah*), whereby immoral public behaviors and businesses were to be banned, and religious law was to be enforced more stringently. In 966/1558, the transfer of the capital from Tabrīz to Qazvīn—closer to the Safavid realm's new "center of gravity"—was formally completed. The prior year, Ṭahmāsb had his son Ismāʿīl (later to rule briefly as Shah Ismāʿīl II) imprisoned at Qahqahah, possibly because he was a whoremonger. (This last event would have both direct and indirect implications for Sām Mīrzā, as will be explained shortly.) Finally, the Ottomans were given a taste of their own medicine at the end of the decade, when Şehzade Bayezid, one of Süleyman's sons, rebelled and fled to the Safavid court in 966–7/1559. In one of the great shrewd moves of the tenth/sixteenth century, Ṭahmāsb allowed the Ottomans to fret over this situation for a couple of years, and then turned over the renegade prince before matters grew too serious. Bayezid was put to death in Iran by Ottoman executioners in the summer of 969/1562.[39]

Meanwhile, Sām Mīrzā kept to his own affairs in Ardabīl. We have record of two developments in his life in the 1550s. In 961/1554, he celebrated the wedding of his sixteen-year-old son, Rustam Mīrzā,

39. For a concise overview of the Şehzade Bayezid affair, see Kaya Şahin, *Empire and Power in the Reign of Süleyman* (Cambridge, 2013), 146*f*.

a youth whose virtues are praised effusively in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*.[40] The wedding is said to have lasted six months and to have been attended by other Safavid princes. Sadly, just after the end of the celebrations, when the bride had moved into the marital household, Rustam Mīrzā fell ill and died. This was, of course, an emotional tragedy for Sām Mīrzā, but it may also have damaged his political prospects in Ardabīl. Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī specifies that Rustam Mīrzā's wife was from the influential Shaykhāvand branch of the Safavid clan. The Shaykhāvandān were led at this time by Maʿṣūm Beg (d. 977/1570),[41] one of the closest advisors to Shah Ṭahmāsb, and the family had previously been in control of the Safavid shrine. (As we will see below, there is some doubt as to whether Sām Mīrzā ever wielded true authority in these years. He may have been a figurehead in Ardabīl, with officials reporting in practice to Maʿṣūm Beg and his relatives.) An alliance with the Shaykhāvandān through marriage might have given Sām Mīrzā a more stable position in Ardabīl. In the end, this did not come to pass. He never managed to endear himself to the dominant local family, and this would contribute to the difficulties that he encountered in later years.

Before getting ahead of ourselves, however, we should finish reviewing the events of the mid 1550s. The final wish of Rustam Mīrzā was to be buried in Mashhad, and his remains were sent there accordingly. In what may be a sign of Sām Mīrzā's continued lack of freedom during this period, he was compelled to wait more than two years for an opportunity to visit his son's tomb. Even then, he

---

40. Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, ed. Ishrāqī, vol. 1, p. 551. The tragic end of Rustam Mīrzā is also mentioned in Ḥayātī Tabrīzī, *Chronicle of the Early Safavids*, ed. Ghereghlou, 120–22.

41. There appears to be some confusion surrounding the year of Maʿṣūm Beg's death, but Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī quotes a chronogram (*ḥayf, Maʿṣūm-i shahīd-i rāh-i Ḥaqq*) whose *abjad* value is 977, and he reports that the date was Thursday, 6 Dhū al-Ḥijjah. According to my calendar conversion utility, that was in fact a Friday, corresponding to 12 May 1570. But a one-day margin of error is generally considered acceptable, and 6 Dhū al-Ḥijjah would have been a *Sunday* in 976, the other year occasionally mentioned for this event in scholarship. It seems more likely that 977 is correct. This is another case in which discrepancies may have been caused by Safavid chroniclers' blending the Islamic calendar and Chinese-Uighur animal years. See *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, vol. 1, pp. 559–61.

was not able to stage his own trip from Ardabīl to Khurāsān. But he found an excuse in due course. As was mentioned above, Ṭahmāsb had his son, Ismāʿīl Mīrzā, imprisoned in 964/1557. To be more specific, the young prince was recalled that year from the governorship of Harāt, which he had held briefly, and he was subsequently imprisoned at Qahqahah. (He would later be joined there by Sām Mīrzā and several younger princes. Unlike all of those inmates, Ismāʿīl Mīrzā would survive the purge of 975/1567, though he would not be released until after his father's death in 984/1576.) Shah Ṭahmāsb initially sent a small group to Khurāsān, led by none other than Maʿṣūm Beg, in order to recall Ismāʿīl to court. Sām Mīrzā was allowed to join this expedition, and to stop at Mashhad, which was then governed by his nephew Ibrāhīm Mīrzā, son of the late Bahrām.[42] This was a chance for Sām to visit his son's tomb, and also to enjoy the pilgrimage to the shrine of Imam Riżā and other holy sites—always an important experience for members of the Safavid family. According to the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, Sām Mīrzā was well entertained by Ibrāhīm for the month that he spent in Mashhad. This would be his last tour of the eastern region in which he had grown up.

On his way back to Ardabīl, Sām Mīrzā stopped at Qazvīn, where he had a brief, cordial visit with Ṭahmāsb. But he found himself increasingly in conflict with the Shaykhāvand family as the decade drew to a close. If Qāżī Aḥmad's account is to be believed, then Sām favored a humble and virtuous lifestyle, and he endeavored to stop the notables of Ardabīl from engaging in various religiously illegitimate activities (*nā-mashrūʿāt*). What might this refer to? Perhaps, in light of Ṭahmāsb's own opposition to the *tamghāvāt* (discussed in the previous chapter), something to do with the levying of inappropriate taxes? We can merely speculate. In any case, it seems that Sām Mīrzā's situation went

42. *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, vol. 1, p. 389.

from stressful to dangerous around 967/1560. Shah Ṭahmāsb fell seriously ill that year, and after his health recovered, a rumor spread that Sām Mīrzā had attempted to travel to Qazvīn in anticipation of the king's death. (As if he were anywhere near the top of the line of succession!) The story went that Sām was almost at the capital when he heard news of Ṭahmāsb's recovery, whereupon he returned to Ardabīl. Earlier, in the section on sources, we saw that the *Naqāvat al-āṡār* of Afūshtah'ī Naṭanzī presents this rumor as fact, in an anecdote about Sulṭān Muḥammad Khudābandah's reluctance to believe that Ismāʿīl II had died in 985/1577.[43] But the account in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* is more detailed and plausible. Qāżī Aḥmad explains that Maʿṣūm Beg himself interceded with the king on Sām Mīrzā's behalf, having discovered that the false rumor was spread by a member of the Shaykhāvandān who had come into conflict with the prince in Ardabīl. Maʿṣūm Beg reportedly told Ṭahmāsb that there would have been no way for Sām Mīrzā to set foot outside that city without word being sent promptly to court.[44] This is another indication of Sām's lack of power.

Continuing a persistent theme in our prince's life, however, the fact that he probably lacked the wherewithal to cause Ṭahmāsb any real trouble did not stop him from suffering politically and personally. Sām Mīrzā felt that his position in Ardabīl was unsustainable, and he would use his next visit to Qazvīn as an excuse to request that he be moved to Mashhad. The opportunity arose in early 1562 (mid 969), following the death of Shah Ṭahmāsb's beloved sister, Shāhzādah Sulṭānum (also known as Mahīn Bānū). Members of the family were called to court for memorial services, and Sām Mīrzā found a moment to plead his case, emphasizing that he did not want to go back to Ardabīl. Qāżī Aḥmad reports that Ṭahmāsb was prepared to grant his brother's request, until his advisors convinced

43. *Naqāvat al-āṡār*, ed. Ishrāqī, 63.
44. *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, vol. 1, p. 553.

him that it was not a good idea to have Sām Mīrzā living anywhere in Khurāsān. And so he was sent to Qahqahah instead, along with his two adolescent sons. They would spend six years at the fortress.

We have record of six Safavid princes who were imprisoned at Qahqahah at this time: Sām Mīrzā and his two sons; the two surviving sons of Alqāṣ Mīrzā; and Ismāʿīl Mīrzā, who, as we know, had been confined since 964/1557. The prisoners were not allowed to socialize with one another—or, at least, Ismāʿīl was kept separate from the remaining five. A particular concern of the guards was to ensure that Ṭahmāsb's son did not have access to blank paper on which to write. According to the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, the margins were cut out of all of his books so that he would have no place to scribble notes.[45] But somehow Sām Mīrzā, in a fateful mistake, managed to send a letter to his nephew's cell. This letter apparently took the form of a *qaṣīdah*, in which Sām expressed his hope that Ismāʿīl, once he took the throne, would treat him better than Ṭahmāsb had done. Some time later, in 975/1567, the castellan of Qahqahah entered Ismāʿīl Mīrzā's chambers for an inspection, and he gathered all of the prince's papers, sealed them in a bag, and sent them back to Qazvīn.

Shah Ṭahmāsb, we are told, read Sām Mīrzā's *qaṣīdah*. Enraged by the scheming of his relatives, he summoned a man named Muḥammad Beg Qūyunchī-ughlī—whose name appears in chronicles solely in connection to this incident—along with a group of armed guards (*qūrchī*s), and told him that he had five enemies at Qahqahah who needed to be dealt with. An order was sent to the castellan that Muḥammad Beg and his men were headed there on royal business, and that all of the princes except Ismāʿīl Mīrzā were to be placed together in one section of the fortress. Thus were the five of them put to death. Qāżī Aḥmad reports that an initial attempt to poison the prisoners failed because they grew

---

45. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 554.

suspicious, and so the executioners were forced to enter their cells and complete the deed by hand. Sām Mīrzā, as the story goes, was garotted after watching his sons and nephews expire.[46] Ismāʿīl Mīrzā was not touched; he would stay at Qahqahah for nearly another decade.

There is only so much that we can say about the details of this incident, which Qāżī Aḥmad dates to December 1567 (Jumādā al-Ākhirah 975), since no other extant source tells the whole story. When the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* comes to the aftermath of Sām Mīrzā's death, however, matters become more contestable. According to Qāżī Aḥmad, the executed princes were initially buried on the grounds of the prison, and their remains were later transferred to the village of Kalkhurān near Ardabīl. There are two stories about what transpired when news of their death came back to court. The first is that Ṭahmāsb claimed a group of armed men had gone to Qahqahah without his knowledge or approval and killed his brother and nephews. The second is that the king announced that there had been an earthquake at the fortress, in which all of the royal prisoners except for Ismāʿīl Mīrzā perished. Qāżī Aḥmad contends that the second version of Ṭahmāsb's public reaction is closer to the truth.[47]

Indeed, the earthquake story is the one that we find reported as fact in the *Takmilat al-akhbār* of ʿAbdī Beg Shīrāzī, a chronicle completed in 978/1570.[48] (ʿAbdī Beg also confirms, helpfully, that Sām Mīrzā died in 975/1567, providing a chronogram for the date.) It seems possible that we have a kind of "Safavid murder mystery" before us: a covert operation to execute several princes; a cover story that finds its way into a court-commissioned chronicle a few years later; and a "true narrative" that barely survives, preserved in a couple of works written after the death of Ṭahmāsb but before the

---

46. Ibid.
47. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 555.
48. *Takmilat al-akhbār*, ed. Navāʾī, 130.

consolidation of the dynasty's early historiography under Shah ʿAbbās. Here the snippet from the *Javāhir al-akhbār* should also be mentioned. Writing in 984/1576–7, during the brief reign of Ismāʿīl II, Būdāq Munshī Qazvīnī reports that Muḥammad Beg Qūyunchī-ughlī, whom he identifies as the killer of Sām Mīrzā and of the son (*sic*) of Alqāṣ Mīrzā, has recently been captured and imprisoned.[49] Justice in this case apparently could not be served until Ṭahmāsb had passed away.

We have just enough evidence to be confident that Sām Mīrzā died at Qahqahah in 975/1567, and that he and his sons and nephews were killed by a named individual at the order of Shah Ṭahmāsb; and we may, at least, strongly suspect that the court endeavored to keep the truth of the matter out of the historical record, by spreading a story that the princes had died in an earthquake, and perhaps by pressuring chroniclers (directly or indirectly) not to discuss the issue.

Conclusions, and looking ahead

In the end, depending on how much one believes of the account in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, we know a fair bit about the life, times, and death of Sām Mīrzā. But why does any of this matter? Why should we care what happened to the third son of Shah Ismāʿīl? Answers to these questions will be elaborated in the following section, but a few of the main ideas may be suggested here. First, history always carries its own imperative. It is worth learning more about any figure that left a substantial legacy, as Sām Mīrzā did with his political career—in particular his involvement in the Safavid-Uzbek struggle over Khurāsān—and with the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, one of our richest sources on the culture of

49. *Javāhir al-akhbār*, ed. Bahrām-nizhād, 238.

Persian poetry in the tenth/sixteenth century. Even if new insight into this legacy were all that could be gained through researching Sām's biography, the exercise would be valuable.

Second, studies of Safavid history in the era of Ṭahmāsb tend to focus on the question of how he kept the polity alive while facing manifold challenges and disadvantages.[50] For a number of reasons, including the orientation of the chronicles that constitute the bulk of our sources, we tend to view the progress of Safavid history from the perspective of the court, with centralization policies and the consolidation of the dynasty construed positively. By focusing instead on the life of Sām Mīrzā, and piecing together one of the peripheral narratives that have survived (if narrowly) in the sources, we can appreciate how the reign of Ṭahmāsb may have appeared to those who were not in his inner circle and who did not emerge victorious from the early power struggles. It quickly becomes clear that the final two decades of Ṭahmāsb's reign, starting with the Peace of Amasya in 962/1555, could be defined at least as much by tyranny and paranoia as by the domestic reforms that have received more attention in scholarship.

This brings us to a third point. Somehow, the prevailing view of the brief reign of Ismāʿīl II (984–5/1576–7) appears to be that his execution of a number of other princes—some of them young and not involved in politics—represented a transgression with no precedent internal to the Safavid dynasty.[51] This, it turns out, is simply untrue. One could debate the various reasons that Ismāʿīl II may have felt compelled to eliminate all of his (actual or potential) rivals, but he needed to look no further than his own father's reign for an idea of how to do so. Ismāʿīl was not just aware that Ṭahmāsb had

50. The books of Roger Savory (1980) and Andrew Newman (2006), and the dissertation of Hani Khafipour (University of Chicago, 2013), offer a few examples of this perspective.
51. See for example Savory, *Iran under the Safavids* (Cambridge, 1980), 68–70; and H. R. Roemer, "The Safavid Period," in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 6 (Cambridge, 1986), 250–53.

ordered the killing of a number of imprisoned princes, including adolescents. He was *at Qahqahah* when it took place. Paying closer attention to the fate of Sām Mīrzā thus offers an important layer of context in which to analyze the violence and disarray that engulfed the Safavid polity following Ṭahmāsb's death.

Finally, a fourth benefit of studying Sām's biography is that it illuminates historiographical problems in the Safavid chronicle tradition—ones that would require a book-length treatment of their own to decipher in full, but whose basic features should be clear, in outline, from the discussion here. How were the first generations of Safavid rule to be remembered? Who controlled this process? And what conclusions might we draw when certain events appear to have been actively de-emphasized by court historians? Of course, the only way of noticing the silence of chroniclers about incidents such as the imprisonment and execution of Sām Mīrzā is to go in search of what they wrote on those issues. It bears repeating that the study of Safavid historiography will require researchers to continue digging in the narrative sources that are our blessing and curse; and the downfall of Sām Mīrzā represents the type of case study that might give us greater analytical purchase on these texts. These issues will be addressed further in the section below.

2.2: Broader implications of Sām Mīrzā's biography

Introduction

Now that we have gone through the effort of establishing a periodization of early Safavid history, surveying a wide range of sources for mention of Sām Mīrzā, and assembling the story of his life to the best of our ability, it is worth pausing to consider some of the broader implications of this study. This may be done briefly, and primarily as a recapitulation and elaboration of points that have already been raised. There are two main areas in which we have some further commentary to offer: Safavid governance and dynastic politics in (and in the wake of) the reign of Shah Ṭahmāsb; and the historiographical tradition—*i.e.*, the progression of court-oriented chronicles—that has both enabled and confounded our efforts to trace Sām Mīrzā's career. We will address these topics in turn.

Safavid and regional history

Much of the historical discussion in this half of the dissertation has centered on the evolving Safavid government around the Ṭahmāsb era, with a particular focus on foreign and domestic challenges to court authority. As has been emphasized above, this is the natural context in which to study the political biography of Sām Mīrzā, since his circumstances were impacted by such problems more than by factors of any other kind. We can make sense of his story, and have some intuition as to the gaps in extant sources, by working within the framework of the early development of the Safavid polity. At the same time, analyzing Sām Mīrzā's life yields certain broader insights about the period. Three such points deserve to be emphasized here.

First, we have observed a trend in the rule of Shah Ṭahmāsb, whereby in the early years, he was prepared to forgive a great deal from his relatives and other senior officials; but, as the decades wore on, this quality lessened and gave way to an acute, if not paranoid concern for potential threats. It got to where Ṭahmāsb (with his inner circle) was unable to tolerate almost *anything* from those same relatives. For example, we may consider the strange episode in which Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū, Sām Mīrzā, and their men fled Harāt before the Uzbeks in 935/1529, and then refrained from returning to court for well over a year. They spent this time conducting raids of some kind in Sīstān. Again, Dickson's interpretation—which is as reasonable as any—is that the Shāmlū were hesitant to appear at court due to their ongoing conflict with the Takkalū faction that was then dominant. Although this behavior would seem to be quite suspicious, Sām Mīrzā was eventually reappointed to Harāt, again with Ḥusayn Khān as his *lalah*, in 940/1533–4. Trusting this arrangement for a second time was a decision by Shah Ṭahmāsb that would soon be revealed as ill-advised.

Of course, one could argue that the "forgiveness" of Ṭahmāsb in the 1520s and early '30s was contingent upon the weakness of his position, as he struggled simultaneously to repel Ottoman and Uzbek threats and to build authority over a fractious Qizilbāsh confederation. But the story is not so simple. Why did Ṭahmāsb welcome Sām Mīrzā back to court in 943/1537? We have focused primarily on the importance of this moment as the end of Sām's high-level political career, given that he would spend the next twelve years confined to the royal encampment. It would be equally sensible, however, to ask why he was not maimed or executed. Sām and his Shāmlū protectors (and in-laws!) had surrendered Harāt and disappeared to the south on two occasions. Then there was the apparent plotting to have the younger prince installed on the throne as an Ottoman puppet. The pardoning of

Sām Mīrzā in 943/1537, as qualified as it may have been, is worth recognizing. Shah Ṭahmāsb made this decision at a time of triumph. We can similarly revisit the question of the end of Alqāṣ Mīrzā's rebellion in 956/1549. Although he was killed not long after his capture—supposedly thrown from the ramparts of Qahqahah—it is remarkable that Ṭahmāsb even considered allowing him to live. What more could Alqāṣ have done to merit execution?

A more fundamental shift in the court's approach can be seen in the years following the Treaty of Amasya. From this point there are decisions that are puzzling in their harshness: the long imprisonment of Ismāʿīl Mīrzā; the transfer of Sām Mīrzā to Qahqahah in 969/1562 (after his request to move to Mashhad); and, of course, the liquidation of several princes in 975/1567. A close study of Sām's career is not *necessary* to perceive this development over Ṭahmāsb's reign, since it was reflected in a range of situations. What we have found, however, adds to the picture.

Second, the mass execution of 975/1567 is worthy of greater consideration than it has received to date. The implications for the rule of Shah Ṭahmāsb—that he ordered such an extermination, and apparently tried to cover it up—are obvious. But the event has broader relevance in both the Safavid and regional contexts. We have noted that the period following Ṭahmāsb's death, in which Ismāʿīl Mīrzā was released from prison and spent much of his fifteen-month reign eliminating other male members of the family, can scarcely be viewed as an aberration if we keep in mind what had taken place in 975/1567. It was Ṭahmāsb who set a precedent for the preëmptive killing of possible rivals. Looking beyond the Safavid realm, it should be emphasized that the execution at Qahqahah was an early purge by the standards of *any* of the dynasties in the region.

We need, of course, to be clear about what we mean by "purge." Intrafamilial violence among princes who were politically or militarily active was not uncommon, nor is this what is intended here. The killing of Alqāṣ Mīrzā, for instance, was not a purge; nor even was the strangling of the Ottoman Şehzade Mustafa in 960/1553, however greatly Sultan Süleyman came to regret it. What Shah Ṭahmāsb ordered in 975/1567 is more akin to the actions of Murad III (r. 982–1003/1574–95), who, upon his accession, had several of his younger brothers put to death summarily. The latter is, to the best of my knowledge, the earliest such event on the Ottoman side. Generally speaking, in investigating the career of Sām Mīrzā, we are led to a darker perspective on the second half of Ṭahmāsb's reign, and this would in turn be relevant to a comparative assessment of dynastic politics among the Ottomans, Safavids, Uzbeks, and Mughals in the tenth/sixteenth century.

Third, on a more methodological note, the attempt to piece together Sām Mīrzā's biography, and to make sense of it, can serve as a demonstration of the striking complexity of the time in which he lived, and of the social and political dynamics in which he was involved. To understand his life would mean understanding issues as diverse as the cultural milieu of Harāt in the 1520s; the ever-shifting conflicts and alliances among various constituent groups of the Qizilbāsh; the wars that the Safavids fought against the Ottomans and the Abū al-Khayrid Uzbeks; the importance to Sām Mīrzā and other members of the family of renovating shrines to their forebears, as well as to the Shiʿi Imams and their descendants; and the inner workings of Ṭahmāsb's court and the influence, particularly in the later years, of figures like Maʿṣūm Beg (d. 977/1570) and Parī Khān Khānum. All of this is *before* we consider Sām *qua* literary patron and anthologist.

It should go without saying that every historical period is complicated, and the biography of an individual of Sām Mīrzā's profile would never be one-dimensional. What vary are the sources and scholarship available to conduct such a study. There is something maddeningly difficult about the Safavid case, perhaps connected to the daunting number of court chronicles on which we are forced to rely; the inconsistency of those texts, and their tendency to be highly specific on certain points and vague (or silent) on others; and the relative paucity of documentary sources that might serve as a counterbalance. As for the scholarly literature on Safavid history, it is immense and diverse, but I have long been frustrated trying to bridge the gap between broader narratives whose importance has been recognized, and highly specific studies focusing on certain figures, texts, or events.

The career of a prince like Sām Mīrzā seems to exist at an elusive intermediate scope. A great deal of effort must be invested to collect bits of information about his life, and, for each snippet that is encountered, to set it in historical context in order to extract as much insight as possible. (For example, the detail given in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, that Sām Mīrzā found himself at odds with the Shaykhāvand branch of the Safavid family in Ardabil around the late 1550s and early '60s, is quite meaningful—if we know who the Shaykhāvandān were. This type of passing reference in a source may demand a foray into a specialist topic.) In the end, is the value of our findings commensurate with the arduousness of the project? It is difficult to say.

We have, in the story of Sām Mīrzā, a vivid case study in the dynastic politics of the early Safavid period, and a different perspective on the Ṭahmāsb era, which is more often viewed in terms of institution-building and the transition from Shah Ismāʿīl's charismatic movement to something more recognizable as an imperial entity. Sām, like many others, struggled to reach a stable position in this

environment. What is most unfortunate about the vicissitudes of his career (as best we understand it) is that he became a suspect figure at a young age, owing to circumstances that were outside of his control, and he could never emerge fully from the shadow of the mid 1530s. He managed to spend some of his adult years as custodian of the shrine in Ardabīl—and to complete the *Tuḥfah* during the same period—only to be sent to Qahqahah in 969/1562. Very little can be determined about the cause of Sām's final imprisonment, but the main factor seems to have been the inconvenience or perceived risk to the court of managing his situation. And then he was quietly killed, along with his young sons and the surviving heirs of Alqāṣ Mīrzā, apparently due to fears that he was cultivating too close a friendship with fellow inmate Ismāʿīl Mīrzā. These are hardly the greatest injustices committed in tenth/sixteenth-century Iran; but again, paying attention to what befell Sām Mīrzā affords us a useful outlook on the second half of Shah Ṭahmāsb's reign, as well as on its aftermath.

Historiographical dilemmas

Our other main area of concern is historiography. Here there is a simple, if unanswerable question that will be obvious by this point: What happened to the discussion of Sām Mīrzā in Safavid narrative histories? It is rare to find any mention of his activities after 943/1537. His appointment to Ardabīl in 956/1549, which is the sort of event to which a line would ordinarily be devoted in a court chronicle, is absent in all but a few sources. The *Aḥsan al-tavārīkh* of Ḥasan Rūmlū and the *ʿĀlam-ārā-yi ʿAbbāsī* of Iskandar Beg—probably the two most famous histories that cover the period of Ṭahmāsb's rule—are nearly silent on Sām Mīrzā's adult years and have nothing at all concerning his death. (And notices on the deaths of prominent individuals are otherwise so routine in these sources!) The story is rendered

more intriguing by the tension between the accounts of the *Takmilat al-akhbār* of ʿAbdī Beg Shīrāzī and the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* of Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī. As we have seen, according to the former, Sām perished in an earthquake at Qahqahah, but the latter text paints this story as an attempt by the court to conceal the reality of the 975/1567 mass execution. Qāżī Aḥmad's version seems to be closer to the truth, once we consider the mention of Sām Mīrzā's killer, Muḥammad Beg Quyūnchī-ughlī, in the *Javāhir al-akhbār* (984/1576) of Būdāq Munshī Qazvīnī.

These facts, among others, have been laid out and analyzed above. At a certain point, we need to make a subjective judgment regarding the possibility that discussion of certain events involving Sām Mīrzā was deliberately avoided by most Safavid historians. We have evidence pointing in this direction. The *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* reports what could be termed a conspiracy on the part of Shah Ṭahmāsb's court to suppress the story of the execution at Qahqahah. The version of events given in the *Takmilat al-akhbār* is strange on its own terms, since it is not explained how Ismāʿīl Mīrzā survived an earthquake that supposedly claimed the lives of all other princes held at the fortress. Būdāq Munshī notes that the killer was punished a decade after the fact, in the wake of Ṭahmāsb's death. And all of this mystery surrounding Sām Mīrzā's grisly end coincides with a general lack of discussion of the prince (after 943/1537) in Safavid chronicles. Would a reasonable observer conclude that there is a pattern here—an effort to keep certain sensitive issues or inconvenient facts out of the historical record? Or am I simply too close to the material, grasping for information on Sām Mīrzā and drawing connections where they likely do not exist? These are questions that will need to be settled, if at all, in future research building on the dissertation project. It may be that there is truly something strange in

the historiographical tradition as it pertains to Sām Mīrzā. To make such an argument persuasively will not be a straightforward matter.

Finally, it might be worth devoting additional time to determine what is written about Sām Mīrzā, if anything, in the (largely anonymous) historical texts of the later Safavid period. From the limited inquiry that I have conducted thus far, I have found nothing. But the number of sources in this category is not small, and it would require some diligence to conclude authoritatively that no new discussion of Sām's adult years occurs in a history later than the *Afżal al-tavārīkh* (1049/1639). If such is indeed the case, then we could state that Shah Ṭahmāsb and his inner circle were almost successful in burying some of the repressive policies of the 1560s. As matters stand, we are heavily dependent on Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī's choice to give a candid account of the period.

Chapter 3:

A Comprehensive Study of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (*ca.* 957/1550)

3.1: An introduction to the Persian *taẕkirah*, and to the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*

Fundamentals of Persian taẕkirah*s*

As we have seen, Sām Mīrzā's most enduring legacy was forged not through his political or military achievements as a Safavid prince, but rather through his authoring a *taẕkirah*, or biographical anthology of poets, titled *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. This proved sufficient, in the long run, to make him one of the most widely known members of the ruling family (except for those who took the throne). Extant manuscripts of the *Tuḥfah*, including early ones, are not lacking; one of the *three* copies held at the British Library, for example, dates to Sām Mīrzā's lifetime.[1] (We will return to this point below.) For those unfamiliar with the Persian *taẕkirah* tradition, it might appear surprising that a work in such a "subordinate" genre—not poetry, but biography and anthology of poets—would attract wide attention and be distributed in considerable numbers. In fact, *taẕkirah*s like the *Tuḥfah* represented a vital component of Persian literary culture. Starting in the late ninth/fifteenth century, they were authored frequently, and they tend to survive in numerous manuscripts, since (it appears) they were copied to serve as reference works for all manner of individuals who were interested in poetry—which, in the Persianate world, has meant almost everyone.

But what are *taẕkirah*s, really? The awkward term "biographical dictionary of poets," which has often been used in scholarship to refer to this genre, does an unsatisfactory job of explaining it. (The fact that we use such a jumble of English words to attempt to render one Persian/Arabic word may already be suggestive of a problem. There are other terminological issues, which will be touched upon

1. See Charles Rieu, *Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum* (3 vols., London, 1879–83), 1:367–8; idem, *Supplement to the Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London, 1895), 71.

in the following pages.) For the benefit of readers beyond the field of Near Eastern studies, one could begin by mentioning a few more familiar texts that share similarities with *taẕkirah*s. Two well-known examples are Giorgio Vasari's *Lives of the Most Excellent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects* (whose final version dates to 1568), and Samuel Johnson's *Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets* (first published in collected form in 1779–81). Another two analogues, from a further-removed context, are the *Twelve Cæsars* and the *Lives of Grammarians and Rhetoricians*, both by Suetonius (d. after 122 CE). Anyone who has seen works such as these is perhaps halfway to understanding the general idea of a Persian *taẕkirah*. (It may go without saying that Arabists who have worked with any variety of *ṭabaqāt* literature will be a good deal closer.) The *taẕkirah* can be described as a genre combining elements of biography, anthology, and reference, in which a certain group of noteworthy individuals is assembled, to be discussed one by one, with details and anecdotes about their lives offered alongside extracts from their works (where applicable).

Almost anything else about these texts could, and did, vary. In the premodern Persianate context, the subjects under consideration were most often poets, but there are well-known exceptions to this.[2] Some *taẕkirah*s are monumental in size, others just a few dozen pages; some anthologists set out to cover the entire history of Persian poetry up to their time, while others (including Sām Mīrzā) focus on their contemporaries; and so forth. Against this wide variation, the constant features of the *taẕkirah* are the selection of a group of subjects according to given criteria, and the presentation of their biographies and excerpted works in sequential entries (also referred to as "notices" in English; or *tarjamah*, pl. *tarājim* in Persian and Arabic).

---

2. One example is the *Gulistān-i hunar* (*ca.* 1005/1596–7) of Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, an important *taẕkirah* (to use the term loosely) focusing on painters and calligraphers.

Another key purpose of *taẕkirah*s, which is not encompassed by the preceding definition and has fewer parallels in works from Western traditions, is hinted at by the etymology of the word. In its original sense in Arabic, *taẕkirah* (properly *tadhkirah*) is a verbal noun denoting the act of *reminding* someone, or *calling attention* to something. This is, in fact, one of the functions performed by Persian literary anthologies. In a notice on a given poet, not only is some amount of information provided about his (or, occasionally, her) life, but selected verses by that individual are quoted—often taken from his most famous works. Here it is important to keep in mind the strongly oral nature of classical Persian poetry, with many literati having thousands of lines by the canonical masters committed to memory.[3] A *taẕkirah* could therefore serve as something of an *aide-mémoire*. If a reader opened an entry on a certain poet, she might find excerpts from *ghazal*s with which she was already familiar.

Again, there is great variation in the structure and content of *taẕkirah*s, as would be found with any textual tradition that remained widespread and vital for centuries. The amount of biographical material provided for each poet could be as much as several long paragraphs in one anthology, and as little as a sentence or two in another; and a similar range applies to the number of lines of poetry quoted. But it should be pointed out that the dominant focus in *taẕkirah*s more often appears to be the collation of choice verses, rather than presenting sustained biographical narratives.[4] Hence the aspect of these texts that we might associate with *aide-mémoire* or anthology is at least as central as their function in collecting data on poets' lives. Returning to the question of terminology, my current preference is to use the word "anthology" when referring to *taẕkirah*s in English. At times I may write

3. According to a famous anecdote in the *Chahār maqālah* (*ca.* 551/1156) of Niẓāmī ʿArūżī, young poets were expected, as part of their education, to memorize tens of thousands of lines from both ancient and more recent figures. See *Chahár maqála*, tr. E. G. Browne (London, 1921), 32.
4. The same assessment is offered by J. T. P. de Bruijn in his portion of the article "Ta<u>dh</u>kira" in the *Encyclopædia of Islam, Second Edition*.

"anthology of poets," at other times "literary anthology" or "biographical anthology," as appropriate; a certain degree of flexibility should pose no problem. The more important point is that the term "biographical dictionary" would better be phased out of use in scholarship, or at least employed with care, since it can give the wrong impression about the nature of these works. There is also a major collateral benefit to settling on "anthology": it will facilitate connections to the field of Arabic literary history, with researchers now using the same term to refer to the genre traditionally known as *ṭabaqāt*, which was directly influential in the early development of the Persian *taẕkirah*.[5]

However we choose to categorize these texts, or to set them in relation to familiar works in other languages, the fact is that they represent an indispensable strand in classical Persian literature; and this must be due in part to the comprehensive value that they offered to readers. *Taẕkirah*s of poets—which, again, are the dominant variety, such that they are conventionally labeled *taẕkirah*s without further specification—contain the kinds of information that one would need in order to stay abreast of a rich and still-evolving literary tradition. This is particularly true if we look at anthologies from the time when the genre had reached full maturity, around the turn of the eleventh/seventeenth century. By then, there were monumental *taẕkirah*s covering several hundred poets or more, and they were organized according to different principles. One of the most famous, the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār va zubdat al-afkār* of Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī (finished in 1016/1607 after four decades of work), arranges contemporary poets by their geographic origin.[6] Another, the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn va ʿaraṣāt al-ʿārifīn* (1024/1615) of Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī, sorts around 3,500 poets alphabetically by pen name (*takhalluṣ*),

5. See, most notably, Bilal Orfali, *The Anthologist's Art: Abū Manṣūr al-Thaʿālibī and His "Yatīmat al-dahr"* (Leiden, 2016).
6. This work has not yet been published in its entirety, but several portions have been edited by ʿAbd al-ʿAlī Adīb Barūmand, Muḥammad Ḥusayn Naṣīrī Kahnamūʾī, and others, and issued by Mīrāṡ-i Maktūb, since 2005. (As of early 2020, I can find record of eight volumes published so far, between 2005 and 2017.)

while further dividing them into three chronological categories.[7] These are just a couple of examples (albeit prominent) of the organizational schemes that were used in *taẕkirah*s. It is easy to imagine what powerful resources they must have been for contemporary readers. If one were curious about any given poet, or about poets from, say, Yazd, then one could find a range of notices with biographical sketches and selected verse.

Of course, in addition to its usefulness, the *taẕkirah* was always a vehicle for the author to set out his personal view of Persian literary history, to record his opinions on which poets deserved to be emphasized (often his friends) and which could be downplayed, omitted, or even attacked (including figures who espoused some disfavored ideology or worked at the wrong court), and so on. It must be acknowledged that neither the selections of *taẕkirah* authors, nor their biographical narratives, can be accepted as fully reliable or authoritative. In fact, these sources have long been viewed with a healthy measure of distrust by historians of Persian literature. Scholars since at least the time of E. G. Browne (d. 1926) have complained that *taẕkirah*s display shameless bias and include biographical anecdotes that are questionable at best, and verifiably incorrect at worst.[8] In the last few decades, researchers have made increasing use of these works, given the undeniably rich historical perspectives that they offer in spite of their problems; but there has never been doubt as to the need for source-critical approaches. (It should also be noted that rising interest in *taẕkirah*s has come in parallel with a vogue in the study of Persian literature of the long-neglected early modern period. This is fitting, since we have a wealth of anthologies from the ninth/fifteenth century on, but few extant from before then.)

---

7. Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī, *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn va ʿaraṣāt al-ʿārifīn*, ed. Muḥsin Nājī Naṣrābādī (7 vols., Tehran, 2009). As has been noted above, there is another edition of this text, published by Mīrāṡ-i Maktūb, which may be preferable.
8. For an example of scathing criticism, see E. G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, vol. 4 (Cambridge, 1924), 224–5.

Finally, with regard to the subjectivity of the material found in *taẕkirah*s, we may choose to view it as an asset, rather than as a liability, in that we have a tradition of texts that tell us what certain highly knowledgeable authors thought about the development of Persian poetry through their lifetimes. Indeed, one of the changes that can be seen in *taẕkirah*s starting around the turn of the eleventh/seventeenth century is that they apply progressively clearer literary-critical frameworks, for example, by assigning poets to different stylistic "schools." This is a trend that I have discussed, at least on a preliminary level, in two articles.[9]

It may be helpful to explain a bit more of the early history of the *taẕkirah* in Persian and other Near Eastern languages. We have addressed the etymology of the word itself, but when and how was it first used in the titles of literary works? It should come as no surprise that the oldest texts to bear the label *taẕkirah* were written in Arabic, given that several Arabic prose genres were well developed by the fourth/tenth century, when the rise of New Persian literature had just gotten underway. The first works whose titles include the word *taẕkirah* (or *tadhkirah*), per the assessment of Wolfhart Heinrichs, fall into two categories: "handbooks," in the sense of comprehensive but concise references on various topics; and "notebooks," *i.e.*, "collections of text snippets that the compiler found of interest to himself and gathered mainly for his own use."[10] ("Commonplace books" might serve as an apt English name for the second category. There are other terms that have been used in Arabic and Persian in similar contexts, such as *kashkūl*, *safīnah*, and *kunnāshah*.) The earliest single work labeled *tadhkirah* that I have seen referenced is an overview of the variant readings (*qirāʾāt*) of the Qur'an, by Ṭāhir ibn ʿAbd

9. See "The Biography of Vahshi Bāfqi (d. 991/1583) and the *Tazkera* Tradition," *Journal of Persianate Studies* 8 (2015): 195–222; "*Taẕkirah-i Khayr al-bayān*: The Earliest Source on the Career and Poetry of Ṣāʾib Tabrīzī (d. *ca*. 1087/1676)," *Al-ʿUṣūr al-Wusṭā* 24 (2016): 114–138.

10. Wolfhart P. Heinrichs, "Tadhkira 1. In Arabic literature," *Encyclopædia of Islam, Second Edition*.

al-Munʿim Ibn Ghalbūn (d. 399/1009).[11] In any case, the first Arabic "*taẕkirah*s" already display two of the central characteristics of the genre that would later take the same name in Persian. First, the texts that Heinrichs calls "handbooks" tend to devote a relatively modest amount of space to each of a fairly large number of subjects or points, which is to say, there is something encyclopædic about them. Second, and more importantly, the use of *taẕkirah* in a title was always connected to the original, *aide-mémoire* sense of the word.

When we consider the beginnings of Persian *taẕkirah*s, a problem quickly arises: Do we mean the oldest works that could be considered anthologies of poetry, or are we looking for the term *taẕkirah* itself in the title? The difference is meaningful. The first text *like* a *taẕkirah* to appear in Persian was probably the *Chahār maqālah* (*ca*. 551/1156) of Niẓāmī ʿArūżī.[12] This is a collection of four discourses (s. *maqālah*) addressing the four types of functionary that the author considered indispensable to any ruler; namely, secretaries, poets, astrologers, and physicians. Each *maqālah* focuses on one profession and discusses its duties, required training, characteristics of the ideal candidate, *etc*., followed by anecdotes about noteworthy individuals who have served in that capacity. The second *maqālah*, which provides some of the only approximately contemporary information on the lives of early classical Persian poets, has long been recognized as a *taẕkirah*-esque source. Later, around the beginning of the seventh/thirteenth century, two landmark works were authored: the *Taẕkirat al-awliyāʾ* of Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār (d. *ca*. 618/1221), a collection of stories about seventy-two Sufi saints (*awliyāʾ*) and other famous Muslim religious figures;[13] and the *Lubāb al-albāb* (*ca*. 618/1221) of Sadīd al-Dīn ʿAwfī, the first

---

11. This is among the works listed by Heinrichs. See *Kitāb al-Tadhkirah fī al-qirāʾāt*, ed. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Buḥayrī Ibrāhīm (2 vols., Cairo, 1990).
12. See the edition and translation by Browne; and Ghulām Ḥusayn Yūsufī, "Čahār maqāla," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.
13. See Mohammad Esteʿlami, "Taḏkerat al-awliāʾ," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

dedicated Persian anthology of poets.[14] Note that ʿAṭṭār's work focuses on mysticism and is labeled as a *taẕkirah* in its title, whereas ʿAwfī's book addresses poetry, but is not presented outwardly as a *taẕkirah* and has only been considered such in retrospect.

How is it, then, that the word *taẕkirah* came to refer predominantly to biographical anthologies of poets? This has been a confusing point in Persian literary history, and for an answer we need to look ahead to the late ninth/fifteenth century, when Timurid Harāt was the dominant political and cultural center of the eastern Muslim world. (It may seem as though we are glossing over a great deal, but in fact we have no major extant *taẕkirah*s from between the 1220s and 1470s CE. As to why this genre saw sparse activity for a period of more than two centuries, it seems that no explanation has been offered in scholarship.) In this rich environment, in which every classical art and science was flourishing, a trio of important literary anthologies—two in Persian, one in Turkic—were written within a few years of one another. The *Bahāristān*, a wide-ranging educational work that the poet-scholar ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (d. 897/1492) wrote in 892/1487, purportedly for his own son, includes a chapter that briefly discusses the lives and works of about thirty of the most eminent figures from the span of the Persian tradition.[15] In the same year, Dawlatshāh Samarqandī, a member of the Timurid élite, authored a dedicated, full-length anthology titled *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ* (lit. *Taẕkirah of the Poets*), with an obvious nod to ʿAṭṭār.[16] Dawlatshāh's work, however much it has been disdained by modern scholars due to its unreliability as a biographical source, was a smashing success, and it set the tone for an entire genre in

14. Muḥammad ʿAwfī, *Matn-i kāmil-i Lubāb al-albāb*, ed. Saʿīd Nafīsī (Tehran, 1957). See also J. Matīnī, "ʿAwfī, Sadīd al-Dīn," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.
15. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī, *Bahāristān va rasāʾil-i Jāmī*, ed. Aʿlá Khān Afṣaḥzād, Muḥammad Jān ʿUmarʾuf, and Abū Bakr Ẓuhūr al-Dīn (Tehran, 2000).
16. Dawlatshāh Samarqandī, *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ*, ed. Fāṭimah ʿAlāqah (Tehran, 2007).

the early modern period. From this point on, not only would anthologies of Persian (and Turkic) poets be written continually, but they would also be known primarily under the label *taẕkirah*.

The final work in the Timurid trio is the *Majālis al-nafā'is*, written in 896/1491 in a variety of Turkic often called Chaghatā'ī.[17] The author, Mīr 'Alī Shīr Navā'ī, was one of the wealthiest and most powerful men in Khurāsān, and he took a special interest in promoting the development of Turkic literature—which was still at a nascent stage, in some respects—using Arabic and Persian models. Navā'ī's book proved tremendously influential among *taẕkirah* authors writing in both Turkic and Persian over the following century. The year 945/1538 saw the completion of the first true Ottoman Turkish *taẕkirah* of poets; this inaugurated a tradition of writing such works at regular intervals, which would persist until 1930 (after the establishment of the Republic!) with few significant gaps.[18]

The three *taẕkirah*s written at the end of the Timurid period, and the flurry of activity that they inspired at the successor courts of the Ottomans, Safavids, Mughals, and Uzbeks, provide us with enough introductory context for Sām Mīrzā's composition of the *Tuḥfah* in the mid tenth/sixteenth century. As has been noted above (and will be explored further in the next chapter), the form and content of anthologies continued to evolve. The late 1500s brought *taẕkirah*s on a monumental scale, followed by the application of increasingly nuanced literary-critical frameworks in place of the vague praise of poets that is typical of earlier works. And the genre's development would not end at that point; there are, for example, a number of innovative Indo-Persian *taẕkirah*s written in the twelfth/eighteenth century, which have recently been the subjects of a wave of scholarly interest.[19] As far as

---

17. 'Alī Shīr Navā'ī, *Mecâlisü'n-nefâyis*, ed. Kemal Eraslan (2 vols., Ankara, 2001).
18. J. Stewart-Robinson, "Ta<u>dh</u>kira 3. In Turkish literature," *Encyclopædia of Islam, Second Edition*.
19. See, for example, recent works by Mana Kia, Alexander Jabbari, Sunil Sharma, and Arthur Dudney—the last of whom wrote his dissertation about the *taẕkirah* author Khān Ārzū (d. 1169/1756).

the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* is concerned, however, it is most important to have a sense of the history that led up to its composition. During Sām Mīrzā's life, as in following generations, there was always a reason to compile new *taẕkirah*s, with young poets regularly arriving on the scene and attempting to distinguish themselves. From the late ninth/fifteenth century on, biographical anthologies served as a constant companion genre to Persian poetry.

Readers who are less familiar with *taẕkirah*s may still have a range of unanswered questions. **How many of these texts were written?** The great Iranian literary historian Aḥmad Gulchīn-i Maʿānī collected information on over three hundred Persian *taẕkirah*s authored before the year 1300/1882.[20] Of course, not all of those are extant, and a smaller number still became influential enough to be cited by later anthologists and to survive in many copies. But in my own research, I have already found occasion to work with at least fifteen important *taẕkirah*s dating between ca. 551/1156 (*i.e.*, the *Chahār maqālah*) and the mid eleventh/seventeenth century, which have not only survived but are available in printed editions. So any narrative history of the Persian *taẕkirah* of poets—none has been written yet—would need to address dozens of works, even if only the "top echelon" were considered.

How large did these books tend to be? It should come as no surprise that the size of *taẕkirah*s varies widely. The *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, whose published editions average around four hundred pages, may be on the smaller side—with the exception of cases like the *Bahāristān* of Jāmī, in which a brief "*taẕkirah*" represents part of a larger project. One example on the other end of the spectrum would be the aforementioned *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn* of Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī, which covers around 3,500 poets and runs to five thousand pages in seven volumes in a recent critical edition. (Here it should be noted that

20. See his *Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā-yi Fārsī* (2 vols., Tehran, 1969–71). This remains the standard reference work in the field.

there is a difference between the length of a *taẕkirah* and the number of poets that it discusses. The *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār* of Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī is probably the most *massive* literary anthology ever written in Persian, but it includes a great quantity of excerpted verses—some 350,000 in total—from only about 650 poets, which is fewer than Sām Mīrzā addresses in his much shorter *Tuḥfah*.) A *taẕkirah* of moderate size would fill perhaps one thick volume in print.

How do these works tend to be organized? As far as the division of biographical anthologies into chapters, almost any scheme that one could imagine was put into practice. Some *taẕkirah*s assign their subjects to categories on the basis of geographic origin (the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār*), others in alphabetical order (the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn*), others chronologically (Dawlatshāh's *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ*), others by social class (ʿAwfī's *Lubāb al-albāb* and the *Tuḥfah*), and beyond. The four criteria just mentioned are probably the most common. At times, more than one system is employed within a single text, such as the combination of chronological order and social stratification employed by ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī.

Was it typical for anthologists to survey the whole range of Persian poets throughout history, or did they choose certain subsets? Perhaps surprisingly, it never went out of fashion to write a "general *taẕkirah*," which could include poets as far back as Rūdakī (d. *ca*. 329/941) and as recent as the author's living contemporaries. (Some authors, notably Dawlatshāh, open their works with brief discussion of classical Arabic poets, who are considered forerunners of the Persian tradition.) One reason for the continued relevance of such broad surveys may be that they allowed anthologists of successive generations to offer new evaluations of the literary history that stood behind them, from its origins to its latest developments. On the other hand, it did become more common in the early modern period, with an ever-growing mass of poets past and present, to limit the scope of a *taẕkirah* to contemporary

figures, or to choose some other manageable group. Sām Mīrzā was one of the first authors in the genre to omit discussion of the great poets of prior centuries—he explains that he has set them aside because their legacy is securely documented, whereas there are contemporaries who risk being lost to history—but he was certainly not the last to make this choice. One example of a rather different approach is the *Javāhir al-ʿajāʾib* (963/1556) of Fakhrī Haravī, a short *taẕkirah* that covers about thirty women poets from all eras.[21]

How do these books function, and how is it to work with individual entries? At a certain point, the only way to gain a better sense of the *taẕkirah* tradition is to set oneself about reading the sources. It has always been the case that students of classical Persian literature need to develop familiarity with *taẕkirah*s gradually, through trial and error, since the field still lacks a book-length study of the genre (setting aside Gulchīn-i Maʿānī's reference text). Anyone interested, however, in a detailed look at one anthology of poets and one of its notices, including photographs of manuscript pages, may refer to my article on the *Khayr al-bayān* (1036/1627) of Shāh Ḥusayn Sīstānī.[22]

A final question to address in a general introduction to *taẕkirah*s is how scholars can utilize them. As the preceding discussion has emphasized, biographical anthologies represent the most significant companion genre to Persian poetry, and over time they came to form a rich tradition in their own right. Thus it would be difficult to enumerate an exhaustive list of the potential uses of *taẕkirah*s in research. It may nevertheless be helpful to mention a few of the approaches that scholars have applied to these texts. First, on the most straightforward level, *taẕkirah*s are harnessed to establish the facts of

21. Sulṭān Muḥammad Fakhrī Haravī, *Taẕkirah-i Rawżat al-salāṭīn, va Javāhir al-ʿajāʾib, maʿa dīvān-i Fakhrī Haravī*, ed. Sayyid Ḥusām al-Dīn Rāshidī (Hyderabad, 1968).
22. Beers, "*Taẕkirah-i Khayr al-bayān*."

poets' biographies. When studying a given author, we may find details about him in his own works, or in mention of him by his peers, or perhaps in historical chronicles, insofar as they include discussion of cultural figures. But it is often the case that most of what we can determine about a poet's life is found in anthologies. One method that researchers have employed is to gather notices on a single poet from several *taẕkirah*s, and then to collate them (perhaps giving preference to earlier sources) in order to construct as full and authoritative a narrative as possible. Studies along these lines have constituted the most common use of *taẕkirah*s among historians of Persian literature.

A second, related approach is to look more analytically at the treatment of a poet by anthologists of successive generations. Who considered this figure important, and when, and for what reasons? In this way, we can effectively investigate the reception history of a poet's works.[23] A third option is to adopt a somewhat broader perspective, and to use one or more *taẕkirah*s from the same period in order to examine the social dimension of Persian literature. This is especially pertinent for the early modern era, when (as far as we can tell) poetic culture across the region grew to be defined ever more by the diverse urban context. Enthusiasts would gather to share their latest work, to compete with one another, to practice *imitatio* (*istiqbāl* or *javāb-gū'ī*), even to exchange ribald satires before crowds of their friends. And this activity is documented in some contemporary *taẕkirah*s, making it possible for us to reconstruct circles of poets that were active in certain periods and locales.

Finally, perhaps the greatest promise of literary anthologies is the window that they offer on the process of canon formation in Persian poetry. We can tell, for example, that Ḥāfiẓ of Shīrāz (d. *ca.* 792/1390) had become a highly influential figure by the late ninth/fifteenth century, in part by noting

23. For a noteworthy example of this approach to *taẕkirah*s, see Paul E. Losensky, *Welcoming Fighānī: Imitation and Poetic Individuality in the Safavid-Mughal Ghazal* (Costa Mesa, CA, 1998).

the discussion of him in *taẕkirah*s such as Jāmī's *Bahāristān*. For members of Timurid society, Ḥāfiẓ had seemingly attained a status not far below that of Firdawsī (d. *ca*. 411/1020) or Saʿdī (d. *ca*. 690/1291). It might be feasible, through studying a number of *taẕkirah*s from a given time and region, to gain a sense of what constituted the agreed-upon "canon" of Persian poets in that context. In none of the four approaches just mentioned would anthologies be our only sources. We can also analyze poetry itself, the codicology of *dīvān*s, court chronicles, archæological evidence, and more. The point to be underscored about *taẕkirah*s is that they are *indispensable*—whatever complications they may have as repositories of historical data.

General characteristics of the Tuḥfah-i Sāmī

In simple terms, as has been mentioned in earlier sections, the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* is a biographical anthology of poets (*taẕkirah*), written by the Safavid prince Sām Mīrzā (923–75/1517–67) around the year 957/1550, while he was living in Ardabīl and serving as (nominal) local governor and custodian of the family shrine. Based on his own statements, it seems likely that Sām worked on his *taẕkirah* for a number of years, on and off, and took the occasion of his relocation to Ardabīl, *ca*. early 956/1549, as an opportunity to complete the work. Other clues in the text give the clear impression that the *Tuḥfah* was finished in 957/1550 or not long thereafter. There is one manuscript of this work whose colophon includes a line suggesting a completion date in late 958/1551—with the copy itself having been made in 1174/1761—but it is worded ambiguously. (We will return to these points below.) In any case, dating the *Tuḥfah* to *ca*. 957/1550 is more than sufficient. We have seen what befell Sām Mīrzā from the mid 1550s on: the loss of his son, Rustam Mīrzā; mounting political difficulties in Ardabīl; imprisonment at

the fortress of Qahqahah in 969/1562; and at last, execution, along with his remaining sons and two of his nephews, in 975/1567. Thus it is not far-fetched to imagine that the *Tuḥfah* is the product of an unusually stable period in Sām Mīrzā's life—considering also the Uzbek invasions of Khurāsān and Qizilbāsh power struggles that defined his youth.

This *taẕkirah* contains around seven hundred notices (the number varies among manuscripts), divided into seven chapters (s. *ṣaḥīfah*), with the organizational scheme being a descending social hierarchy. The first chapter describes the poetic activities of kings and princes of several dynasties; the second is for *sayyid*s and religious scholars (*ʿulamāʾ*); the third (or fourth) is devoted to government ministers (*vuzarāʾ*) and other men of the pen (*arbāb-i qalam*); the fourth (or third) focuses on assorted prominent individuals who composed some poetry; the fifth, and by far the largest chapter addresses "poets proper" (*shuʿarāʾ*); the sixth is for (ethnically) Turkic poets; and the seventh is set aside for "other common folk" (*sāʾir-i ʿavāmm*).[24] In this kind of anthology, in which some of the figures treated are famous, and others totally obscure, it seems natural that the length of notices is not consistent. An important poet like ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (d. 898/1492) may be given up to ten pages (in a modern printed edition), whereas many of the subjects of the seventh chapter are dispatched in just a few lines. In general, however, it is worth noting that the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* is among the most "space-efficient" of all Persian anthologies, fitting several hundred notices in a work of modest overall size. Another

24. In the 1960s edition of Rukn al-Dīn Humāyūn Farrukh, which is by far the most commonly cited, the third chapter is for government officials, and the fourth is for other high-status individuals. This is based on the manuscripts used for the edition, though Humāyūn Farrukh admits that some copies have the order reversed. The most recent editor of the *Tuḥfah*, Aḥmad Mudaqqiq Yazdī, opted for the other arrangement, after a review of more early manuscripts than were available to Humāyūn Farrukh. It is difficult to determine what is correct, with conflicts in the textual tradition. One potential reason to side with Mudaqqiq Yazdī, which neither editor has mentioned, is the strong influence of ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī's *Majālis al-nafāʾis* on Sām Mīrzā. In the portion of the *Majālis* that is organized by social station, distinguished men (*fużalāʾ*) who composed some poetry precede members of the governing or military class (*amīr-zādagān*).

distinguishing feature of this *taẕkirah* is its focus on recent and contemporary individuals. Sām Mīrzā does not include a notice on anyone who died before the closing decades of the Timurid period.

Who might be interested in reading the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*? Academic uses for this text would mostly fall in two categories. First, there are important Persian poets of the early tenth/sixteenth century, for whose careers the *Tuḥfah* is an invaluable contemporary source. These figures include Bābā Faghānī (d. 925/1519), Hilālī Chaghatā'ī (d. 936/1529), and Lisānī Shīrāzī (d. *ca*. 941/1534–5). Looking to Sām Mīrzā's documentation of poets of his own time—some of whom he met—represents the traditional way of utilizing a *taẕkirah*. A second approach is made possible by the *Tuḥfah*'s discussion of members of lower socioeconomic strata who tried their hands at poetry. The author not-infrequently mentions what trades people practiced; for example, there are at least ten storytellers (s. *qiṣṣah-khwān*), eleven painters (s. *naqqāsh*), and six musicians (s. *mūsīqá-dān* or *khwush-khwān*). This aspect of the *Tuḥfah* has long been recognized, and Rukn al-Dīn Humāyūn Farrukh, who produced a critical edition of the text in the 1960s, added several indices to help the reader find entries on individuals whose vocations are noted. In short, this is a source that can be leveraged for a kind of social history, in addition to its value in the more familiar territory of literary biography, canon formation, and so forth. The fame of the *Tuḥfah* has also likely been enhanced by Sām Mīrzā's status as a Safavid prince, and by the healthy number of surviving manuscripts, some of them quite early.

What has been outlined in the preceding paragraphs is a reasonable introduction to the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. Of course, we will go much further, aiming to provide an understanding of this text that is fairly comprehensive and in-depth. One of the appendices to the dissertation is a spreadsheet of key details from all of the notices in the *Tuḥfah*; we will draw on it in some detail in the next section. But there

are still more general issues to be addressed, including the codicological situation of this *taẕkirah*, the editions that have been published, and the evidence available to determine when and how Sām Mīrzā completed the work.

The composition process of the Tuḥfah

We have noted on several occasions that the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* was written—or largely drafted and completed, at least—in Ardabīl around the year 957/1550. The reason that we do not have a precise date for the work is that Sām Mīrzā provides little information about its composition process, and other sources on the prince's biography do not go into great detail. In attempting to date the *Tuḥfah*, we are left in a not-uncommon situation for premodern Persian works: we look for the latest year or event mentioned within the text, and make what judgments we can. Fortunately, Sām Mīrzā has left useful clues in the first chapter of the *taẕkirah*, where he discusses the literary activities of members of ruling houses. In two of the entries in this section—pertaining to the Mughal Humāyūn and the Ottoman Süleyman I—Sām refers to 957/1550 as the "current year." The former case is particularly valuable, since the date is paired with mention of specific historical events. Sām Mīrzā states that the year is 957/1550, and that Humāyūn is ruling from Kabul, having defeated his brothers.[25] This matches what we know from Mughal history: in the late 1530s, Humāyūn's authority had been usurped by those brothers. He was compelled to flee to the northwest in 947/1540, under attack by Afghan warlords, and he eventually sought refuge and assistance at the Safavid court in 951/1544. Humāyūn then managed to reëstablish a center of power in Kabul in 951/1545. He operated from there until he could bring his

25. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 22.

rivals under control and mount an invasion to retake his Indian territories, which was accomplished in 961–2/1554–5.

The details provided by Sām Mīrzā tell us two things. First, this is the latest date mentioned in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, and it is referred to as the present time. Second, the description of Humāyūn's position that is offered here would only have remained valid up to 962/1555. Even if we speculate that Sām Mīrzā may have continued to add to his work after 957/1550, and that he left unchanged his two references to that year, we must assume that he would have returned to the notice on Humāyūn and updated it after the reconquest of Lahore and Delhi. Thus we not only have a suggestion that the year was 957/1550 when the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* was written in its final form, but it is difficult to imagine that the text was still being revised beyond the mid 1550s—at the latest—since Humāyūn is described as governing from Kabul. This is the strongest indication of a completion date found within the *taẕkirah*, and no other part of the text gives the impression of having been written later.[26]

Among the external sources that comment on Sām Mīrzā's life, only one sheds significant light on the composition of the *Tuḥfah*. In a chronicle titled *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* (discussed above), written by Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī and dating to 999/1591, there is a section that serves as a kind of obituary for Sām Mīrzā, included in the annal for the year of his execution, 975/1567.[27] This passage gives us some of our clearest information on the prince's later years. According to Qāżī Aḥmad, after Sām Mīrzā moved to Ardabīl in 956/1549, he occupied himself at the beginning of his time there (*dar avā'il-i ḥāl*) by writing his *taẕkirah*. This lends further support to a completion date of 957/1550—or perhaps up to a few

26. It should be added that there are *four* entries in the *Tuḥfah* in which individuals are reported to have died in the prior year, 956/1549. Together, these data points suggest a *terminus ad quem* for the composition of the work.
27. Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, ed. Iḥsān Ishrāqī (2 vols., Tehran, 1980–), vol. 1, pp. 550–57.

years thereafter—as suggested by the contents of the work. Qāżī Aḥmad also reports that during this time, Sām Mīrzā hosted intellectuals and men of culture at his new home, and it is implied that these gatherings helped him to gather data on developments in Persian poetry.

The more that we consider the composition process of the *Tuḥfah*, however, the more questions may arise. We have a decent sense of when Sām Mīrzā set pen to paper and composed the *taẕkirah* as we know it, but how, and over what period of time, did he assemble his information about hundreds of poets who flourished as far back as the 1480s?[28] As to this, we can do little better than to speculate. Sām Mīrzā opens the concluding passage of the *Tuḥfah* by expressing gratitude that he has been able to complete his book, and he indicates that he has been trying to write it for a long time, on and off, but that he faced obstacles and and misfortunes that made him set the project aside. We should infer that years, perhaps decades of thought and preparation went into this *taẕkirah*. Did Sām Mīrzā have accumulated notes that he could rely upon after he moved to Ardabīl? It is clear that he had access to copies of earlier literary anthologies, in particular the *Majālis al-nafā'is* of Navā'ī, the *Bahāristān* of Jāmī, and the *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarā'* of Dawlatshāh, since he cites them. Unfortunately, it is not possible to determine what personal resources he may have gathered and saved throughout his life. Sām Mīrzā raises tantalizing questions when he discusses poets whom he knew in decades past, such as Hilālī of Astarābād (d. 936/1529), who apparently acted as a kind of mentor to the young prince in Harāt. Was he left to call upon his memory in writing these notices, twenty to thirty years later? We probably will never know; and this is a larger problem in the study of Persian *taẕkirah*s. Scholarship to date has

28. This is setting aside Jāmī, who was born earlier than most of the other individuals covered by Sām Mīrzā.

hardly explored the questions of how these works tended to be composed, and how anthologists may have gathered their biographical data and poetry selections.

Having considered the matters of *when* and *how* Sām Mīrzā wrote the *Tuḥfah*, it is sensible to ask *why* he did so. What were his motivations, and what was he trying to accomplish with his book? As it turns out, this is a thought-provoking problem indeed—but it will be better to wait to address it until we have given a more comprehensive summary of the text.

Notes on extant manuscripts

Copies of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* are not lacking. In the introduction to his 2009 critical edition of the text, Aḥmad Mudaqqiq Yazdī explains that he was able to identify more than three dozen manuscripts in Iran and abroad.[29] And he admits that this may not be an exhaustive accounting—he was focused mainly on a smaller number of early codices that would form the basis of his edition. There are three copies at the British Library alone: Or. 3490, Add. 7670, and Add. 24,362.[30] The last of these, while it is missing some parts, is dated 969/1561–2, *i.e.*, the year that Sām Mīrzā was sent to Qahqahah, and well before his death. Another relatively early, complete manuscript is (or was) held at the Bibliothèque nationale de France; it was described at length by A. I. Silvestre de Sacy (d. 1838) in the fourth volume of *Notices et extraits*, published in the seventh year of the French Republican calendar (or, 1798–9).[31] The colophon of this codex is dated Rajab 1001 (March–April 1593), and it was copied by one Darvīsh Muḥammad *ʿAbdī-beg-zādah*—perhaps a descendant of ʿAbdī Beg Shīrāzī, whose chronicle is among

29. Sām Mīrzā Ṣafavī, *Taẕkirah-i Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Aḥmad Mudaqqiq Yazdī (Yazd: Sāmī, 2009), lxxxi-ii.
30. Rieu, *Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. 1, 367–8; idem, *Supplement to the Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 71.
31. *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale*, vol. 4 (Paris, 1798/9), 273–308.

the essential sources on Sām Mīrzā's life.[32] If this were not remarkable enough, the manuscript came from the collection of Antoine Galland (d. 1715), the first European translator of *One Thousand and One Nights*. And so we have a copy of the *Tuḥfah*—carried out a couple of decades after Sām Mīrzā's death, possibly by the son of a senior official at Shah Ṭahmāsb's court—which was later acquired by one of the most influential orientalists of all time, passed into the holdings of the Bibliothèque du Roi (before its nationalization), and was described in detail by de Sacy (no slouch) in a work published in the strange context of the First Republic. This *taẕkirah* attracted international academic interest as early as any other in the genre.

There are further manuscripts worth mentioning. Mudaqqiq Yazdī relies above all on a copy made in Ramaḍān 972 (April 1565) in Constantinople. (He has badly misinterpreted the colophon date as the year in which Sām Mīrzā completed the work, although it is signed by the scribe, ʿAhdī ibn Shams al-Baghdādī.) Humāyūn Farrukh, for his part, gave precedence to a manuscript held at the Āstān-i Quds-i Rażavī in Mashhad, which is missing some leaves but has been dated roughly to the late tenth/sixteenth century. Finally, there is a codex that was acquired by the scholar Mujtabá Mīnuvī (d. 1977), whose colophon indicates that it was executed in 1174/1761, based on an earlier copy completed on 27 Dhū al-Qaʿdah 958 (26 November 1551) in Mashhad.[33] This last date, if accurate, would be surprisingly early, though not impossible. Might Sām Mīrzā have sent copies of his *taẕkirah* to family members in other important cities of the Safavid realm? There is little that can be said at this point, given that the

32. Recall that it was ʿAbdī Beg's *Takmilat al-akhbār* (978/1570) that transmitted the story that Sām Mīrzā and his sons and nephews died in an earthquake at Qahqahah.

33. This is described on p. lxxxviii of Mudaqqiq Yazdī's edition, and a photograph of the colophon is given on p. cxix.

actually extant manuscript is two hundred years younger. But this is another hint that the authorship of the *Tuḥfah* did not go much beyond 957/1550.

Yet another copy that would be worth reviewing is Persian MS 317 in the John Rylands Library at the University of Manchester.[34] This was in the collection of Nathaniel Bland (d. 1865), the first scholar to write in English about Persian literary anthologies. Perhaps surprisingly, a paper that he wrote for the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* in 1847 is still among the most substantial general works on *taẕkirah*s of poets available in any European language.[35] He never worked on the *Tuḥfah* in depth, but the manuscript that he acquired is reportedly complete and dates to 977/1570.

Published editions

The demand for an accessible printed version of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* was recognized by historians such as E. G. Browne, who refers to it, in the fourth volume of his *Literary History of Persia*, as a "biography of contemporary poets … which urgently needs publication."[36] It took only about a decade for this call to be answered. Vaḥīd Dastgirdī, a poet and scholar who is perhaps best remembered for his work on the *Khamsah* of Niẓāmī, carried out an edition of the *Tuḥfah* in the 1930s.[37] (It seems to have been published initially in late 1314 SH, *i.e.*, early 1936 CE.) By Dastgirdī's own admission, he did not have access to a great number of manuscripts, and in fact he relied primarily on a single copy owned by a member of the Najmābādī family.[38] The resulting edition, while it allowed a much wider

34. I found this manuscript through the UK Fihrist website: https://www.fihrist.org.uk/catalog/manuscript_6810.
35. Nathaniel Bland, "On the earliest Persian Biography of Poets, by Muhammad Aúfi, and on some other Works of the class called *Tazkirat ul Shuârá*," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 9 (1847): 111–76.
36. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, vol. 4, p. 25.
37. Sām Mīrzā Ṣafavī, *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Vaḥīd Dastgirdī (Tehran: Armaghān, 1936).
38. Ibid., ii–iii.

audience to read the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* and was not superseded for thirty years, is missing some notices found in fuller manuscripts, and it lacks a critical apparatus.

In the 1960s, with the encouragement and support of a number of colleagues (including Gulchīn-i Maʿānī), Rukn al-Dīn Humāyūn Farrukh produced a true scholarly edition of the *Tuḥfah*.[39] He did not have at his disposal what we would now consider the best manuscripts, but he was able to assemble a fair collection of materials. As was noted above, his reference text was the Āstān-i Quds-i Rażavī copy. Humāyūn Farrukh's edition represents a large step forward from that of Dastgirdī, with more notices, fewer obvious textual problems, manuscript variations indicated in footnotes, a lengthy introduction, and several useful indices. This is not to say that the edition is flawless. There are gaps in the Āstān-i Quds-i Rażavī manuscript, particularly at the beginning and end of the work. Humāyūn Farrukh relied on other, potentially less reliable copies, and on Dastgirdī's edition, in order to produce a complete text. He also felt comfortable making minor emendations where he sensed that something incorrect had been introduced by the scribes and he wanted to improve readability.[40] Many of these "fixes" appear not to be indicated in the notes. The introduction to this edition is, understandably, somewhat dated. From the sources available to him, Humāyūn Farrukh concluded that Sām Mīrzā died in an earthquake at Qahqahah in 975/1567. (That is, he found the relevant passage in the *Takmilat al-akhbār* and took it at face value.)

On the matter of the completion date of the *Tuḥfah*, Humāyūn Farrukh argues that Sām must have been working on the *taẕkirah* up to the time of his imprisonment at Qahqahah, and that he finished it

---

39. Sām Mīrzā Ṣafavī, *Taẕkirah-i Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Rukn al-Dīn Humāyūn Farrukh (Tehran: ʿIlmī, n.d.). While no specific publication date is indicated, Mudaqqiq Yazdī, in his own edition (p. xc), reports that Humāyūn Farrukh's version first appeared in 1346 SH, *i.e.*, 1967–8.
40. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, xxx.

hurriedly and left it in a rough state.[41] This claim is based on several assumptions, most importantly that the mention of 957/1550 as the "current date" in the first chapter of the *Tuḥfah* indicates the year in which Sām Mīrzā was *beginning* his work. It would be difficult to reconcile this interpretation with the various pieces of evidence (reviewed above) for 957/1550 as a *terminus ad quem*. A final issue with Humāyūn Farrukh's edition is that, even by the standards of the mid twentieth century, it is not nicely typeset. In the end, however, this is the version of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* that has been available to most researchers, and it remains usable.

Very few Persianists seem to be aware that a more recent edition of the *Tuḥfah* exists. It was first published in Yazd in 2009, in what must have been a small run.[42] When I was trying to locate a copy, the only one that I found anywhere in North America was at Princeton. There is, unfortunately, little chance that this edition, carried out by Aḥmad Mudaqqīq Yazdī (known for his work on the *Taẕkirah-i Naṣrābādī*), will become widespread in the foreseeable future, with the original printing not having been ordered by the usual group of research libraries. And so the citations of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* in this dissertation point to the Humāyūn Farrukh version, though it probably should have been superseded. Nevertheless, there are a few points worth noting about Mudaqqiq Yazdī's effort. First, he has relied primarily on an early, complete, and evidently high-quality manuscript, which was copied in Istanbul (Qusṭanṭīnīyah) in Ramaḍān 972 (April 1565) and bears the seal of the library of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shah Qājār (r. 1848–96).[43] This alone is a major improvement. Mudaqqiq Yazdī, unlike his predecessors, had access to a single manuscript that can furnish the full text of the *Tuḥfah*, with no need for patchwork.

41. Ibid., xvii–ix.
42. *Taẕkirah-i Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Aḥmad Mudaqqiq Yazdī (Yazd: Sāmī, 2009).
43. Ibid., lxxxii. A photograph of the colophon is provided on p. cxv.

(There are still some notices that Mudaqqiq Yazdī includes in this edition based on other copies, since they are skipped in the Istanbul codex; but this is not the same problem as missing passages.) He was, furthermore, able to benefit from the work of Dastgirdī and Humāyūn Farrukh, and to review their sources. The result is an edition that is more comprehensive, and presumably more reliable, than was possible before.

Second, Mudaqqiq Yazdī's hundred-page introduction and extensive indices go beyond the already respectable effort of Humāyūn Farrukh. The scholarship, unfortunately, is not impeccable. Sām Mīrzā's death is again attributed to an earthquake at Qahqahah, based on the account in the *Takmilat al-akhbār*, and Mudaqqiq Yazdī makes no mention of the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*.[44] This oversight is less excusable in the 2000s than it was in the 1960s, since the relevant chronicles have been available in printed editions for some time. A more serious error made by Mudaqqiq Yazdī is his interpretation of the scribal note on the colophon of the Istanbul manuscript as indicating the completion date of the work itself (!), rather than of the copy. It is clear that the scribe, ʿAhdī ibn Shams al-Baghdādī, means that he finished *his* task on 28 Ramaḍān 972 (29 April 1565). But Mudaqqiq Yazdī has taken this to be the date of Sām Mīrzā's completion of the *Tuḥfah*.[45] He has also included the copyist's note as the final paragraph of text in the *taẕkirah*, which is strange. This problem, more than any other, might shake the reader's confidence in an edition that generally appears rigorous. There are further minor points that one might criticize. For example, Mudaqqiq Yazdī occasionally incorporates Humāyūn Farrukh's unilateral "corrections," where it would have been preferable to keep the text as it is found in the early manuscripts—whether or not it reads easily. In this edition, at least, all such changes are disclosed in

44. Ibid., lxxvii.
45. Ibid., xxv–vi. See also p. 428.

footnotes. Finally, it makes a difference that this version of the *Tuḥfah* is typeset according to modern standards. It is considerably more tractable than prior editions. For those few researchers who are able to consult a copy of Mudaqqiq Yazdī's work, it may serve as the new standard, if used carefully.

Beyond the three complete (or approximately complete) editions of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* that have appeared to date, a printing of the fifth chapter alone—which contains the notices on well-known poets of Sām Mīrzā's time, and is generally considered the most important part of the *taẕkirah*—was published in 1934.[46] The editor in this case was Mawlavī Iqbāl Ḥusayn, a professor at Patna University, and he relied on two early manuscripts of the *Tuḥfah* that were held at the Bankipore Oriental Public Library (now called the Khudā Bakhsh Oriental Library). It is unlikely that a researcher would need to cite this partial edition today, but Iqbāl Ḥusayn's work is still worth mentioning, both for the sake of thoroughness and because it was used as a corroborating source by Dastgirdī and Humāyūn Farrukh. The *Tuḥfah* has seen more rounds of editing than almost any other Persian *taẕkirah*.

The influence of the Tuḥfah *on later works*

Now that we have a sense of the time and manner in which the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* was written, the early codicology of the work, and its modern publication history, we might usefully comment on the influence of Sām Mīrzā's *taẕkirah* on later authors in the genre. But this turns out to be more difficult than it may seem. There is the simple answer: the *Tuḥfah* was recognized as a prominent text within a few decades of its composition, and Persian anthologists of the period were clearly familiar with it and held it in high regard. We know this because other *taẕkirah*s often mention the *Tuḥfah* among their

46. Sām Mīrzā Ṣafavī, *Kitāb-i Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (*ṣaḥīfah-i panjum*), ed. Iqbāl Ḥusayn (Patna, 1934).

sources of information and inspiration. Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī, in his monumental *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn va ʿaraṣāt al-ʿārifīn* (1024/1615), refers to Sām Mīrzā's work as famous (*mashhūr*) in a biographical notice that also judges the prince as having had greater talent than his brothers in the Safavid dynasty.[47] And there is no indication that the currency of the *Tuḥfah* (at least within the realm of *taẕkirah*s) ebbed as time wore on. In the *Majmaʿ al-fuṣaḥāʾ* (1867) of Riżā Qulī Khān Hidāyat—perhaps the last truly great Persian anthology of poets—the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* is included in the list of authorities upon which the author relied.[48] Thus we could give a basic response to the question of whether Sām Mīrzā's work was influential in the later development of the *taẕkirah* genre; namely, that if we posit any group of texts that exerted such influence, surely his is among them.

It would be challenging or perhaps impossible, however, to construct a more detailed account of this process, since we do not yet have the kind of general history of the *taẕkirah* that would provide a framework for tracing the impact of a given book. I have suggested elsewhere that certain features of the *Tuḥfah* do seem to represent innovations that subsequently became common in literary anthologies—or, at least, that Sām Mīrzā was an early participant in those trends.[49] Two of the more straightforward examples are the *Tuḥfah*'s focus on contemporary poets, rather than on canonical figures of ages past; and the inclusion of notices on men from a range of social classes. (We will return to these points below.) But to say that the popularity and high esteem of the *Tuḥfah* contributed directly to the incorporation of similar features in later *taẕkirah*s would be something like an educated guess. Questions of influence are always among the last to be answerable as a scholarly field matures.

---

47. *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn*, ed. Naṣrābādī, vol. 3, p. 1877.
48. See Riżā Qulī Khān Hidāyat, *Majmaʿ al-fuṣaḥāʾ*, 2 vols. in 6, ed. Maẓāhir Muṣaffā (Tehran: Amīr Kabīr, 1957–61), vol. 1, pt. 1, p. xi.
49. This topic is treated, to an extent, in my two articles cited above.

Surveying the contents of the anthology

Sām Mīrzā wrote his *Tuḥfah* in a preface, seven chapters (*ṣaḥīfah*, pl. *ṣaḥā'if*), and brief addenda (*ẕayl*). The work can best be described as an anthology of poets—including both professionals and members of other groups in society who were known for composing poetry—covering a total of around seven hundred individuals, and providing for each a biographical sketch (usually brief) and selections of verse. (No women are given entries in this *taẕkirah*; there are others from the period that include both sexes, but Sām Mīrzā seems not to have been interested.)[50] Among the signature features of the *Tuḥfah* is its chapter organization, which proceeds according to social class, starting with kings and princes who had an interest in poetry, and continuing in descending order, with the final section addressing common folk (*'avāmm*) and their literary pretensions. The *taẕkirah* therefore presents an explicit, fairly broad social hierarchy.

The first chapter contains notices on nineteen members of royal families, focusing primarily on the four dynasties that dominated the eastern Islamicate world as of the mid tenth/sixteenth century: the Safavids, Ottomans, Mughals, and Abū al-Khayrid Uzbeks.[51] Of particular interest in this chapter are the political sensitivities that Sām Mīrzā needed to negotiate, given his own status as a prince and his personal history with foreign powers. When he discusses the Uzbek ruler 'Ubayd Allāh Khān (d. 946/1539), for example, there is the clear subtext that the Uzbeks repeatedly invaded Khurāsān during Sām Mīrzā's governorship in the 1520s and '30s. 'Ubayd Khān played a significant role in the collapse

50. Of particular note is the *Javāhir al-'ajā'ib* (963/1556) of Fakhrī Haravī, a short *taẕkirah* that focuses on women poets. See *Taẕkirah-i Rawżat al-salāṭīn, va Javāhir al-'ajā'ib, ma'a dīvān-i Fakhrī Haravī*, ed. Sayyid Ḥusām al-Dīn Rāshidī (Hyderabad: Sindhī Adabī Būrd, 1968).

51. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 8–30.

of Sām's career, yet the entry on the former in the *Tuḥfah* makes note of his poetic acumen, even as it condemns him as a bloodthirsty warlord.[52] The inclusion of notices on Ottoman and Uzbek rulers—sworn enemies of the Safavid dynasty—clearly represented some kind of risk in the eyes of Sām Mīrzā, for he adds a disclaimer (*tanbīh*) to his preface to explain that he means no endorsement of the character of these men. He compares his discussion of enemy kings and princes in the *Tuḥfah* to the treatment of the Pharaoh in the Qur'an, which has documentary and didactic purposes.[53] It seems that, having settled on an idiosyncratic social-class framework for this *taẕkirah*, Sām Mīrzā wanted to follow a comprehensive approach in each category that he addresses.

The second chapter of the *Tuḥfah* is devoted to members of families claiming prophetic descent (*i.e.*, *sayyid*s) and religious scholars (*ʿulamāʾ*)—in two separate sections—covering a total of nearly 150 individuals.[54] Sām Mīrzā makes implicit the priorities that underlie his chapter organization: kings and princes must come first, but they are followed by men whose status in society is connected to religion. Only after this group does the focus return to the realm of government, with the third chapter covering thirty-four court officials, be they ministers (*vuzarāʾ*) or "masters of the pen" (*arbāb-i qalam*).[55] The fourth chapter, which is the least precisely defined in the *Tuḥfah*, is set aside for various other prominent individuals (*ḥażarāt-i vājib al-taʿẓīm*, lit. "eminent men who must be glorified") who, although they were not poets *per se*, sometimes composed poetry (*agar-chih shāʿir na-būdah-and, ammā gāhī zabān bi-guftan-i shiʿr mī-gushūdah-and*).[56]

---

52. Ibid., 28–9. In one of his cleverer moments, Sām Mīrzā writes, "This ʿUbayd Allāh is worse than that ʿUbayd Allāh" (*īn ʿUbayd Allāh ziyād az ān ʿUbayd Allāh ast*). The reference is clearly to ʿUbayd Allāh ibn Ziyād (d. 67/686), including a pun from his name.
53. Ibid., 4–5.
54. Ibid., 31–75 (first section), 76–88 (second section).
55. Ibid., 89–101.
56. Ibid., 102–42. The last part of this chapter (pp. 133–42) is presented semi-separately as an addendum (*ẕayl*) in some

This category contains another sixty-nine notices, and I argue that its vague criteria suggest two points about Sām Mīrzā's intentions. First, as can be seen throughout the *Tuḥfah*, comprehensiveness is a goal unto itself. Any contemporary of Sām's who has attracted attention with his poetry, or who is well known for some other reason but has poems attributed to him, is to be included. Second, having cast such a wide net, the author is keen to maintain a degree of separation between individuals who are working poets or at least known primarily for their verse, and those who could be placed in a different—and, it seems, higher—stratum. (Separately, it should be noted again that the order of the third and fourth chapters of the *Tuḥfah* varies in different manuscripts. There are early copies of the work that would support either sequence. Humāyūn Farrukh places the government officials before the miscellaneous prominent men, while Mudaqqiq Yazdī, on the basis of his reference manuscript, has opted for the inverse. If there is truly no way of arriving at a definitive answer as to the order of these chapters, then my inclination is to side with Humāyūn Farrukh, since it seems reasonable for the section designed as a "catch-all" to come after the one specifically allotted to court officials.)

By the end of the fourth chapter, Sām Mīrzā has provided notices on over 250 individuals, and written more than one-third of the total volume of the *Tuḥfah*, without yet addressing the group that we might term "poets proper." It is true that the fifth chapter, which is devoted to "poets who are famous by their pen names" (*shāʿirānī kih bi-takhalluṣ mashhūr-and*), is the longest in the *taẕkirah*, containing some 370 notices and accounting for roughly half of the size of the work. The chapter is in fact divided into two subsections (*maṭlaʿ*, pl. *maṭāliʿ*), the first of which focuses on prominent poets, the second on lesser-known figures.[57] And this part of the *taẕkirah* has received more attention than

copies. A number of the entries are devoted to musicians, calligraphers, and storytellers (s. *qiṣṣah-khwān*).

57. Ibid., 143–249 (first section), 250–333 (second section).

any other, since it offers biographical sketches and excerpted lines for poets that researchers have actually wanted to study: Bābā Faghānī (d. 925/1519), Ahlī Shīrāzī (d. 942/1535), Hilālī Chaghatāʾī (d. 936/1529), Jāmī (d. 898/1492), *etc.*[58] The idea that the fifth chapter is particularly important is reflected even in the codicology and editions of the text. Extant manuscripts sometimes have chapters missing, but this one is always included (if perhaps with lacunae);[59] and, as was noted above, the first printed edition of the *Tuḥfah* omitted the remainder of the work. While the centrality of the fifth chapter cannot be disputed—Sām Mīrzā obviously intended it this way—it is worth recognizing the breadth of the *taẕkirah*. Only half of the book is devoted to individuals who were known primarily as Persian poets, and a still-smaller subsection holds the notices on virtually all of those figures whose fame endured over the course of generations. Considering the *Tuḥfah* as a whole compels us to ask further questions about the author's vision and the social and cultural context reflected in the work.

After the roughly 370 notices in the fifth chapter—about 90 of them in the first *maṭlaʿ*, 280 in the second—the *taẕkirah* is almost finished. In the edition of Humāyūn Farrukh, only around forty-five more pages, or just over a tenth of the book by volume, are needed for the sixth and seventh chapters, plus the addenda. And yet these final sections contain some of the most fascinating comments offered by Sām Mīrzā anywhere, and probably the most *unusual* material included, relative to other *taẕkirah*s before and since. The sixth chapter is set aside for Turkic poets.[60] It is clear that Sām Mīrzā intends this as an ethnic category, encompassing more than language, since he quotes mostly Persian poetry from

---

58. See pp. 176–7 (Faghānī), 177–9 (Ahlī), 152–60 (Hilālī), 143–52 (Jāmī). There are *Encyclopædia Iranica* entries on all of these poets, which have been cited elsewhere throughout the dissertation and are listed in the bibliography.
59. In fairness, it is not always clear whether missing sections have been left out of codices on purpose, or have been lost in the intervening centuries. And one could argue that the fifth chapter, situated in the middle of the work, would be relatively likely to survive.
60. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 334–60.

the thirty individuals that he addresses here. The inclusion of a chapter on Turks in the *Tuḥfah* reflects multiple important dynamics in Iranian history of the late Timurid and early Safavid periods. One key point is that Timurid Harāt, where Sām Mīrzā was, in effect, raised—the cultural environment not having changed overnight with the shift in political power—was a cosmopolitan center in which both Persian and Turkic literature flourished. The latter was, of course, a more recent phenomenon, and it owed much to the efforts of the statesman ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī (d. 906/1501), who wrote extensively in the two languages and was a staunch advocate for the development of Turkic prose and verse.[61]

What had emerged in Harāt was a literary culture in which Persian was dominant, but a growing number of ethnic Turks were garnering attention for their poetry (whether composed in Turkic or Persian). And this more or less matches what we find in the sixth chapter of the *Tuḥfah*. The very first notice, in fact, is for Navāʾī.[62] But the Timurid perspective is only part of the story for Sām Mīrzā, who was born into a family whose primary spoken language was Turkic. His father, Shah Ismāʿīl, was and still is famous for his *dīvān* of Turkic poetry. Furthermore, although scholarship on Safavid history has often been marked by the simple idea that Persian was the dominant language of literature and civil administration—whereas Turkic was spoken by the Qizilbāsh military class, and the nascent Twelver Shiʿi clergy and religious intellectuals focused on Arabic—we are beginning to understand, through the work of scholars like Ferenc Csirkés, that Turkic was still relevant in literary contexts at the Safavid court through at least the turn of the eleventh/seventeenth century.[63] That the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* includes

61. Navāʾī wrote the first Turkic *taẕkirah*, *Majālis al-nafāʾis* (896/1491), which proved hugely influential in succeeding generations—in both Turkic and Persian (it was soon translated). Another of his well-known works is the *Muḥākamat al-lughatayn* (905/1499), or *The Judgment between the Two Languages*, in which he argues for the superiority of Turkic.
62. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 334–8.
63. See Ferenc P. Csirkés, " 'Chaghatay Oration, Ottoman Eloquence, Qizilbash Rhetoric': Turkic Literature in Safavid Persia" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2016).

a chapter on Turkic poets (some associated with the Timurid east, others with the Safavid-Turkmen west), and even quotes lines in Turkic, should be seen as a confirmation of this oft-neglected aspect of early modern Iranian society.

As much as there is interesting material throughout the *Tuḥfah*, it could be argued that nothing quite compares to the surprise of the seventh chapter. Sām Mīrzā has finally made it to the bottom of his grand social hierarchy, having discussed kings and princes, *sayyid*s and *ʿulamā*ʾ, court ministers and secretaries, miscellaneous prominent men (including artists), major and minor poets, and a handful of noteworthy Turks. The time has come for him to address the literary adventures of common folk. In the seventh chapter there are around forty-five notices, which, in the edition of Humāyūn Farrukh, occupy a bit over fifteen pages.[64] This may give a sense of just how little space Sām Mīrzā allocates to each of the humble figures that he addresses here; he tends to give a few lines of biographical description, followed by one or two lines that represent the individual's poetry. (In earlier sections of the *taẕkirah*, one occasionally finds a whole paragraph on a poet's biography, and something on the order of five to ten excerpted lines. Some exceptional cases, such as Jāmī and Navāʾī, are given far more space.) The brevity of the notices in the seventh chapter is just one factor that contributes to the impression that Sām Mīrzā is not discussing these individuals on account of the value of their poetry. Indeed, as we will see, he lampoons several of them for their lack of talent or training in the rules and conventions of Persian verse; and it is clear, overall, that the goal of the seventh chapter, apart from rounding out a comprehensive portrait of Persian poetry as it was practiced across social classes in Greater Iran in the late Timurid and early Safavid periods, is to entertain the reader by giving a taste of

64. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 361–76.

the attempts by members of lower socioeconomic strata to compose poetry (as well as some of their other amusing exploits).

The final chapter of the Tuḥfah

The subtitle that Sām Mīrzā gives to this chapter is as follows: "On the speakers of curiosities whose words are pleasing, and on the rest of the commoners" (*dar ẕikr-i ṭurfah-gūyān-i maqbūl al-kalām va īrād-i sā'ir-i 'avāmm*).[65] This suggests that he has in mind individuals of two kinds, though there is some overlap between them. On the one hand, Sām will discuss men whose verse might not be of a character that qualifies as poetry *per se*, but which is still agreeable and appreciated. In some cases, as we will see, this involves satire and vulgarity, which have a long and proud history in Persian literature but were not always deemed fit to be discussed in the same context as "serious" poetry. The second part of the chapter subtitle, however, exudes dismissiveness: "the rest of the commoners," apparently included in the *Tuḥfah* for no specific reason. It should be noted that none of the people covered in this section of the *taẕkirah* appears to hold a particularly high station in society; and the impression is that anyone who *did* belong to a more respected class would be placed in one of the earlier chapters, regardless of the merit of his poetry. What we tend to find in the seventh chapter are subjects who, at best, are valued for the entertainment that they provide.

Again, in the Humāyūn Farrukh edition, the seventh chapter comprises forty-six notices, all of which fit in sixteen pages. The shortest of these entries consist of one line of biographical description followed by one line of poetry; and none of them devotes more than eleven lines to the biographical

65. Ibid., 361.

sketch, or quotes more than six lines of poetry. That is to say, the notices in the seventh chapter range from literally as short as possible, to an upper limit that would still appear brief in the context of most Persian *taẕkirah*s. What is Sām Mīrzā able to accomplish with this tightly limited space? A name is always provided, of course. There is also, in nearly all cases, an indication of where the individual is from; often this is implied through the inclusion of a geographic *nisbah* in the name, or else Sām Mīrzā mentions a place. Perhaps more surprisingly, around two-thirds of the notices give some information about the subject's profession. This too can be part of the name. One of the men is called Basmalī *Kallah-paz*, and he in fact earns his living by dressing and selling *kallah*, the heads (usually along with the hooves) of sheep.[66] Another notice is for an individual named Ustād Shāh Qulī *Naqqāsh* Qumī, who is, accordingly, a painter (or engraver).[67] But there are numerous cases in which, absent any hint in the names, Sām Mīrzā goes out of his way to make note of professions. We find, for example, several storytellers (s. *qiṣṣah-khwān*), a butcher (*qaṣṣāb*), a barber (*sar-tarāsh*), and—if I have understood correctly—a broker (*dallāl*).[68]

The presence of these details is fascinating in and of itself. The *Tuḥfah* offers solid evidence that no group in (male) society was cut off from the culture of composing and sharing *ghazal*s. This was a pastime for tripe vendors, as it was for *sayyid*s and princes. But it is worth considering that Sām Mīrzā makes an effort to include this information in notices that usually consist of one or two sentences. Mentioning the individuals' professions is a clear priority. This strengthens the impression that Sām has endeavored to create a snapshot of urban society in tenth/sixteenth-century Iran as reflected in

66. Ibid., 367.
67. Ibid., 372.
68. The storytellers include Mawlānā Shamālī Kāshānī (p. 366), Mawlānā Ḥasan Mushtāqī Shīrāzī (p. 367), and Mawlānā Lavandī (p. 368). The butcher is Ḥāfiẓ Mīrak Kāshānī (p. 370); the barber, Gilū ʿAlī (pp. 368–9); and the *dallāl*, Tazrīqī Ardabīlī (p. 366).

the practice of poetry. While other chapters in the *Tuḥfah* may fit with the goal stated in the preface—to document the lives and works of poets at the vanguard of Persian lyric style—in the seventh chapter the legacy belongs rather to a certain milieu and historical moment. (See below for further discussion of the preface and of Sām Mīrzā's authorly motivations.)

Beyond the name—which might further include titles, a *nisbah*, a *takhalluṣ*—and the profession and place of origin, the next most common feature in these notices is an amusing anecdote or pithy remark given by Sām Mīrzā about the individual in question. We will examine several of these in detail in the following section. But we should also note what is *not* found in the entries of the seventh chapter. One clear omission is reference to specific dates. In only two of the forty-six notices does Sām Mīrzā mention a year; both of these pertain to the deaths of the men under discussion, one of them in 950/1543–4 and the other in 953/1546–7.[69] It is generally the case that the *Tuḥfah* does not refer to many dates. The focus, after all, is on poets who were contemporary with Sām Mīrzā, and many of them were still active at the time of the work's composition. It can likewise be said of Persian *taẕkirah*s of this period that they tend to be concerned chiefly with providing a bit of identifying information about a given poet, followed perhaps by an anecdote or two, or some comment on his or her poetry—then, crucially, a selection of lines. Specific dates are not emphasized, and when one is mentioned, it is most often in reference to a poet's death. Even with this in mind, the seventh chapter of the *Tuḥfah* appears unusually divorced from chronology.[70] Sām Mīrzā discusses individuals from

69. Mawlānā Ḥasan Mushtāqī Shīrāzī (p. 367) is reported to have died in 950, and Khwājah Khurd (pp. 374–5) in 953.
70. The one other section in the *taẕkirah* that is similarly lacking in date references is the second part of the fifth chapter (on minor poets). In fact, just a single year—935/1528–9, on p. 293—is mentioned across all of its 282 notices.

Harāt, whom he may have encountered in his youth, alongside others from places like Qazvīn and Ardabīl, who are more likely acquaintances of his adulthood; but there is no visible differentiation.

The sense of a generalized, out-of-time snapshot is enhanced by the brevity of these notices. With only a line or two to devote to each subject, there is (with the occasional exception) no way to make specific comments on the poetry being cited. In one case, which we will discuss below, Sām Mīrzā quips that the man's verse neither obeys the rules of prosody nor has any meaning.[71] In another, he mentions the background story for a bit of satire that he found amusing. But there are plenty of notices in this chapter in which the poetry selection is introduced simply with the statement, "The following *maṭlaʿ* [*i.e.*, the opening line of a *ghazal*] is by him." Again, the prevailing impression given by this section of the *Tuḥfah* is of a sampling of the kinds of people that one might encounter, and the poetry that one might hear them exchanging, while walking through the bazaar of an Iranian city in the early to mid tenth/sixteenth century. And it is difficult to ignore the fact that Sām Mīrzā paints this portrait from a vantage point at the top of the social hierarchy.

Further notes on the seventh chapter

Some of the notable characteristics of the seventh chapter can be seen elsewhere in the *Tuḥfah*, if perhaps in milder form. There are anecdotes about incompetent poetasters and individuals from strange backgrounds—to say nothing of the consistent references to debauched behavior throughout the book. (We will examine quite a number of these cases below.) It should also be acknowledged that the same features may appear in other *taẕkirah*s of the early Safavid-Mughal period. Leafing through

71. This is the notice on "Mawlānā Ustād Nūrī Qufl-gar" (p. 365). See the next section (3.2) for a full description.

some of the larger anthologies, such as the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār* (completed in 1016/1607–8) of Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī and the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn* (1024/1615) of Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī Balyānī, one will stumble upon notices that are less than effusive about the skill or style of the poets in question, and many of the individuals covered were born in a class somewhere beneath the "landed gentry" (to use the term loosely). What sets apart the work of Sām Mīrzā, and in particular the closing section of his anthology, is the *concentration* and *extremeness* of these attributes. To include a whole chapter in which all of the subjects are from lower socioeconomic strata, with much of their poetry described as bad, sometimes to the point of hilarity, is either unique in the *taẕkirah* genre, or so unusual that I have yet to hear of a comparable example.

Similarly, the attention paid by Sām Mīrzā to men who seem to be on the margins of society is striking. It is one thing to add a notice on someone like the young Muḥtasham Kāshānī (d. 996/1588), who holds a respectable job in the bazaar and has poetic talent to boot.[72] But a number of the figures described in the seventh chapter belong to the humblest stations in society. Sām Mīrzā makes statements such as the following: "He is among the vagabonds of the city of Harāt" (*az chapāniyān-i shahr-i Harāt ast*); "He is a dervish, a commoner, a pauper" (*mardī darvīsh va ʿāmmī ast va faqīr ast*); "He is a poor hermit from Baghdad" (*Baghdādī ast va mardī gūshah-nishīn va faqīr ast*); "He is from the city of Ḥillah, and he used to wander the earth as a *qalandar*" (*az shahr-i Ḥillah ast, va dar avāʾil bi-ṣūrat-i qalandarī bar-āmadah gird-i jahān mī-gardīd*).[73] (To be fair, this erstwhile wanderer from Ḥillah

72. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 373. We will return later to the entry on Muḥtasham, which is unusual in the context of the seventh chapter.
73. See, respectively, pp. 362–3, 365, 369, 373–4.

later entered the service of Shah Ṭahmāsb, though Sām Mīrzā does not specify in what capacity.) It is the sum of what we find in the *Tuḥfah* that makes it such an extraordinary source.

Sām Mīrzā's motivations in writing the Tuḥfah; *conclusions*

Having considered the general characteristics of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* and its contents, we should turn briefly to Sām Mīrzā's preface, in which he offers an explanation of his ostensible purpose in authoring a *taẕkirah*. The issue that he raises is that the great poets of the Persian tradition, stretching as far back as Rūdakī (d. 329/940–41), already have their life stories and the reception of their works thoroughly documented in anthologies such as the *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ* (892/1487) of Dawlatshāh Samarqandī, the *Bahāristān* (892/1487) of Jāmī, and the *Majālis al-nafāʾis* (896/1491) of ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī. (He mentions these works by name.)[74] While Sām Mīrzā does not state as much explicitly, he clearly implies that there would be little point in retreading the ground covered by earlier *taẕkirah* authors. But he goes on to note that Persian poetry has not ceased to develop, and that there are great poets of his lifetime whose legacies still need to be secured. His stated goal, then, is to write a *taẕkirah* that picks up where the aforementioned anthologists left off—around the end of the Timurid period. Sām Mīrzā claims to hold the poets of his own time in high regard. With perhaps a touch of hyperbole, he announces that his contemporaries "have snatched the ball of elegance with the polo stick of striving ahead" (*gū-yi laṭāfat bi-chūgān-i musābaqat rubūdah-and*), and that each of them is like Amīr Khusraw (d. 725/1325) or Saʿdī (d. *ca.* 691/1292) or Anvarī (fl. sixth/twelfth century) in eloquence, and like Firdawsī (d. *ca.* 410/1020) or Sanāʾī (d. *ca.* 525/1130–31) in wisdom. Sām also notes that, absent his

74. Sām Mīrzā discusses his goals for the *Tuḥfah*, and mentions these earlier works, on pp. 3–4.

intervention, “the memory of these speakers of rarities will be erased from the pages of time” (*ẕikr-i īn nādirah-gūyān az ṣafḥah-i zamān suturdah mī-gardad*).[75]

To a meaningful extent, what we find in the *Tuḥfah* is the realization of this objective. Again, around half of the volume of the *taẕkirah* is taken up by the fifth chapter, in which Sām Mīrzā records information about poets who might truly deserve a legacy. (Several of them now hold places in the pantheon. One good example is Bābā Faghānī, for whose biography the *Tuḥfah* serves as a crucial early source.) Much of the remaining half of the work is devoted to discussion of prominent men in society who had literary interests, and it is not difficult to imagine how they fit with Sām Mīrzā’s comments in the preface. For one thing, the author was himself part of a ruling family—one of several whose members were often fiercely devoted to the arts—and preserving some remarks on, say, the poetry of Humāyūn would be of clear value. It should be kept in mind that Sām knew some of these kings and princes personally.

The same general idea would apply to the chapters on *sayyid*s, *vazīr*s, *etc*. In fact, there are at least a few cases in which an individual is placed in one of these earlier chapters, despite being more than famous enough as a poet to qualify for inclusion in the fifth. The notice on Shihāb al-Dīn Murvārīd (d. 922/1516), for example, occurs at the beginning of the fourth chapter (on “eminent men who must be glorified”).[76] It seems that Sām Mīrzā considered various factors in deciding where to place an individual who could fit in more than one category. Murvārīd was a top-tier poet of his day, but he was also a famous calligrapher and the author of a history of the reign of Shah Ismāʿīl. Perhaps the breadth of his reputation led to his inclusion in the fourth chapter rather than the fifth. It may also be relevant

75. Ibid., 4.
76. Ibid., 102–7.

that Murvārīd came from a prominent family, and Sām Mīrzā has constructed a framework in which the "actual poets" are presented at a lower rank than men whose prominence in society is attributable to court service, religious scholarship, or simple birthright. In any event, the first four chapters of the *Tuḥfah* cannot reasonably be considered a *diversion* from the mission that is set out in the preface, even though they are not as focused as the fifth chapter on preserving the legacies of contemporary poets. Furthermore, the sixth chapter can be viewed as a kind of annex to the fifth; there is still clearly an effort to give an account of important figures, with the difference that the individuals covered are Turks (in some cases composing verse in Turkic).

It is only when we arrive at the seventh chapter that the scope and even the basic approach of the *Tuḥfah* seem to have gone significantly astray. These forty-six notices cannot possibly be intended to ensure that the works of eloquent and wise men are saved for posterity. Sām Mīrzā is, at best, amused by their poetry.[77] Nor, in most cases, do the subjects hold any status in society that would otherwise recommend them for inclusion in a *taẕkirah*. And so the peculiar seventh chapter, whose presence would be difficult to rationalize on the terms of a typical anthology of poets, provides an occasion to look more critically at Sām Mīrzā's project as a whole. On second examination, other aspects of the *Tuḥfah* appear to be in some tension with the goal set out in the preface. Why, for instance, would Sām Mīrzā devote nearly all of his resources to breadth, and so little to depth? When he makes reference to poets of his day who resemble Anvarī in eloquence and Firdawsī in wisdom, how many does he have in mind? Surely not anything close to the seven hundred individuals covered in the *Tuḥfah*. Would it not have been more effective to focus on, say, the one hundred poets who strike the author as most

77. Again, the notice on Muḥtasham Kāshānī (p. 373) stands as an exception.

important in carrying forward the Persian tradition? (Researchers in literary history would certainly prefer longer discussions of figures like Faghānī and Ahlī, even if it meant sacrificing the litany of two- and three-line notices on obscure individuals whose names appear nowhere outside of this *taẕkirah*.)

The reality is that the *Tuḥfah* offers less material for each poet, on average, than just about any other extant work in the genre. What are Sām Mīrzā's true intentions here? He has authored a text that performs a striking range of functions, including documenting the lives and works of prominent men of the late Timurid and early Safavid periods; capturing a particular moment in Persian literary culture, with vignettes of the different segments of society that were participating in their own ways; and collecting all manner of interesting anecdotes and snippets of poetry from individuals that Sām Mīrzā met, or heard about, over the course of his tumultuous life. I am not sure whether there is an established term among Persianists to refer to such a variegated book. In the next section, I will argue (among other things) that the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* can be analyzed productively as a work of *adab*. The key point, for now, is that the confounding experience of coming upon the seventh chapter is what forces a reckoning with the complicated nature of this text.

3.2: From reference text to *adab*

Introduction

One of the special concerns of this study—an area in which it seems that real value might be added—is to provide a synoptic account of a *tażkirah* of poets.[78] Works in this genre are so rarely read from start to finish; even an analysis of one whole chapter of an anthology would be unusual. The reasons for this tendency are discussed in greater depth elsewhere, but the simple issue is that *tażkirah*s tend to be treated as reference sources. Most commonly, we are looking for biographical information and selected verses for specific poets. We find the relevant passages in a number of *tażkirah*s, and the task is finished. It ought to be acknowledged, in fairness, that for all we know, the audiences of these texts during the periods in which they were composed used them in a similar manner. But this is difficult to determine in any case. If only to err on the safe side, should we not develop an understanding of what a *tażkirah* can impart to us, when we approach it as a literary work in its own right? The question remains open—and this half of the dissertation is concerned, in part, with testing such an approach and attempting to demonstrate its value.

While researching Sām Mīrzā's life and œuvre, I read through all of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (on multiple occasions…) and built a spreadsheet to collect information from each of the more than seven hundred

78. As is the case throughout the dissertation, dates in this chapter are generally given in both the Islamic (AH) and the Julian/Gregorian (CE) calendars, with the switch from Julian to Gregorian conversion applied after the year 990/1582. It may be worth adding that, for convenience, some Turkic names are written in accordance with modern Turkish orthography. Unless otherwise noted, citations of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* refer to the edition of Rukn al-Dīn Humāyūn Farrukh (Tehran: ʿIlmī, n.d.). It would perhaps be useful, in future elaboration of this research, to insert parallel citations of the more recent edition of Aḥmad Mudaqqiq Yazdī (Yazd: Sāmī, 2009); but I have opted not to add that complication here. Finally, the focus in this section of the dissertation is the *Tuḥfah* itself, and so an effort has been made to limit references to secondary literature.

entries found therein. This is included as an appendix. It will become clear, with the full picture before us, that we can draw observations from a broad reading of the *Tuḥfah* that would never emerge from examining short and scattered snippets of the text. In the following pages, we will briefly address five such areas of insight. **First**, there is some value in being able to develop, and substantiate, general conclusions about the structure and content of a *taẕkirah*. We know that Sām Mīrzā tends to provide brief notices on the individuals that he discusses, often consisting of a few lines of biographical description (as printed in the edition of Humāyūn Farrukh) followed by one or two lines of poetry. But it is something different to state authoritatively that the median notice in the *Tuḥfah* provides a three-line biographical sketch and one line of poetry. Is this consistent from one chapter to the next? Not exactly. In the first chapter, devoted to members of ruling families, the median length of biographical passages is fourteen lines. And in the first part of the fifth chapter, reserved for well-established poets, the median value for the number of lines quoted increases to four. Moving beyond the surface level, we can also gain insight into the way that Sām Mīrzā assigns the individuals covered in his *taẕkirah* to different chapters, based partly on a hierarchy of social classes. The second chapter is for *sayyid*s and *ʿulamāʾ*, the third for men of state, and the fourth for miscellaneous prominent individuals; but how simple is it to separate these categories? We will return to such questions below.

Second, on a related note, looking at the entirety of the *Tuḥfah* makes it easier to determine what Sām Mīrzā considers truly remarkable, or which kinds of information and anecdotes he is most keen to share with the reader. In a *taẕkirah* dominated by short notices—many of which offer just a name, a sentence or two about the individual's origins and characteristics, and one line excerpted from a *ghazal*—the cases in which Sām Mīrzā has significantly more to say stand out. The second part of the

fifth chapter, for example, deals with minor poets. It contains around 280 notices, but almost all of them are short. We find only a handful—nine entries, to be precise—in which the biographical sketch and excerpted poetry combined amount to ten lines or more. In these relatively long passages, there tends to be something unusual that Sām Mīrzā is attempting to convey. (We will look at a number of examples later.) And there are further variations in approach among the seven chapters that become apparent after a comprehensive review. For instance, through most of the *Tuḥfah*, the notices are consistent in giving some indication of each individual's geographic origin or affiliation—at least by adding a *nisbah* at the end of the name. But the sixth chapter, which focuses on poets of Turkic background, is exceptional in this regard. Sām Mīrzā omits geographic details for a majority of them, and he sometimes mentions a tribal affiliation instead. The implications of this distinction are another matter, but it is certainly interesting, and noticing it relies on an understanding of the *Tuḥfah* as a whole.

Third, there is a rich dimension of this *taẕkirah* that engages with connections among the figures under discussion. Sām Mīrzā brings up family ties, teacher-student relationships, literary friendships and rivalries, and the highly important practice of *imitatio* (usually, *javāb-gū'ī*) in Persian poetry of the Timurid and Safavid-Mughal eras. In a number of cases, a relationship between two individuals is mentioned, both of whom are *included* in the *Tuḥfah*. We are told, for example, that a Turkic *amīr* named Ḥusayn ʿAlī Jalāyir "Ṭufaylī" (entry no. 640) sparred in satirical poetry (*hajv*) with Umīdī Tihrānī (no. 271).[79] In the earlier chapters of the *taẕkirah*, several family groups are outlined, including a line of *sayyid*s in Qazvīn descended from a certain Qāżī Sayf al-Dīn, and the relatives of a man

79. The entry for Umīdī occurs on pp. 173–6, and is *numbered* 271, in the Humāyūn Farrukh edition. Notice numbers are included in the main text of this chapter, since they can greatly facilitate referring to the spreadsheet.

named Qāżī ʿĪsá, who had served at the Āqquyūnlū court in the decades leading up to Shah Ismāʿīl's accession.[80] I have tried to be fastidious in making a note in the spreadsheet for each interpersonal connection that Sām Mīrzā mentions explicitly. This leads us to the next point.

Fourth, given that Sām Mīrzā periodically discusses *javāb*s, or quotes from one poet in an entry dedicated to another, we have a way of observing that certain figures seem to have been especially popular or influential in this period. (Or, at least, that Sām is unusually fond of their work…) It will come as no surprise that Jāmī's name (no. 265) is invoked throughout the *Tuḥfah* more than that of any other poet.[81] *Javāb*s of his lines by at least six others are quoted. (This is in addition to various anecdotes involving Jāmī, places where Sām Mīrzā quotes him directly to emphasize an idea, *etc.*) But not all of the outliers are so intuitive. Another poet who emerges as a member of the top tier is Umīdī Tihrānī (no. 271; killed in 925/1519). His name would probably be unfamiliar to most specialists in Persian literature, except for those who have made a close study of the early Safavid period. He is, however, more consistently present in the *Tuḥfah* than any other poet save Jāmī. Sām Mīrzā quotes one of his lines in the very first notice in the *taẕkirah*, devoted to Shah Ismāʿīl. The currency of Umīdī's work in the early to mid tenth/sixteenth century becomes apparent through sporadic mention of his name and references to his poetry across the *Tuḥfah*. His entry itself is complimentary and portrays him as a well-known individual, but not to such an extreme degree. Sām Mīrzā also provides indications that certain *poems* were popular and subject to frequent responses. One of these is a *qaṣīdah* by Kātibī Nīshāpūrī (d. *ca.* 839/1435–6) whose *radīf* is *gul*.[82] This work remained influential

80. Kioumars Ghereghlou includes a brief introduction to this family in his *Encyclopædia Iranica* entry on "Sayfi Qazvini," who was (as his name suggests) one of the Sayfīs of Qazvīn, known for authoring the chronicle *Lubb al-tavārīkh* (*ca.* 956/1549).
81. The dedicated notice on Jāmī falls on pp. 143–52 in the Humāyūn Farrukh edition.
82. Unfortunately, the complete poems of Kātibī have not been published. His *ghazal*s are available in print, edited by

enough, a century or more after Kātibī's death, that Sām Mīrzā refers to it (on two separate occasions) in a way that suggests the reader should know it well. Another example is a *qaṣīdah* by Amīr Khusraw (d. 725/1325) known under the title *Daryā-yi abrār*.[83]

Fifth, and finally, the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* asserts itself more as a work of *adab* when it is read freely and not simply mined as a reference source. This may be the most important point of all. If we approach the *Tuḥfah* in a spirit of curiosity and open-mindedness, then we may find in it the mixture of entertainment and edification that we associate with *adab* literature in the classical Arabic and Persian traditions (and beyond). A number of the most memorable passages in this *taẕkirah* occur not in the notices dedicated to major poets, but rather in places that an information-motivated reader would be unlikely to venture. Sām Mīrzā displays a sense of humor, sometimes at the expense of individuals whose behavior strikes him as bizarre or inappropriate. He also betrays a taste for irreverence, at least under the right circumstances. It could be said that the overall *feeling* imparted by the *Tuḥfah* changes under a less conditional reading. There is, of course, some subjectivity involved in this assessment; but we will cover a range of example passages from the text in the discussion to follow. Again, the ultimate goal is to explore various ways in which this *taẕkirah* offers new insight into the literary culture of early Safavid Iran, as well as a sense of how it functions as a *book*, if taken on its own terms.

Taqī Vaḥīdiyān Kāmyār, Saʿīd Khū-Muḥammadī Khayrābādī, and Mujtabá Javādī-niyā (Mashhad: Āstān-i Quds-i Rażavī, 1382/2003–4). For the text of the *"gul" qaṣīdah*, the best place to look is the entry on Kātibī in Dawlatshāh's *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ*, which quotes the poem in full. See pp. 689–704 in the edition of Fāṭimah ʿAlāqah (Tehran: Pizhūhishgāh-i ʿUlūm-i Insānī va Muṭālaʿāt-i Farhangī, 2007).

83. It is surprisingly difficult to find a printed version of this *qaṣīdah*, though it is a very well-known poem that prompted numerous *javāb*s in the Timurid and Safavid-Mughal periods. On Ganjoor, *Daryā-yi abrār* is *qaṣīdah* no. 3 from Amīr Khusraw. Its first line begins, *Kūs-i shah khālī va bāng-i ghalghalash dard-i sar ast*.

1) High-level observations about the Tuḥfah

As was mentioned above, a close reading and tabulation of the entire *Tuḥfah* allows us to describe its general characteristics in a more authoritative manner than is usually feasible in scholarship on *taẕkirah*s. The median number of lines of biographical description in a single notice is three. At a narrower scope, however, this figure ranges as high as fourteen (in the first chapter) and as low as two (in the seventh chapter and the second part of the fifth). It is hardly surprising that the section of the *Tuḥfah* that tends to provide the longest biographical sketches is the chapter focusing on kings and princes, whereas minimal attention is paid to the lives of the lower-class individuals at the end of the work. If we turn to the number of lines of poetry quoted in a single notice (and attributed to the subject of that notice), the story is somewhat different. Across the whole *Tuḥfah*, the median figure is just one! It is also one in the first chapter, which, despite its long biographical passages, shows little interest in the poetry of most of the royal figures. The highest median number of lines transmitted is—again, unsurprisingly—in the first part of the fifth chapter, which is set aside for the most successful poets. Still, the figure is only four.

One of the key aspects of the *Tuḥfah* is that the amount of space allocated to each notice is nowhere near evenly distributed. Rather, we find a large number of cursory entries, punctuated by a few that are significantly longer. In the first section of the fifth chapter, for example, twelve of the eighty-eight notices quote merely a single line from the poet in question, and another eighteen notices quote two lines each. This may be contrasted with the entry on Jāmī, in the same section, which transmits seventy-nine lines of his poetry; or the entry on Hilālī Chaghatāʾī (no. 266), which includes

sixty-eight lines.[84] The unevenness of this distribution is the reason that we cite median figures, which are not as distorted by outliers. The median number of lines quoted in this part of the *taẕkirah* is four, but the *average* (*i.e.*, arithmetic mean) figure would be just below eight. The same tendency can be observed throughout the *Tuḥfah*. To give another example, the *median* number of lines of poetry quoted per notice across the entire work may be one, but this would rise to between two and three if we instead calculated the *mean*. In a context such as this, the median gives a more accurate sense of how a *typical* entry would appear.

There are a couple of other useful statistics that we can calculate. For example, as we have noted, Sām Mīrzā usually offers some indication of an individual's geographic origin or affiliation—at least through the use of a *nisbah* adjective (*e.g.*, Kāshānī, Ardabīlī, Qazvīnī). In only eighty-two of the seven hundred and ten notices in the *Tuḥfah* (per Humāyūn Farrukh's edition) is there an absence of explicit or clearly implied geographic information. (These are rows in the spreadsheet in which I have written "N/A.") And so it can be said that Sām Mīrzā includes this kind of data in almost ninety percent of cases. Of course, this also varies from one section to another. In the second part of the fifth chapter, which focuses on relatively minor poets, there are 282 notices, and only six of them (or around two percent) give no solid indication of their subjects' geographic affiliations. It may be worth noting that two of those six entries are unusual in other ways that may help to explain the lack of place names. One of the men, a certain Ṭufaylī (no. 362) was apparently among the slaves (*mamlūkān*) of Jahānshāh Qarāquyūnlū. The other, Mawlānā Āsī (no. 525), belonged to the Ās tribe (*qabīlah-i Ās*), known in English as the Ossetians.[85]

---

84. The entry for Hilālī is found on pp. 152–60 of the Humāyūn Farrukh edition.
85. For Ṭufaylī, see p. 253 in Humāyūn Farrukh's edition; for Āsī, see p. 298.

The idea of tribal affiliation as a kind of stand-in for geographic origin is particularly interesting in light of what we find in the sixth chapter, on Turkic poets. Bucking the trend in the remainder of the *Tuḥfah*, Sām Mīrzā neglects to mention where twenty of the thirty individuals (or two-thirds) are from. But he names their tribes in a number of cases. For example, there is an Īv-ughlī Chaghatāʾī (no. 650), a Bahārlū (no. 652), a Chamish-gazak (no. 662; this was evidently a Khurāsānī Kurdish group), and a Chāvushlū Ustājlū (no. 643).[86] It seems clear, with data from the whole *taẕkirah* collected before us, that the one intriguing exception to Sām Mīrzā's tendency to give some geographic affiliation in each notice, is the sixth chapter—and that his focus on the Turks' tribal membership is meant to fill the same role.[87] Furthermore, it may be noteworthy in itself that the *Tuḥfah* is so consistent in providing this information, given how brief most of the entries are. The only datum that is absolutely necessary, of course, is the name of each individual. (There also needs to be at least one line of poetry quoted.) But the next most common feature of a notice in this *taẕkirah* is a geographic reference, if only because it becomes part of the name through the use of a *nisbah*.

We could likewise examine the frequency with which Sām Mīrzā mentions specific dates (almost always years) throughout the *Tuḥfah*. The short answer is "not very often": only ninety notices out of seven hundred and ten, or a bit less than thirteen percent, include date references. There is also an entry whose subject is said to have made the *ḥajj* pilgrimage "two years ago," which should mean roughly 955/1548–9; and a similar case in which an individual reportedly died within the last couple

86. Their names are, respectively, Yūsuf Beg Tūshmāl, Būdāq Beg, Yartīlmīsh, and Yūsuf Beg. For page numbers, please refer to the spreadsheet. (The sixth chapter falls on pp. 334–60 in the Humāyūn Farrukh edition.)

87. The first chapter is also relatively lacking in references to geographic origin, but there the reason is even more obvious: Why would Sām Mīrzā bother reciting these facts for men as great as Sulṭān Ḥusayn Bāyqarā, Humāyūn Pādshāh, and Sultan Süleyman?

years.[88] At any rate, while Sām Mīrzā uses geographic origin throughout as a basic way of categorizing and distinguishing people, he tends to mention dates in a narrower set of circumstances. Either there was an important event in which the figure under discussion was involved, or he has passed away and Sām Mīrzā is aware of the year in which that occurred. Accordingly, specific dates are found most often in notices on men who took part in political or military affairs, or on well-known poets from relatively early in the *Tuḥfah*'s period of coverage (*e.g.*, Jāmī). In the first chapter, fourteen of nineteen notices (or nearly three-quarters) include mention of at least one year. The first section of the fifth chapter, on important poets, is also exceptional in this regard, albeit to a lesser extent. Twenty-seven of its eighty-eight notices (or just over thirty percent) have date references. All of these are death years for the respective poets, save one: the entry on ʿAbd Allāh Hātifī (no. 267) also relates the story of his meeting Shah Ismāʿīl in 917/1511–12.[89]

In general, dates come up when they are *relevant* and *available*; Sām Mīrzā does not go out of his way to include them. Why might this be? There are at least three possible reasons. First, as has been noted elsewhere, the *Tuḥfah* is predominantly a *taẕkirah* of recent and contemporary poets. Many of the individuals that it describes were still living *ca.* 957/1550, and, in the absence of a year of death, there is usually no other date that would be mentioned. Second, of the roughly seven hundred men covered in this work, the great majority are not famous. Sām Mīrzā is willing to make note of important events and the dates on which they took place, but in most cases there is nothing of the

88. These are the notices on Shāh Qāsim "Vāqifī" (no. 53, p. 54) and ʿAbdī (no. 243, p. 134), respectively. (Note that there are two entries numbered 53 in the Humāyūn Farrukh edition—or, at least, in the printing that I used. Shāh Qāsīm is the second of the two, as a result of which his number in the spreadsheet is 53.5. There are several such irregularities throughout the edition.)

89. The entry is on pp. 160–64 in the Humāyūn Farrukh edition. The story of Shah Ismāʿīl's visiting the poet in Kharjird is apparently thought to be legitimate. See Michele Bernardini, "Hātefi, ʿAbd-Allāh," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

sort to discuss. Third, and perhaps most importantly, a *taẕkirah* is not a historical chronicle. The treatment of dates in the *Tuḥfah* is typical enough for this genre. The purpose of a given notice in an anthology, generally speaking, is to introduce the poet; to provide a bit of information about his or her biography; perhaps to share an anecdote or two; and, crucially, to quote excerpts of verse. If a date is mentioned, it is probably the poet's year of death. This is true of the *Tuḥfah* and of *taẕkirah*s broadly.

Yet another column in the spreadsheet that may be informative is on the professions of individuals, which Sām Mīrzā sometimes specifies. Unfortunately, it would do little good to examine the frequency of these details' occurrence across the whole work, since the meaning of "profession" (or even the applicability of the concept) varies considerably from one social class to another. Would it make sense to count the description of Shah Ismāʿīl's royal activities as an indication of what he did for a living? Surely not. And what criteria, precisely, should we require for someone to be considered a "professional poet"? This is a difficult question, in a *taẕkirah* that describes men from a wide range of backgrounds, all of whom have at least a bit of poetry attributed to them. Where is the line crossed from hobby to vocation? To be sure, there are some individuals—particularly in the first part of the fifth chapter—who made their living as poets. Hilālī Chaghatā'ī (no. 266) and Bābā Faghānī (no. 272) are clear examples. But the matter of deciding which figures can reasonably be labeled "professionals" in this field is, for the most part, too arbitrary.

There are two main contexts in which it is actually helpful to track Sām Mīrzā's inclusion of data on occupations. The first case is for men who held important positions in society, *e.g.*, as government ministers (*vuzarā'*) or magistrates (*qużāt*). The second is for practitioners of arts and trades, *e.g.*, storytellers (*qiṣṣah-khwānān*), scribes or secretaries (*kuttāb*), schoolmasters (*maktab-dārān*), and

physicians (*aṭibbā’*).[90] And it was these details that I wanted to record by adding a column to the spreadsheet. In the seventh chapter of the *Tuḥfah*, on commoners and their literary pretensions, the notices tend to be exceedingly brief, consisting of as little as one sentence of biographical description and a single line of poetry. Interestingly, despite the paltry amount of space dedicated to each figure, Sām Mīrzā includes some note about the professions of most of them—thirty-one out of forty-six, or about two-thirds. This is probably because the jobs held by the working-class would-be poets are part of what makes them interesting subjects. They include a barber (*sar-tarāsh*), a *kallah-pāchah* vendor (*kallah-paz*), a locksmith (*qufl-gar*), a gardener (*bāghbān*), and a butcher (*qaṣṣāb*).[91] Since these men are not prominent or especially renowned for their poetry—with the exception of Muḥtasham Kāshānī (no. 701; d. 996/1588), who was somehow assigned to this chapter and is described as a young textile merchant (*bazzāz*) with poetic talent—Sām Mīrzā refers to them by whatever distinguishing terms are available.[92]

It will hopefully be clear already, after considering just a few high-level features of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, that a different idea of a *taẕkirah* can coalesce when it is approached holistically. There are also questions about the structure of the work that would be difficult to answer without studying it in its entirety. One example is the ambiguity surrounding the categories into which Sām Mīrzā organizes his subjects. A few of the chapters have relatively clear definitions. Any member of a ruling dynasty, for instance, will be placed in the first chapter; and a common worker in the bazaar who enjoys composing *ghazal*s will go in the seventh. The first part of the second chapter is for *sayyid*s, which is

90. This social-historical data is of sufficient interest to Humāyūn Farrukh that he includes appendices to list poets whom Sām Mīrzā describes as practicing certain crafts. See pp. 400–01.

91. See the notices on Gilū ʿAlī (no. 683), Basmalī Kallah-paz (no. 677), Nūrī Qufl-gar (no. 671), Ghiyāṡ al-Dīn Bāghbān Kanī (no. 702), and Ḥāfiẓ Mīrak Kāshānī (no. 692), respectively. Page numbers are listed in the spreadsheet.

92. The entry on Muḥtasham, which is stunning with the benefit of hindsight, is on p. 373.

not a classification on which Sām Mīrzā would negotiate; and the first section of the fifth chapter addresses serious Persian poets. (This last category is, admittedly, a bit more subjective and flexible.) In the remainder of the *taẕkirah*, however, the situation is surprisingly hazy. The best illustration of this problem is the fourth chapter, which Sām Mīrzā sets aside for "eminent men who must be glorified, who, although they were not poets, sometimes composed poetry" (*ḥażarāt-i vājib al-taʿẓīm kih, agar-chih shāʿir na-būdah-and, gāhī zabān bi-shiʿr mī-gushūdah-and*).[93]

What does this mean in practice? The first notice in the chapter is given to Khwājah ʿAbd Allāh Murvārīd (d. 922/1516), a prominent figure in late Timurid Harāt who survived into the early Safavid period.[94] Murvārīd was easily famous enough as a poet that he could have been placed near the beginning of the fifth chapter. He also held a variety of senior positions at the court of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Bāyqarā (r. 875–911/1470–1506), such that it would have been appropriate to assign him to the third chapter, on "venerable ministers and other men of the pen" (*vuzarāʾ-i mukarram va sāʾir-i arbāb-i qalam*). Why, then, is he in the fourth chapter? This is legitimately unclear. Other notices in this section raise similar questions. There is a certain Mīrzā Kāfī (no. 210), whom Sām Mīrzā describes as a secretary (*munshī*) in the service of Shah Ṭahmāsb.[95] He would seem to be a natural fit for the third chapter. The same could be said of Qāżī ʿĪsá (no. 212), a longtime aide to the Āqquyūnlū Sultan Yaʿqūb (r. 883–96/1478–90).[96] Ultimately, we cannot avoid the conclusion that the assigning of individuals to different chapters in the *Tuḥfah* involves some arbitrariness—or, at least, that Sām Mīrzā's reasoning will not always be comprehensible to readers as far-removed as we are.

93. For the chapter subtitle, see p. 102.
94. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 102–7. See also P. P. Soucek, "ʿAbdallāh Morvārid," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.
95. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 115.
96. Ibid., 117–18.

There are cases in which it does appear logical for a given person to have been placed in the fourth chapter. The historian Khwāndamīr (no. 198), for example, matches the definition of an eminent man who might not fit in any of the other categories.[97] He was involved in court service in a certain sense, but he was not a *vazīr* or (as far as I could determine) an official in the *dīvān*. And his fame obviously derives from his historical work, which is a kind of scholarship, but not what Sām Mīrzā has in mind with the term *ʿulamāʾ* in the second part of the second chapter. On the topic of that section, it is another whose definition is difficult to pin down. The most prominent figure addressed there is Jalāl al-Dīn Davānī (no. 140), and it is clearly reasonable to classify him above all as an *ʿālim*.[98] But the other twenty-two notices in this short subchapter represent an interesting assortment. There are two judges (nos. 143 and 150)—while a number of other judges have been assigned to the fourth chapter.[99] One group that Sām Mīrzā has decided belong among the *ʿulamāʾ*, which might not be self-evident to readers, is medical doctors (*aṭibbāʾ*). There are at least five such individuals, and possibly a sixth (described as having *studied* medicine), in this section.[100] Two of them apparently served as personal physicians to Safavid rulers: an Iṣfahānī named Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad, under Shah Ismāʿīl; and a Shīrāzī named Rukn al-Dīn Masʿūd, under Ṭahmāsb. (Sām Mīrzā mentions that both of them studied with a certain Ṣadr al-Dīn ʿAlī Shīrāzī, who must have been one of the key figures in medicine in Iran around the turn of the tenth/sixteenth century.) It does not seem *wrong* that around a quarter of the

97. Ibid., 108–9.
98. Ibid., 76–7. See also Andrew J. Newman, "Davāni, Jalāl-al-Din Moḥammad," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.
99. The two judges in this section are Amīr Fayż Allāh "Ḥājibī" (no. 143, pp. 79–80), who served as some kind of military magistrate (*qāżī-i muʿaskar*); and Qāżī ʿAbd al-Khāliq Karah-rūdī (no. 150, p. 84).
100. See Rukn al-Dīn Masʿūd (no. 146, p. 82), Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn (no. 147, pp. 82–3), Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Ṭabīb (no. 148, p. 83), Ẕū al-Nūn (no. 153, pp. 85–6), and Ṣunʿ Allāh (no. 155, pp. 86–7). The one who is reported to have studied medicine, but is not referred to explicitly as a physician, is Ṭālib Gīlānī (no. 159, p. 88).

notices in the section on *ʿulamāʾ* are devoted to physicians, but again, this might not be obvious until one has delved into the text. The organization of the *Tuḥfah* carries a number of idiosyncracies.

2) *What does Sām Mīrzā consider remarkable?*

We have noted above that the entries in this *taẕkirah* follow a kind of bimodal distribution. Most of them are cursory, and a smaller number are of significantly greater length. (This is why the median number of lines is distinctly lower than the mean in most chapters.) A consequence of this tendency is that it is simple to tell when Sām Mīrzā actually has something to say about a given individual, beyond the bare minimum. What are some of the common features in these cases? Three can be identified easily. First, and most obviously, a figure who is famous or in some way highly influential is more likely to be discussed at length. This is the case throughout the *Tuḥfah*. The biggest names tend to be placed near the beginning of their respective chapters, and their biographical sketches, in particular, can be ten to twenty times longer than the median. The three largest notices in the *taẕkirah* (excluding quoted lines of poetry) are given to ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī (no. 636; sixty-seven lines), who opens the sixth chapter; Shah Ismāʿīl (no 1; sixty-five lines), who opens the first ; and Jāmī (no. 265; fifty-five lines), who opens the fifth.[101]

If we focus instead on the amount of poetry transmitted per notice, there is less consistency across the work, since not all chapters focus on men who were best known as poets. But the top examples are found mainly near the beginning of the first section of the fifth chapter, as would be expected. (By far the most extensively quoted poets are the first two in this section: Jāmī, with seventy-nine lines, and

101. These entries are on pp. 334–8, 8–11, and 143–52, respectively.

Hilālī, with sixty-eight.) There is nothing particularly noteworthy about this inclination displayed by Sām Mīrzā. *Of course* he offers substantial commentary on his father, who launched the Safavid polity, or Jāmī, whose works in multiple genres cast a long shadow over the tenth/sixteenth century. Heaping praise upon these figures, obligatory as it was, gives us little insight. (In fact, it is more eye-catching to come upon a *brief* entry on a famous person. Two examples are Khwāndamīr, no. 198, and the poet Fużūlī Baghdādī, no. 343.[102] Not only does Sām Mīrzā have little to say about Fużūlī and quote just two lines from him, but he places him close to the end of the section on important poets.)

Of greater use is the second feature shared by many of the non-cursory notices in the *Tuḥfah*: a personal connection between Sām Mīrzā and the individual in question. Given the author's high social status, and his explicit focus on describing men of his own time, it is not rare for him to mention that he has met someone. In some cases, this provides an opportunity for Sām Mīrzā to share an interesting anecdote (more on this below), or the personal relationship may affect the tone of the notice. One example arises in the brief entry on the painter Āqā Mīrak (no. 134), who worked on some of the most famous illustrated manuscript projects of the mid tenth/sixteenth century.[103] (Note that he is placed in the second chapter by virtue of his *sayyid* status, which overrides his profession.) Sām Mīrzā chooses to quote a *javāb* that Āqā Mīrak composed for a famous line by Jāmī. The original line, which is provided, goes as follows: "It's been two weeks since I last saw my moon of two weeks (*i.e.*, my lover with a face like the full moon); where shall I go, to whom shall I disclose my hidden sorrow?" (*du haftah shud kih na-dīdam mah-i du-haftah-i khud rā; kujā ravam, bi-kih gūyam gham-i nihuftah-i khud*

102. Fużūlī is found on pp. 245–6. While the notice is cursory, it is also complimentary. Sām Mīrzā introduces him as the best poet from Baghdād (*az ān shahr shāʿirī bihtar az ū paydā na-shudah*), notes that he composes in both Persian and Turkic, and concludes that most of his poetry is in praise of the Imams (*manqabat-i aʾimmah*).

103. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 74. See also P. P. Soucek, "Āqā Mirak," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

rā?). Āqā Mīrak has the following *javāb*: "I went to the garden and saw my newly blossomed rose; I heard my hidden sorrow from the rose and the nightingale" (*bi-bāgh raftam u dīdam gul-i shikuftah-i khud rā; shinīdam az gul u bulbul gham-i nihuftah-i khud rā*).

After introducing the original and the *javāb*, Sām Mīrzā notes that he asked Āqā Mīrak for a clarification of part of his line: "Did you hear from the rose *and* the nightingale, or just from the nightingale?" (*az gul u bulbul har du shinīdīd, yā az bulbul tanhā?*). Āqā Mīrak replied that he had in mind a certain sound that a flower makes at the moment of its budding. The anecdote goes no further, but this is one of several points in the *Tuḥfah* where it is not entirely clear whether Sām Mīrzā means to criticize someone's poetry. In fact, this is not the only occasion on which the author claims to have asked for an explanation of a given line. A similar story occurs in the notice on Mīrzā Sulṭān Ibrāhīm Amīnī (no. 40), a senior official under Sulṭān Ḥusayn Bāyqarā and the author of the *Futūḥāt-i shāhī* (927/1521).[104] Sām Mīrzā supposedly asked Amīnī about the meaning of a line that he had inscribed on a *bālā-khānah* (some kind of gallery or scenic vista?) near the tomb of Khwājah ʿAbd Allāh Anṣārī in Harāt. He was given a private explanation, which he does not share in the *Tuḥfah*.[105]

It might be pointed out that figures like Āqā Mīrak and Ibrāhīm Amīnī are still quite famous. But Sām Mīrzā occasionally lengthens a notice on a more obscure individual through reference to his personal connection. This occurs, for example, in the discussion of an Iṣfahānī storyteller (*qiṣṣah-khwān*) named Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn (no. 256).[106] He is described as "very sweet-voiced and eloquent"

104. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 46–7. The *Futūḥāt-i shāhī* has been edited by Muḥammad Riżā Naṣīrī (Tehran: Anjuman-i Āṡār va Mafākhir-i Farhangī, 2004). See also Ali Anooshahr, "The Rise of the Safavids According to Their Old Veterans: Amini Haravi's *Futuhat-i Shahi*," *Iranian Studies* 48, no. 2 (2015): 249–67.

105. As Sām Mīrzā puts it, "He gave an answer as to the private meaning [of that line], which is too long to get into" (*bi-maʿná-yi khāṣṣ javābī dādand kih dar taqrīr namī-gunjad*).

106. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 138–9.

(*bisyār shīrīn-sukhan va garm-guftār*), and he apparently spent twelve years as part of Sām Mīrzā's retinue, followed by another eight years in the service of Shah Ṭahmāsb. Sadly, this Kamāl al-Dīn fell victim to opium addiction, and "an ugly change came over his appearance and character" (*tafāvut-i fāḥish dar ṣūrat va sayrat-i ū paydā shud*). Sām Mīrzā continues, "It was as though he had metamorphosed, or, per the ideas of those who believe in transmigration, his soul had been taken and put in another vessel" (*gū'ī maskh shudah būd, yā dar maẕhab-i tanāsukh, rūḥ-i ū rā dar qālib-i digar dar-āvardah būdand*). The relatively candid references to drug and alcohol abuse in the *Tuḥfah* have been noted in prior scholarship, including in Matthee's book on the subject.[107]

Indeed it would be difficult to miss, since this *taẕkirah* is littered with comments, mostly offhand and seemingly neutral in tone, about people's alcoholism and other debauched habits. The number of times that the term *lavand* or *lavand-pīshah* ("libertine") alone is deployed is staggering. And Sām Mīrzā will share the most remarkable details about people's behavior without dwelling on them or expressing any judgment. In the notice on a certain Khwājah Mayram-i Siyāh (no. 326), Sām reports that "he preferred drinking over religion" (*mashrab rā bi-maẕhab tarjīḥ mī-kard*), and that "he was always in search of easily sold boys, and this commodity was more readily obtained in Transoxiana, so he moved to that area" (*va chūn hamīshah ṭālib-i pisarān-i sahl al-bayʿ būd, va īn matāʿ dar mā varā' al-nahr bīshtar bi-dast miyuftād, rūy bidān diyār nihādah*).[108] The notice ends with one of Mayram's quatrains, which, according to Sām Mīrzā, "is not devoid of wit" (*khālī az ẓarāfatī nīst*). The initial impression given to the reader of the *Tuḥfah* will be that it makes little to no difference to the author whether his contemporaries spend their days at the mosque or engaged in drunken pederasty. But a

107. Rudolph P. Matthee, *The Pursuit of Pleasure: Drugs and Stimulants in Iranian History, 1500–1900* (Princeton UP, 2005).
108. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 237.

slightly more nuanced picture emerges after one has spent significant time with the text. There is the occasional case, such as that of the *qiṣṣah-khwān* Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn, in which Sām Mīrzā expresses something closer to genuine concern or pity. Another example is the notice on Aḥmad Kāfī Kāshānī (no. 476), an alcoholic who continually struggled to get clean in an effort not to disappoint his patron, Qāżī Mīr Ḥusayn Kāshānī.[109]

Setting aside the digression into the matter of substance abuse, there are interesting anecdotes of other kinds involving friends and associates of Sām Mīrzā. One of them is Muḥibb ʿAlī Nāʾī (no. 259), a musician and boon companion who used to accompany Sām, until he was taken away and sent into the service of an official named Sayyid Manṣūr Kamānah (popularly known as Sayyid Beg).[110] The story goes that Muḥibb ʿAlī was at his new patron's encampment one day, and Sayyid Beg was reading and translating Arabic poetry. Suddenly a camel that was tethered outside lost its temper and started to bellow, such that it could be heard clearly in the tent where the men were assembled. Muḥibb ʿAlī quipped, "Good Lord, your camel is reciting poetry, too!" (*khudāvandigārā, ushtur-i shumā nīz shiʿr mī-gūyad*). Sayyid Beg was not amused, and he said to Muḥibb ʿAlī, "If you talk like that again, I'll teach you a lesson" (*agar dīgar miṡl-i īn sukhanān bi-gūʾī, tu rā adab khwāham kard*). Amazingly, Muḥibb ʿAlī then upped the ante by replying, "You should give me a reward, since I told a joke" (*marā bāyad kih jāʾizah shafaqat farmāyīd kih laṭīfah guftah-am*). Sayyid Beg pondered this for a moment, and finally laughed, and the situation was defused. (It goes unsaid, but is probably supposed to be clear, that the joke lay in comparing the grunting of a camel to the sound of Arabic.) We will return to this anecdote

109. Ibid., 283–4. Note that the number 476 is assigned to two consecutive poets—at least, in the printing of Humāyūn Farrukh's edition that I consulted. Aḥmad Kāfī Kāshānī comes first. For clarity's sake, the other poet, Mullā Jān Kāshī, is numbered 476.5 in the spreadsheet. (We saw the same problem above, with Shāh Qāsim "Vāqifī," no. 53.5.)

110. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 140.

below, since it is also a perfect illustration of the negotiability of *adab*—including a rare occurrence of the word itself! Muḥibb ʿAlī escapes one, rather concrete form of *adab* by practicing another. The main point here, anyway, is that personal relationships between Sām Mīrzā and the subjects of the *Tuḥfah* sometimes produce longer discussions than would otherwise be devoted to men of little fame.

The third and final type of notice that tends to go into greater detail is related to the preceding examples: it is when Sām Mīrzā has an amusing or otherwise extraordinary anecdote to share about someone. This may be a friend of his, as in the case of Muḥibb ʿAlī and the joke about the camel. But there are tangential stories that arise in notices on individuals whom Sām does not describe as acquaintances. Take, for example, Amīr Sayyid (no. 98), a member of a prominent family in Ray.[111] (His father, Amīr ʿInāyat Allāh, no. 96, was custodian of the shrine of Imāmzādah ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīm.) Sām Mīrzā introduces this man by stating that he has an interest in poetry but is somehow incapable of following the rules of meter (*daghdaghah-i shāʿirī dārad, ammā nā-mawzūn ast*). He then describes an occasion on which Amīr Sayyid was with his friends, and he fell asleep, and upon waking he began to pray immediately. The friends stopped him and asked why he was praying without having performed the necessary ablutions (*vużūʾ*). Amīr Sayyid replied, "I had done my *vużūʾ* and then gone to sleep" (*vużūʾ sākhtah va bi-khwāb raftah būdam*). Then his friends pointed out, reasonably enough, that the state of ritual purity is nullified (*bāṭil*) upon sleeping. Amīr Sayyid finally answered, "It is a special characteristic of mine that my *vużūʾ* is not voided through sleep" (*khāṣṣīyat-i man īn ast kih dar khwāb vużūʾ-i man bāṭil na-shavad*)! Sām Mīrzā concludes the entry by reporting that Amīr Sayyid has tried to pass off a thirty-year-old poem by Darvīsh Dihakī (no. 279) as his own.[112]

111. Ibid., 65–6.
112. The entry for Darvīsh Dihakī, which does not mention Amīr Sayyid's attempted theft, is on pp. 186–7.

One of the filthier anecdotes in the *Tuḥfah* occurs in the notice on a certain Khwājah Darvīsh (no. 169), who worked in the service of the Timurid prince Köpek Mīrzā, a son of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Bāyqarā.[113] (I believe this was the popular name of Muḥammad Muḥsin Mīrzā.) Sām Mīrzā describes an exchange in which Köpek Mīrzā asked Khwājah Darvīsh, "They say that you're a sodomite (*ahl-i pusht*). Is that true?" He answered, "Yes, my lord, just so." The prince asked why, and Khwājah Darvīsh replied, "Haven't you heard that 'people follow the religion of their rulers'?" (*magar na-shinīdah-īd kih "al-nās ʿalá dīn mulūkihim"?*). The quote is of a popular Arabic saying, the equivalent in Islamicate culture of the Latin *cuius regio, eius religio*. (It is not a *ḥadīth* but is deployed in a similar way; perhaps the most commonly cited source for the statement is Ibn Kathīr's universal history, *al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah*.)[114] We could point to other moments in the *Tuḥfah* at which startling interactions between senior officials and their subordinates are recounted. But the idea should be clear, that a remarkable anecdote—especially if it is funny—may lead Sām Mīrzā to add extra commentary on a given figure, whether or not he is prominent.

It is often too easy to forget that the *Tuḥfah* is, in the first place, an anthology of *poets* and *poetry*. (In fact, it says something about the nature of this work that the poetry fades into the background for long stretches.) There are, however, notices in which the lines of verse become a real subject of discussion. These cases are not categorically different from the ones examined above. It is still true that Sām Mīrzā breaks his habit of providing terse descriptions when there is something out of the ordinary for him to mention. It may be a matter of someone's character or an incident in which he was

113. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 93. The proper reading of this name is not clear. Could it be Kabak Mīrzā?

114. Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1373) gives a slightly different version of the saying: *al-nās ʿalá dīn malīkihim* ("ruler," not "rulers"). This occurs in his discussion of the Umayyad caliph al-Walīd ibn ʿAbd al-Malik (r. 86–96/705–15). In the printing that I consulted (Beirut: Maktabat al-Maʿārif, 1990), the relevant passage is at vol. 9, p. 165.

involved, or it may relate to his poetry. A particularly amusing example of the latter is found in the notice on Nāzukī Hamadānī (no. 492), one of the minor poets covered in the second part of the fifth chapter.[115] According to Sām Mīrzā, Nāzukī composes around a thousand lines of poetry per day (*dar har rūz qarīb bi-hazār bayt mī-gūyad*), and he has taken it upon himself to write imitative responses of all of the famous books of verse (*bar khud lāzim kardah kih jamīʿ-i kutub-i naẓm rā javāb gūyad*). This includes "the *Shāhnāmah*, which Firdawsī wrote over a period of thirty years; and [Nāzukī] completed his in thirty days" (*Shāhnāmah kih Firdawsī bi-sī sāl guftah, ū bi-sī rūz guftah būd*). Unfortunately, if not surprisingly, the prolific output of Nāzukī comes at the expense of frequent prosodic errors (*dar shiʿir-i ū radīf va qāfiyah-i ghalaṭ bisyār ast*). Sam Mīrzā adds that there is nothing delicate (*nāzuk*) about him except for his pen name. The notice contains a quotation of ten lines, in a truly ridiculous style, from Nāzukī's *Shāhnāmah*, including the following: "All the brave men were trembling like willow trees, when suddenly a valiant lion arrived; he set upon the right flank like a lion, with a spear like a shovel in his hand" (*hamah pur-dilān larzah-zan hamchu bīd, kih nāgah yakī shīr-i pur-dil rasīd; abar maymanah tākht mānand-i pīl, bi-dastash yakī nayzah mānand-i bīl*). Ten lines is well above the median amount of poetry quoted per entry in the *Tuḥfah*. Why do we have more transmitted from Nāzukī than from dozens, if not hundreds, of legitimately skilled practitioners? Sām Mīrzā has set his own priorities.

A similar case, which would be on the short list for the most absurd passage in the entire *taẕkirah*, is the notice in the seventh chapter on a humble locksmith and would-be poet called Nūrī (Mawlānā Ustād Nūrī Qufl-gar, no. 671).[116] The way that he is introduced is striking enough: "He is among the

---

115. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 288–9.
116. Ibid., 365.

greats of the age and the rarities of the epoch" (*az buzurgān-i zamān va navādir-i dawrān ast*). Sām Mīrzā follows this with an ambiguously sarcastic remark about Nūrī's skill as a locksmith, and then turns to the matter of the man's literary activities: "After seventy years, it occurred to his noble mind that he should become a poet; so he made himself a poet, and, although his poetry neither obeys meter nor has any meaning, the following line is the product of his graceful disposition…" (*baʿd az haftād sāl bi-khāṭir-i sharīf-i īshān rasīd kih shāʿir mī-bāyad shud; bunyād-i shāʿirī kard, va bā vujūd-i ān-kih shiʿr-i ū nā-mawzūn ast va maʿná ham na-dārad, īn maṭlaʿ zādah-i ṭabʿ-i laṭīf-i īshān ast*). The final part of the notice provides a description of a particularly odd bit of verse composed by Nūrī. It is a *javāb* of the opening line of a *ghazal* by Ḥāfiẓ. The original, which is quoted, goes as follows: "I saw the verdant field of the heavens and the scythe of the new crescent moon; I was reminded of my own farm and the time of harvest" (*mazraʿ-i sabz-i falak dīdam u dās-i mah-i naw; yādam az kishtah-i khwīsh āmad u hangām-i diraw*). Nūrī takes this imagery in a rather different direction: "I saw the swift sphere of the heavens flitting about; I told it, 'Slow down! *Jaw jaw jaw, jaw jaw jaw*'" (*kurah-i tund-i falak dīdam va ū dar tak u daw; guftam-ash tund ma-raw, jaw jaw jaw, jaw jaw jaw*).

According to Sām Mīrzā's explanation, Nūrī meant to analogize the movement of the firmament to that of a flighty horse, which might be placated with an offer of barley (*jaw*). He notes that one of the methods for calming such a horse is to hold a pile of barley in the skirt of one's tunic and shake it. Nūrī would apparently mimic this motion while reciting his line. Here we have a single passage embodying a few of the features that are common among longer notices in the *Tuḥfah*. Nūrī is not an influential man, and certainly not a famous poet; nor does Sām Mīrzā indicate that he knows him personally. But he is a fascinating character whose behavior is a topic of amusement, and whose

experiments with poetry are, shall we say, ahead of their time. It also bears noting that the discussion of Nūrī involves his composition of a *javāb*. This is another key phenomenon in the *Tuḥfah*—and in *taẕkirah*s of the Safavid-Mughal period generally—to which we will return shortly.

Again, while the examples above are dominated by cases in which the biographical portion of an entry is expanded to include some noteworthy anecdote, the circumstances in which the *poetry* portion might be longer than usual are not entirely dissimilar. Figures like Jāmī (no. 265) and Hātifī (no. 267) are quoted extensively—seventy-nine and thirty-seven lines in their respective notices—because they are among the few most famous poets of the era under consideration. The same is true of Hilālī (no. 266; sixty-eight lines), except that he probably receives extra emphasis because Sām Mīrzā spent time with him during his childhood in Harāt.[117] And we have already seen that an obscure poet with no ostensible ties to the author may have a disproportionate amount of his work transmitted in the *Tuḥfah*, if there is something interesting about it. One caveat that may be worth adding is that Sām Mīrzā's brevity is even stronger in excerpting poetry than it is in the biographical sketches. In 438 of the 710 notices (or a bit over sixty percent), he gives just one line. The number of notices that reach the double digits in this respect is only *thirty* (or about four percent). (The great majority of these occur in the first part of the fifth chapter.) By contrast, biographical comments that add up to ten lines or more are found in seventy-two notices (or ten percent).

What this means in practice is that it is not uncommon to see a well-known poet who is lightly quoted by Sām Mīrzā. We are given only one line from Shah Ismāʿīl (no. 1), six from ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī (no. 636), and three from Niẓām al-Dīn Aḥmad "Suhaylī" (no. 637; the nominal dedicatee of Vāʿiẓ Kāshifī's

117. Ibid., 152–60. Sām Mīrzā says of Hilālī, "He often visited with me" (*bisyār bi-ṣuḥbat-i man mī-rasīd*).

Anvār-i suhaylī).[118] It is also clear that in some sections of the *taẕkirah*—especially the first chapter—poetry transmission is actively de-emphasized, since the individuals being discussed are better known for their exploits in other fields. There is no part of the text in which the opposite tendency appears. At the beginning of the fifth chapter, which is really the only area where Sām Mīrzā focuses on poetry in a sustained manner, there is likewise plenty of biographical material. Still, the general patterns that we have outlined apply to both segments of a notice in the *Tuḥfah*.

3) Connections among figures discussed by Sām Mīrzā

A given entry in this *taẕkirah* does not exist in a vacuum. Since the work covers hundreds of individuals who lived in the same region during a period of about three generations, there is every possibility that two people (or more) who have some connection to one another will be included. We might find a teacher and his student; a father and his son; a famous poet and someone who composed a *javāb* of one of his *ghazal*s; a prince and his boon companion; *etc*. All of these examples do, in fact, occur in the *Tuḥfah*, and they help to make it an innovative anthology relative to earlier works in the genre. Sām Mīrzā states explicitly in his preface that he aims to pick up where Jāmī's *Bahāristān*, Dawlatshāh's *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ*, and Navāʾī's *Majālis al-nafāʾis* left off.[119] Combined with his other decisions about what kinds of people to include in the *Tuḥfah*, this produces a text that is temporally delimited and socially broad, and, in consequence, well suited to a focus on interconnectivity. This is another topic that would be difficult to investigate without considering the *taẕkirah* as a whole—or at

118. The notice on Niẓām al-Dīn Aḥmad is on pp. 338–9. See also G. M. Wickens, "Anwār-e sohayli," *Encyclopædia Iranica*; and Christine van Ruymbeke, *Kashefi's "Anvar-e Sohayli": Rewriting "Kalila and Dimna" in Timurid Herat* (Leiden: Brill, 2016). The connection between Aḥmad Suhaylī and Kāshifī's work is incidental, but interesting nonetheless.

119. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 3–4.

least reading large swaths of it. Many of the notices that point to one another concern relatively less famous individuals, and a pair may be separated by hundreds of pages.

Perhaps the most straightforward examples are the points in the *Tuḥfah* at which Sām Mīrzā introduces multiple members of a family. There are several such clusters, especially in the first part of the second chapter, which addresses *sayyid*s. (This is unsurprising, given that genealogy is what makes these figures noteworthy to begin with.) We touched on one of the *sayyid* families above, in discussing a certain aptly named Amīr Sayyid (no. 98) and his peculiar approach to *vużū'*. He is in fact one of four members of an immediate family who are mentioned almost in succession (nos. 96–8, 100). The patriarch of the family, Amīr ʿInāyat Allāh (no. 96), serves as custodian (*mutavallī*) of the shrine of Imāmzādah ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīm—a descendant of al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī—in Ray.[120] And the other three are his sons, Amīr Nūr Allāh (no. 97), the aforementioned Amīr Sayyid (no. 98), and Sayyid ʿAlī Shāh (no. 100). It can be assumed that all of them are from Ray, though only the notice on Amīr ʿInāyat Allāh states as much explicitly. Sām Mīrzā does not discuss these men in detail. The longest entry is that of Amīr Sayyid, due entirely to the anecdote about *vużū'*. There may be a bit of historical value in documenting which family was responsible for the management of the shrine in Ray in the early to mid tenth/sixteenth century. For the most part, however, it is simply interesting to note Sām Mīrzā's attention to family networks, which seems not to be common in *taẕkirah*s of the period. (This is essentially an educated guess. We will require more in-depth studies of anthologies, like what is offered here for the *Tuḥfah*, before we can state with confidence what was or was not typical in the genre.)

120. Ibid., 65.

Similar family clusters occur throughout the text. There is a group of four brothers from Uskū (near Tabrīz), again in the section on *sayyid*s. The four of them (nos. 67–70) were apparently in the service of Shah Ṭahmāsb during the early years of his reign, until they fell from grace due to their crass behavior.[121] Sām Mīrzā describes them as *rūstāʾī* (false cognate with "rustic"), which seems to mean "unsophisticated" in this context. One of the Uskūʾīs, Amīr Niẓām al-Dīn Aḥmad (no. 69), served as key-holder (*kilīd-dār*) of the king's library, and he had aspirations to be appointed co-regent (*vakīl*), before he and the others were banished from court. The last of the brothers mentioned by Sām Mīrzā, Abū al-Maḥārim (no. 70), is, in addition to his generally immoral behavior, an alleged poetry thief. He is said to have recited a *qaṣīdah* by someone else at court, and he not only got away with this, but was given a generous reward (*ṣilah-i ʿaẓīm*).

We could cite plenty of other instances. The third chapter, on *vazīr*s and administrative officials, includes a set of three brothers of Shīrāzī origin (nos. 180–82).[122] Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn (no. 256), the storyteller whose opium addiction was described above, has a brother named Quṭb al-Dīn Aḥmad (no. 257) who belongs to the same profession.[123] The second part of the fifth chapter, on less famous poets, has notices on two brothers from Tabrīz called Nūrī (no. 364) and Nāmī (no. 365).[124] The former makes his living selling beverages in summer and honey in winter; the latter has composed a lot of *qaṣīdah*s, but no one likes his poetry. And these are simply cases involving brothers. As was explained earlier, I endeavored to add a comment in the spreadsheet at any point where Sām Mīrzā mentions a personal

121. Ibid., 57–9. The brothers are named Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad (no. 67), Qamar al-Dīn Maḥmūd (no. 68), Niẓām al-Dīn Aḥmad (no. 69), and Abū al-Maḥārim (no. 70).
122. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 98–9. Their names are Khwājah Murshid (no. 180), Masʿūd Beg (no. 181), and Mīrzā Adham (no. 182).
123. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 139.
124. Ibid., 254.

connection between two individuals (or more). Searches for "father," "son," "teacher," "student," *etc.* will yield additional results.

It may be worth noting again that individuals described by Sām Mīrzā as having some relationship do not necessarily occur in close proximity in the text. One of the more influential poets treated in the *Tuḥfah* (though his fame ebbed in later centuries), Mawlānā Umīdī (no. 271), has several relatives who are also given notices. But while Umīdī himself is placed near the beginning of the fifth chapter, along with major figures like Hātifī (no. 267) and Ahlī Shīrāzī (no. 273), the other members of his family are scattered around the *taẕkirah*. He has two nephews. The first, Sharīf Muḥammad (no. 346), is found near the end of the first part of the fifth chapter, which suggests that he is considered an established poet, if not in the top echelon.[125] The second, a brother of Sharīf Muḥammad named Mīrzā Aḥmad Tihrānī (no. 617), is deep in the second part of the fifth chapter, implying that he has far less of a reputation.[126] Umīdī also has a son, Ṭāhirī Rāzī (no. 372), whose notice occurs in the same section (but closer to its start).[127] Finally, there is a certain Khwājah Luhrāsb (no. 226) in the first part of the fourth chapter (on miscellaneous prominent men), a former governor of Tihrān who is described as a brother of Umīdī, and who has written a fair bit of poetry in his own right.[128] And so we find notices on five members of this Tihrānī/Rāzī family in total—including Umīdī himself—with the earliest (Khwājah Luhrāsb) and the latest (Mīrzā Aḥmad) separated by about two hundred pages.

Another case that comes to mind is that of a clan of Qazvīnī *sayyid*s, who form a sufficiently distinct group that they are referred to as the Sayfīs, after an ancestor named Qāżī Sayf al-Dīn. Five

125. Ibid., 246–7.
126. Ibid., 328.
127. Ibid., 258.
128. Ibid., 126.

members of this extended family are found throughout the first part of the second chapter.[129] Then, in the fifth chapter, there is a notice on a poet called ʿAbd Allāh Shihābī (no. 344), and Sām Mīrzā mentions that he "was originally among the slaves of the Sayfī *sayyid*s of Qazvīn" (*dar aṣl az mamālīk-i sādāt-i Sayfīyah-i Qazvīn ast*).[130] This reference might make sense on its own to someone well-versed in tenth/sixteenth-century Safavid history, but it is also helpful to be aware that a number of the Sayfīs are given notices elsewhere in the *taẕkirah*. (In effect, familiarity with Iranian society of this period is not altogether different from a holistic understanding of the *Tuḥfah*, since Sām Mīrzā makes his work into a microcosm.)

In order to explore different kinds of interpersonal connection reflected in this text, beyond family ties, we can return to Mawlānā Umīdī. He has several relatives who are mentioned by Sām Mīrzā, but this is nowhere near the full extent of his presence throughout the anthology. Umīdī's name appears in at least three other contexts: when a line of his is quoted by the author to emphasize a point; when someone is described as having composed a *javāb* of one of his poems; and when a contemporary is said to have exchanged satirical verse (*hajv*) with him (albeit in only one case). We will set aside the quotes of Umīdī for the time being, since they do not involve direct connections to other poets—though they affirm that Sām Mīrzā holds him in unusually high regard. There are four notices in the *Tuḥfah* that mention a *javāb* of Umīdī: Sayf al-Dīn Maḥmūd Rajāʾī (no. 172), Shawqī Yazdī (no. 282), Żamīrī Hamadānī (no. 308), and Mīr Shāh ʿAlī (no. 647).

---

129. The Sayfīs mentioned in the *Tuḥfah* are Qāżī Rūḥ Allāh (no. 34, p. 44), ʿAbd al-Ṣamad (no. 89, p. 63), Amīr Jaʿfar Ṣādiqī (no. 93, p. 64), Mīr Mūsá (no. 119, p. 70), and Mīr ʿAlī Kiyā (no. 124, p. 71).
130. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 246.

In the first instance, Sām Mīrzā quotes one line (likely the opening line) of a *qaṣīdah* by Umīdī, to which Rajāʾī has composed a *javāb*.[131] (While Umīdī's *dīvān* has survived—at least in part, in a handful of manuscripts, most of which seem to be deficient—no published edition has appeared to date. And his name and work are seldom mentioned in scholarship. Where he does appear, however, Umīdī is described consistently as a *qaṣīdah* specialist who dedicated panegyrics to the Safavid rulers and the Ahl al-Bayt. This would have endeared him to Sām Mīrzā. See below for further discussion of Umīdī's poetry. I have tried to strike a balance, taking the time to learn who this poet was, without stumbling into a whole other research project.)[132] The original line to which Rajāʾī responded goes as follows: "Now when, from the top of the cypress and the base of the fir, the bird draws out its sweet voice, the tulip its wine-cup" (*kunūn k-az sar-i sarv u pā-yi ṣanawbar, kashad murgh marghūlah va lālah sāghar*). Two lines of Rajāʾī's *javāb* are quoted, and the first goes as follows: "My (beloved), tall as a fir tree, whose fruit is coquetry; I have bound my heart to him/her like a pine cone" (*ṣanawbar-qad-i man kih nāzish buvad bar; bar ū bastah-am dil chu bār-i ṣanawbar*). Sām Mīrzā claims that Rajāʾī's *qaṣīdah* is "illustrious" (*ghurā*); this may be an overstatement, judging from the sample provided.

Of greater interest are the other three *javāb*s—by Shawqī, Żamīrī, and Mīr Shāh ʿAlī—since they are all based on a single *qaṣīdah*. Its first line is quoted in the entry on Shawqī, and it goes as follows: "O ruler of the kingdom of beauty; we are beggars, you, (our) entertainment" (*ay tu sulṭān-i mulk-i zībāʾī; mā gadā-pīshagān, tamāshāʾī*).[133] (The line needs to be parsed this way to conform to the *khafīf*

---

131. Ibid., 94–5.

132. One of the few substantial assessments of Umīdī that I have found in print is an article by ʿAbd al-Vahhāb Nūrānī Viṣāl (d. 1995), a longtime professor at Shiraz University (and a descendant of the great Qajar-era poet Viṣāl Shīrāzī, d. 1262/1846). The essay is titled "Dar-bārah-i Umīdī Tihrānī," and it was published in *Adabistān*, a monthly periodical that ran between 1989 and 1994. See issue no. 46 (Mihr 1372 / September–October 1993), pp. 10–14.

133. The notice on Shawqī is found on pp. 191–3 in the Humāyūn Farrukh edition.

meter. It is not entirely clear how the end of the second hemistich should then be read, but the basic meaning comes across.) Shawqī has made use of this poem in multiple ways. There is a proper *javāb*, in which he employs the same meter and rhyme, treats similar themes, and borrows a few key words or structures from the original to make clear his inspiration. The following is the opening line: "O, your face is the moon at the zenith of beauty; your stature, the cypress of the garden of elegance" (*ay rukhat māh-i awj-i zībāʾī; qāmatat sarv-i bāgh-i raʿnāʾī*). Several more lines of this *javāb* are quoted. But then Sām Mīrzā notes that Shawqī has also worked Umīdī's original into a *tażmīn*—a poem that borrows a whole line (or at least a hemistich) from its source, while meeting the other criteria of *javāb*. Shawqī takes an interesting approach, interspersing the two halves of Umīdī's line with original material, as follows: "O king of the throne of desire; 'O ruler of the kingdom of beauty'; you are the sovereign of the lovelies of the world; 'we watch you as beggars'" (*ay tu shāh-i sarīr-i dil-jūʾī; ay tu sulṭān-i mulk-i zībāʾī; shāh-i khūbān-i ʿālamī va tu rā; mā gadā-pīshagān tamāshāʾī*). Sām Mīrzā is clearly fond of Shawqī's *javāb*s of other poets, since he quotes one more, based on the famous *qaṣīdah* of Kātibī Nīshāpūrī (d. *ca*. 839/1435–6) with the *radīf* of *gul*.[134]

The two remaining *javāb*s of Umīdī's *qaṣīdah* are presented differently, in that Sām Mīrzā does not reproduce any lines from the original. In fact, we cannot be *absolutely* certain that the source material is the same—but the rhyme syllables (each line ends with *-āʾī*) and the meter (*khafīf*) match in all cases, making it quite unlikely that Żamīrī or Mīr Shāh ʿAlī was responding to a different *qaṣīdah* than Shawqī. The *javāb* by Żamīrī (no. 308) is introduced as part of an interesting anecdote.[135] He dedicated his poem to the prince Bahrām Mīrzā (d. 956/1549) and recited it before Shah Ṭahmāsb, who was so

---

134. This *javāb* of Kātibī is described below.
135. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 224–5.

upset by a couple of the lines that he nearly had the poet executed. In the end, Żamīrī had a kind of wooden stock put on his head (a practice known as *takhtah-kulāh*) and his face blackened, and he was paraded around Tabrīz in humiliation. What could he have said to warrant such punishment? The offending lines, which Sām Mīrzā quotes, go as follows: "Every Ḥāfiẓ So-and-so is *māhīchah*, every dervish a sign of *bughrāʾī*; for coquetry and drumming are a hundred times / better than being a poet or a *mullā*" (*hamah Ḥāfiẓ fulān u māhīchah, hamah darvīsh ramz-i bughrāʾī; kih dalālī u daf-kashī ṣad-bār / bihtar az shāʿirī u mullāʾī*).

According to Steingass, both *māhīchah* and *bughrāʾī*—the latter short for *Bughrā-khānī*—could refer to certain meat products placed in soup.[136] This may be an incorrect reading, but my basic understanding of the first line is that Żamīrī is poking fun at the perceived importance of the work of poets and men of the cloth. The second line, at any rate, drives this point home. It is possible that Żamīrī intended to play with tropes of *rindī* (a sort of "enlightened hedonism"), which were well established in classical Persian poetry and associated with the work of Ḥāfiẓ Shīrāzī (d. *ca*. 792/1390) in particular.[137] Sām Mīrzā adds that Ṭahmāsb asked the poet why he would say such a thing, to which Żamīrī replied simply that it was a sincere statement. (The notice ends by emphasizing his irreverent attitude, which continued even after he was punished.) A charitable interpretation of the incident might be that Żamīrī gauged his audience poorly, or that the wording of the lines in question turned out rougher than he intended. Whatever the true circumstances may have been, this is a reminder that crossing certain boundaries while reciting a poem before one's patron or superior could produce unfortunate results. And the *Tuḥfah*, as we have seen already and will discuss at greater length below,

---

136. In the 1963 reprint of Steingass (and perhaps in all printings), *bughrāʾī* is found on p. 192, and *māhīchah* on p. 1147.
137. See Franklin D. Lewis, "Ḥāfeẓ viii. Ḥāfeẓ and Rendi," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

more often documents just how much a courtier could *get away with*, provided it was a source of amusement.

A simpler *javāb* occurs in the notice on Mīr Shāh ʿAlī (no. 647) in the sixth chapter (on poets of Turkic background).[138] Sām Mīrzā describes Shāh ʿAlī as belonging to a leading Chaghatāʾī family. He was apparently one of the greatest archers of his day (*dar kamān-dārī sar-āmad-i zamān*), and Sām claims to be his student (or perhaps follower?) in that art (*man dar kamān-dārī shāgird-i ū-yam*). This is also among the relatively few entries in which a year of death is mentioned: 938/1531–2. The only poetry that is quoted from Shāh ʿAlī is two lines of his *javāb* of Umīdī, which go as follows: "O, your face, in the heavens of beauty, is a world-adorning sun; in the bazaar of elegance, you are Joseph of Egypt, and we are empty purses" (*ay rukhat dar sipihr-i zībāʾī, āftābī bi-ʿālam-ārāʾī; tu bi-bāzār-i ḥusn Yūsuf-i Miṣr, mā tahī-kīsah-hā-yi sawdāʾī*).[139] It may be worth reiterating that Sām Mīrzā does not provide any lines of Umīdī's original poem when introducing the *javāb*s of Żamīrī and Mīr Shāh ʿAlī. This is another context in which it is obvious that our understanding of specific points in the *Tuḥfah* is enriched, if not transformed, when we consider the work as a whole. The fact that we have (in all likelihood) *javāb*s of the same *qaṣīdah* of Umīdī by three other poets would otherwise be invisible.

As was mentioned above, there is also one notice that describes an exchange of insult poetry (*hajv*) involving Umīdī. The rival in question is Amīr Ḥusayn ʿAlī Jalāyir (no. 640), pen name Ṭufaylī, who, like Mīr Shāh ʿAlī, is discussed in the sixth chapter.[140] According to Sām Mīrzā, he was as an *amīr* under Sulṭān Ḥusayn Bāyqarā and later entered the service of Najm-i S̱ānī (d. 918/1512), the ill-fated

---

138. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 349.
139. There is a *double entendre* with *sawdāʾī*: commerce (hence "purses"), or lovesickness?
140. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 342–3.

vakīl of Shah Ismāʿīl.[141] Ḥusayn ʿAlī outlived his latter patron, passing away in 925/1519. While he was still working for Najm-i S̱ānī, he dedicated several *qaṣīdah*s to him—and this evidently put him in competition with Umīdī. The two men leveled satires at one other (*hajv-i yak-dīgar kardah būdand*), and Sām Mīrzā cites as an example four lines from a *qaṣīdah* by Umīdī. (Interestingly, although this notice is dedicated to Ḥusayn ʿAlī, his contribution to the exchange is not quoted.)

The lines go as follows (in an admittedly dubious reading): "My problem is that I am from Ray, and not Samarqand or Bukhārā; empty prattlers will say that any bowl of crusts / is more moist than the bread in *bughrāʾī*; thus Ṭufaylī of the children's table / spreads out the carpet of manhood; someone who has strung together a few lines of verse—how could he be accepted as a master?" (*ʿaybam īn ast k-az diyār-i Ray-am, nah Samarqandī u Bukhārāʾī; yāvah-gūyān-i kāsah har jābir, tarrah-tar tā zi-nān-i bughrāʾī; kih Ṭufaylī-i khwān-i ṭiflānash, gustarānad bisāṭ-i bābāʾī; har-kih baytī sih-chār mawzūn bast, kay musallam shavad bi-ustāʾī?*). While it is difficult to parse the second and third lines—particularly the second, which has been read differently by every editor of the *Tuḥfah*, and never in a way that makes sense—the general idea seems clear.[142] Umīdī is complaining that he is accorded little respect owing to his Rāzī background, while Ṭufaylī, who came from Khurāsān with an impressive record of service under the Timurids, is given more credit than he deserves as a court poet.[143]

These lines of *hajv* become more interesting upon consideration of their formal attributes: the meter is *khafīf* and the rhyme is on *-āʾī*. Is this again from the same *qaṣīdah* of Umīdī to which Rajāʾī, Shawqī, and Żamīrī composed *javāb*s? It appears likely. There is also the fact that both Umīdī's poem

---

141. On this sad story, see Michel M. Mazzaoui, "Najm-e Ṯāni," *Encyclopædia Iranica*; and Andrew J. Newman, *Safavid Iran: Rebirth of a Persian Empire* (London: I.B.Tauris, 2006), 17, 20.

142. For example, this poem occurs on p. 387 of the edition of Aḥmad Mudaqqiq Yazdī (Yazd: Sāmī, 1388 SH / 2009 CE). His reading is equally difficult to parse, and he does not explain it in a footnote.

143. As we saw above, Umīdī and other members of his family are sometimes labeled Tihrānī, and sometimes Rāzī.

containing *hajv* of Ḥusayn ʿAlī Jalāyir, and the *javāb* quoted from Żamīrī, include mention of *bughrāʾī*. It is hard to imagine that the works are not linked. Of course, all of this would be simple to evaluate if we had at hand a copy of Umīdī's *dīvān*. So I resolved to locate a manuscript, and, at length, I managed to access one. It is available through the web portal of the National Library of Iran (*Sāzmān-i Asnād va Kitābkhānah-i Millī*), under reference number 1725738.[144] The codex contains a mixture of the poetry of Ẓahīr Fāryābī (d. 598/1201) and Umīdī Ṭihrānī (*sic*, with *ṭāʾ*); according to the description, the two authors are not clearly separated.[145] It was supposedly copied in the eleventh/seventeenth century, though there does not appear to be a colophon. There are twelve lines of poetry per page, in decent handwriting. The quality of the black-and-white photographs available online is insufficient to determine much else about the physical characteristics of the manuscript. In any event, it was a frustrating task to find the relevant *qaṣīdah* by Umīdī, especially considering that some (if not most) of the material is from Ẓahīr. But our poem is there, on pages 252–60 (per the numbering applied by the web portal). It is a mammoth *qaṣīdah* of ninety-six lines. The opening is as expected (*ay tu sulṭān-i mulk-i zībāʾī…*), and the bit about Ṭufaylī's Khurāsānī privilege is included (on p. 258).

It should be noted that we have only scratched the surface in this discussion of Umīdī, based on snippets in the *Tuḥfah*, which give a surprising impression of the poet's importance around the early tenth/sixteenth century. (Again, it could be hypothesized that Umīdī was not quite so influential, and that Sām Mīrzā was personally fond of his work owing to Safavid and/or Shiʿi partisanship.) And we have done at least the minimum diligence to confirm that a single, long *qaṣīdah* by Umīdī, intended

---

144. This manuscript can most easily be found by navigating to the main page of the Library's portal (http://dl.nlai.ir/) and searching for the two terms Ẓahīr and Umīdī (in Persian script).

145. See J. T. P. de Bruijn, "Fāryābi, Ẓahir-al-Din Abu'l-Fażl Ṭāher," *Encyclopædia Iranica*. The connection between Ẓahīr and Umīdī is less than clear. Both focused on the *qaṣīdah* form, but this was typical in the sixth/twelfth century.

for the patronage of Najm-i S̤ānī, was the subject of several *javāb*s in this period. It would be easier if there were more scholarship on this poet (rather than virtually none), investigating his treatment in a range of anthological sources—not to mention a wider selection of his verse.

A final note on this issue is that Sām Mīrzā not only describes *javāb*s of Umīdī's poetry, and a case in which he exchanged *hajv* with a competitor before Najm-i S̤ānī; there are also lines quoted from Umīdī to emphasize points made in discussing other figures. This was mentioned above, and we initially set aside such cases, since they do not involve direct connections with Umīdī. In light of the complication surrounding multiple references to a single *qaṣīdah*, however, it is worth checking the other lines that Sām Mīrzā quotes. They occur in the notices on Shah Ismāʿīl (no. 1), Mīr ʿAbd al-Bāqī (no. 20), and Shaykh-zādah-i Lāhījī, pen name Fidāʾī (no. 199).[146] The line in reference to Shah Ismāʿīl comes close to following the format seen above—the rhyme is on *-āʾī*—but the meter is *hazaj maḥẕūf*, not *khafīf*. There are no further matches. In the end, it is still remarkable to see a number of echoes of a single *qaṣīdah* by Umīdī, with love poetry in the beginning section (or *nasīb*) that prompted *javāb*s from contemporaries, and, later, a satirical reference to a high-ranking rival at court. Sām Mīrzā never acknowledges that he has touched upon the same source material in a range of contexts.

The preceding exploration of references to Umīdī, lengthy though it may be, is meant to illustrate a point about the *Tuḥfah* and the interconnectedness of the world that it constructs. This is one of the more extreme cases: there are three "invocations" of Umīdī's poetry (for lack of a better word) by Sām Mīrzā, four instances of *javāb* (one of which also includes a *tażmīn*), and one exchange of *hajv*. And let us not forget that four other individuals covered in this *taẕkirah* are described as members of Umīdī's

146. In the Humāyūn Farrukh edition, these entries are found on pp. 8–11, 31–2, and 109–10, respectively.

family. However, the same features occur, usually to a milder degree, throughout the text. Further investigation of this dimension of the *Tuḥfah* will be facilitated by the availability of our spreadsheet.

4) *Additional notes on* javāb-gūʾī

The importance of *javāb*s in this anthology should be clear by now, but it is worth discussing the issue from an additional angle. To put it simply, we can look for poets, or indeed specific poems, that are mentioned as subjects of *javāb-gūʾī* on multiple occasions, and use this as a rough indication that the respective figures or works were influential during the *Tuḥfah*'s period of coverage. We would need to add the caveat that we are viewing a literary microcosmos of Sām Mīrzā's creation, reflecting his priorities and tastes, and so the value judgments cannot be accepted on their face. But the subjectivity encoded in the text does not render it useless, either. Taking the case of Umīdī as an example, one would conclude based on the repeated, complimentary mentions of him in the *Tuḥfah* that he was among the great poets of the early tenth/sixteenth century. Those of us who have a general familiarity with Persian literature of the period, however, might doubt this assessment. Again, the name Umīdī Tihrānī is hardly well known today, even among experts, and the condition of his *dīvān* in surviving manuscripts is difficult to determine. We know that he was a specialist in the panegyric *qaṣīdah*, and that he dedicated poems to Safavid rulers and officials, as well as to the Ahl al-Bayt. We have the aforementioned hypothesis that Sām Mīrzā, as a son of Shah Ismāʿīl and brother of Ṭahmāsb, and as an outwardly committed Shiʿi, gives an unrealistic sense of Umīdī's importance for his own reasons. And yet we see *javāb*s of Umīdī's poetry, which appear legitimate enough; and the other examples of figures who loom large in the *Tuḥfah* (a few of which we will note below) are not as unexpected. The

truth probably falls somewhere in the middle. We need to remain critical of Sām Mīrzā's perspective, while attempting to tease out the insights offered by his work.

The poet who towers over this *taẕkirah* is, unsurprisingly, Jāmī (no. 265).[147] How could it be otherwise, in a book written *ca*. 957/1550 that functions as a retrospective of the changes since the late Timurid period? Sām Mīrzā opens the notice on Jāmī by stating that, due to the extreme exaltedness of the poet's nature (*ghāyat-i ʿuluvv-i fiṭrat*) and the maximal strength of his fame (*nihāyat-i shiddat-i shuhrat*), he has no need of introduction (*iḥtiyāj bi-taqrīr-i ḥāl va tabyīn-i maqāl na-dārad*). This is not terribly unusual in itself; it is something of a convention in *taẕkirah*s to display such modesty when writing a notice on a famous individual. But Sām Mīrzā goes a few steps further. He includes a snippet of poetry, possibly of his own composition, in praise of Jāmī. The first line goes as follows: "It is not a *dīvān* of poetry that belongs to Jāmī; he has spread out a feast-table in the custom of the munificent" (*nah dīvān-i shiʿr ast īn milk-i Jāmī; kashīda-st khwānī bi-rasm-i karīmān*). After this *qiṭʿah*, the notice resumes by emphasizing that "there is no debate on the matter of his virtues" (*mukhālif va muʾālif* [sic] *rā dar bāb-i jihāt-i maḥsanātash* [sic] *sukhanī nah*). And Sām Mīrzā makes the unusual decision to specify the date of Jāmī's birth, down to the time of day: late evening (*ʿishāʾ*) on 23 Shaʿbān 817, *i.e.*, 7 November 1414. The only other birth date mentioned explicitly in the *Tuḥfah* is that of Shah Ismāʿīl.[148] The biographical portion of the notice goes on at some length. It runs to fifty-five lines (in Humāyūn Farrukh's edition), which is exceeded only by the passages on ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī (sixty-seven lines) and

147. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 143–52.

148. Ibid., 9. In the case of Shah Ismāʿīl, Sām Mīrzā mentions only the *year* of birth (892/1487). This makes the passage on Jāmī seem all the more remarkable.

Shah Ismāʿīl (sixty-five). Sām Mīrzā also transmits seventy-nine lines of poetry from Jāmī, more than from any other figure. The overall size of this entry ranks first by a considerable margin.

As we saw vividly in the case of Umīdī, however, there can be more to the story than what is found in the dedicated discussion of an individual. What drives home the impression that Jāmī is the premier poet in the *Tuḥfah* is the frequency and variety with which his name is mentioned, or his poetry is invoked or responded to. Sām Mīrzā cites *javāb*s of Jāmī from six others: Mīr Abū al-Makārim (no. 129), Āqā Mīrak Naqqāsh (no. 134; discussed above), Sharaf al-Dīn ʿAlī Bāfqī (no. 149), Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn (no. 162), ʿĀshiqī (no. 366), and Aḥmad Kāfī Kāshānī (no. 476; discussed above).[149] It may not seem extraordinary, in a *taẕkirah* with over seven hundred notices, that a handful of them feature *javāb*s of Jāmī. But this is more than we find for any other poet. Furthermore, there are points in the *Tuḥfah* at which Jāmī's poetry is mentioned, which do not involve *javāb* as such, but still attest to his influence in unusual ways.

One amusing example occurs in the notice on Hūshī Shīrāzī (no. 309), who is described by Sām Mīrzā as a crazy man and habitual poetry thief.[150] He was known for reciting a line by Jāmī as if it were his own. The original goes as follows: "Jāmī, you and the wine cup and stupor and drunkenness; what do you know of the wise path of sober men?" (*Jāmī tu va jām-i may u bī-hūshī u mastī; rāh-i khirad-i mardum-i hushyār chih dānī?*). Hūshī needed only to replace Jāmī's name with his own, the two having the same metrical value. When he recited his version of the line, he was promptly challenged on it, and he admitted what he had done. He answered, "What difference does it make?" (*chih shavad?*), and explained, "He was Sunni, and I am Shiʿi, and Sunni property is *ḥalāl* for the Shiʿah" (*ū Sunnī būd va*

149. In the Humāyūn Farrukh edition, these entries are found on pp. 72, 74, 83–4, 89–90, 254–6, and 283–4, respectively.
150. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 225–6.

man Shīʿī-am; māl-i Sunnī bar Shīʿah ḥalāl ast). Anecdotes involving stolen poems are not especially rare in this *taẕkirah*, but it is a different matter for a line to be recognized, and the thief confronted. (The only comparable case is found in the entry for Sawsanī, no. 665.)[151] There is a tone of incredulity that Hūshī would try to pass off a well-known *maṭlaʿ* by Jāmī, of all poets, as his own.

Another passage in which Jāmī's poetry is cited in an atypical manner is the notice on ʿAbd Allāh Hātifī (no. 267).[152] These two share a family relation, of course: Hātifī is Jāmī's nephew. And it seems he often sought mentorship and encouragement from his uncle. For instance, Hātifī intended to compose his own take on *Laylī u Majnūn*, and he asked Jāmī to provide an opening line (*iftitāḥ*). The latter agreed, offering the following: "This book, whose foundation the pen has laid; may it be blessed with the seal of approval" (*īn nāmah kih khāmah kard bunyād; tawqīʿ-i qabūl rūzī-ash bād*). Sām Mīrzā adds that Hātifī did succeed in bringing the work to fruition, and that it was well received. Again, this is not really a case of *javāb*, *tatabbuʿ*, or *tażmīn*—though it shares something with the definition of the last term. As we saw in the anecdote with Hūshī, anyway, this involves a poet's use of material by Jāmī and further demonstrates his stature.

It is also worth noting that all six of the *javāb*s of Jāmī that are quoted in the *Tuḥfah* are based on separate poems. This gives a somewhat different impression than, for example, the various responses to a single *qaṣīdah* of Umīdī. We must wonder whether Umīdī gained a reputation for just a few specimens of verse, whereas Jāmī had a huge body of work, a fair portion of which was in currency to an extent that people drew on it for *javāb*s. His presence in the *taẕkirah* is definitely umatched in this

151. Ibid., 358–60. This is another memorable story, in which Sawsānī wows his friends by "extemporizing" a *ghazal*, only for one of them to realize that the poem is by Kamāl Khujandī (d. 803/1400–01). When confronted, in the presence of a copy of Kamāl's *dīvān* (!), Sawsanī denies any foul play.

152. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 160–64.

regard. Furthermore, there is an instance, in the notice on the Safavid official Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn (no. 162), in which a *javāb* of Jāmī is quoted in the absence of the source line.[153] All that we are given is the following, from Shāh Ḥusayn: "Lovers have made separation from you their companion; since union is not feasible, they did what they could" (*ʿāshiqān hajr-i tu rā muʾnis-i jān sākhtah-and; vaṣl chūn nīst muyassar, bi-hamān sākhtah-and*).

In order to find the original, one would need to consult Jāmī's *dīvān*. There is a poem by him with the correct meter, rhyme, and *radīf*; its first line goes as follows: "They made your ruby jewel-case (*i.e.*, your red lips containing pearly teeth) from the essence of souls; they have hidden the desire of every wounded one in that box" (*ḥuqqah-i laʿl-i tu az jawhar-i jān sākhtah-and; kām-i har khastah dar ān ḥuqqah nihān sākhtah-and*).[154] While it is not difficult for a reader today to make this connection, Sām Mīrzā's omission of the source material suggests something about his proximate audience: he expects them to know Jāmī's œuvre well enough to detect Shāh Ḥusayn's *javāb*. This is also atypical in the context of the *Tuḥfah*. (It is different from the case of Umīdī, where we saw repeated discussion of the same *qaṣīdah*, sometimes with quotes and sometimes without.) Jāmī stands in a category of his own, at least among poets of the period covered by Sām Mīrzā.

There are a few others whose poetry is brought up in the *Tuḥfah* to an extent, or in a manner, that appears noteworthy. After Jāmī and Umīdī, the next most striking example is Amīr Khusraw (d. 725/1325). It ought to be acknowledged that we are, in a sense, addressing a different question at this point. There is no notice in this *taẕkirah* for Khusraw, who died almost two centuries too early for Sām

153. Ibid., 89–90.

154. For the time being, the best version of Jāmī's collected *ghazal*s to which I have access is a lithograph of his *kullīyāt*, printed in Kānpūr (*i.e.*, Cawnpore) in 1890, by Maṭbaʿ-i Nāmī Munshī. This poem is found on pp. 201–2. There is not, so far as I can determine, any other *ghazal* by Jāmī that matches all of these formal characteristics.

Mīrzā to include him. If we restricted ourselves to the matter of which poets *described in the Tuḥfah* are elevated through mention of *javāb*s of their work, then there would be no further cases. But it is useful to adopt a slightly wider perspective, since we can gain insight into the corpus of poetry that had become "classical" and was still current enough that members of Sām Mīrzā's generation took it as a basis for some of their own work. Amīr Khusraw is cited in this context to a surprising degree. What is perhaps most remarkable is that, of the *five* instances of *javāb* (or *tatabbuʿ*) of Khusraw mentioned by Sām Mīrzā, four are derived from a single poem: a *qaṣīdah* known as *Daryā-yi abrār*.

The original is a poem of twenty-five lines, in the meter *ramal maḥẕūf* (*mus̈amman*), with *-ar* as the rhyme syllable and a *radīf* of *ast*.[155] The first two lines are as follows: "The king's drum is empty, and its clamorous sound causes headaches; whoever is content with dry (bread) and wet (water) rules the sea and the earth; as long as you are buffeted by every wind, stand firm like a mountain; man is just a handful of dust, and life passes like the wind" (*kūs-i shah khālī va bāng-i ghalghalash dard-i sar ast; har-kih qāniʿ shud bi-khushk u tar, shah-i baḥr u bar ast; tā zi-har bādī bi-junbī pā bi-dāman kash chu kūh; k-ādamī mushtī ghubār u ʿumr bād-i ṣarṣar ast*). This is one of Khusraw's famous works—perhaps even the most influential of his short poems—and its popularity in the first half of the tenth/sixteenth century may be linked to a well-known *javāb* written by Jāmī, called *Lujjat al-asrār*.[156] (Sām Mīrzā does not mention this in his notice on Jāmī.) The *Tuḥfah* quotes the responses of four other individuals to Khusraw's *qaṣīdah*: Sayyid Māyilī (no. 61), Āgahī Khurāsānī (no. 293), Maḥmūd Khāmūshī Kāshānī (no. 472), and ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī (no. 636).

155. On Ganjoor, this is *qaṣīdah* no. 3 by Amīr Khusraw.

156. In the 1890 lithograph of Jāmī's *kullīyāt*, cited above, this poem is on pp. 39–45. The title *Lujjat al-asrār* is not present, but it is easy to identify the *javāb* on a formal (not to mention thematic) basis. Note that Jāmī's *qaṣīdah* is one hundred lines, or four times longer than Amīr Khusraw's original.

We may as well begin with Navāʾī's *javāb*, since he belongs to the earliest generation covered in this *tażkirah*, and his towering importance in the early Ottoman-Safavid-Mughal period is such that he may have influenced the other three.[157] Sām Mīrzā indicates that the line he quotes is the *maṭlaʿ* of Navāʾī's *javāb* of Khusraw. It goes as follows: "The fiery ruby that adorns the royal crown, is a coal on the head meant to cook the raw imagination" (*ātashīn laʿlī kih tāj-i khusruvān rā zīvar ast, akhgarī bahr-i khayāl-i khām pukhtan dar sar ast*). Commentary on the worth of worldly power and riches is a theme addressed in Khusraw's original poem, and it also appears in these *javāb*s. The following is the contribution of Māyilī, a Kāshānī *sayyid* whom Sām Mīrzā describes as having a predilection for the *qaṣīdah* form: "If the oppressor drives the wind-footed horse of rule across the world, the cry of the oppressed will follow him like a roaring wind" (*ẓālim ar bar charkh rānad bād-pā-yi salṭanat, āh-i maẓlūm az pay-i ū ham-chu bād-i ṣarṣar ast*).[158] And the version of Maḥmūd Khāmūshī Kāshānī, a relatively minor poet covered in the second part of the fifth chapter, has the following as its first line: "This transient world in which happiness is scarce; even if you find in it the treasure of Qārūn, its dirt will cover your head" (*ʿālam-i fānī kih dar vay shādmānī kamtar ast; ḥāṣilash gar ganj-i Qārūn ast, khākash bar sar ast*).[159] (Qārūn is the Arabic name of the biblical figure Korah. He is mentioned in the Qur'an and known in Islamicate culture, as in the rabbinical literature, as a possessor of immeasurable wealth.) Sām Mīrzā adds that some people attribute Khāmūshī's line to Jāmī's son, Żiyāʾ al-Dīn Yūsuf (for whom the *Bahāristān* was ostensibly written). This may indicate suspicion regarding an unusually successful line from an obscure poet.

157. On the works and reception of ʿAlī Shīr, see Nicholas Walmsley, "'O Navāʾī!': Imitation, Innovation, and the Invention of a Central Asian Literary Icon, 1500–1900" (PhD diss., Indiana University, 2016).
158. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 56. Note the use of *bād-i ṣarṣar* in this line, as in the original poem.
159. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 282–3.

The *tatabbuʿ* of the *Daryā-yi abrār* by Āgahī Khurāsānī is rather different.[160] He apparently served as a court secretary (*munshī*) under Sulṭān Ḥusayn Bāyqarā, and committed some malfeasance involving a forged document—though the ruler forgave him. Āgahī adapted the form of Khusraw's *qaṣīdah* to compose a *shahr-āshūb* about the people of Harāt.[161] Sām Mīrzā quotes several lines from this poem; it begins by praising the city itself, before lamenting the low quality of its residents, as follows: "It is the seat of hundreds of thousands of world-conquering rulers; its history is full of kings with armies as populous as the stars; behold the crooked heavens, by whose influence such a city / is home to an assembly of ill-fated losers" (*pāytakht-i ṣad-hazārān khusrav-i gītī-gushā-st; kuhnah-tārīkh-i basī shāhān-i anjum-lashkar ast; charkh-i kaj-raw bīn kih az taʾsīr-i ū shahrī chunīn / maskan-i jamʿī parīshān-rūzgār-i abtar ast*). The poem goes on to satirize various individuals, and some of this is lewd enough that Sām Mīrzā deems it unfit to excerpt. He does quote a couple of lines directed at a certain Muʿīn Mīkāl, whose face Āgahī compares to a soiled spatula (*kaf-gīr*). It probably says something about the popularity of composing *javāb*s of the *Daryā-yi abrār* that Āgahī's *shahr-āshūb* is interpreted as such, rather than as a poem coincidentally sharing the same meter, rhyme, and *radīf*.

Why do we find four instances of *javāb* or *tatabbuʿ* of this *qaṣīdah* in the *Tuḥfah*? The likely answer is simple enough: Jāmī and Navāʾī had both written well-known responses, called *Lujjat al-asrār* and *Tuḥfat al-afkār*, respectively.[162] It is no surprise that poets of the succeeding generations, who idolized those titans of Timurid Harāt, would attempt contributions of their own. Still, this phenomenon does

160. Ibid., 208–9.
161. *Shahr-āshūb* (lit. "disturber of the city") is a sort of genre in classical Persian poetry, which is often traced to the career of Masʿūd-i Saʿd-i Salmān (d. 515/1121–2)—though it did not reach great popularity until the Timurid and Safavid-Mughal periods. In a *shahr-āshūb* poem, the various denizens of a given city are described, sometimes with reference to their beauty and coquetry, sometimes in a satirical manner.
162. Regrettably, I have not been able to find a source for the full text of Navāʾī's *Tuḥfat al-afkār*.

not seem to have been noted in prior scholarship. It is another small insight that becomes clear after combing through the *Tuḥfah*. The four individuals discussed here—Māyilī, Āgahī, Khāmūshī, and Navāʾī—are found in four different sections of the *taẕkirah*. It was mentioned above that Sām Mīrzā records a fifth *javāb* of Khusraw, though not of the *Daryā-yi abrār*. This is found in the notice on Amīr Ḥājj (no. 29), a *sayyid* of Gunābād who was known for his piety and asceticism.[163] In his case, there is a *javāb* of one of Khusraw's *ghazal*s,[164] which includes an ingenious play on an image from the original poem. But this is less relevant to the current discussion.

Major poets from earlier historical periods occasionally come up in the *Tuḥfah*, including with reference to *javāb-gūʾī* or *tatabbuʿ*. As we saw, Sām Mīrzā mocks one man's hilariously inept attempt to compose his own *Shāhnāmah*.[165] There are at least a few notices in which mention is made of *javāb*s of the narrative poems of Niẓāmī Ganjavī. (This includes ʿAbdī Beg Shīrāzī, no. 173, who would ultimately complete *three* full responses to the *Khamsah*. He would also go on to record the dubious story about Sām Mīrzā's death in an earthquake, in the chronicle *Takmilat al-akhbār*. But the entry on him in the *Tuḥfah*, written at a happier time, is entirely complimentary.)[166] These points in the text do not, however, seem to convey much meaningful information, and they have the tone of something taken for granted. Yes, of course, the poetry of figures like Firdawsī, Niẓāmī, Anvarī, and Ḥāfiẓ was important to people in the tenth/sixteenth century. The fact that their legacies were so secure was, as we know, a

---

163. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 38–9.
164. On Ganjoor, this is *ghazal* no. 69 from Amīr Khusraw. Its opening line goes as follows: "I spent many a night with that moon-faced one—where did all those nights go?; now it is also night, but it is black from the smoke of anguished supplications" (*basī shab bā mahī būdam, kujā shud ān hamah shab-hā; kunūn ham hast shab, līkan siyāh az dūd-i yā-rabb-hā*). The meter is *hazaj sālim* (used famously in the opening *ghazal* of the *dīvān* of Ḥāfiẓ).
165. This was Nāzukī Hamadānī (no. 492), whose entry occurs on pp. 288–9 in the Humāyūn Farrukh edition.
166. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 95–6. See also Paul E. Losensky, "ʿAbdī Shīrāzī," *Encyclopædia of Islam, THREE*.

motivating factor for Sām Mīrzā to write the *Tuḥfah*: he wanted to carry the torch following the efforts of earlier *taẕkirah* authors, and to preserve for posterity the notable literary activities of *his* time.

But there is the occasional surprise. The vogue in composing *javāb*s of the *Daryā-yi abrār* is one example, since it is less obvious that a specific *qaṣīdah* by a canonical poet should gain popularity in this way. A further case worth noting involves a work by Kātibī Nīshāpūrī Turshīzī (d. *ca.* 839/1435–6), also a *qaṣīdah*, whose defining feature is its *radīf* of *gul*. (The meter is *ramal maḥẕūf musamman*, and the rhyme is on the syllable *-ār*.) Sām Mīrzā cites two *javāb*s of this poem, in the entries on Shawqī Yazdī (no. 282; discussed earlier with reference to Umīdī) and a certain Abdāl from Iṣfahān (no. 298).[167] The original *"gul" qaṣīdah*, which is not quoted in either instance, has the following as its first line: "The flower returned to the meadow with a hundred leaves; like a narcissus, it became the focus of the people of perception" (*bāz bā ṣad barg āmad jānib-i gulzār, gul; hamchu nargis gasht manẓūr-i ulu'l-abṣār, gul*).[168]

From Shawqī's *javāb*, Sām Mīrzā provides one line, which goes as follows (in a rough attempt at translation): "The branch, in vanity, would hide its flower from the sky, if *my* newly blossomed flower challenged it to a duel" (*shākh gul rā az tafākhur sar zi-gardūn bi-g'ẕarad, naw-gul-i man gar zanad bar gūshah-i dastār, gul*). It is unfortunate that this is difficult to parse, since Sām Mīrzā claims that "the rest of Shawqī's *qaṣīdah* can be understood from this line" (*az īn yak bayt bāqī-i qaṣīdah-i ū rā mafhūm mī-tavān kard*). The case of Abdāl is less troublesome. After describing his biography—which is itself fascinating, and includes details such as his being involuntarily committed at a hospital (*dār al-shifā'*)

167. The notice for Abdāl is on pp. 212–16 in the Humāyūn Farrukh edition.
168. As was explained in an earlier footnote, the *ghazal*s of Kātibī have been edited and published, but his *qaṣīdah*s have not. It is fortunate that the *"gul" qaṣīdah* is quoted in full by Dawlatshāh, in his extensive discussion of Kātibī.

for lovesickness—Sām Mīrzā quotes from several of his poems. One of these is a *javāb* of Kātibī's *"gul" qaṣīdah*, with the theme changed to focus on the virtues (*manqabat*) of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib. Two lines are excerpted; the second goes as follows: "When the bright star of your appearance casts a reflection on them, there is no need to embroider flowers on the leather falconry gloves" (*chun suhayl-i ṭalʿatat mī-afkanad ʿaksī bar ū, nīst ḥājat dūkhtan bar bahlah-i bulghār, gul*). (It may be that a floral pattern was a common decoration for such gloves.)

Kātibī was not a minor poet in any sense. He may not have been among the few greatest names in Persian literature of the ninth/fifteenth century—*e.g.*, Jāmī, Navāʾī, Qāsim-i Anvār (d. 837/1433–4), Vāʿiẓ-i Kāshifī (d. 910/1504–5)—but he was at most one tier of prominence below such figures. Dawlatshāh provides a lengthy notice on Kātibī in the sixth chapter of the *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ*, and he transmits the entirety of the *"gul" qaṣīdah* (some thirty-five lines), which was evidently among the poet's most popular works.[169] There is nothing strange, therefore, in finding mention of two *javāb*s in the *Tuḥfah*. Sām Mīrzā does make it clear that he expects his readers to know this *qaṣīdah*, referring to it by name and omitting quotes from the original. On a more fundamental level, even when the traces of influence that we find are thoroughly intuitive, they still need to be uncovered. The patient study of *taẕkirah*s of this period, with an eye toward their recording of *javāb-gūʾī* and similar interactive practices, will help us to build a deeper understanding of literary history. Part of this work is to *read* anthologies, rather than simply leveraging them for data on topics that we already know interest us.

169. Again, see the edition of Fāṭimah ʿAlāqah (Tehran, 2007), 689–704.

5) *From reference text to* adab

All of the preceding discussion has, in a sense, revolved around a single question: What kind of text is the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, when we make an effort to consider it on its own terms? One answer would be that Sām Mīrzā offers us many things. He has produced a book that is partly a documentation of the lives and works of some of the great men of the late Timurid and early Safavid periods; partly a snapshot of a moment in Persian literary culture, giving tantalizing bits of information about the range of groups in society that were participating in their own ways; partly a repository of amusing anecdotes and failed attempts at verse; and, on some level, just a record of the people that Sām Mīrzā met and the poetry that he heard throughout a tumultuous life, organized in a top-down social framework that reflects his perspective as a prince. Another answer, distilling this complexity, would be to refer to the *Tuḥfah* as a work of *adab*.

And what do we mean by *adab* literature? This is a notoriously difficult problem, such that it is uncommon in European-language scholarship to attempt a one-to-one translation of the term. Before we even come to the issue of literary styles or modes, there are several different contexts in which the word *adab*, or a derivative thereof, can be invoked, with a corresponding variety of connotations.[170] In a basic sense, to borrow the formulation of Pellat, "*adab* indicate[s] a set of rules inherited from the ancestors which [comprise] practical ethics … and also the sum of educational elements needed by a man who want[s] to behave appropriately in all circumstances of life."[171] This leads, in both Arabic and Persian (and beyond), to a vocabulary of moral instruction—including the Persian verb *adab kardan*,

---

170. For a helpful review of the layers of meaning of *adab*, see Nuha Alshaar's introductory essay in her edited volume, *The Qur'an and Adab* (Oxford, 2017).
171. Charles Pellat, "*Adab* ii. *Adab* in Arabic Literature," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

which we saw earlier in the notice on Muḥibb ʻAlī Nāʼī (no. 259), with the meaning of "teaching a lesson" through punishment.[172] In the literary traditions of Islamicate societies, *adab* has been identified with works of various kinds, relating in some manner to the core ideas of ethics, customs, acculturation, *etc*. To exacerbate an already complicated situation, *adab* is the standard term used to refer to "literature" *in general* in modern Arabic; and in Persian, the plural form *adabīyāt*; and in Turkish, *edebiyat*. What a tangled web! For our purposes, trying to make sense of a tenth/sixteenth-century *taẕkirah*, we may as well say that *adab* is *adab*, a descriptor fit for any literature that encodes the mores, humor, tastes, and etiquette of a social milieu. (Or perhaps we should paraphrase Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart's famous statement about another kind of published material, concluding that we know it when we see it.) On a more productive note, however, we can at least highlight a few characteristics of the *Tuḥfah* that suggest its "*adab*-ness."

First, Sām Mīrzā offers an assortment of material in which the reader will find both entertainment and edification, and the two cannot be separated neatly. This has been demonstrated in many of the example notices described above. It would, of course, be a distortion to claim that the *Tuḥfah solely* prioritizes anecdotes and poetry that the author finds amusing or somehow striking. Sām Mīrzā states in his introduction that his goal is to create a record of the skilled and innovative poets of his time, so that their legacies will be secure like those of the masters of prior eras. To a meaningful extent, he fulfills this objective. We see in the first section of the fifth chapter, in particular, discussion of many (if not most) of the key figures in Persian poetry of the early to mid tenth/sixteenth century. The *Tuḥfah*

172. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 140.

provides the closest available *tazkirah* notices for several of these individuals, and therefore serves as a base-level source on their lives—as in the case of Bābā Faghānī (no. 272).[173]

Not only does Sām Mīrzā cover these poets, but he gives them entries that are unusually long by the standards of the *Tuḥfah*, in terms of both biographical description and excerpts from their verse. There is a real degree of emphasis placed on the documentary function of this text. In fact, despite the relatively narrow mission declared by Sām Mīrzā—to prevent the best poetry of his generation from being lost in the sands of time—it would be easy to interpret some of the other material in the *Tuḥfah* as complying with an expanded version of this idea. The second chapter, for example, preserves information on the careers of notable *sayyid*s and *ʿulamāʾ* of the ninth/fifteenth and tenth/sixteenth centuries, including such luminaries as Mīr ʿAbd al-Bāqī (no. 20) and Jalāl al-Dīn Davānī (no. 140).[174] Similar highlights can be found throughout the *tazkirah*, where Sām Mīrzā discusses important figures beyond the rubric of those known mainly as poets. All this is to say that the *Tuḥfah* is legitimately a source of knowledge for its readers, and it could be used for reference or as part of an education in Persian literature.

As we have seen throughout this study, however, there are entire swaths of the book in which the dominant impression is rather different. In a *tazkirah* full of notices with three-line biographical sketches and one or two quoted lines of poetry, the moments that stand out are often connected to an entertaining anecdote of one kind or another. This tendency has been described above, in addressing the question of what Sām Mīrzā considers remarkable. Yes, there are cases in which an individual's

---

173. Ibid., 176–7. See also the approach to the poet's biography taken by Paul E. Losensky in his book, *Welcoming Fighānī: Imitation and Poetic Individuality in the Safavid-Mughal Ghazal* (Costa Mesa, Calif.: Mazda, 1998).

174. See P. P. Soucek, "ʿAbd-al-Bāqi Yazdi," *Encyclopædia Iranica*. ʿAbd al-Bāqī was a descendent of the founder of the Niʿmat-Allāhī Sufi order. He distinguished himself in calligraphy, and succeeded Najm-i Śānī as Shah Ismāʿīl's *vakīl* in 918/1512—only to meet the same grisly end as his precedessor a couple of years later, at Chāldirān.

prominence or the high merit of his work may lead to his receiving a substantial entry; and there are figures of humbler status whom Sām Mīrzā knows personally, leaving him with stories to share. But the *Tuḥfah* contains over seven hundred notices, and most of the people included are neither distinguished men nor have any clear connection to the author. Thus if one reads through the entire *taẕkirah*, or even a couple of chapters, one is liable to forget that this was ever supposed to be a record of the lives and works of great poets. Extraordinary anecdotes arise from nowhere; some of these have been discussed, but some have not.

To select yet another example, in the depths of the second part of the fifth chapter—which is already addressing fairly obscure individuals—there is a notice on a certain Jārūbī Haravī (no. 564).[175] Sām Mīrzā introduces him as a romantic (*ʿāshiq-pīshah*) and a libertine (*lavand*), which is conventional enough. Then the description takes a strange turn: "But his practice of love was not good" (*ammā ʿāshiqī-i ū bi-ṣūrat-i khūb na-būd*). Jārūbī would apparently "fall in love" with anyone who held some measure of power (*har-kih ḥākim u buzurg būd, ū ʿāshiqash mī-shud*). This included Bābur Pādshāh, at a time when the ruler was fifty years old (*dar sinn-i panjāh sālagī*) and in less-than-perfect health. (In fact, if there is any truth to this anecdote, it must have been close to the end of Bābur's life, since he died in 937/1530 at the age of forty-nine by the lunar calendar, or forty-seven in solar years. We would need to read "fifty" as an approximation.) After his attempt to achieve intimacy with the senior Bābur was unsuccessful, Jārūbī was hardly discouraged. He went to Harāt and professed his love for Dūrmīsh Khān Shāmlū, Sām Mīrzā's *lalah* at the time and the effective governor of the area. This is presumably how our author came to know about Jārūbī. It could then be argued that there is a distant,

175. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 311.

indirect personal connection between them; but we need not split hairs. The main point here is that, throughout the majority of the *Tuḥfah*, we are presented with material that might lead us to question the classification of the work as an "anthology of poets," or, more productively, to wonder what defines this genre in the first place. This is, in itself, a meaningful insight that can be reached through reading the *Tuḥfah* as a work of literature and not simply as a source on it.

But we need to remain mindful of both sides of the coin. Sām Mīrzā has brought together a great deal of information about literary culture in the late Timurid and early Safavid periods, and he has succeeded in carrying forward the *taẕkirah* tradition from the prior generation, helping to cement the legacies of a new cohort of poets. The fact that much of the text seems to operate on a different wavelength cannot negate the parts that *do* fit with Sām Mīrzā's stated goals. This is a book with multiple functions. And even if we wanted to separate the passages in which there are substantial discussions of individuals who are held in high regard by the author, from the mass of cursory notices that fill the remaining pages, it would not be a straightforward task. In fact, upon closer examination, there are consistent features of Sām Mīrzā's approach, irrespective of the status of the figure that he is addressing in a given entry. A colorful anecdote may appear in the biographical sketch of someone famous, just as one might occur in an obscure case (examples of which have been shown above).

In describing the alcoholism of Bābā Faghānī (no. 272), for instance, Sām Mīrzā claims that when the poet was living in Abīvard, the local ruler ensured that he was given one *man* of wine, in addition to one *man* of meat, each day.[176] (The *man*, sometimes anglicized as "maund," was and is a unit of weight in the Near East and South Asia. Its value varied widely in different localities and time periods,

176. Ibid., 176: *Ḥākim-i ān diyār har rūz yak man sharāb va yak man gūsht muqarrar kardah būd kih bi-ū mī-dādand.*

but it was equivalent to *at least* a few kilograms. According to Walther Hinz, a *man* of liquid under the Safavids weighed around 4.3 kg.)[177] This seems as though it must be hyperbolic. In any event, the notice portrays Faghānī's descent to an increasingly pathetic condition, with others at the tavern ridiculing him. He moved at last to Mashhad, where, as Sām Mīrzā puts it, "he swallowed the drink of 'Every soul will taste death' " (*jur'ah-i 'kull nafs dhā'iqat al-mawt' chashīd*). (The quote is from verse 185 of *sūrah* 3 of the Qur'an, Āl 'Imrān.) We can see bits of embellishment, puns, clever references, and the like, even if the individual in question is acknowledged as one of the major poets of his generation. Any number of similar examples could be cited.

Overall, there is no exclusive answer to the question of whether the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* is meant to edify or to entertain the reader. Such a state of mixture, or ambiguity, is a hallmark of *adab* literature. In the medieval Arabic context, this is often referred to with the phrase *al-jidd wa-al-hazl*, which Van Gelder translates as "jest and earnest" (reversing the order of the terms) in a pair of classic articles.[178] For an author like al-Jāḥiẓ (d. 255/868–9), it is actually *crucial* that discussion of serious topics include attention to points that seem more frivolous. The latter contribute to the mission of the text, and may be revealed as equally important, in their own way.

A second indicator of "*adab*-ness" worth highlighting in this *taẕkirah* is the presence of what we might call "inside references." Sām Mīrzā often includes details in his entries that must be recognized in order for their meaning and tone to be understood fully, and this is an expectation placed upon the reader. It is perhaps most obvious in the humorous passages in the *Tuḥfah*. How, after all, could this

177. This is from Hinz's classic *Islamische Masse und Gewichte* (Leiden: Brill, 1970). On the liquid *man* of the Safavid period, see p. 21.
178. This is really one large article, in two parts, published in consecutive issues of the *Journal of Arabic Literature* in 1992. See Geert Jan van Gelder, "Mixtures of Jest and Earnest in Classical Arabic Literature: Part I," *JAL* 23, no. 2 (1992): 83–108; "Mixtures of Jest and Earnest in Classical Arabic Literature: Part II," *JAL* 23, no. 3 (1992): 169–90.

not be the case with humor? In order for any joke to succeed, there needs to be some shared background knowledge between the narrator and his or her audience. The requisite context may be very simple. For example, in the aforementioned notice on Amīr Sayyid (no. 98), where we find the anecdote about ritual ablutions (*vużūʾ*), the reader need only understand how absurd it would be for a Muslim to claim that he could sleep without losing his state of purity.[179] A similarly straightforward case is that of Hūshī Shīrāzī (no. 309), who justifies his theft of a line from Jāmī by stating that "Sunni property is *ḥalāl* for the Shiʿah."[180]

There are several points at which Sām Mīrzā expects the reader to be familiar with classic works of Persian poetry, in order for it to be clear how the literary efforts of a contemporary individual are noteworthy. One example discussed above is Nāzukī Hamadānī (no. 492), the prolific "poet" who spent thirty days composing his version of the *Shāhnāmah*, Firdawsī's thirty-year *magnum opus*.[181] The lines quoted from this quixotic project are cringeworthy, but the effect relies on having been exposed to the real *Shāhnāmah*. Nāzukī has written terrible poetry that is unmistakably in the same style. Another memorable anecdote on the theme of inept responses to the great masters occurs in the seventh chapter of the *Tuḥfah*, on members of lower socioeconomic strata—a section of the *taẕkirah* that we have not explored in depth in this study, since its contents are extraordinary enough that it is easier to address them separately.[182] But the notice in question is one that was mentioned above; it concerns a man called Nūrī Qufl-gar (no. 671), or "Nūrī the Locksmith."[183]

---

179. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 65–6.
180. Ibid., 225–6.
181. Ibid., 288–9.
182. I have a forthcoming paper that takes the seventh chapter as its centerpiece. The title is "Speaking for the Subaltern in an Early Safavid *Taẕkira*," and it is supposed to appear in an edited volume organized by Andrew J. Newman.
183. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 365.

Sām Mīrzā, as we have seen, introduces this fellow in an incredibly sarcastic manner, explaining that he decided at age seventy to delve into the literary arts, and noting that "his poetry is not in accordance with formal meter, nor does it have any meaning" (*shiʿr-i ū nā-mawzūn ast va maʿná ham na-dārad*). This characterization is substantiated by one of the poems of Nūrī that Sām Mīrzā quotes, which culminates in the repeated shouting of "Barley!" (*jaw*). Of course, the image of this old locksmith reciting his free verse, while pretending to shake a handful of barley in the front of his tunic, is plenty ridiculous on its own. But the effect of the anecdote is heightened by the fact that Nūrī intended to compose a *javāb* of a famous *ghazal* of Ḥāfiẓ (which likens the crescent moon in the field of the heavens to a scythe meant for harvest). The reader is clearly assumed to be acquainted with the original poem, and this context provides part of the humor.

We should consider the likelihood that some of the allusions included in notices in the *Tuḥfah* might be difficult, if not impossible, for us to grasp, given the temporal and cultural distance that lies between us and Sām Mīrzā's initial audience. One useful example occurs in the fourth chapter, in the notice on a certain Qāżī Lāghar Sīstānī (no. 209).[184] With reference to this individual's unusual moniker—*lāghar* means "thin"—Sām Mīrzā states that there were two judges in Sīstān at this time, and the other one was fat (*qāżī-i dīgar būd kih farbah būd*). The last part of the notice is devoted to a story told by Qāżī Lāghar, which hinges on the (alleged) fact that "most of the people of Sīstān are gypsies and thieves" (*akṡar-i mardum-i Sīstān lagūr va duzd-and*). Apparently these people would go to the judge when they fell into disputes regarding the distribution of money that they had stolen. He would refuse, explaining that no legitimate claim (*daʿvá-yi sharʿī*) could be made under such

184. Ibid., 114–15.

circumstances—and they would protest that they considered their gains well earned. This story makes sense on its own terms, but it helps that there is explicit mention of the thieving nature of Sīstānīs. If that detail were left to the reader to understand, then it might cause us a bit of confusion. Accordingly, there may in fact be passages in this *taẕkirah* in which there are layers of meaning that we have failed to recognize, lacking some context that was generally available to an educated member of Persianate society in the tenth/sixteenth century.

A great deal more could be said about the "inside references" in the *Tuḥfah*. They are not limited to instances of humor; another major category relates to the discussion of *javāb-gū'ī*. (That is, in notices where Sām Mīrzā is not poking fun at the poetry…) All of the *javāb*s mentioned above, to a greater or lesser extent, involve an expectation that the reader is familiar with the original poem. This is especially true in those cases where the source is not quoted; we are supposed to be able to recognize it from the meter, rhyme, *radīf*, and content of the *javāb*. Or, as we saw with the "*gul" qaṣīdah* of Kātibī, the original poem is considered famous enough to be referred to by its popular title, without any need to excerpt a verse or two. Yet another type of allusion occurs, with some frequency, when Sām Mīrzā is describing people from different ethnicities or groups within society (like Sīstānīs). One example that we covered earlier is the references to the Sayfī *sayyid*s of Qazvīn. Sām Mīrzā clearly thinks it is worth mentioning this family association, in notices where it is applicable, but he never elaborates on the importance of the Sayfīs. Of course, it is not difficult—even for the student of Safavid history today—to find information about prominent descendants of Qāżī Sayf al-Dīn. (One of them is the author of

the chronicle *Lubb al-tavārīkh*.)[185] It is still meaningful that Sām Mīrzā includes no such background on the family in the *Tuḥfah*, while naming them on several occasions.

In the sixth chapter, on poets of Turkic origin, there is even more that seems to lurk between the lines. This is another section of the *taẕkirah* that we have not covered in detail in the current study; like the seventh chapter, it has features that are better addressed in a separate discussion. But we may at least note here that Sām Mīrzā hints at a complex, if not conflicted, perspective on Turkic culture. On the one hand, he is a proud member of the Safavid family who presumably grew up speaking Turkic and hearing poetry from his father's *dīvān*, and he has taken care to set aside this chapter in the *Tuḥfah*. He also quotes Turkic poetry directly on a number of occasions, in an otherwise Persian text.[186] But there are passages in which something different rises to the surface. For example, in the notice on a certain Yūsuf Beg (no. 643), Sām Mīrzā begins by noting that he belongs to the Chāvushlū group within the Ustājlū (the latter being one of the major Qizilbāsh tribes).[187] He then makes the following remark: "Although he is a Turk, humane conduct issues from him" (*agar-chih Turk ast, ammā aṭvār-i ādamiyānah az īshān bi-ẓuhūr mī-rasad*). After describing Yūsuf Beg's many fine qualities, Sām Mīrzā concludes by stating that "in this age, few Turks like him, and even few Tajiks, are found" (*dar īn zamān, miṡl-i ū Turk bal-kih Tājīk nīz kam paydā mī-shavad*).

This is not the only notice in the sixth chapter in which we find a backhanded compliment. Khayālī (no. 645) is described as "matched in rank by few of the Turkic poets" (*az shuʿarāʾ-i Turk, kam kasī rā rutbah-i ū tavānad būd*).[188] Allāh-Qulī (no. 651) is "a Turk by origin, but more resembles the

185. Again, see Kioumars Ghereghlou's article on "Sayfi Qazvini" in *Encyclopædia Iranica*.
186. For instance, the entry on Sulṭān Ḥusayn Bāyqarā (no. 5, pp. 14–16) ends with a quote of two lines of Turkic poetry by the ruler. This is apart from the dedicated chapter on Turks, which contains poetry in both languages.
187. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 344–6.
188. Ibid., 347–8.

Tajiks" (*aṣlash Turk ast ammā khud bi-Tājīkān shabīh-tar ast*).[189] Muṭīʿī Beg (no. 655) and Mīrzā Būdāq (no. 658) are both introduced as Turks who spent enough time among Tajiks to have been effectively persianized.[190] Again, it would be fair to say that Sām Mīrzā holds a mélange of views regarding Turkic culture. This is somewhat difficult to interpret, and it may be that early readers of the *Tuḥfah* were in a better position to understand the nuances of the Turk-Tajik dynamic.

What does the persistent allusive quality of the *Tuḥfah* have to do with *adab*? The idea is that it works to strengthen the rapport between author and reader. Sām Mīrzā tells a joke, and we get it. He quotes a few words from the Qur'an in a clever way—as in the description of Bābā Faghānī's death—and we know the chapter and verse. He shares a selection of atrocious poetry in the style of the *Shāhnāmah*, or in response to a *ghazal* of Ḥāfiẓ, and we are able to laugh along at the ineptitude and cluelessness of the men responsible. He mentions that a given individual was martyred at Chāldirān, and we can appreciate (on some level) the significance of that event.[191] If, as we have suggested elsewhere, Sām Mīrzā is using this *taẕkirah* to construct a microcosm of society, a world of his own, then the "inside references" with which the text is peppered serve as hints for the reader of the background understanding that he or she should possess in order to join the author on this journey. To the extent that we recognize the allusions in the *Tuḥfah*, we can deepen our identification with Sām Mīrzā and his work, coming to feel as though we share something of his education, his æsthetics, his humor, *etc*. Or, in something closer to the original sense of the word, we have a common *adab* that is reflected in the *Tuḥfah*. This may be making too much of a banal observation, but it is at least worth

189. Ibid., 352.
190. Ibid., 353, 354 (respectively).
191. See the entry on Mīr ʿAbd al-Bāqī (no. 20, pp. 31–2).

pointing out that strategies by which an author builds a rapport with the reader—sometimes going so far as to break the fourth wall—are typical features of *adab* literature.

The third characteristic of the *Tuḥfah* for us to discuss here is related to the first, and will require less space to explain. It has often been noted by specialists in medieval Arabic literature that texts in the *adab* tradition tend to be difficult to shoehorn into single genres, or to categorize in simple terms of any kind. (Of course, *adab* itself should not be referred to as a genre; we would better consider it a mode or posture.) In the case of the *Tuḥfah*, we do not really have a dilemma in deciding what to *call* the work. It is, for better or worse, a *taẕkirah* of poets and poetry—however sorrily our idea of this genre remains in need of problematization. But we have seen how frustrating it can be to determine what Sām Mīrzā is trying to accomplish with his anthology, and what the reader is supposed to gain from it. This is treated above in terms of edification and entertainment, documenting great poets and introducing nobodies, *al-jidd wa-al-hazl*, and so forth. A final issue to raise, in the same general vein, is that we would encounter difficulty if we tried to align the *Tuḥfah* with an overarching ideological, religious, or ethical framework.

For example, there is no reason to doubt that Sām Mīrzā is a devout Shiʻi Muslim. In our study of his political career, we found that the key source on his later years—Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī's *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* (999/1591)—portrays Sām Mīrzā as unusually serious about the observance of Islamic law, and suggests that his inflexibility in this area contributed to the conflict between him and the other leading family in Ardabīl in the 1550s and '60s.[192] This, like anything else that we read in a Safavid chronicle, may be taken with a grain of salt; but we have no source of any kind that calls into question

192. See Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, ed. Iḥsān Ishrāqī (2 vols., Tehran, 1980–), vol. 1, p. 550*ff.*

Sām Mīrzā's piety or devotion to the Ahl al-Bayt. In the *Tuḥfah*, he occasionally makes a special point of praising a given individual for his upright conduct, humility, avoidance of material pleasures, or similar positive traits relating to the faith. This occurs, for instance, in the notice on Amīr Ḥājj (no. 29), a *sayyid* from Gunābād who was mentioned above in connection to a *javāb* of Amīr Khusraw.[193] Sām Mīrzā opens his description of Amīr Ḥājj by praising the purity of his lineage (*ṭahārat-i aṣl*) and the fineness of his disposition (*laṭāfat-i ṭabʿ*). He then recounts a story about this man's well-known asceticism. One day, we are told, ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī visited Amīr Ḥājj at his home (*ḥujrah*, lit. "chamber"), and he found it "empty of worldly comfort, like the grief-stricken minds of romantics" (*chūn khāṭir-i maḥzūn-i ahl-i dil az matāʿ-i dunyavī khālī*). ʿAlī Shīr was upset by this situation, and he resolved to see that his friend's needs were met. (The word used here is *tafaqqud*.) He ordered that money (*naqd*) and all manner of household goods (*jins-i sāmānī*) be sent to Amīr Ḥājj's *ḥujrah*. When the latter was presented with these gifts, he promptly moved to a different, empty abode.

There are numerous points in the *Tuḥfah* at which less detailed indications are given of people's religiosity. ʿAbd al-ʿAlī Tūnī (no. 156), for example, is said to be famous among learned men of this period for his "eschewing illegitimate conduct" (*ijtināb az nā-mashrūʿāt*).[194] On a similar note, Sām Mīrzā specifies in several notices that the inidviduals in question have made praise of the Imams (*manqabat*, lit. "virtue") a focus of their poetry. The following assessment is found in the (surprisingly short) entry on Fużūlī Baghdādī (no. 343; d. 963/1555–6): "Most of his poetry is in praise of the Imams of the Religion, may God's prayers be upon them all" (*akṡar-i shiʿr-i ū manqabat-i aʾimmah-i dīn,*

193. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 38–9.
194. Ibid., 87.

ṣalavāt-i Allāh ʿalayhim ajmaʿīn, ast).[195] We could list further examples, but the idea should be clear by now: it would not be reasonable to downplay or question Sām Mīrzā's religious conviction. On the other hand, for every passage in the *Tuḥfah* in which mention is made of someone's piety, it seems as though there are several that point in the opposite direction. The use of words like "libertine" (*lavand*), "reckless" (*lā-ubālī*), and "unrestrained" (*bī-qayd*) to describe people in this *taẕkirah* is so common that I gave up trying to record each instance in the spreadsheet. It may be, in fact, that *lavand* is the single most common descriptor used by Sām Mīrzā. And the anecdotes concerning behavior that is un-Islamic—to put it quite mildly—are related in a strikingly matter-of-fact tone.

Several examples of this have been cited above, including the following: the infatuation of Jārūbī Haravī (no. 564) with any man who was in power, including fifty-year-old Bābur;[196] the decision of Mayram Siyāh (no. 326) to move to Transoxiana, since it was considered easier to practice pederasty there;[197] and the banter of Khwājah Darvīsh (no. 169) with his patron, Köpek Mīrzā, regarding the former's penchant for sodomy.[198] In none of these notices does Sām Mīrzā express clear disapproval. The impression is rather that he finds amusement in off-color stories. It should be emphasized that we are grappling with a text that is *complex*, and not *contradictory*. The author is, ostensibly, a man of faith, a lifelong devotee of the family of the Prophet, who also appreciates dirty jokes. He sets aside the second chapter of the *taẕkirah* for *sayyid*s and religious scholars, and then includes among them Amīr Bīkhudī (no. 64), a heavy user of *ḥashīsh* who, we learn, once went to the mosque while stoned.[199] It

195. Ibid., 245–6.
196. Ibid., 311.
197. Ibid., 237.
198. Ibid., 93.
199. Ibid., 57.

would be fallacious for us to identify a problem in the coexistence of these tendencies in the *Tuḥfah*, when it seems to come naturally to Sām Mīrzā.

Another point of interest, which was discussed briefly in the previous subchapter, is the political position of this work. Is the *Tuḥfah* intended to glorify the Safavid family and celebrate its rule? The answer is clearly yes, at least on some level. Sām Mīrzā goes out of his way in the preface to the book to show his respect and support for the Safavid project. He specifies, for instance, that he will use the term *Ṣāḥib-Qirān* ("Lord of the Auspicious Conjunction") when referring to his brother, Shah Ṭahmāsb, while *Ṣāḥib-Qirān-i Māżī* ("the *late* Lord of the Auspicious Conjunction") should be understood to mean Shah Ismāʿīl.[200] Even the passage in which he explains his motivation for writing the *Tuḥfah* is tied to his family's position: he notes that the time period in which new great poets have appeared, but still have not been recorded in *taẕkirah*s, begins with "the rise of the world-illuminating sun of this mighty empire" (*ṭulūʿ-i āftāb-i ʿālam-tāb-i īn dawlat-i ʿuẓmá*).[201] And so this book could be interpreted as a way for Sām Mīrzā, a son of Shah Ismāʿīl, to declare that the literary efflorescence of the Timurid period has continued apace under the dominion of his family.

There is, however, more complication to the story. The preface ends with a disclaimer (*tanbīh*), meant to clarify that the inclusion of notices on certain high-profile enemies of the Safavids should not be interpreted as an endorsement of their character, nor as a threat to the foundation of the religion (*pāyah-i dīn*) or the face of imperial fortune (*chihrah-i dawlat*).[202] It is at this point, as we saw earlier, that Sām Mīrzā defends his decision to cover such figures as the Uzbek ʿUbayd Allāh Khān (no.

---

200. Ibid., 5. Sām Mīrzā stresses that he does not want this nomenclature to be unclear (*maḥjūb na-mānad kih…*).
201. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 4.
202. Ibid., 4–5.

17) and the Ottoman Selim (no. 14), by invoking the discussion in the Qur'an of "the disobedience and transgressions of despots and pharaohs" (*ʿiṣyān va ṭughyān-i jabābirah va farāʿinah*). Sām claims a documentary purpose (*tārīkh*), as opposed to a display of good will (*ʿuṭūfat*) toward these men. One imagines that it would have been safer for him to avoid raising political sensitivities in the first place, if he was concerned enough that he felt compelled to add a note of *apologia*—particularly given the controversies in which he had been embroiled as an adolescent. But there is a larger plan for the *Tuḥfah*, whereby it is supposed to paint a comprehensive portrait of Persian (and, to an extent, Turkic) literary society of the first half of the tenth/sixteenth century. This involves the mention of friends and foes, sometimes acknowledging the poetic merit of the latter. Sām Mīrzā shows a willingness to accept a bit of risk, while emphasizing his loyalty to *dīn* and *dawlat* where he can.

Yet another realm in which the *Tuḥfah* resists simple characterization is its portrayal of interactions among authority figures and their courtiers. We need not go into great detail on this topic, given the volume of examples already cited. It becomes clear, when reading through this *taẕkirah*, that the "correct" course of action for someone in a subordinate position is not always the same. On a few occasions, Sām Mīrzā describes the punishment meted out to a poet who pushed his luck too far. Aḥmad Ṭabasī (no. 294; also called Aḥmad Tūnī), for instance, had his tongue and right hand cut off at the order of the governor of Harāt, after directing a *shahr-āshūb* at the people of that city.[203] More often, however, the *Tuḥfah* shows just how much a courtier could get away with, provided it was under the right circumstances. Two cases that come to mind (and have been described above) are those of Muḥibb ʿAlī Nā'ī (no. 259), who made a joke comparing the grunting of a camel to the recitation of

203. Ibid., 209–11.

Arabic poetry, then managed to defuse the situation after his patron reacted angrily;[204] and Khwājah Darvīsh (no. 169), who quipped to Köpek Mīrzā that he was a sodomite because "people follow the religion of their rulers."[205] The impression is that it could be more beneficial to make oneself a source of amusement to those in power, than to engage in sycophancy. This, again, is connected to the sense of *adab* as etiquette. What is the appropriate way to behave? It depends on the context, on a range of factors—as straightforward as social status, or as delicate as sensing whether a joke will be received positively. Literary works that we associate with *adab* tend to illustrate the context-dependency of preferred behavior. (Some of the most famous examples are found in the *maqāmāt* of al-Hamadhānī, d. 398/1007–8, and al-Ḥarīrī, d. 516/1122.) This characteristic can be seen readily in the *Tuḥfah*, once we have invested the time for a sustained reading of the text.

We have reviewed several aspects of this *taẕkirah* that would support its interpretation as a work of *adab*, focusing on three broad "indicators": first, the ambiguity surrounding the nature and purpose of the book, in particular the mixture of documenting the careers of poets (which we might consider the core function of an anthology of this kind), and the inclusion of a great deal of material that is less immediately "useful" to us, but paints an illuminating and entertaining picture in aggregate; second, the "inside references" that are frequently employed by Sām Mīrzā, with the effect of cultivating a rapport with the reader who shares enough of his background and education to understand the many allusions, puns, *etc.*; and third, the difficulty of applying any simple frame of analysis to the text, for example, in terms of its religious or political orientation. It is worth emphasizing once more that the

204. Ibid., 140.
205. Ibid., 93.

complex character of *adab qua* literary mode reflects the complexity of *adab qua* social system. The different levels of meaning of this word are interrelated.

It would be fair to question the validity of analyzing the *Tuḥfah* using ideas that are well elaborated in the study of medieval and early modern Arabic literature, but less present on the Persian side. What explicit basis is there to situate a Persian *taẕkirah* of poets in an *adab* tradition? There may be none; or, it is not easy to conceive of the work that would be required to draw this connection rigorously. *Taẕkirah*s as literary texts in their own right have only recently begun to receive attention from an appreciable number of researchers. It remains unclear how we are "supposed" to employ these sources, and which analytical frameworks should be considered appropriate and productive. We encountered a similar problem with the decision to read the *Tuḥfah* in its entirety. How common was it, in earlier centuries, to make use of an anthology in this manner? What if the practice of modern scholars of Persian poetry, whereby *taẕkirah*s are treated as reference texts and mined for bits of information at a time, is *closer* to the way that Sām Mīrzā's initial audience would have read his book? These questions are not currently answerable. The goal here, however, is to pursue a deeper and more nuanced understanding of the text before us—one whose fascinating content is capable of speaking for itself—and to attempt new approaches in the process. What we have presented may, or may not, be helpful in interpreting the *Tuḥfah* and other anthologies of the period, irrespective of how confident we can be that we have re-enacted the way that the book was typically read in its heyday.

Conclusions

The mission of this chapter has been to explore what we can learn about, and from, a Persian *taẕkirah* by reading it as a whole and attempting to view it unconditionally. Much was involved in reaching this point. Notably, in the first part of the chapter, we carried out a brief introduction to the *taẕkirah* genre (if it can be called such); reviewed the basic facts surrounding the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, including the date and location of its composition, its codicology, and the editions that have been published; and gave an overview of the contents of the work. Another important part of this study was to catalogue all of the roughly seven hundred notices in the *Tuḥfah* (in the Humāyūn Farrukh edition), in the form of a spreadsheet, which is available both as an appendix to the dissertation and as a digital resource. (There are, in fact, two parts to the spreadsheet; one contains the information on all of the entries, and the other presents summary statistics, which have been discussed above.) Collecting such a volume of data, and making it easily accessible, serves a few purposes. There can be no questioning that the interpretation of the *Tuḥfah* in this chapter resulted from a careful reading of the work from cover to cover. The conclusions may be flawed, but, even in the worst case, they are not baseless. On a related point, a searchable catalogue of the notices in this *taẕkirah* may be of use to other researchers, whether or not they are sympathetic to the analysis here.

But the most important justification for going through this philological exercise is that it yielded interesting results, which we have described above, using five categories: high-level observations about the structure and content of the *Tuḥfah*; determining what Sām Mīrzā seems to consider remarkable, based on where he adds an unusual degree of elaboration; tracing connections among different individuals mentioned in the *taẕkirah*, some of which would be difficult, if not impossible, to find

without studying the whole text; insights into the practices of *javāb-gū'ī*, *tatabbu'*, and *tażmīn*, whose importance in the literary culture of the early modern period can scarcely be overstated; and, last but not least, the opportunity to approach the *Tuḥfah* as a work of *adab*. In summary, we have taken a "deep dive" into a *taẕkirah* of poets, which is not something that has often been done in prior scholarship. The next chapter will return to a broader scale, articulating several general principles to advance the study of anthological sources among Persianists, and attempting to situate Sām Mīrzā's work in the evolution of the *taẕkirah* during the critical period from the late ninth/fifteenth century (at Timurid Harāt) to the early eleventh/seventeenth (taking the deaths of Shah 'Abbās and Jahāngīr Pādshāh as a convenient endpoint).

Chapter 4:

A Preliminary Typology and Periodization of the Persian *Taẕkirah*

4.1: How to read a *taẕkirah* of poets

Introduction

In the previous chapter, we carried out a comprehensive assessment of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, the anthology of poets (*taẕkirah*) written by Safavid prince Sām Mīrzā around the year 957/1550, during what seems to have been a period of unusual freedom in his turbulent life. Our concern was to arrive at a more holistic understanding of this work than is generally available for *taẕkirah*s, which, as a category of sources, have often been considered encyclopædic in nature and mined for bits of data at a time. As we have acknowledged, the question of how Persian literary anthologies were originally intended to be read, or how more proximate audiences might have engaged with these texts, remains largely open. Even if reading the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* from cover to cover is somewhat anachronistic, however, there is value in the exercise, given the outsize role that *taẕkirah*s played in the evolution of the Persian poetic tradition. This, at least, has been our contention in piecing together a kind of anatomy of a *taẕkirah*, reviewing the author's biography, the circumstances of the work's composition, and its contents and their import.

In the process of studying the *Tuḥfah* from a broad perspective, it has often been unavoidable to characterize the text in relative terms, with implicit or explicit reference to other *taẕkirah*s. For example, Sām Mīrzā seems to have drafted the existing form of his anthology over a modest period of time—perhaps just a year—whereas a number of famous *taẕkirah*s from the Safavid-Mughal period were decades-long projects for their authors and sometimes went through multiple identifiable recensions. (It is worth pointing out again that Sām Mīrzā may, for all we know, have spent his entire

adult life collecting the data that would eventually be set down in the *Tuḥfah*. We have suggestions that the writing process itself was short, but it is difficult to say anything with certainty about earlier work that went into the project.) On the topic of organization, we saw that the body of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* is divided into seven chapters (s. *ṣaḥīfah*), each of them devoted to individuals of a certain social class, in descending order from kings and princes down to "miscellaneous common folk" (*sā'ir-i ʿavāmm*). The natural follow-up question would be whether this was typical; and, as was indicated above, the answer is that organizing a *taẕkirah* by social status was one of several approaches that were employed by anthologists around the time of Sām Mīrzā's career (particularly if we include the decades after his death). Another noteworthy facet of the *Tuḥfah* is the brevity of its biographical notices—in some sections, just a few lines per poet—which allows the author to cover some seven hundred individuals in perhaps half as many (printed) pages. On this point, we commented that *taẕkirah*s show considerable variation in the amount of space that they devote to each subject, as well as in the balance between prose biographical sketches and poetry excerpts, but that the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* is close to the extreme of offering little discussion in most of its entries.

Yet another curious point that arose is Sām Mīrzā's inclusion of a large number of figures in his *taẕkirah* who were not really poets; rather, they were prominent men who took part in literary activities outside of their primary vocations. The first four of seven chapters in the *Tuḥfah*, accounting for roughly a third of its total volume, are concerned with members of ruling houses (mainly the Timurids, Safavids, and Ottomans); *sayyid*s and religious scholars (*ʿulamā'*); ministers (*vuzarā'*) and court officials; and other notable individuals who were not truly poets (*shāʿir na-būdah-and*) but were

known to have composed some poems.[1] Here, again, it is difficult to avoid seeking a comparison to other *taẕkirah*s, and we noted that it was not unusual for anthologists to include mention of social élites who were involved in poetry at the serious recreational level—which was always a well-established phenomenon in the medieval and early modern Persianate world—but that the degree of attention paid to these groups by Sām Mīrzā was exceptional. (Keeping in mind his own position as a Safavid prince, however, this is not surprising.)

The list could go on much further. Any general review of the features of a single *taẕkirah* such as the *Tuḥfah* would raise the need for categorization and comparison, so that we might make sense of the text, its value as a source, and its place in the Persian tradition. This process of contextualization is made difficult, however, by the nature of existing scholarly literature drawing on anthologies, which has tended to fall into one of three categories. In the first place, we have a great volume of research on the lives and works of individual Persian poets—or even on the history of Persian poetry at large—which cites biographical information and excerpted verses from *taẕkirah*s in a fragmentary manner. For example, one could point to Paul Losensky's landmark study of Bābā Faghānī (d. 925/1519),[2] which includes a survey of the poet's reception and evolving reputation as demonstrated by a range of *taẕkirah* notices written about him in the generations following his death. This type of scholarship is also found in the introductions to critical editions of poets' *dīvān*s, which often feature a chronological overview of the remarks made about the poet in question by various noteworthy anthologists. Given that research on individual figures generally brings together small pieces from each of a number of

1. Sām Mīrzā Ṣafavī, *Taẕkirah-i Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Rukn al-Dīn Humāyūn Farrukh (Tehran: ʻIlmī, n.d.), 6. With a few exceptions, I cite this edition throughout the dissertation, though there is a newer one by Aḥmad Mudaqqiq Yazdī (discussed elsewhere), which is almost unknown and appears to be held by very few libraries.
2. Paul E. Losensky, *Welcoming Fighānī: Imitation and Poetic Individuality in the Safavid-Mughal Ghazal* (Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda, 1998). See especially ch. 1.

*taẕkirah*s, and that broader work on Persian literary history relies in turn on those more focused studies, it could be argued that anthologies rank among our most important base-level sources on the poetic tradition and the authors active therein—and yet, with certain exceptions, it has been atypical for a scholar to read a substantial portion of any one of the major works in this genre. To be fair, this was less true in the early phases of the field's development. E. G. Browne, for example, clearly paid careful and sustained attention to the *taẕkirah*s of Dawlatshāh Samarqandī (892/1487) and Riżā Qulī Khān Hidāyat (1284/1867), two of the most influential ever written.[3] (Whether he held these texts in high regard is rather a different question.) But the point stands, at least in more recent decades, and especially in analytical and critical scholarship written in European languages, that *taẕkirah*s have offered their contribution without often being addressed in their own right. As we have noted in a previous chapter, this is finally beginning to change, through the work of researchers such as Sunil Sharma, Arthur Dudney, Alexander Jabbari, and Kevin L. Schwartz, to name a few.[4] There seems to be a particular growth of interest in the literary-critical implications of *taẕkirah*s written in India toward the end of the Mughal period, with somewhat less attention directed thus far to sources from this dissertation's period of focus (*ca*. 1480–1630 CE).

A second category of scholarship consists of painstakingly researched tomes, all in Persian, along the lines of Ẕabīḥ Allāh Ṣafā's *Tārīkh-i adabīyāt dar Īrān*, and the works of Aḥmad Gulchīn-i Maʿānī, including *Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā-yi Fārsī*, *Kārvān-i Hind*, and *Maktab-i vuqūʿ dar shiʿr-i Fārsī*.[5] These

3. E. G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, vol. 4 (1924; repr., Cambridge, 1969), 224–5.
4. See, for example, Sunil Sharma, *Mughal Arcadia: Persian Literature in an Indian Court* (Harvard UP, 2017); Kevin L. Schwartz, "The Local Lives of a Transregional Poet: ʿAbd al-Qâdir Bîdil and the Writing of Persianate Literary History," *Journal of Persianate Studies* 9 (2016): 83–106; and Alexander Jabbari, "The Making of Modernity in Persianate Literary History," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 36, no. 3 (2016): 418–34.
5. Ẕabīḥ Allāh Ṣafā, *Tārīkh-i adabīyāt dar Īrān* (5 vols. in 8, Tehran: Firdawsī, 1956–91); Aḥmad Gulchīn-i Maʿānī, *Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā-yi Fārsī* (2 vols., Dānishgāh-i Tihrān, 1969–71); idem, *Kārvān-i Hind: dar aḥvāl va ās̱ār-i shāʿirān-i ʿaṣr-i*

philologists have made almost unfathomably extensive use of *taẕkirah*s in their efforts to assemble as much information as possible on classical Persian literary history. Unfortunately, the resulting books are themselves more encyclopædic and suited to reference than they are narrative accounts of the topics that they cover. One could leaf through the *Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā* and find descriptions of hundreds of anthologies written between the *Chahār maqālah* of Niẓāmī ʿArūżī (*ca.* 551/1156) and the twilight of the genre in the early twentieth century. But a general sense of the development of *taẕkirah*s, their various types and patterns, the influence of one generation on the next, *etc.*, remains difficult to grasp. In a way, the rigorous philologically oriented surveys that have done the best job of drawing on *taẕkirah*s have fallen into the same trap as their sources: they are treated as references and tend to be read only to the extent required for a given project. We have ended up with books that could be labeled "*taẕkirah*s of *taẕkirah*s."[6]

Finally, critical editions of Persian anthologies represent a third category of scholarship that must be acknowledged. In such cases, there can be no doubt that the researcher gave a close reading to the entirety of the *taẕkirah* that he or she edited, and, more importantly, modern editions tend to include lengthy introductions that cover the author's biography, the circumstances of the work's composition, key features of its contents, and beyond. (See, for example, the hundred pages of supplementary material that Aḥmad Mudaqqiq Yazdī added to his 2009 edition of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*.)[7] The problem, yet again, relates to the presentation of this material, and the way in which readers can be expected to engage with it (or not). The introduction to a *taẕkirah* edition will naturally focus in depth on the work

Ṣafavī kih bih Hindūstān raftah-and (Mashhad: Āstān-i Quds-i Rażavī, 1369/1990–91); idem, *Maktab-i vuqūʿ dar shiʿr-i Fārsī* (Tehran: Bunyād-i Farhang-i Īrān, 1348/1969–70).

6. I owe this turn of phrase to a conversation with two colleagues in Chicago, Sam Lasman and Shaahin Pishbin.
7. Sām Mīrzā Ṣafavī, *Taẕkirah-i Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Aḥmad Mudaqqiq Yazdī (Yazd: Sāmī, 2009).

at hand, rather than on the evolution of the broader genre, and it will tend toward a descriptive summary of the text, rather than critical analysis. Furthermore, and crucially, it will always be the case that most researchers who open a *taẕkirah* will be looking for a small number of individual passages that contain information on the figures whom they are studying, and they are unlikely to devote much time to reading a detailed introduction. The disconnect between *taẕkirah*s and the end users of the data that they provide is pervasive. It is, in fact, difficult to think of works of scholarship that have included serious, wide-ranging assessments of Persian literary anthologies and have not themselves been relegated to the status of reference sources. Exceptions to this tendency, such as Arthur Dudney's study of Khān Ārzū,[8] are recent and still modest in number.

As has been emphasized several times throughout the dissertation, the field of Persian literary history is in need of a broad analytical survey of the *taẕkirah* tradition that would provide readers with the requisite context to make more nuanced use of these sources, presented in a digestible narrative format. But that will be a large project, and it is anyone's guess when such a work might appear. In the mean time, I believe that it will at least help to enhance our understanding of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* and its place in the Persian poetic tradition if we can establish a few guidelines on "how to read a *taẕkirah*." What are the factors that might have significant bearing on the interpretation of an anthology? Put differently, what are the basic questions that a researcher should be able to answer about any *taẕkirah* that he or she is citing, even if only one biographical notice is being used? Below I will cover a number of such preliminary points, organized into five categories.

8. Arthur Dudney, "A Desire for Meaning: Khān-i Ārzū's Philology and the Place of India in the Eighteenth-Century Persianate World" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 2013).

First, the author's own biography. This should be fairly obvious, but the status of the anthologist can have a significant impact on his work—and on its reception—in multiple senses. Any description of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, for example, would need to include the fact that Sām Mīrzā was a Safavid prince, son of Shah Ismāʿīl (d. 930/1524) and brother to Shah Ṭahmāsb (r. 930–84/1524–76). And this is not merely a curiosity associated with the *taẕkirah*. Its first chapter, which consists of notices on recent and current members of ruling dynasties throughout the region, must be interpreted in light of the personal and political connections between them and Sām Mīrzā. In some cases, when the author is discussing Ottoman and Uzbek rulers, who had faced the Safavids on the battlefield and made repeated attempts to capture their lands, there appears to be a tension between Sām Mīrzā's moral condemnation of the individuals in question, and his appreciation for their literary merit. This led him to append a disclaimer (*tanbīh*) to the preface of the *taẕkirah*, explaining that his inclusion of enemy figures should not be considered an endorsement of their character or a threat to imperial fortune.[9] The case of Sām Mīrzā is unusually striking—this is our only example of a Persian anthology written by a prince of a major dynasty—but there is no lack of *taẕkirah*s whose authors found themselves in somewhat unusual circumstances that appear to have influenced their work.

As I have described in an article centering on the *Khayr al-bayān*, an anthology of poets written between 1017/1608–9 and 1036/1627, its author, Malik Shāh Ḥusayn Sīstānī, was a member of the local dynasty that had ruled the area around Sīstān intermittently since the Mongol period.[10] In that case,

9. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 4–5.
10. Theodore S. Beers, "*Taẕkirah-i Khayr al-bayān*: The Earliest Source on the Career and Poetry of Ṣāʾib Tabrīzī (d. *ca.* 1087/1676)," *Al-ʿUṣūr al-Wusṭā* 24 (2016): 114–38.

the importance of the author's social position is demonstrated by his having obtained information about poets that might have been unavailable to someone less well-connected. He includes, for example, material drawn from commonplace books (*jung*s) that were sent as gifts to his family from prominent friends in India. By the same token, it was possible for a *lack* of traditionally high status to influence the composition of a *taẕkirah*. One might point to Muḥammad Ṭāhir Naṣrābādī, an eleventh/seventeenth-century anthologist who lost his father at a young age and subsequently spent years living in an Iṣfahānī coffee-house that served as a meeting place for poets and intellectuals. His *taẕkirah*, completed in 1091/1680, is a reflection of this peculiar social context and the artists he encountered therein.[11]

Beyond the social position of an anthologist, it is also important to be aware of other literary pursuits in which he engaged. Shāh Ḥusayn Sīstānī again deserves to be mentioned in this connection, since his *taẕkirah*, *Khayr al-bayān*, is a relatively obscure text in comparison to his *Iḥyāʾ al-mulūk*, a local history of Sīstān that is one of our central sources on that region in the medieval period.[12] At one point in the *Khayr al-bayān*, while offering brief remarks about his own biography, Shāh Ḥusayn refers the reader to the *Iḥyāʾ*, since it includes more description of his travels and service at the Safavid court. A particularly famous example of a *taẕkirah* written by an author with other works to his name is the *Bahāristān* (892/1487) of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī.[13] It would be nonsensical to attempt to read Jāmī's

---

11. Muḥammad Ṭāhir Naṣrābādī, *Taẕkirah-i Naṣrābādī*, ed. Aḥmad Mudaqqiq Yazdī (Dānishgāh-i Yazd, 1378/1999–2000). See also Mahmoud Fotoohi, "Taḏkera-ye Naṣrābādi," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.
12. Shāh Ḥusayn Sīstānī, *Iḥyāʾ al-mulūk*, ed. Manūchihr Sutūdah (Tehran: Bungāh-i Tarjumah va Nashr-i Kitāb, 1966). See also C. E. Bosworth, *The History of the Saffarids of Sistan and the Maliks of Nimruz* (Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda, 1994); and Kioumars Ghereghlou, "Sistāni, Mirzā Šāh-Ḥosayn," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.
13. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī, *Bahāristān va rasāʾil-i Jāmī*, ed. Aʿlá Khān Afṣaḥzād, Muḥammad Jān ʿUmar'uf, Abū Bakr Ẓuhūr al-Dīn (Tehran: Mīrāṡ-i Maktūb, 2000). When we refer to the *Bahāristān* as a *taẕkirah*, we mean the seventh chapter of the work, which was a wide-ranging educational text that Jāmī wrote (ostensibly) for his own son, on the model of the *Gulistān* (656/1258) of Saʿdī.

discussion of great poets of past generations without considering his own participation and prominence—already recognized during his lifetime—in the same tradition. There are other personal characteristics of a *taẕkirah* author that could prove significant in interpreting his work, such as affiliation with a court, or migration from Iran to India (a major trend in the late tenth/sixteenth and early eleventh/seventeenth centuries). But the basic point is clear: various attributes of an anthologist could impact the source materials available to him, the choice of which individuals to cover, the tone of discussion of their lives and works, and so forth.

Second, the circumstances of a *taẕkirah*'s composition. This should likewise be obvious, but in some ways, it still needs to be emphasized that the conditions under which an anthology was written will have bearing on its use as a source. One data point that is almost always noted in a citation from a *taẕkirah* is the year of its composition—in practice, usually the year of completion. Providing a single date, however, can be misleading, since one of the signal features of Persian literary anthologies is that they could take decades to be brought to their final form, and some were drafted in multiple stages. For instance, the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār va zubdat al-afkār* of Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī—probably the largest *taẕkirah* ever written, in terms of sheer volume—was begun around 975/1567 and finished in 1016/1607.[14] Not only does the author make clear that he has carried out several revisions, but in this case, we have at least one extant manuscript (dated 993/1585) that represents an intermediate draft. If someone were to make reference to a certain notice in the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār*, it would be fair to ask when exactly it seems to have been written, or whether Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī had different things to say

14. Since 2005, a number of volumes of this *taẕkirah* have been edited by ʿAbd al-ʿAlī Adīb Barūmand, Muḥammad Ḥusayn Naṣīrī Kahnamūʾī, and others, and published by Mīrāṡ-i Maktūb. It is unclear whether this editing project has been completed. For a list of references, see the bibliography of my article on the *Khayr al-bayān*.

about the poet in question over the course of decades of work on his anthology. In situations where a *tazkirah* was compiled gradually but it is not possible to determine the date at which a given section or notice was added, it might be more informative to mention a range of years, rather than to settle on the year of the work's completion.

The question of *when* a *tazkirah* was written will probably be among the first to occur to any reader, but it is also worth considering *why* (at least purportedly) the author undertook the project. It seems to have been uncommon, but was not unheard-of, for a ruler or court official to commission a *tazkirah*. In fact, the earliest true Persian anthology of poets, the *Lubāb al-albāb* (*ca*. 1220s) of Sadīd al-Dīn ʿAwfī, was written under the direct support of the author's patron, then-minister (*vazīr*) to the Ghurid governor of Sind and Mūltān.[15] More often, however, there is a dedicatee who is praised in the preface and/or conclusion of a *tazkirah*, without any indication of involvement in the creation of the work. Shāh Ḥusayn Sīstānī, for example, dedicates his *Khayr al-bayān* to Shah ʿAbbās I (r. 995–1038/1587–1629), but we know that he wrote the *tazkirah* in Harāt during periods when he was not in active court service. It appears likely that Shāh Ḥusayn placed the work in the name of his king out of convention and general respect. As we saw in the previous chapter, the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* is another case of an anthology that was written with no specific impetus apart from the author's interest in the project. Sām Mīrzā claims that he decided to compile a *tazkirah* to preserve the legacies of excellent poets of his time, since earlier anthologists such as Dawlatshāh, ʿAlī Shīr Navā'i (in Turkic), and Jāmī had ensured that the contributions of the masters of generations past would not be lost.[16] Looking at

15. Sadīd al-Dīn Muḥammad ʿAwfī, *Matn-i kāmil-i Lubāb al-albāb*, ed. Saʿīd Nafīsī (Tehran: Ibn Sīnā, 1957). See also J. Matīnī, "ʿAwfī, Sadīd-al-Dīn," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.
16. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 3–4.

the range of material included in the *Tuḥfah*, one gets the impression that Sām Mīrzā was also broadly curious about recent poetry that reached his ears—be it good or bad—and that he acted to save what he could for purposes of entertainment and edification. These decisions, in any event, were his to make, which may help to explain why the content of the *Tuḥfah* occasionally exceeds the boundaries of what one might expect in a *taẕkirah*.

Beyond patronage relationships, there could also be ideological motivations for the authorship of an anthology. The *Majālis al-nafā'is* (896/1491) of ʿAlī Shīr Navā'ī was created as part of a deliberate, self-conscious attempt to promote the development of Turkic poetry along Persian models.[17] (This *taẕkirah* was written in the form of Turkic often referred to as Chaghatā'ī, but Persian translations appeared soon thereafter, and the work enjoyed wide influence in both languages.)[18] On a deeper level, it is not unusual to find that an anthologist has a certain agenda regarding the evolution of poetic style, or about which poets of recent generations should be considered the standard-bearers of the tradition. This point is mentioned in my article on the biography of Vaḥshī Bāfqī (d. 991/1583), since there appears to have been some difference of opinion among *taẕkirah* authors of the late tenth/sixteenth and early eleventh/seventeenth centuries surrounding the relative merits of the lyric styles of Vaḥshī and his most prominent contemporary, Muḥtasham Kāshānī (d. 996/1588).[19] The latter is championed in the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār* of Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī, a friend who served as the poet's literary executor after his death. In a slightly later anthology written in India, the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn va ʿaraṣāt al-ʿārifīn* (1024/1615) of Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī, Vaḥshī is instead held up as the figure who pushed the

17. ʿAlī Shīr Navā'ī, *Mecâlisü'n-nefâyis*, ed. Kemal Eraslan (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, 2001).
18. Two early tenth/sixteenth-century Persian translations have been published together under the title *Taẕkirah-i Majālis al-nafā'is*, ed. ʿAlī Aṣghar Ḥikmat (Tehran: Kitāb-furūshī-i Manūchihrī, 1984).
19. Theodore S. Beers, "The Biography of Vahshi Bāfqi (d. 991/1583) and the *Tazkera* Tradition," *Journal of Persianate Studies* 8 (2015): 195–222.

style of the Persian *ghazal* into fresh territory.[20] Awḥadī reports that he has also taken it upon himself to assemble Vaḥshī's *dīvān*. All manner of battles of interpretation were pursued in the pages of *taẕkirah*s, and it is clear that one of the motivating factors for anthologists—particularly as the genre matured from the second half of the tenth/sixteenth century on—was the opportunity to connect the documentation of what took place in the literary past of the Persianate world to debates over the present and future. Any of these issues that could inform why a given *taẕkirah* was authored, could in turn affect its content in ways to which readers should be sensitive.

Two other significant characteristics of the authorship of a *taẕkirah* are the location in which it was written, and the process by which it was researched and drafted. Both of these points relate to questions that have been discussed above. (In truth, all of these concerns are interrelated.) The *locus scribendi* of a *taẕkirah* would also be part of the author's biography. To take a familiar example, as we know, Sām Mīrzā had recently been permitted to settle in Ardabīl, after more than a decade spent living in the itinerant Safavid army camp, when he seized the opportunity to work on his *Tuḥfah*. This may not give us a great deal of additional insight into the *taẕkirah*, but we should at least be aware that, in cases where Sām Mīrzā describes an Ardabīlī poet, it may be someone he encountered around the time that the work was being finalized. Perhaps the most meaningful distinction in the places in which *taẕkirah*s were written is that some anthologists, as with poets themselves, migrated to Mughal India during the reigns of Akbar (963–1014/1556–1605) and his son, Jahāngīr (1014–37/1605–27). (Later, toward the end of the eleventh/seventeenth century, and more so in the twelfth/eighteenth, there would be another vogue in *taẕkirah*-writing in India, this time dominated by "locals" rather than

---

20. Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī, *Taẕkirah-i ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn va ʿaraṣāt al-ʿārifīn*, 7 vols., ed. Muḥsin Nājī Naṣrābādī (Tehran: Asāṭīr, 2009), vol. 6, p. 4076.

by immigrants from Iran and Central Asia.) An anthologist working in India at the time of the literary migration, such as Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī, would be better positioned to report on the work of prominent poets who had also left Iran.

Finally, there is the question of how a *taẕkirah* was pieced together. This topic has received fairly little attention in scholarship to date, and it tends to be difficult to investigate, even having spent a significant amount of time scrutinizing an anthology. In surveying the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, we came to the disappointing realization that there is only so much we can tell about the process by which it was compiled. Where did Sām Mīrzā obtain his data on hundreds of contemporary poets from diverse backgrounds? We know that he met some of them in person, whether during his early years in Harāt or through his travels as a quasi-prisoner of the royal encampment between 943/1537 and 956/1549. Even in cases where Sām Mīrzā is clearly writing based on experience, however, it is often not possible to determine when he encountered those individuals. And we must confront the related question of whether the prince kept some written notes on literary curiosities that he found over the years, which he then had at his disposal in writing the *Tuḥfah*. Or did he rely on memory? Sadly, there is little that we could state with confidence. Insight into the working processes of *taẕkirah* authors, where it is available at all, generally needs to be gathered one small piece at a time.

In practice, one of the more straightforward factors to keep in mind is the potential impact of an anthologist's personal relationships on his selection of poets and the manner in which he presents them. It should come as no surprise that Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī transmits a large number of verses by his friend, Muḥtasham, and casts him as the "absolute master" (*ustād-i ʿalá al-iṭlāq*) among poets of his generation—while other, less immediate sources suggest that Muḥtasham's style in the *ghazal* form

was not supremely influential.[21] Similarly, when reading the *taẕkirah*s of Dawlatshāh, Navāʾī, and Jāmī, it ought to be remembered that all three were prominent figures in late Timurid Harāt. They were closely familiar with each other's works, and they discuss one another in terms that make it clear they thought the literary environment in which they were active represented a new pinnacle of the Persian tradition. The impact of an author's personal connections on the material presented in his *taẕkirah* might range from determining which poets he *could* include—*i.e.*, a question of hearing about them or having access to their work in the first place—to the decision of which figures should receive the greatest emphasis and highest praise. All of these factors should at least be given brief consideration when drawing on a *taẕkirah* as a source on poets' biographies and their influence.

Third, the overall scope and organizational scheme of an anthology. Among the features of a Persian *taẕkirah*, these are two of the simplest to determine, yet they can make a large difference in the interpretation of the text. By scope, we mean essentially how restrictive the anthologist has been in selecting which poets (or, in some cases, which poems) will be covered. One extreme example in this regard is the aforementioned *Bahāristān* of Jāmī, which is in fact a broader educational text written for the benefit of the author's son (or so he claims), with only the seventh chapter taking the form of a concise *taẕkirah*. In this context, Jāmī states openly that his intention is to provide brief descriptions of a small number (around thirty) of the most influential poets from the beginnings of the Persian tradition up to that time.[22] We can say that the scope of this chapter of the *Bahāristān* is not at all restrictive in terms of era or poetic style—Jāmī includes authors known for narrative verse (*maṡnavī*) and panegyric odes (*qaṣīdah*s), while noting that the *ghazal* is currently dominant—but

21. See Paul E. Losensky, "Moḥtašam Kāšāni," *Encyclopædia Iranica.*
22. *Bahāristān*, ed. Afṣaḥzād *et al.*, 123.

there is severe restriction on grounds of perceived virtuosity. This is worth keeping in mind, since it means that any poet who is given a notice in the *Bahāristān* must have been an important figure in the eyes of Jāmī.

In the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, as we know, a rather different approach is followed: Sām Mīrzā limits his discussion to individuals active during his own lifetime or in the few decades preceding his birth, but he sets virtually no other criteria. The *Tuḥfah* covers the professional and the amateur, the skillful and the inept, the rich and the poor, even making space for a chapter on Turkic poets. Other *taẕkirah*s of the Safavid-Mughal period were designed to focus on figures who fit within certain categories. The *Javāhir al-ʿajāʾib* (963/1556) of Fakhrī Haravī remains well known (and atypical) as an anthology of women poets.[23] The *Maykhānah* (1028/1619) of Fakhr al-Zamānī Qazvīnī is dedicated to a specific genre of poetry, the "ode to the cupbearer" (*sāqī-nāmah*), and the individuals who composed works in that style.[24] In some cases, understanding the scope of a *taẕkirah* could itself provide new insight into the careers and legacies of the poets included. It should be acknowledged, however, that the most popular choice among anthologists was always to compile what Aḥmad Gulchīn-i Maʿānī called the "general *taẕkirah*" (*taẕkirah-i ʿumūmī*), setting no strict limits in terms of period, geography, or form.[25]

The issue of organizational frameworks has been discussed already at some length, since one of the distinctive features of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* is its division into seven chapters largely on the basis of social class. There is also a brief section addressing this topic in my article on the *Khayr al-bayān* as a

23. Fakhrī Haravī, *Taẕkirah-i Rawżat al-salāṭīn, va Javāhir al-ʿajāʾib, maʿa dīvān-i Fakhrī Haravī*, ed. Sayyid Ḥusām al-Dīn Rāshidī (Hyderabad: Sindhī Adabī Būrd, 1968). A new edition has recently appeared, published by Safīr-i Ardihāl, but I have not yet been able to obtain a copy.
24. ʿAbd al-Nabī Fakhr al-Zamānī Qazvīnī, *Taẕkirah-i Maykhānah*, ed. Aḥmad Gulchīn-i Maʿānī (Tehran: Ḥājj Muḥammad Ḥusayn Iqbāl va Shurakāʾ, 1961).
25. This is a term that Gulchīn-i Maʿānī uses throughout his two-volume *Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā-yi Fārsī*.

source on the biography of Ṣā'ib Tabrīzī (d. *ca.* 1087/1676).[26] Without going into unnecessary detail or repeating a great deal of material, what should be emphasized is that *taẕkirah* authors had a variety of options from which to choose in organizing their biographical notices into meaningful categories. The idea of grouping subjects based on their position in society—and, in particular, assigning members of ruling families to a section of their own—can be traced all the way back to the *Lubāb al-albāb*. A more common choice was to employ a chronological framework of one kind or another. Navā'ī, for example, defines most of the chapters in the *Majālis al-nafā'is* by succeeding generations (*i.e.*, *ṭabaqāt*). The bulk of the *Khayr al-bayān* of Shāh Ḥusayn Sīstānī is divided into two sections: one for older poets (*mutaqaddimīn*), in this case meaning anyone from Rūdakī (d. *ca.* 329/941) to Jāmī (d. 898/1492); and the other for recent poets (*muta'akhkhirīn*). (The *Khayr al-bayān* was written between 1017/1608–9 and 1036/1627, so its "recent" section covers more than a century.) Yet another option, which was not employed as often as one might expect, was to organize poets alphabetically by pen name (*takhalluṣ*). Perhaps the best-known example of this format is Awḥadī's *'Arafāt al-'āshiqīn*, which has a chapter for each letter of the alphabet, while further dividing poets chronologically into early (*mutaqaddimīn*), middle (*mutavassiṭīn*), and recent (*muta'akhkhirīn*) cohorts.

Beyond social status, time period, and pen name, the one other major characteristic that was used to categorize poets was their region or city of origin. There are *taẕkirah*s in which separate chapters are defined geographically. One prominent representative of this approach is the *Khulāṣat al-ash'ār* of Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī, which has recent and contemporary poets divided into twelve groups, based on the areas of Iran in which they were born or spent their careers. Even in anthologies whose primary

26. Beers, "*Taẕkirah-i Khayr al-bayan*," 120–22.

framework is not geographic, it often seems to be the case that poets from the same city are associated with one another, to an extent that notices on them occur in clusters. In any event, understanding the basis (or bases) on which a *taẕkirah* is organized can add further subtlety to the interpretation of specific passages in the text. We have seen this in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, for example, where some of the individuals covered by Sām Mīrzā might have qualified for inclusion in more than one of the groups in his social hierarchy, meaning that conscious decisions were likely made about the most appropriate ways to categorize them.

Fourth, the average length of notices on poets, and the balance between biographical sketches and selected verses. In general, a *taẕkirah* notice consists of a certain amount of prose discussion of the poet's life—usually not more than a paragraph or two—followed by selections from his or her work, amounting to perhaps a couple of pages. The excerpted verses may occasionally include a whole *ghazal*, but it is more common to see a few noteworthy lines, or even just one line, from each of a number of poems. (*Rubāʿī*s, of course, can be quoted in full.) The preceding description is a very rough characterization of how a typical notice would be structured in a *taẕkirah* from our period of focus. In practice, there is wide variation in these parameters from one text to another, and sometimes between different parts of the same work. One could go mad attempting to calculate average lengths of notices in various anthologies and their constituent parts, and gain limited insight from the effort invested. (I speak from experience…) What is most important and worthwhile is to have a sense of the format of entries on poets in any *taẕkirah* being cited as a source. In surveying the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, we noted that the length of Sām Mīrzā's discussion of an individual often seems to reflect his perceived importance.

A famous poet like Jāmī or Hilālī (d. 936/1529) will receive several pages,[27] whereas the commoners treated in the final chapter may be described in one or two sentences followed by a couple of lines of poetry. Most of the notices in the *Tuḥfah* fall somewhere between these two extremes (though closer to the latter). Overall, as we have seen, one of the distinctive features of the work is that Sām Mīrzā is able to cover a large number of subjects relative to the space that he uses.

A particularly stark example of divergent notice length between two otherwise comparable anthologies may be found in the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār* of Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī and the *ʿArafāt alʿ-āshiqīn* of Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī, both of which have been mentioned above. These two *taẕkirah*s were written in approximately the same period, and both rank among the most massive extant works in the genre and are considered major sources on Persian literary history in the tenth/sixteenth and early eleventh/ seventeenth centuries. The *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār* contains notices on around 650 poets, while the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn* covers some 3,500—yet the former text is larger overall. This is because Kāshānī transmits an average of several hundred lines of poetry from each individual whom he discusses, whereas Awḥadī's notices tend to be of moderate length. This difference in balance between breadth and depth immediately suggests something about the purposes that the two anthologists may have had in mind. Awḥadī's goal appears to be to offer a respectable amount of information on as many poets as possible from the span of the Persian tradition. Kāshānī, on the other hand, includes such extensive selections from his subjects that it might obviate the need for the reader to refer to their *dīvān*s. The *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār* nearly offers one-stop shopping, albeit for a smaller set of poets.

27. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 143–52 (on Jāmī), 152–60 (on Hilālī).

One of the problems that we confronted earlier in the dissertation (if not with great success) is the ongoing uncertainty over what, exactly, *taẕkirah*s were supposed to provide to their audiences. Some works in this genre, such as the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn*, appear more like reference texts than anything else. Others, like the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, display a similar lack of depth in much of the material that they cover, and yet their driving purpose seems just as likely to lie in collecting literary curiosities and painting a portrait of a certain cultural environment. The poetry chapter in the *Bahāristān*, for its part, functions as a cursory primer on a number of important poets whose full works will presumably be included in the reader's (*i.e.*, Jāmī's son's) course of study. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that *taẕkirah*s could be many things; and in judging these differences, the amount of space dedicated to each figure in an anthology is among our key indicators.

A related concern, which is less relevant for our immediate purposes, is the balance struck between the biographical material in each notice and the poetry excerpts that follow. That is, letting the total size of a notice remain constant, what proportion is taken up by the anthologist's own prose? This is not a particularly important consideration when reading *taẕkirah*s from our chosen time period, since, as a general rule, they are concerned *at least* as much with quoting choice verses as they are with laying out a poet's biography or commenting on his style. In later centuries, primarily in the Indo-Persian context, there would be a shift toward prose-heavy *taẕkirah*s whose authors carried out increasingly sophisticated literary criticism.[28] But this is beyond the scope of a study centering on the

28. One anthologist whose work is closer to this end of the spectrum, as far as I understand, is Khān Ārzū (d. 1169/1756). But I have limited familiarity with late Indo-Persian *taẕkirah*s, and so I rely on the interpretation of specialists such as Arthur Dudney and Shahla Farghadani.

Tuḥfah-i Sāmī. The key point, for the time being, is that the format and concerns of the typical Persian anthology were not constant over time.

Fifth, and finally, the influence of a given *taẕkirah* on works of subsequent generations. This is another unsurprising point, but it should be kept in mind that *taẕkirah* authors tended to be well aware of earlier contributions to the genre. In the introduction to the *Tuḥfah*, Sām Mīrzā explicitly compares his work to the *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ* of Dawlatshāh, the *Bahāristān* of Jāmī, and the *Majālis al-nafāʾis* of Navāʾī—acknowledging that those texts recorded the contributions of poets of past eras, and announcing his intention to perform a similar service for his contemporaries. The *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, in turn, would be listed among the sources of many later anthologists, all the way down to Riżā Qulī Khān Hidāyat in his monumental *Majmaʿ al-fuṣaḥāʾ* (completed in 1284/1867).[29] If and when the field of Persian literary history sees the publication of a dedicated overview of the *taẕkirah* tradition, one of the issues to explore will be the extent to which authors in this genre made reference to one another and used their works as vehicles for inter-generational cultural debate. On a more basic level, however, it is important to be aware of the fact that anthologists relied on earlier *taẕkirah*s as sources, and that biographical information about poets was often borrowed, adapted, and transmuted over time. When looking at a chronological succession of *taẕkirah* notices on a single poet, one must apply a critical approach and attempt to determine where independent documentation of the individual's life gives way to reception history.

29. Riżā Qulī Khān Hidāyat, *Majmaʿ al-fuṣaḥāʾ*, 2 vols. in 6, ed. Maẓāhir Muṣaffā (Tehran: Amīr Kabīr, 1957–61). Mention of the *Tuḥfah* occurs, for example, at vol. 1, pt. 1, pp. xxiv–xxv.

Conclusions

This section has been concerned with outlining several top-level features of Persian *taẕkirah*s, the identification of which might enable a researcher to make more nuanced and effective use of these sources. For our purposes, with the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, building some idea of the key characteristics of *taẕkirah*s will also give us a better chance of contextualizing Sām Mīrzā's work within the evolution of the genre. The *Tuḥfah* stands roughly halfway between the watershed anthologies produced in late Timurid Harāt—by Dawlatshāh, Jāmī, and Navāʾī—and the massive, more mature works of authors like Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī and Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī, which appeared around the turn of the eleventh/seventeenth century. What changed over this period of nearly a century and a half? This question will be taken up in the second part of the chapter, now that we are closer to understanding the criteria that would need to be met to construct a typology of the *taẕkirah*. We are at least able to classify the *Tuḥfah* in terms of its author's career and personal relationships as a Safavid prince; the circumstances under which the work was written, including the year (*ca*. 957/1550), location (Ardabīl), patronage (effectively none), and beyond; the broad scope and social-class organizational framework employed by Sām Mīrzā; the relatively brief format of notices, allowing for seven hundred figures to be covered in a book of modest size; and the way that this text was openly intended to build upon the work of earlier anthologists. This is not bad for a preliminary set of features. If we could answer the same questions in reference to all of the influential *taẕkirah*s of the Timurid and Safavid-Mughal periods, then we would be well situated to achieve the goal of producing an analytical history of the genre.

4.2: The development of the Persian *taẕkirah* up to *ca*. 1038/1629

Introduction

The nature of existing scholarship on *taẕkirah*s, and in particular the lack of a sustained analytical history of the genre and the small number of in-depth studies of individual texts, has not only left the field in need of a typology. We are also missing a periodization. That is to say, we are not in a position to describe with great confidence what functions *taẕkirah*s were "supposed" to perform, how they were compiled, what variations they encompassed, which groups constituted their intended or actual audiences, *etc*.; nor has it been explained thoroughly how the genre developed, from its origins in the thirteenth century CE (or before), to its formalization in the context of Timurid Harāt and subsequent dramatic growth in the early Safavid-Mughal era,[30] and beyond. The present study is not intended to fill either of these lacunae in full. Realistically, as I have suggested above, it will take some time before the necessary building blocks are in place for such a comprehensive study to be carried out successfully. But we may be able to make some progress on the question of periodization, in a similar vein to our efforts to lay out the general characteristics of *taẕkirah*s, important ways in which they vary, and recommendations for leveraging them as sources.

In this case, it should be reiterated at the outset that the number of extant Persian *taẕkirah*s is daunting. We noted in an earlier chapter that Aḥmad Gulchīn-i Maʿānī collected information on over

30. As always, I should emphasize that I intend no dismissal of Ottoman contributions to the *taẕkirah* genre in referring to the "Safavid-Mughal era." This is a textual tradition that grew to be every bit as Turkic as it was Persian. In the early to mid sixteenth century CE, the *Majālis al-nafāʾis* (896/1491) of ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī—authored in Turkic but soon translated to Persian—was possibly the most influential *taẕkirah* across the region. At least a few notable anthologists, including Ṣādiqī Beg Afshār (d. 1018/1609–10) and, to a degree, Sām Mīrzā himself, worked in both languages.

three hundred of these works authored before the year 1300/1882–3 (and more thereafter).[31] Beyond the matter of sheer quantity, the geographic and temporal range represented by *taẕkirah*s is obviously beyond the area of expertise of any researcher in Persian literature. One scholar might use ʿAwfī's *Lubāb al-albāb* (*ca.* 618/1221) to learn more about *qaṣīdah* poets at the Ghaznavid court; another might open Jāmī's *Bahāristān* (892/1487) to investigate the reception of Ḥāfiẓ in the Timurid period; and a third might rely on the *taẕkirah* of Muḥammad Ṭāhir Naṣr'ābādī (1091/1680) as a source on the café culture of mid eleventh/seventeenth-century Iṣfahān. These are three very different works written in dissimilar contexts, and the same is true of the poetry that they document. Indeed, it would be nearly as difficult to write a history of the *taẕkirah* as it would of Persian poetry itself. Another, more specific problem that has emerged in the field is an apparent disconnect between researchers who work on anthologies written in the twelfth/eighteenth century (or even after), predominantly in India, and those whose focus falls in earlier periods.[32] Some of the differences between these categories of sources—for example, the late Indo-Persian *taẕkirah*s, in a major shift, are sometimes dominated by prose discussion of the figures under review, not by excerpts from their poetry—are such that it may be impractical to analyze them within a single framework.

A more appropriate and attainable goal for our purposes is to establish a sense of how Persian literary anthologies evolved up to around the halfway point of the Safavid period. While this would technically cover several centuries, it is worth remembering that, with a handful of qualified exceptions, we have no extant *taẕkirah*s authored between the 1220s and the 1480s CE. And from the

31. For a list, see Aḥmad Gulchīn-i Maʿānī, *Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā-yi Fārsī* (Tehran, 1969–71), vol. 2, p. 871*ff*. Not all of these works have survived, and some are not *taẕkirah*s of poets in the strictest sense, but the quantity is still enormous.
32. Researchers in the latter group include Mana Kia, Arthur D. Dudney, Kevin L. Schwartz, and Alexander Jabbari. Several of their works have been cited in previous sections.

early period, there is little material to discuss other than the *Chahār maqālah* (*ca.* 551/1156) of Niẓāmī ʿArūżī, one of whose chapters functions in part as an anthology of poets; and the aforementioned *Lubāb al-albāb*, considered the first true Persian "*taẕkirah*" despite the absence of any indication that ʿAwfī would have used that term to refer to his work. In order to pursue a wider inquiry focusing on the pre-Mongol era, one would need to look beyond the confines of poetry, for example at the *Taẕkirat al-awliyāʾ* of Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār (d. 618/1221)—or perhaps outside of Persian literature entirely, turning to the influence of the older Arabic *ṭabaqāt* genre. But we need not get ahead of ourselves. The key point here is that surviving *taẕkirah*s (however broadly defined) from before the ninth/fifteenth century are so scarce, and the gap between the *Lubāb al-albāb* and its Timurid successors so wide, that covering the early texts adds less difficulty than one might expect. In fact, it is up for debate whether the work of ʿAwfī should even be placed on a continuum with those of Dawlatshāh Samarqandī, ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī, and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī. It is not clear that the *Lubāb al-albāb* was known in Timurid Harāt, and Dawlatshāh seemingly thought that he was inaugurating a new genre in Persian.[33] With this in mind, I make no strong claim as to whether the sixth/twelfth and seventh/thirteenth centuries should be considered the *early* history of the *taẕkirah* of poets, or its *pre*-history.

We will set out a total of four periods, including the one just described, to account for the development of Persian anthologies through the 1030s/1620s. The second period begins in 892/1487, with the nearly simultaneous appearance of Jāmī's *Bahāristān* and Dawlatshāh's *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ*, and it continues through the early tenth/sixteenth century. A third period can be discerned starting around the middle of that century, marked by the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* and the later works of Fakhrī Haravī

33. See Gulchīn-i Maʿānī, *Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā*, vol. 2, p. 295. He quotes here from Muḥammad Qazvīnī, an editor of the *Lubāb al-albāb*, who reports with confidence that Dawlatshāh neither saw this text nor was aware of its existence.

(d. after 974/1566–7). Finally, and perhaps more debatably, we may posit a fourth period from around 993/1585. If we wanted to assign brief labels to each of these phases, the first would be defined by *foundations*; the second, by *maturation* and *expansion*; the third, by *experimentation*; and the fourth, by *monumentality*, nascent *literary-critical perspective*, and a distinct *shift to India*. It must be emphasized that this periodization, like the one that we applied to the reign of Shah Ṭahmāsb in the first half of the dissertation, is not meant to be absolute or to draw sharp dividing lines. Historical change is almost always gradual and multilayered, and periodization inherently comes at a price of some oversimplification. The benefit that it offers in exchange is intelligibility. I would argue that it is particularly important to establish clear conceptual frameworks in areas of study that have not yet seen generations' worth of scholarly debate. Research on Persian *taẕkirah*s certainly belongs in this category, for reasons that have been noted above. It could be that that any periodization of the genre's development attempted today will be supplanted entirely within a decade, and the field may, at some point, reach a level of maturity that renders such broad analytical approaches obsolete. But we are not there. Our immediate use for a preliminary, incomplete periodization of *taẕkirah*s, in any case, is to elaborate further the context surrounding the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*.

The earliest period

At the end of Gulchīn-i Maʿānī's monumental two-volume *Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā-yi Fārsī*, among the indices, there is a list of all of the works that are included, divided first by century of composition (in the Islamic calendar) and then set in alphabetical order.[34] Less than a full page of this index is needed

34. Again, this list begins at vol. 2, p. 871.

to cover the sixth/twelfth, seventh/thirteenth, and eighth/fourteenth centuries. Gulchīn-i Maʿānī lists only seven works from this entire span. Two of them apparently have not survived: an "illustrated anthology" of poets (*taẕkirah-i muṣavvar*),[35] which was prepared by Zayn al-Dīn Rāvandī—an uncle of the better-known Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī Rāvandī, author of the *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr* (*ca.* 601/1204–5)—at the request of the Saljuq Sultan Ṭughrul III (d. 590/1194); and the *Manāqib al-shuʿarāʾ*, a text written in the early sixth/twelfth century by Abū Ṭāhir Khātūnī, who served under another Saljuq, Muḥammad ibn Malikshāh (r. 498–511/1105–18).[36] While the *Manāqib* is no longer extant, it is cited by Dawlatshāh as a source on several poets. Among the other five early works identified by Gulchīn-i Maʿānī, one is in fact a history that contains some discussion of literary figures: the *Tārīkh-i guzīdah* (730/1330) of Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī.[37]

Another text in this group, the *Tārīkh-i Bayhaq* of Ẓahīr al-Dīn Bayhaqī (also known as Ibn Funduq; d. 565/1169–70),[38] has been described by Heinz Halm as a "[prosopography] written in praise of a particular region and of the learned men who were born or resided there."[39] In this case, the region is Bayhaq, and there is a very short section concerning local poets. Two further works from the earliest centuries come closer to what we might consider "proper *taẕkirah*s," yet they are broader collections of material in which portions are devoted to anecdotes about poets, including selections of

---

35. To be clear, the descriptor *taẕkirah-i muṣavvar* was applied by Gulchīn-i Maʿānī. See *Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā*, vol. 1, p. 347. In the *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*, the only source to mention this text, it is referred to as a "collection of poetry" (*majmūʿahʾī … az ashʿār*). It remains the case that the first well-known Persian work to be called a *taẕkirah* was that of ʿAṭṭār, and the first use of the label in the context of literary biography and anthology was by Dawlatshāh.

36. The *Manāqib al-shuʿarāʾ* is described by Gulchīn-i Maʿānī in *Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā*, vol. 2, pp. 294–302. See also Djalal Khaleghi-Motlagh, "Abu Ṭāher Ḵātuni," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

37. A detailed description of the *Tārīkh-i guzīdah* is found in E. G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, vol. 3, p. 90*ff*. For more about the author, see Charles Melville, "Ḥamd-Allāh Mostawfi," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

38. This is not to be confused with the earlier, more famous *Tārīkh-i Bayhaqī*, which was composed between 444/1052 and 470/1077 by *Abū al-Fażl* Bayhaqī.

39. Heinz Halm, "Bayhaqī, Ẓahīr-al-Dīn," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

verse. The first is the *Chahār maqālah*, about which a fair bit has been written above; and the second is the *Laṭā'if-i Ashrafī*, compiled in the late eighth/fourteenth century to document the life and teachings of the Sufi saint Ashraf al-Dīn Jahāngīr Simnānī (d. 808/1405?).[40] (The author, a certain Niẓām al-Dīn Yamanī, was one of Simnānī's disciples.)

After accounting for lost texts, histories that double as sources on poetry, and "quasi-*taẕkirah*s," we are left with the *Lubāb al-albāb*, which clearly stands apart in the whole of Persian literature before the Timurid period.[41] Gulchīn-i Maʿānī, it should be noted, cast a deliberately wide net in compiling his *Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā*. Even a work such as the *taẕkirah-i muṣavvar* of Rāvandī, which is mentioned in a single source and otherwise may as well not have existed, is included for the sake of thoroughness. And yet there is no hint of anything quite like the *Lubāb al-albāb* in the first centuries. Sadīd al-Dīn ʿAwfī, for his part, makes clear in the preface to his *taẕkirah* that his goal was to create something in Persian that would compare to well-known works in the Arabic *ṭabaqāt* genre, such as the *Yatīmat al-dahr* of al-Thaʿālibī (d. 429/1038).[42] As has been indicated repeatedly, ʿAwfī at no point refers to the *Lubāb*—or, for that matter, to any other work—as a *taẕkirah*. It is due to this terminological problem, along with the gap in time before the Timurid rebirth of the genre, and the apparent unawareness of Dawlatshāh and his contemporaries of the *Lubāb al-albāb*, that there is no simple way to describe the evolution of the *taẕkirah* before the ninth/fifteenth century in a unified narrative.

Perhaps the strongest argument for maintaining a wide enough perspective on Persian literary anthologies to cast ʿAwfī as the original contributor to the same genre that would later become vital in

40. A lithograph of this work was published at Delhi in 1298/1880–81.
41. The standard edition is titled *Matn-i kāmil-i Lubāb al-albāb* (Tehran: Ibn Sīnā, 1957); it is essentially an update of the earlier edition of E. G. Browne and Muḥammad Qazvīnī, with corrections and new commentary by Saʿīd Nafīsī.
42. For a recent study of this literary tradition in Arabic, see Bilal Orfali, *The Anthologist's Art: Abū Manṣūr al-Thaʿālibī and His "Yatīmat al-dahr"* (Leiden: Brill, 2016).

the Timurid and Safavid-Mughal periods, is that the *Lubāb* compares quite favorably to works like the *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ* and even the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. ʿAwfī provides some 300 notices in a book that runs to 560 pages (excluding frontmatter, indices, scholarly commentary, *etc*.) in Saʿīd Nafīsī's updated edition of 1957. The organizational framework of the *Lubāb* is fairly complex. A series of short introductory discourses is followed by a chapter devoted to the poetic activities of kings and princes, seemingly in chronological order; another for *vuzarāʾ* and various court officials, again chronologically; and a third for scholars and jurisprudents (*ʿulamāʾ*, *fuẓalāʾ*), divided among several geographic regions. Only after this does ʿAwfī proceed to discuss "actual poets" (*shuʿarāʾ*), whom he organizes by dynastic affiliation, starting with the Saffarids (*Āl-i Layṡ*), Tahirids, and Samanids.

Such a comprehensive and systematic text cannot be dismissed as the product of a primordial era in Persian literary history. True, there are obvious caveats about the authenticity of biographical anecdotes in the *Lubāb al-albāb*, but when did this cease to be a problem for *taẕkirah*s? Similarly, it may be the case, as Jalāl Matīnī claims in his *Encyclopædia Iranica* article on ʿAwfī, that the anthologist is "uncritical in his appraisals of the poets" and "often loquacious and rhetorical," and that his selections are imbalanced and "show poor taste";[43] but these faults have also been identified in much later works. The emergence of an explicit critical perspective on poetry, in particular, was a gradual process that bore little fruit before the early eleventh/seventeenth century. The *Lubāb* can only be considered far ahead of its time. Alas, this is part of what makes our periodization disjointed—and, as we will see, there are certain advantages to viewing the late Timurid period as the second founding of the *taẕkirah*, rather than as a direct continuation.

43. J. Matīnī, "ʿAwfī, Sadīd-al-Dīn," *Encyclopædia Iranica*. See also Ève Feuillebois, "ʿAwfī, Sadīd al-Dīn," *Encyclopædia of Islam, THREE*.

Maturation and irrevocable expansion

The years 892/1487 and 896/1491 saw the completion of three texts that would forever change the traditions of literary biography and anthology in both Persian and Turkic. All of them were written in Harāt during the reign of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Bāyqarā (875–911/1470–1506),[44] by prominent members of Timurid society who knew one another. First, in 892/1487, Dawlatshāh Samarqandī, a littérateur and confidant of Sulṭān Ḥusayn who had withdrawn from court service for a quieter lifestyle, finished his *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ*, whose importance is reflected in the fact that its title became the name of a genre;[45] and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (d. 898/1492), by acclamation the greatest poet of the century (among other distinctions), wrote a work of *belles lettres* titled *Bahāristān*, modeled after the *Gulistān* (656/1258) of Saʿdī, in which the seventh chapter takes the form of a short but incisive review of the Persian poetic tradition since the time of Rūdakī (d. 329/940–41).[46] Four years later, in 896/1491, Mīr ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī, a high-ranking administrator at Sulṭān Ḥusayn's court, sponsor of building projects, patron of the arts, and scholar whose cultural legacy defies measure, compiled the *Majālis al-nafāʾis*, a *taẕkirah* written in Chaghatāʾī Turkic and focused on poets contemporary with the author.[47] Navāʾī was a staunch defender of his mother tongue and one of the originators of Chaghatāʾī literature. The

44. This dates the beginning of Sulṭān Ḥusayn's rule to his defeat of the Shāhrukhid Yādgār Muḥammad, though he had taken Harāt and claimed the throne in 873/1469. See H. R. Roemer, "Ḥosayn Bāyqarā" (*sic*), *Encyclopædia Iranica.*

45. The latest critical edition of Dawlatshāh is by Fāṭimah ʿAlāqah (Tehran: Pizhūhishgāh-i ʿUlūm-i Insānī va Muṭālaʿāt-i Farhangī, 2007). See also Matthew Melvin-Koushki, "Dawlatshāh Samarqandī," *Encyclopædia of Islam, THREE*.

46. *Bahāristān va rasāʾil-i Jāmī*, ed. Aʿlá Khān Afṣaḥzād, Muḥammad Jān ʿUmar'uf, Abū Bakr Ẓuhūr al-Dīn (Tehran: Mīrāṡ-i Maktūb, 2000). A brief description of the work is given in G. M. Wickens, "Bahārestān (1)," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

47. The most easily referenced edition of this text is *Mecâlisü'n-nefâyis*, ed. Kemal Eraslan (2 vols., Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, 2001). Eraslan provides a romanization of the original Chaghatāʾī and a modern Turkish translation, along with a helpful introduction, indices, *etc*. The *Majālis* can also be read in the Persian translations of Fakhrī Haravī and Ḥakīm Shāh Qazvīnī, which were edited by ʿAlī Aṣghar Ḥikmat (Tehran, 1984).

Majālis al-nafāʾis was part of an effort to elevate the status of Turkic vis-à-vis Persian; its impact would be transformative.

It is remarkable enough that such a group of works appeared in one urban center within the space of a few years, considering the sparseness of what came before. Again, the three Timurid anthologists were acquainted with one another. The *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ* is in fact dedicated to ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī. The *Majālis al-nafāʾis*, in turn, has in its preface some discussion of both Dawlatshāh and Jāmī.[48] We know that Navāʾī had read these recently completed texts and viewed them as models. All of these factors—geographic and temporal proximity, the personal relationships among the anthologists, the staggering influence of their works in subsequent generations—would make a joint study of the *Bahāristān*, the *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ*, and the *Majālis al-nafāʾis* a valuable project in its own right.[49] For the moment, we can at least consider each of these works, paying attention to its organization, contents, and role in the advancement of the *taẕkirah* genre.

To offer a concise description of Dawlatshāh's *Taẕkirah*, along the lines of the criteria established in the first half of this chapter, is straightforward enough. This anthology, completed in 892/1487 in Harāt and dedicated to ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī—who was an acquaintance of the author and a fellow member of the Timurid élite—contains notices on around 150 individuals. The organization is approximately chronological, with an introduction (*muqaddimah*) covering the biographies of ten Arab poets, the latest of whom is al-Ḥarīrī (d. 516/1122); seven chapters (s. *ṭabaqah*) tracing the development of Persian verse from its Samanid beginnings to the author's own lifetime; and an epilogue (*khātimah*) focusing on several of the most prominent literary figures who were active at the time of the work's

48. *Mecâlisü'n-nefâyis*, ed. Eraslan, vol. 1, p. 4.
49. I hope eventually to write a paper on this topic.

composition. With regard to the internal balance of the *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ*, it may be useful to note that it is not a short text by any means—the 2007 edition of Fāṭimah ʿAlāqah runs to around twelve hundred pages, including critical apparatus—and yet the number of poets covered is not enormous. There is, accordingly, more space devoted to each subject (on average) than is possible in many other *taẕkirah*s. It is not uncommon for Dawlatshāh to go into detail in discussing anecdotes in poets' lives, or to quote from them length. A related matter is the breadth of literary history outlined in this work. Dawlatshāh selects around seventy-five poets from the entire pre-Timurid period, whereas the *Lubāb al-albāb* covers some three hundred up to the time of the Ghurid dynasty (which ʿAwfī served). Finally, no description of Dawlatshāh's *Taẕkirah* would be complete without mentioning the notorious unreliability of much of the biographical data that it provides, especially for the early poets. Scholars of classical Persian literature since at least the time of E. G. Browne have complained bitterly about this problem.[50] But the concerns of much later historians may be set aside; what is more relevant is the dramatic success of the *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ* moving into the tenth/sixteenth century.

How did this work achieve such foundational importance in a matter of years? The spread of the term *taẕkirah* is itself a puzzle. Dawlatshāh seems to have taken inspiration from Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār (d. 618/1221), whose *Taẕkirat al-awliyāʾ* had attained the status of a widely recognized classic.[51] But why should the title of one anthology of poets, based on that of a renowned collection of anecdotes about Sufis, come to label a whole genre? Part of the reason must be that Dawlatshāh was, for all intents and purposes, the first successful practitioner of a new type of work in Persian. From our perspective, it is

---

50. In the words of Ẕabīḥ Allāh Ṣafā, "[Dawlatshāh] paid little heed to the veracity of the information that he collected, some of which belongs to the realm of fairy tales." See his *Encyclopædia Iranica* article, "Dawlatšāh Samarqandi." We will turn to E. G. Browne's commentary on the reliability of *taẕkirah*s later in this section.
51. See *Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār's Memorial of God's Friends*, tr. Paul E. Losensky (New York: Paulist, 2009); Mohammad Esteʿlami, "*Taḏkerat al-awliāʾ*," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

plain to see that the *Lubāb al-albāb* should qualify as a full-fledged biographical anthology. And yet it was probably unavailable, if not unknown, in the literary circles of late Timurid Harāt. The same was true, as far as we can tell, in the contexts in which the *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ* was first received. This text was taken to be something novel. It also seems likely that Dawlatshāh was writing at an especially opportune time and place; he was able, for example, to provide first-hand accounts of the careers of Jāmī and Navāʾī.[52] Whatever combination of factors may have been at play, we know that it took only a few decades for the influence of Dawlatshāh to reach far enough that Kastamonulu Latîfî, the second Ottoman author of an anthology of poets, chose to title his own work *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ* (953/1546–7).[53] (Many would follow this convention over the four centuries of the Ottoman *taẕkirah* tradition.)

The *Bahāristān* is perhaps less central to our discussion than the contributions of Dawlatshāh and Navāʾī. This is not to say that it was unimportant in general terms—on the contrary, it saw extensive use as an educational text and survives in a plethora of manuscripts—but, as we have noted, just one of its eight chapters (s. *rawżah*) is devoted to poets' biographies. In a recent critical edition, this amounts to roughly thirty pages.[54] (The number of actual entries included is also around thirty.) Jāmī wrote this text, a wide-ranging combination of prose and verse, on the model of the *Gulistān*, and although its dedicatee is Sulṭān Ḥusayn Bāyqarā, it is also nominally intended for the education of the author's son, Żiyāʾ al-Dīn Yūsuf.[55] The seventh chapter of the *Bahāristān* is one of the most concise and selective *taẕkirah*s, or "mini-*taẕkirah*s," in the history of the genre. Interestingly, the limited space

52. In the edition of Fāṭimah ʿAlāqah, Dawlatshāh's notices on Jāmī and Navāʾī begin on pp. 876 and 890, respectively.
53. Latifî, *Tezkiretü'ş-şuʿarâ ve tabsıratü'n-nuzamâ*, ed. Rıdvan Canım (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı, 2000). See also J. Stewart-Robinson, "Ta<u>dh</u>kira 3. In Turkish literature," *Encyclopædia of Islam, Second Edition*.
54. *Bahāristān va rasāʾil-i Jāmī*, ed. Afṣaḥzād *et al.*, 122–53.
55. This may be a point of convention. The *Gulistān* itself was dedicated in part to the son of Saʿdī's patron. See Franklin D. Lewis, "Golestān-e Saʿdi," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

available to Jāmī in this passage, combined with his desire to take a general approach to the Persian poetic tradition, leads him to offer brief but astute commentary to explain his choices. He notes that the total number of poets, especially from recent generations (*muta'akhkhirān*), is limitless (*ʿadad-i īn ṭā'ifah az ḥadd va ḥaṣr bīrūn ast*); that recording all of their particulars would exceed comprehension (*ẕikr-i tafāṣīl-i īshān az qāʿidah-i iḥāṭah mutajāviz*); and that he has necessarily restricted his survey to a modest number of the best-known figures (*lā-jaram bar ẕikr-i chandī az mashāhīr-i īshān iqtiṣār kardah mī-shavad*).[56] What this means in practice is that Jāmī discusses a select group of about thirty poets, starting with Rūdakī and continuing in partially (though not consistently) chronological order up to the end of the eighth/fourteenth century; and then he more briefly mentions several individuals closer to his time. The chapter ends with a section in praise of ʿAlī Shīr Navā'ī.[57]

By the standards that we would generally use to assess a *taẕkirah*, the *Bahāristān* could appear as though it has little to offer. The biographical passages tend not to be particularly long or informative, and the poetry extracts, with few exceptions, do not reach ten lines. But there are aspects of this text that lend it considerable value, both in terms of its proximate audiences and from a modern academic perspective. As we saw in our study of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, the *Bahāristān* is mentioned by Sām Mīrzā in connection to the *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarā'* and the *Majālis al-nafā'is*, in order to make the point that poets up to the late ninth/fifteenth century already had documented legacies.[58] It seems to have been typical among literati of the succeeding period to view the three Timurid works as a kind of unit; this view is also expressed by Edirneli Sehî (d. 955/1548), the earliest of the Ottoman anthologists, in the preface

56. *Bahāristān va rasā'il-i Jāmī*, ed. Afṣaḥzād *et al.*, 123.
57. Ibid., 151–3.
58. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 3–4.

to his *taẕkirah*. He cites Jāmī, Dawlatshāh, and Navā'ī in quick succession as inspirations and models.[59] Apart from being grouped with two other successful *taẕkirah*s produced around the same time, the poets' chapter of the *Bahāristān* must have gained exposure through the use of the entire book as a teaching text. Finally, Jāmī was Jāmī. He did not produce a substantial literature-focused anthology,[60] but his quick review of some of the most prominent poets of earlier centuries often makes for an entertaining read, and his opinions on style are of manifest relevance, given his own status. It is not difficult to understand why the *Bahāristān* held a secure position among the Timurid *taẕkirah*s that spurred the development of a flourishing genre in both Persian and Turkic.

The potential of the *Bahāristān* as a source for research on literary history is further-reaching than we will be able to explore in the current study, and it still has not received a great deal of scholarly attention.[61] In particular, the unusual, self-conscious selectivity shown by Jāmī in attempting to cover centuries' worth of poetry in one short chapter, and the setting of this discussion in a text intended (at least conventionally) for educational use, open up promising avenues to investigate canon formation in Persian literature. One of the general characteristics of *taẕkirah*s that may have contributed to their popularity in the early modern period is that they seemingly function as registers of cultural capital (to borrow a term from Pierre Bourdieu).[62] By reading a widely respected anthology, a member of, say,

---

59. Edirneli Sehî, *Âsar-ı eslâfdan Tezkire-yi Sehî*, ed. Mehmet Şükrü (Istanbul, 1325/1907–8), 3–4.
60. It should be noted that Jāmī completed a large work of Sufi biography and hagiography, *Nafaḥāt al-uns*, in 883/1478, and several of the individuals covered there are also well-known poets. The relevance of texts like this to the *taẕkirah* genre is a question in need of further study.
61. One exception is Franklin D. Lewis, "To Round and Rondeau the Canon: Jāmī and Fānī's Reception of the Persian Lyrical Tradition," in *Jāmī in Regional Contexts: The Reception of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī's Works in the Islamicate World, ca. 9th/15th – 14th/20th Century*, ed. Thibaut d'Hubert and Alexandre Papas (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 463–567. This is a long, thought-provoking essay on the *Bahāristān* and a range of other materials relating to the development of the canon(s) of classical Persian poetry.
62. Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, tr. Richard Nice (Harvard UP, 1984). For an application of these ideas more directly suited to our purposes, see John D. Guillory, *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (University of Chicago Press, 1993).

early Safavid society could gain an idea of which poets—and even which famous poems—he or she should be familiar with in order to behave comfortably as a member of the urban literate class. This set of "must-read" poets and the associated cultural reference points can be thought of, on some level, as a canon. And if we are comfortable analyzing *taẕkirah*s from this angle, then a source that follows a stringent approach in determining which figures merit inclusion, and is written with an eye toward the acculturation of young people from privileged backgrounds (*e.g.*, Jāmī's son), will be most useful. That is to say, the group of poets assembled in the *Bahāristān*, at least from the Rūdakī–Ḥāfiẓ period, may be a fair representation of "the canon" as it appeared in Timurid Harāt. And when Jāmī endorses the idea that there are three "apostles" (*payambarān*) in Persian verse—Firdawsī for narrative (*awṣāf*), Anvarī for the *qaṣīdah*, and Saʿdī for the *ghazal*—it may mean something.[63] But this is a deep topic in its own right, and far from innocuous, given many scholars' aversion to canon-related debates.[64] Our concern lies more with the disproportionate impact of the seventh chapter of the *Bahāristān* on the *taẕkirah* genre, given how little space Jāmī chose to devote to it.

Four years after the appearance of the *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ* and the *Bahāristān*, in full awareness of those works, ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī set out to compose an anthology of poets in Turkic, which he defended as a superior language to Persian and promoted throughout his career as a scholar-statesman. The result, titled *Majālis al-nafāʾis*, is nothing less than one of the foundational documents of Turkic poetry.[65] This is not the place, and I am not the specialist, to comment at length on the ramifications of Navāʾī's *taẕkirah* (along with his other pro-Turkic advocacy and patronage) for later cultural developments in

---

63. *Bahāristān va rasāʾil-i Jāmī*, ed. Afṣaḥzād *et al.*, 148.
64. Perhaps I am too pessimistic. In addition to Lewis' paper on Jāmī, there is a recent and seemingly important book by Prashant Keshavmurthy, titled *Persian Authorship and Canonicity in Late Mughal Delhi* (London, 2016).
65. Again, citations of the Turkic *Majālis* here point to the edition of Kemal Eraslan.

the Ottoman lands and Transoxiana. Some of this story has been hinted at above: the *Majālis* served as a crucial model for early literary anthologists at the Ottoman court, who were documenting a poetic tradition still in the process of forging its own distinctive identity.[66] Of course, the influence on Turkic of Persian poetic conventions, which had been more thoroughly developed for longer, was and would remain strong. And bilingual literacy—trilingual, if we include Arabic—was the norm among those who composed works in Turkic. A clear reflection of this cultural enmeshment may be found in the *Majālis al-nafā'is*: much of the poetry excerpted in it is Persian.

For Navā'ī and his readers, there would have been nothing contradictory about a Turkic *taẕkirah* including numerous Persian subjects. (In another work, *Muḥākamat al-lughatayn*, or, *The Judgment between the Two Languages*, Navā'ī cites the fact that Turks learn Persian as a matter of course, while Persians struggle to learn Turkic, as a point of advantage for the latter language.)[67] This was simply the way of things at Timurid Harāt, and a similar dynamic would persist at Safavid Tabrīz and beyond.[68] For our purposes, while it may be difficult to appreciate from a Persianist's limited perspective, it is crucial to acknowledge the sweeping impact of the *Majālis* on literary biography and anthology in two language families. As we will see shortly, this *taẕkirah* was translated into Persian twice in the 1520s (in Harāt and Istanbul), and several of its features should be immediately reminiscent of our examination of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*.

---

66. See J. Stewart-Robinson, "Tadhkira 3. In Turkish literature," *Encyclopædia of Islam, Second Edition*. He identifies the *Majālis* as "the first Turkic biography of poets" and mentions its influence, along with the *Bahāristān* and the *Taẕkirat al-shu'arā'*, on Sehî of Edirne.
67. An English translation of the *Muḥākamat al-lughatayn*, with an introduction and notes, was carried out by Robert Devereux and published in installments in *The Muslim World* 54, no. 4 (October 1964): 270–87; and 55, no. 1 (January 1965): 28–45. For the point about Turks' learning Persian, see the first part, p. 272.
68. See, for example, Ferenc P. Csirkés, " 'Chaghatay Oration, Ottoman Eloquence, Qizilbash Rhetoric': Turkic Literature in Safavid Persia" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2016).

The *Majālis al-nafāʾis* contains 461 notices divided among eight chapters (s. *majlis*). In proportion to the number of individuals covered, the overall size of the work is fairly modest. (It is, however, difficult for me to carry out a direct comparison to Persian *taẕkirah*s. The edition of the original Turkic that I have consulted sets the text in Roman-script transliteration, which seems to allow for more to fit on each page. There are also the Persian translations of the *Majālis*, but they add and remove some material and would not give an accurate representation of the length of Navāʾī's work.) The first three chapters proceed as a series of generational *ṭabaqāt*, with the earliest group consisting of poets who died before the time of the author's birth or when he was too young to meet them. The second chapter is devoted to those who were alive during Navāʾī's youth, but passed well before he wrote this work; and the third concerns his actual contemporaries.

It may provide a clearer sense of this arrangement to note that the first chapter opens with the controversial poet Qāsim-i Anvār (d. *ca.* 836/1433–4);[69] the second, with the scholar and historian Sharaf al-Dīn ʿAlī Yazdī (d. 858/1454); and the third, with Jāmī (d. 898/1492). (Navāʾī himself was born in 844/1441.) After this chronological section, which accounts for roughly two-thirds of the notices in the *taẕkirah*, there are five further chapters determined more on the basis of social class. The fourth is for prominent figures who were not famous as poets but occasionally composed verse;[70] the fifth, for high-ranking Timurid officials (many of whom are given the title *mīr/amīr*), including Dawlatshāh; the sixth, for poets from beyond Khurāsān;[71] the seventh, for members of the ruling family; and the eighth, for Sulṭān Ḥusayn Bāyqarā personally. Beyond the large number of mostly short notices, and the

69. On this poet's life, see R. M. Savory, "Ḳāsim-i Anwār," *Encyclopædia of Islam, Second Edition*; and İlker Evrim Binbaş, "The Anatomy of a Regicide Attempt: Shāhrukh, the Ḥurūfīs, and the Timurid Intellectuals in 830/1426–27," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 23, no. 3 (June 2013): 391–428.

70. This is quite similar in concept to the fourth chapter of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*.

71. Most of the *Majālis* focuses on the author's home region. It is a distinctly Timurid work.

mixture of *ṭabaqāt* and social organization, another noteworthy feature of this *taẕkirah* is its temporal restriction. Navāʾī does not reach back further than the period of Shāhrukh (r. 811–50/1409–47).

In a strong indication of the importance of the *Majālis*, two Persian translations of the work were produced in the early 1520s. We need not discuss these texts in depth, but there are a few points worth mentioning about them—especially the first, written at Harāt by Fakhrī Haravī in 928/1521–2 (though it may have been completed shortly thereafter). The title of this translation is *Laṭāʾif-nāmah*, and it is intended, per Fakhrī's introductory remarks, to allow the substantial set of readers who do not know Turkic to access the valuable work of ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī.[72] Some of the notices in the original *Majālis* are omitted in the *Laṭāʾif-nāmah*, and a good deal more are added in a ninth chapter that serves to bring the *taẕkirah* up to date. More interesting than these details, perhaps, is the dedication that Fakhrī adds at the beginning of his translation: it is presented in honor of Shah Ismāʿīl and his son, Sām Mīrzā, who has just assumed the governorship of Harāt with his *lalah*, Dūrmīsh Khān Shāmlū.[73]

As we know, Sām was four to five years old at this point, and so he cannot have been aware of his status as a literary patron. It is still meaningful, however, to see the prince's name appear in this context. The *Laṭāʾif-nāmah* may well have been one of the texts used in his education a bit later in the 1520s. And there is something poetic in the fact that the most direct influence on the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* seems to have been the *Majālis al-nafāʾis*—perhaps mediated through the Harāt translation, of which Sām Mīrzā was a dedicatee. (We should bear in mind that Sām was literate in Turkic, and he could also have read the original version by Navāʾī.) In fact, one of the manuscripts of the *Laṭāʾif-nāmah*, copied

---

72. *Taẕkirah-i Majālis al-nafāʾis*, ed. Ḥikmat, 2. Fakhrī describes the intended audience of his translation as *baʿẓī aʿizzah va makhādīmī kih bi-ʿibārat-i Turkī iṭṭilāʿ na-dārand*.
73. Ibid., 2–3.

in 992/1584, evidently has passages from the *Tuḥfah* added in the margins.[74] Connections abound, as is often the case in the *taẕkirah* tradition.

The second Persian translation of the *Majālis* was carried out in Istanbul between 927/1520–21 and 929/1522–3 by Ḥakīm Shāh Muḥammad Qazvīnī, who served as a physician at the court of Sultan Selim I (r. 918–26/1512–20). This version has no specific title of its own, and it is commonly referred to as *Majālis al-nafāʾis-i Fārsī* to distinguish it from the Turkic original. The dedicatee is the late Sultan Selim, who had died in the fall of 926/1520. Qazvīnī follows an approach similar in many respects to that of Fakhrī, in that he excises or condenses certain sections by Navāʾī, while adding a fair amount of new material to document the activities of recent and contemporary poets. The most valuable parts of this text are notices on individuals who worked at the Ottoman and Āqquyūnlū courts.[75] But it is also relevant for our purposes simply to appreciate that a translation of a Turkic *taẕkirah* into Persian was a project that made sense in early tenth/sixteenth-century Istanbul. This may evoke for us the same kind of anachronistic irony—for there was, in reality, nothing strange about it—that we sense upon learning that the poetry of Sultan Selim is in Persian, whereas Shah Ismāʿīl composed in Turkic.

We have dwelt upon the period from roughly 892/1487 to 929/1523 at length because it represents the most consequential moment in the history of the Persian *taẕkirah*. The authorship of the three Timurid anthologies, followed by their enthusiastic reception and the two quick translations of the *Majālis al-nafāʾis*, gave a burst of energy to this genre whose momentum would never fade entirely. As we saw earlier, Gulchīn-i Maʿānī identified seven *taẕkirah*s (rather broadly defined) from the entire

74. So reports ʿAlī Aṣghar Ḥikmat in his introduction, p. xxvi.
75. See especially the second section (*rawżah-i duvvum*) of the eighth chapter (*bihisht-i hashtum*), starting on p. 359 in Ḥikmat's edition.

period before 800/1397–8. Then, for the ninth/fifteenth century alone, he is able to list another seven texts. In the tenth/sixteenth century, the number rises to thirty-three; and then fifty-eight in the next hundred years; and so on.[76] Not only were *taẕkirah*s written with progressively greater frequency, but the works of Dawlatshāh, Jāmī, and Navāʾī established a standard model—or perhaps a set of standard options—which could be repeated and built upon. The *taẕkirah* now had a robust foundation.

Carrying the torch, and experimentation

After the Persian translations and updates of the *Majālis*, the next set of important anthologies would not come until the 1550s, and in fact it begins with the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. This period is tougher to define than the ones preceding it, since it emerges from somewhat more subjective developments. Sām Mīrzā was not trying to inaugurate a new literary form; this much he makes clear in his preface to the *Tuḥfah*, which is concerned with the question of how to move forward from the Timurid works, to ensure that poets of a new generation will have their legacies secured.[77] The process of change that is suggested here is iterative and incremental. But it is change nonetheless. Although Sām Mīrzā does not comment explicitly on the future that he envisions for the *taẕkirah* genre, it is difficult to read the opening pages of the *Tuḥfah* without sensing the implication that there will need to be more of these books every generation. There will always be those who, in Sām's words, "snatch the ball of refinement from their forebears with the polo stick of striving ahead."[78] The expression of this idea may, in itself, be enough to mark a new phase for the Persian *taẕkirah*. But the 1550s also saw experimentation with

76. Gulchīn-i Maʿānī, *Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā*, vol. 2, p. 871*ff*. These totals are indicated under each century heading.
77. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 3–4.
78. Ibid., 3. Sām Mīrzā makes this statement about recent poets: *Gū-yi laṭāfat bi-chūgān-i musābaqat az shuʿarā-yi salaf rubūdah-and.*

regard to the organization and scope of anthologies. This can be seen in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*—which we have covered in detail, but will review briefly—as well as in two of the later works of Fakhrī Haravī, who had moved to India in the intervening years.

With brevity in mind, and to limit repetition, it will suffice here to mention three ways in which Sām Mīrzā innovated beyond his sources. First, while there was precedent for categorizing subjects at least partly on the basis of social class, the *Tuḥfah* takes this concept to its logical conclusion. All of the chapters of this *taẕkirah* are determined by position in society, moving in steps from kings and princes, to *sayyid*s and scholars, then court officials, various prominent individuals, "actual poets" (*shuʿarāʾ*), Turkic poets, and finally "the remaining common folk" (*sāʾir-i ʿavāmm*). As we discussed previously, the remarkable nature of this organizational scheme is enhanced by Sām Mīrzā's status as a member of the Safavid family. He offers a sort of microcosm of society, ordered from his position at the top. A second innovative feature of the *Tuḥfah* is the very presence of the chapter focusing on lower-class members of society, including (or especially) those with little aptitude in verse. There may not be anything quite like this from *any* stage in the *taẕkirah* tradition. Third, and finally, Sām Mīrzā's treatment of Turkic poets should be highlighted. The sharing of poetic culture across these languages was not always on equal terms—as Navāʾī had acknowledged—and it is unusual to see attention paid to Turkic in a predominantly Persian anthology, rather than the inverse.[79]

A more outwardly striking change starting in the mid tenth/sixteenth century was the appearance of what I have elsewhere called the "special-interest *taẕkirah*," in which the lives and works of a group far narrower than *poets in general* is covered. One of the most famous works of this type, written in

---

79. Of course, as we saw in an earlier chapter, Sām Mīrzā gives the impression that he holds a few negative stereotypes about Turks, though he appreciates some of their poetry. (And his own family was ethnically Turkic!)

963/1556 by our friend Fakhrī Haravī (d. after 974/1566–7), is the *Javāhir al-ʿajāʾib*, a *tażkirah* of women poets.[80] Fakhrī dedicated this short text to Māhim Angah,[81] the chief nurse and caretaker of the Mughal Akbar before his accession at age thirteen (also in 963 AH) and an influential figure in the first several years of his reign. The *Javāhir al-ʿajāʾib* contains twenty-three notices, beginning with Mahsatī Ganjavī (sixth/twelfth century) and proceeding in chronological order. Such an anthology was, of course, unprecedented at the time of its composition, and it continues to serve as one of our few key sources on Persian women poets of the premodern era. In 963/1555–6, just after the enthronement of Akbar, Fakhrī was apparently seeking a place in Mughal patronage circles. He had been living in Sind and working for the minor Arghūn dynasty,[82] after leaving Safavid lands at some point in the first half of Shah Ṭahmāsb's reign. One of the works that Fakhrī wrote for his Arghūnid patron, Mīrzā Shāh Ḥasan (d. 963/1556),[83] is also worthy of mention here. It is a *tażkirah* concentrating on the poetry of kings of various dynasties and their officials (*umarāʾ*), titled *Rawżat al-salāṭīn* (*ca.* 960/1553).[84] The organization of this anthology is both dynastic and geographic; for example, there is a chapter for the Timurids, and another for rulers in India. That Fakhrī followed such a range of approaches to literary anthology over a long career, finding something new to suit each of the places and patronage contexts in which he worked, is extraordinary. Almost no scholarship about him exists in English.[85]

80. *Tażkirah-i Rawżat al-salāṭīn, va Javāhir al-ʿajāʾib, maʿa dīvān-i Fakhrī Haravī*, ed. Sayyid Ḥusām al-Dīn Rāshidī (Hyderabad: Sindhī Adabī Būrd, 1968).
81. I am unsure of the proper voweling of this name, which is usually given as "Maham Anga." Dihkhudā's dictionary has an entry for *ingah*, a word of Turkic origin for a sister-in-law or female nurse. Doerfer (2:9) lists *änäkä* or *änägä* as the feminine form of the more familiar *ätäkä*.
82. C. E. Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties* (Edinburgh, 1996), 329–30.
83. This name is sometimes given as Shāh Ḥusayn, including in Bosworth (ibid.).
84. This is included in the same collection of Fakhrī's works that is cited above: *Tażkirah-i Rawżat al-salāṭīn, va Javāhir al-ʿajāʾib, maʿa dīvān-i Fakhrī Haravī*, ed. Rāshidī.
85. See the *very* brief entry in *Encyclopædia Iranica*: Sharif Husain Qasemi, "Faḵri Heravi, Solṭān-Moḥammad."

This third period in the history of the *taẕkirah* may not be sharply delineated, but it is important to recognize the beginnings of progress beyond the framework established by Dawlatshāh, Jāmī, and Navā'ī. In particular, Sām Mīrzā and Fakhrī Haravī demonstrated that literary anthologies could take on significantly, even radically different forms as the genre evolved to reflect social and political shifts and changes in the culture of Persian poetry.

Monumentality and cosmopolitanism

Two of the most massive *taẕkirah*s ever written were compiled around the turn of the eleventh/ seventeenth century. In each case, the project consumed enough of the author's career that citing the year of completion can be misleading: these are the products of many years of work. One of them was produced in Kāshān, the other in Agra at the court of the Mughal Jahāngīr (r. 1014–37/1605–27). One provides notices on almost 3,500 poets; the other is restricted to around 650, yet its verse selections are so voluminous that it makes for a longer text overall. Both of these anthologies are comprehensive in scope, covering the entire sweep of Persian literary history, which by this point was seven centuries removed from the lifetime of Rūdakī. This is where the *taẕkirah* stood during what I consider its fourth period, extending from approximately 993/1585 until the death of Shah ʿAbbās I (not long after that of Jahāngīr) in 1038/1629. Works of monumental scale, among other qualities, suggest a genre that has reached full flower.

Before we delve further into our final period, two disclaimers should be issued. First, there is no way that we could pretend to do justice to the *taẕkirah*s written in these years without devoting a great deal of space to the matter. The sources are too numerous and varied—to say nothing of their often

daunting individual length. Second, as was the case with the preceding period, the boundaries here are not easy to define. The year 993/1585 marks the completion of a key draft of the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār va zubdat al-afkār* of Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī, one of the immense anthologies mentioned above.[86] (The ultimate version of this text would not appear until 1016/1607.) I have taken this as the start of a new phase on account of its outsize importance, but it is worth noting that most of the works in this group were authored a bit later, from the mid 1590s onward. At the other end, it is admittedly strange to use political events—the deaths of Jahāngīr and ʿAbbās—to demarcate a period in literary history. This is just a point of convenience. For reasons that have yet to be explained, there appears to be something of a lull in *taẕkirah* sources from the middle decades of the eleventh/seventeenth century. The situation may change if additional texts are discovered to be extant—Gulchīn-i Maʿānī lists several that are thought to have been lost—but I have not seen more than a cursory mention of any Persian anthology of poets written between the late 1620s and the early 1660s.[87] (The next widely influential *taẕkirah* is, in fact, that of Muḥammad Ṭāhir Naṣrābādī, completed in 1091/1680.) Given the current state of knowledge, we may reasonably pause our inquiry around 1038/1629.

There are five developments from this period of the *taẕkirah* genre that I would like to highlight. It will be more practical to consider one aspect at a time, rather than attempting to describe each source in such an expansive corpus. First, as has been discussed briefly above, the end of the tenth/sixteenth century saw the emergence of what may be called "monumental *taẕkirah*s." These works, which began

86. The composition process of the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār* is summarized in my article, "The Biography of Vahshi Bāfqi (d. 991/1583) and the *Tazkera* Tradition," *Journal of Persianate Studies* 8 (2015): 202–3. For a list of the volumes of this anthology that have been published so far, see the bibliography of my other article, "*Taẕkirah-i Khayr al-bayān*: The Earliest Source on the Career and Poetry of Ṣāʾib Tabrīzī (d. *ca*. 1087/1676)," *Al-ʿUṣūr al-Wusṭā* 24 (2016): 137.

87. Among the presumably lost works from this period mentioned by Gulchīn-i Maʿānī are the *Taẕkirah-i Abū Ḥayyān* (1:172–4), the *Taẕkirah-i Munīr-i Lāhūrī* (1:377), and the *Taẕkirah-i Quṭb-shāhī* (1:321–2).

with the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār* (written between *ca*. 975/1567–8 and 1016/1607–8) of Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī, are on a totally different scale from what came before. To explain the distinction in simple terms, texts in this category fill several volumes in published editions, whereas the great majority of *taẕkirah*s, even from later eras, can be printed in one. The *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār* is in fact the largest anthology ever written in Persian, according to the assessment of Gulchīn-i Maʿānī.[88] This work was compiled over *four decades* by a prominent resident of Kāshān, which was a focal point of literary activity in early Safavid Iran.[89] It is a comprehensive *taẕkirah*, covering poets of all periods, while devoting special attention to those who lived closer to the author's time. The section on contemporary figures alone is divided into twelve chapters (s. *aṣl*), each corresponding to a geographic area within the Safavid realm. The length of the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār* is perhaps best described in terms of the quantity of excerpted lines of poetry included with the notices. They reportedly total around 350,000, or seven times the number in the *Shāhnāmah* of Firdawsī. On account of his huge achievement and dedication to the work of literary biography and anthology, Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī came to be known as "Mīr Taẕkirah." I have written about him in somewhat greater detail elsewhere.[90]

The appearance of one enormous *taẕkirah*, or one project of a sort that allowed almost the entire history and present of Persian poetry to be brought into a unified dialogue, would represent a major shift for the genre. But this period gave rise to *two* such works. The second, titled *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn va ʿaraṣāt al-ʿārifīn*, was completed in 1024/1615 by Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī (in a rare coincidence of naming), who was born in the village of Balyān near Kāzirūn; remained in Iran through young adulthood and

---

88. Gulchīn-i Maʿānī, *Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā*, vol. 1, pp. 538–9.
89. Taqī al-Dīn was a student and friend of the famous poet Muḥtasham (d. 996/1588), also from Kāshān, and he later served as his literary executor. See Paul E. Losensky, "Moḥtašam Kāšāni," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.
90. Beers, "The Biography of Vahshi Bāfqi," 202–5.

wrote poetry in praise of Shah ʿAbbās during the early years of his reign (995–1038/1587–1629); then moved to India in 1005/1596–7, and spent the remainder of his life working at the court of Jahāngīr.[91] Awḥadī wrote the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn* at Agra. While he did not spend as much time on this project as Kāshānī did on the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār*, we should remember that *writing* a *taẕkirah* would have come after long years of collecting materials (as seems to be the case with the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*).

The *ʿArafāt* is smaller than Kāshānī's work overall, but it holds the distinction of containing more notices than any other Persian anthology: nearly 3,500. These tend to be shorter, offering perhaps a paragraph or two of biographical description followed by a few dozen selected lines. Awḥadī chose a novel organizational scheme for his *taẕkirah*, devoting a chapter to each letter of the alphabet, with poets assigned usually on the basis of their pen names (s. *takhalluṣ*). Within each chapter, there are subsections for early figures (*mutaqaddimīn*), those from the intermediate period (*mutavassiṭīn*), and recent and contemporary poets (*mutaʾakhkhirīn*). This unusually systematic layout is helpful, given the number of notices. Apart from its monumental scale, the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn* is noteworthy as a source on the literary migration from Iran to India in the late tenth/sixteenth and early eleventh/seventeenth centuries, in which Awḥadī was a participant.[92]

This point brings us to a second broad development for *taẕkirah*s: an unmistakable shift to India. The same economic and political forces that drove a large number of poets to move from Iran to the Mughal court (and its subsidiaries) during the reigns of Akbar (963–1014/1556–1605), Jahāngīr (1014–37/1605–27), and Shāh Jahān (1037–68/1628–58), also involved authors in other genres, including

91. The *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn* has been edited twice in recent years, first by Muḥsin Nājī Naṣrābādī (7 vols., Tehran: Asāṭīr, 2009), then by Ẕabīḥ Allāh Ṣāḥibkārī and Āminah Fakhr Aḥmad (8 vols., Tehran: Mīrāṡ-i Maktūb, 2010). The latter edition, which is less widely available, appears to have been done with greater care.

92. Gulchīn-i Maʿānī cites the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn* hundreds of times in *Kārvān-i Hind* (2 vols., Mashhad: Āstān-i Quds-i Rażavī, 1369/1990–91), an important work about poets who migrated to India during the Safavid period.

literary anthology.[93] Of the nine well-known *taẕkirah*s completed between 1002/1593–4 and 1036/1627 that I have consulted (a few of which may be labeled "pseudo-*taẕkirah*s"), four were written in India by Iranian émigrés. These consist of the *Haft iqlīm* (*ca*. 1002/1593–4) of Amīn ibn Aḥmad Rāzī, a large geographic and biographical encyclopædia, many of whose roughly 1,500 notices are devoted to poets;[94] the *Majālis al-muʾminīn* (1010/1602) of Nūr Allāh Shūshtarī,[95] which is mainly a *taẕkirah* of prominent Shiʿis throughout history, literary figures included; the aforementioned *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn* (1024/1615) of Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī Balyānī; and the *Maykhānah* (1028/1619) of ʿAbd al-Nabī Fakhr al-Zamānī Qazvīnī, an anthology of ninety notices, with a focus on poets who had composed works in a mystical form known as the *sāqī-nāmah*, or "ode to the cupbearer."[96] We will explore more specific issues relating to some of these texts below. For the moment, however, the point to be emphasized is that the end of the tenth/sixteenth century saw the rise of a tradition of *taẕkirah* authorship on the Indian subcontinent, which was no less consequential than the movement of poets themselves. Later Indo-Persian works of the twelfth/eighteenth century, which have inspired a lively dialogue among researchers in recent years, can (on some level) be traced back to anthologies of Awḥadī's generation.

The next feature of this period that should be mentioned, if only in brief, is the evolution of what might be termed "literary-critical perspective" in *taẕkirah*s. Looking at earlier works, it is often difficult to tell what, if anything, the authors think of the poets that they are discussing. Who composed the strongest *ghazal*s? What are the various styles that were pursued in a given form, and which of them

93. On this issue, see also Shiblī Nuʿmānī, *Shiʿr al-ʿajam* (5 vols., Aligaṛh, 1909–21).

94. Amīn ibn Aḥmad Rāzī, *Haft iqlīm*, ed. Javād Fāżil (3 vols., Tehran: ʿIlmī, 1961). See also M. U. Memon, "Amin Aḥmad Rāzi," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

95. The only edition I have seen is that of Amīn Ṭihrānī, published in 1881. See also M. Hidayet Hosain, "Nūr Allāh," *Encyclopædia of Islam, Second Edition*.

96. *Taẕkirah-i Maykhānah*, ed. Aḥmad Gulchīn-i Maʿānī (Tehran: Ḥājj Muḥammad Ḥusayn Iqbāl va Shurakāʾ, 1961). On the *sāqī-nāmah* genre (or whatever we should call it) in Persian, see Paul E. Losensky, "Sāqi-nāma," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

had the greatest influence? Are there different "schools" of poetry that can be identified by name? To seek answers to questions of this kind in, say, the *Taẕkirah* of Dawlatshāh, is discouraging at best. The basic problem is that the evaluative commentary offered by Persian anthologists seldom goes beyond vague praise.[97] In an effort to dig deeper, one may resort to scrutinizing less direct indications of the author's position. All or virtually all of the poets in a given *taẕkirah* might be described positively, but perhaps some of the notices are longer, more detailed, or more enthusiastic than others. It would then be possible to establish a general idea of which figures are considered most deserving of attention.

Of course, this is no substitute for the kind of critical approach that one would hope to find paired with biography and anthology. One example of an earlier text that stands out for the candor and usefulness of the author's commentary is the *Bahāristān*. At the outset of the relevant chapter, Jāmī explains that poets may focus on different forms in their work, with those from the first centuries (*mutaqaddimān*) having specialized in the *qaṣīdah*, be it panegyric (*madāʾiḥ*) or exhortatory (*mavāʿiẓ*), as well as in narrative verse (*maśnavī*). This he juxtaposes against the practice of recent poets (*mutaʾakhkhirān*), who have mostly composed *ghazal*s (*sukhanān-i īshān akṡar bar ṭarīq-i ghazal vāqiʿ shudah-ast*).[98] Even for such a simple, uncontroversial point about Persian literary history, it is rare, in my experience, to find an explicit statement in a *taẕkirah*—let alone if we sought answers to the more complex questions of stylistic development.

There are hints that this situation has begun to change by the midpoint of the Safavid-Mughal era. Perhaps the clearest sign available to us is the adoption of what appear to be technical terms to refer

97. E. G. Browne ties this issue to the tendency of *taẕkirah* authors to include notices on their personal friends, or others who are considered "influential or amiable." See *A Literary History of Persia*, vol. 4, pp. 224–6.

98. *Bahāristān va rasāʾil-i Jāmī*, ed. Afṣaḥzād *et al.*, 123.

to different trends in the *ghazal* form. I have written about this issue with reference to the biography and early reception of Vaḥshī Bāfqī (d. 991/1583), one of the two most famous poets of his generation, at least in Safavid lands—the other being Muḥtasham Kāshānī (d. 996/1588).[99] In the decades following his death, Vaḥshī received attention from all of the major anthologists, who show that his lyric style was an influence on younger poets such as ʿUrfī Shīrāzī (d. 999/1591).[100] Some of the notices are typically short and vague, but a few others discuss Vaḥshī in ways that could facilitate the study of broader developments in Persian literary history. Awḥadī, for example, states that none of the poets of recent generations have matched Vaḥshī with regard to "fresh speech" (*tāzah-gūʾī*).[101] This term, which should be familiar to any Persianist, went on to become a standard way of referring to the inventive *ghazal* style that dominated in the eleventh/seventeenth and twelfth/eighteenth centuries. It is, in fact, possible that the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn* was the earliest *tażkirah* to place emphasis on *tāzah-gūʾī*.

Later in the same notice, Awḥadī posits a conflict between the approaches to poetry of Vaḥshī and Muḥtasham, and he judges that the former rendered the style of the latter obsolete (*ṭarz-i ū rā mansūkh gardānīd*).[102] To see commentary of this kind in a *tażkirah* from any previous period would come as a surprise. (It may exist, however, somewhere in the heaps of source material waiting to be examined in detail.) Another intriguing assessment of Vaḥshī is given by Fakhr al-Zamānī Qazvīnī, who includes the poet in his *Maykhānah* because he composed a well-known *sāqī-nāmah*. According

99. Beers, "The Biography of Vahshi Bāfqi." See also Paul E. Losensky, "Moḥtašam Kāšāni," *Encyclopædia Iranica*; idem, "Vaḥši Bāfqi," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

100. The importance of Vaḥshī in the evolution of the *ghazal* is reflected in Losensky's study of the reception of Bābā Faghānī (d. 925/1519). Vaḥshī appears as one of the key nodes between Faghānī and later practitioners of the "fresh style" (*shīvah-i tāzah*), down to Ṣāʾib Tabrīzī (d. *ca*. 1087/1676). See Paul E. Losensky, *Welcoming Fighānī: Imitation and Poetic Individuality in the Safavid-Mughal Ghazal* (Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda, 1998), ch. 1.

101. *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn*, ed. Naṣrābādī, vol. 6, p. 4076.

102. Ibid.

to this anthologist, the poems of Vaḥshī are mostly in the "incidentalist style" (*ṭarz-i vuqūʿ*)—another key term that has been a topic of debate among literary historians.[103] Did Qazvīnī and Awḥadī disagree in their evaluations of Vaḥshī? It would be difficult to say. The general problem of how the *taẕkirah* tradition shifted from the realm of biographical anecdote, nonspecific praise, and quotation, to something more like criticism, is a forbidding one. For the purposes of this periodization, it should be enough to suggest, somewhat anecdotally, that the early eleventh/seventeenth century was a time of important changes—particularly among anthologists who, like Awḥadī and Qazvīnī, worked in India during the reign of Jahāngīr. (I would happily be proven wrong on these points.)

The last two developments for us to highlight in this period are more straightforward and may be dispatched without extensive explanation. First (*i.e.*, fourth), the increased frequency with which *taẕkirah*s were being written under the Safavids and Mughals resulted in the documentation of poets' careers as they happened, or with only a short delay after their deaths. In some cases, we are fortunate enough to have more than one notice written during a poet's lifetime. This is true of Muḥtasham, who was mentioned in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* just after he began to earn a reputation,[104] and was later included in the 993/1585 draft of the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār*, by which point he was a towering figure.[105] A related consequence of the density of *taẕkirah*s that were compiled during this period, and of anthologists' greater focus on their contemporaries, is that we can observe more of the social dynamic of Persian poetry that was thriving in urban areas throughout the region. Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī, for example, paints

103. *Taẕkirah-i Maykhānah*, ed. Gulchīn-i Maʿānī, 181. On "incidentalism" in Persian poetry, see Muḥammad Riżā Shafīʿī Kadkanī, "Persian Literature (*Belles-Lettres*) from the Time of Jāmī to the Present Day," in *History of Persian Literature*, ed. George Morrison (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 146*ff*.

104. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, ed. Humāyūn Farrukh, 373.

105. Taqī al-Dīn describes Muḥtasham as the "absolute master" (*ustād-i ʿalá al-iṭlāq*) among poets of his time. See Losensky, "Moḥtašam Kāšāni," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

a vivid portrait of a literary circle in Shīrāz in which he participated in the early 1580s. He recounts that poets would meet every day at the shop of an architect (*ṭarrāḥ*) called Maḥmūd Ṭarḥī, and they would compete with one another in composing responses to *ghazal*s by masters from earlier generations.[106] This is not simply a change in the *taẕkirah* genre—poetry was also being shared in new contexts, and any number of relevant social or economic trends could be cited—but the shifting role of literary biographers is an important part of the story.

Finally (*i.e.*, fifth), the growth of "special-interest *taẕkirah*s," or otherwise works of unconventional scope, continued apace. The *Maykhānah*, as we have seen, focuses on poets who were known to have authored a particular kind of work: the "ode to the cupbearer." One of the interesting aspects of this *taẕkirah* is that Fakhr al-Zamānī Qazvīnī traces the *sāqī-nāmah* from its first well-known practitioner, Niẓāmī Ganjavī (d. *ca*. 605/1208–9), through a long period of development that was still underway during his own life. It is clear that the *sāqī-nāmah* existed as a definable genre for centuries before Qazvīnī.[107] These poems are mostly in rhyming couplets (*maśnavī*), in the *mutaqārib maḥẕūf* meter, with a set of common tropes—all this following the form of Niẓāmī's original.[108] But did anyone write about the *sāqī-nāmah* formally, or collect a number of examples in one book, before the *Maykhānah*? What was Qazvīnī's role in the "creation" of the genre as we know it? Another idiosyncratic text from this period is the *Gulistān-i hunar* (1005/1597–8) of Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī—whose chronicle, *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* (999/1591), was a crucial source for the first half of the dissertation.[109] The *Gulistān-i hunar*

106. *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn*, ed. Naṣrābādī, vol. 4, pp. 2256–7.
107. Again, see Losensky, "Sāqi-nāma," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.
108. Niẓāmī experimented with recurring invocation of the *sāqī* in *Laylī u Majnūn* (584/1188), but it is the more extensive, systematic deployment of this trope in the *Iskandar-nāmah* (*ca*. 599/1202–3) that became a kind of standard format in later generations.
109. Qāżī Aḥmad produced a revised version of the *Gulistān-i hunar* around 1015/1606–7. See Kambiz Eslami, "Golestān-e honar," *Encyclopædia Iranica*. An English translation of this work, by Vladimir Minorsky, was published under the title

is effectively a *taẕkirah* of calligraphers, miniaturists, and other visual artists, though some of them were also poets. Art historians have long paid attention to this work, which is extraordinarily useful for their research on the late Timurid and early Safavid periods. Viewed in terms of the development of literary anthologies, Qāżī Aḥmad's contribution demonstrates that the genre could be adapted to suit a wide range of subject matter. What had begun with poets and Sufis now encompassed manuscript gilders.[110]

This final period that we have outlined, from approximately 993/1585 to 1038/1629, is far too rich to be treated in adequate depth through less than a book-length study. While I stand by the claim that the Timurid anthologies of Dawlatshāh, Jāmī, and Navā'ī represent the most *consequential* time for the Persian *taẕkirah* (to say nothing of Turkic), the popularity of the genre that they unleashed grew to a point that, by the beginning of the eleventh/seventeenth century, we have simply too many sources, from too wide a variety of contexts, containing too much data. And this would still be considered early history from the perspective of many Indo-Persianists! In any case, the goal here has been to establish a basic sense of how the *taẕkirah* evolved up to the point at which Sām Mīrzā wrote his *Tuḥfah*, and in the several decades that followed. The broad strokes, it is hoped, have been made clear.

Conclusions

Ultimately, the most productive way of situating the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* in the *taẕkirah* tradition is to consider it as a waypoint between the works produced in Timurid Harāt and the monumental efforts

---

Calligraphers and Painters (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1959).

110. There is also the *Rayḥān-i nastaʿlīq* (989/1581), a short treatise by an unknown author, which describes noteworthy calligraphers. An edition (of sorts) by M. A. Chaghatai was published at Lahore in 1941.

of authors such as Kāshānī and Awḥadī that appeared a century later. We can think of the larger period implied here, from around 892/1487 to 1038/1629, as the crucial time during which the Persian literary anthology both rose to prominence and attained the great majority of the characteristics that would sustain it into the modern era. There is coherence to this framework: "*taẕkirah*s" (under various labels) before the ninth/fifteenth century were written sporadically and never gained the momentum of a vibrant literary tradition; and, at the other end of our periodization, the decades after the deaths of Jahāngīr and Shah ʿAbbās saw a slight lull in the production of anthologies. The latter boundary is not as definite as the former, but it should also be emphasized that the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār* and the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn* cast a long shadow over subsequent work in the genre. Only a handful of *taẕkirah*s of comparable scale were ever written, and the next one, the *Riyāż al-shuʿarā'* of Vālih Dāghistānī, was not completed until 1161/1748.[111] It could further be argued that the density of important anthologies authored in the early eleventh/seventeenth century was never matched. There is more than sufficient support for this organizational scheme.

What is meant by placing the *Tuḥfah* at the center of the macro-period 892–1038/1487–1629? As we have seen, the Timurid *taẕkirah*s succeeded in laying the foundations for a kind of text that would soon be a consistent, inseparable companion to Persian poetry. And the basic format never needed to change, however much experimentation and expansion later took place. (In fact, the *Lubāb al-albāb* could just as well have served as a template, except that it was unknown to so many.) The contribution of Sām Mīrzā came at a point when it was clear—to him, at least—that preserving the work of more recent poets would depend on the authorship of new *taẕkirah*s. He was content to shift his discussion

---

111. *Taẕkirah-i Riyāż al-shuʿarā'*, 5 vols., ed. Muḥsin Nājī Naṣrābādī (Tehran: Asāṭīr, 1384/2005–6). See also W. Kirmani, "ʿAli-Qoli Ḵān Wāleh," *Encyclopædia Iranica*.

away from the acknowledged virtuosi of earlier centuries, and to focus on the area where he had the greatest value to add. Considering the *Tuḥfah*'s irreplaceable documentation of the careers of poets such as Bābā Faghānī (d. 925/1519), Hilālī Astarābādī (d. 936/1529), and Ahlī Shīrāzī (d. 942/1535), this was a decision that continues to pay dividends for literary historians.[112] Sām Mīrzā also innovated in the form and scope of his *taẕkirah*, organizing it through a social hierarchy and, most surprising of all, including a chapter that focuses on members of lower classes. Much further development was on the horizon for Persian literary anthologies, but the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, along with the Indian works of Fakhrī Haravī, represents a significant transitional phase.

Three final points should be made. First, to ask what the *Tuḥfah* means to the *taẕkirah* tradition is not the same as asking what it means for Sām Mīrzā. This issue will be addressed in the concluding pages of the dissertation, since it offers us a way of connecting the two halves of the project. To put it briefly, however, we will return to the interpretation that the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* is a microcosm of society in verse—a world under the sole authority of this prince-littérateur, whose participation in politics, by contrast, was drowned in forces beyond his control. Second, as was mentioned in the previous section, some of this material on the typology and periodization of the *taẕkirah* could be of more general use. There is at least a few careers' worth of research to be done with the sources described here, which is only a makeshift selection.[113] The study of Persian anthologies is, in many ways, still at an early stage, and I hope to have aided in the advancement of the field. Third, to close by pointing to opportunities for improvement, I would suggest that future scholarship on *taẕkirah*s attempt to build a clearer understanding of connections and influences that are currently hazy. To what extent was the Persian

112. In Humāyūn Farrukh's edition, Faghānī, Hilālī, and Ahlī are covered on pp. 176–7, 152–60, and 177–9, respectively.
113. For example, the career and works of Fakhrī Haravī could easily form the basis of a dissertation project.

tradition, as early as ʿAwfī or as late as Dawlatshāh, adapted from Arabic models? Was *anything* new added by Persian anthologists? This is a fair question, in light of the sophistication of works such as the *Yatīmat al-dahr*.[114] The answer, of course, is that Persian *taẕkirah*s came to have their own unique range of attributes; but the process by which this occurred demands further study.

Another crucial link is with Turkic literature, in particular after the career of Navāʾī. More research has been done in this area—the dissertation of Ferenc P. Csirkés is one recent, impressive example—yet it remains the case that specialists on the Persian side often have a poor appreciation for Turkic influences, in the *taẕkirah* genre and beyond, which continued at least through the tenth/sixteenth century.[115] Finally, if there is scholarship that treats anthologies of poets along with collections of Sufi biography and hagiography in a single framework, then I have yet to find it. But we cannot forget that it was a nod from Dawlatshāh to ʿAṭṭār that generated the now-dominant meaning of the word *taẕkirah*. Similarly, we might ask whether the start of Persian anthologies' rise to prominence should be set back a few years, to 883/1478, to reflect Jāmī's completion of the *Nafaḥāt al-uns*. The immediate success of that text may have helped to inspire work on the lives of poets.[116] But questions like these may be left to future study.

114. Again, on al-Thaʿālibī and his successors in the Arabic tradition, see Orfali, *The Anthologist's Art*.
115. Csirkés, "'Chaghatay Oration, Ottoman Eloquence, Qizilbash Rhetoric.'"
116. The *Nafaḥāt* evidently made a strong impression on ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī, who requested that Jāmī write a sequel about the biography and miracles of the Prophet Muḥammad. The latter text, titled *Shawāhid al-nubūwah*, dates to 885/1480–81—still several years before the *Bahāristān* and the *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ*. See Paul E. Losensky, "Jāmi i. Life and Works," *Encyclopædia Iranica*; and, for an outline of the *Shawāhid*, Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, vol. 3, pp. 512–13.

Conclusion

At the beginning of the dissertation, I have attached a brief abstract for the project and summaries of the main points from each of the body chapters. This is followed by a short Introduction, which is meant to explain a few of the broader questions under discussion, and my motivations in pursuing such a study. Something similar is called for in this Conclusion—with the difference that we have now ventured through the four body chapters. In the following pages, I will attempt to address three issues: the key insights that have been gained in each section of the dissertation (in greater detail than what is mentioned in the frontmatter); the corpora of sources that have been assembled and employed; and a few thoughts on tying together the two halves of the project, namely, the investigation into Sām Mīrzā's princely career, and the study built around his *taẕkirah*. This may serve as a kind of "executive summary," which should be useful, given the diversity of topics that we have investigated.[1]

Key points from Chapter 1

The goal of the opening chapter is to establish context for the life of Sām Mīrzā, in various ways. First, we need to have an understanding of the reign of Shah Ṭahmāsb (930–84/1524–76), including the evolution of the Safavid polity and the development of several of its key institutions across those decades, and the conflicts that were reshaping the region—most importantly with the territorial expansion of the Ottomans. The device that I have chosen to give some structure to this narrative is a four-part periodization of the Ṭahmāsb era. We begin with the years between Ṭahmāsb's 930/1524

1. Full citations of sources are not given in these concluding notes, since anything recapitulated here will have been covered in greater detail elsewhere.

accession and his rise to largely unchallenged power in the mid 1530s. (For our purposes, the endpoint is around 943/1537, which represents the conclusion of the most threatening series of Uzbek invasions of Khurāsān and, significantly, the return of a disgraced Sām Mīrzā to the Safavid royal encampment.) This first period was characterized by discord and power struggles among Qizilbāsh factions of such severity that some historians have referred to it as a civil war—combined with make-or-break battles against both the Uzbeks and the Ottomans. As far as Sām Mīrzā is concerned, the key point about the opening decade of his brother's reign is that the political situation was evidently too volatile for him to be monitored closely. Sām was, for the most part, left in Khurāsān to be enmeshed in the Shāmlū sphere of influence. We have already explored the negative long-term impact that these early events had on his position within the dynasty.

The second period in our outline of Ṭahmāsb's rule runs from the mid 1530s until the late 1540s, when the rebellion of Alqāṣ Mīrzā inaugurated a new phase of high-level conflict for the Safavid polity to navigate. In the intervening decade, Ṭahmāsb and his inner circle were able to focus primarily on domestic consolidation and reforms. This was an auspicious time for the young monarch, as is reflected, for example, in the travel account of the Venetian emissary Michele Membré, who visited the Safavid court in 946–7/1539–40. Of course, in addition to describing the confident bearing of Shah Ṭahmāsb and the genuine respect that he commanded, Membré notes the disfavored position of Sām Mīrzā. It would not be until 956/1549, during the later stages of Alqāṣ' ill-fated attempt to effect a *coup d'état*, that Sām was allowed to return to public life, and given a post as custodian of the Safavid shrine in Ardabīl. Our third period for Ṭahmāsb's reign begins as early as 953/1546, with the first open acts of defiance by Alqāṣ Mīrzā; and it closes more definitively with the 962/1555 Peace of Amasya between

the Safavids and the Ottomans. During these years, the Safavid administration was forced to confront another sustained bout of aggression directed by Sultan Süleyman. This began with Ottoman support of Alqāṣ' revolt, and after his failure, the effort to seize new territory from the Safavids continued with an outright war in 960/1553. Concurrently with this string of conflicts, Sām Mīrzā was enjoying the most productive stretch in his career—including the authorship of the *Tuḥfah* (*ca*. 957/1550).

The fourth, final, and longest period that we identified in the rule of Shah Ṭahmāsb extends from Amasya until his death in 984/1576. These two decades offer a study in contrasts. On the one hand, the Safavids had negotiated peace with the Ottomans, enjoyed cordial relations with the Mughals, and faced no serious threat from the Uzbeks—who would return to the offensive only in the 1580s—which again allowed for a focus on domestic matters. On the other hand, as we have seen, the same period was characterized by acute fiscal challenges and what seem to be increasingly repressive policies on the part of the central court. Sām Mīrzā was imprisoned at Qahqahah in 969/1562, under odd circumstances, and at last he was put to death as part of the quiet mass execution of 975/1567—an event that we have dwelled upon at several points in the dissertation. The general idea with this periodization of Ṭahmāsb's reign is to gain analytical purchase on a number of key developments in Safavid and regional history, and, more specifically, to construct a framework in which to study the life of Sām Mīrzā. To an extent, the insight that we gain should be bi-directional. Examining Sām's career helps us to understand the Ṭahmāsb era, and in particular the darker side of the post-Amasya years.

Methodological context represents the other main concern of Chapter 1. What primary sources have survived that offer some information about Sām Mīrzā? This turned out to be an extraordinarily frustrating subject. We reviewed texts of several different kinds in search of discussion of the prince.

These can be divided into two main categories: Safavid narrative histories (for the most part court chronicles), and everything else. The second category, in turn, consists of historical texts from other regional powers, *i.e.*, the Ottomans, Mughals, and Uzbeks; *taẕkirah*s; and travel narratives (only one of which yielded new data). In the early stages of collecting and combing through sources, my hope was to identify a fair variety of texts in which there is some mention of Sām Mīrzā, and ideally, to have a number of those reports prove significant. The actual results have been rather different—though by no means uninteresting. In the case of Safavid chronicles, the treatment of Sām Mīrzā is peculiar enough that it raises the question of whether his biography was a purposefully avoided topic among many historians affiliated with the court. Sām's early years, in which he held the titular governorship of Harāt and participated in the 935/1528 Battle of Jām, are covered in Safavid sources more or less as one would expect. It is when we come to the last three decades of the prince's life—between his semi-imprisonment in 943/1537 and his execution in 975/1567—that it becomes much more difficult to find any comment on his activities.

We know, for example, that Sām was appointed to the shrine in Ardabīl in 956/1549. This is the type of event that, under normal circumstances, often merits a brief note in a chronicle. But there are surprisingly few sources that have anything to say in this case. The *Aḥsan al-tavārīkh* (985/1577) of Ḥasan Rūmlū and the *ʿĀlam-ārā-yi ʿAbbāsī* (1038/1629) of Iskandar Beg Munshī are both silent on the matter. (It should be emphasized that these are two of the most influential histories of the first half of the Safavid period.) While the lack of discussion of Sām Mīrzā in reference to events after the mid 1530s is generally puzzling, the question of his death raises a different kind of problem, since it is not only poorly documented, but there is conflict among those accounts that exist.

According to a cursory, enigmatic passage in the *Takmilat al-akhbār* (978/1570) of ʿAbdī Beg Shīrāzī—a poet and official who was close to Shah Ṭahmāsb and his inner circle—Sām Mīrzā died in an *earthquake* at the prison fortress of Qahqahah. (When was he sent to Qahqahah, and for what reason? ʿAbdī Beg never explains. The note about Sām's death is all that we find on the subject in this chronicle.) This account is explicitly rejected in a later source, the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* (999/1591) of Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, which provides the only sustained description of the second half of Sām Mīrzā's life that has survived. Qāżī Aḥmad explains that Sām was imprisoned in 969/1562, after his position in Ardabīl became unstable; that he was suspected of developing a conspiratorial rapport with Ismāʿīl Mīrzā (later Shah Ismāʿīl II), Ṭahmāsb's son and a fellow inmate at Qahqahah; that Sām, along with his sons and the surviving sons of Alqāṣ Mīrzā, was quietly put to death in 975/1567 by a group of men dispatched by the king; and that the court tried to conceal the reality of this event by spreading a story about an earthquake.

The discrepancy between the reports in the *Takmilat al-akhbār* and the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* is remarkable on its own. It is not difficult to believe, given ʿAbdī Beg's position in Qazvīn, that he would place the "official narrative" of Sām Mīrzā's passing in his chronicle. Nor is it implausible that Qāżī Aḥmad, who wrote his history after Ṭahmāsb was dead and without a specific commission, might have been able to afford an unusual degree of candor in reference to these events. Beyond what we find in the accounts of ʿAbdī Beg and Qāżī Aḥmad, there is a brief passage in the *Javāhir al-akhbār* (984/1576) of Būdāq Munshī Qazvīnī that describes the punishment of Sām Mīrzā's killer, a certain Muḥammad Beg Qūyunchī-ughlī, in the wake of Ṭahmāsb's death. (The same name is mentioned in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*.) And it can be argued that the earthquake story given in the *Takmilat al-akhbār* is

questionable on its own terms. How, for example, would we account for the fact that Ismāʿīl Mīrzā was also at Qahqahah but was left unscathed? It seems more reasonable that Shah Ṭahmāsb ordered the killing of several princes at the fortress, with the exception of his own son.

The questions surrounding the mass execution are, in themselves, relatively straightforward. More difficult is the problem of connecting the sparse and inconsistent reports relating to this event, to the sources' treatment of Sām Mīrzā *in general*. Can we hypothesize that the authors of several Safavid chronicles limited their discussion of the prince after the 1530s due to the political sensitivity of the entire subject? Is it possible that the same dynamic that drove ʿAbdī Beg to insert a (probably) false explanation for Sām's death, was also at play in Ḥasan Rūmlū's decision not to mention events such as the 956/1549 appointment to Ardabīl or the 969/1562 imprisonment? To me it seems plausible, but it is difficult to tell how far this argument could be pursued, given the paucity of evidence.

It should be noted that the problem of the discussion of Sām Mīrzā (or lack thereof) in the chronicle tradition extends beyond the first half of the Safavid period. Some evidence of the dynastic purge of 975/1567 survived, at least in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* and the brief mention of Muḥammad Beg Qūyunchī-ughlī in the *Javāhir al-akhbār*. But I have yet to find anything about this consequential event in later Safavid sources. It may be important that Iskandar Beg avoids the topic in his *ʿĀlam-ārā-yi ʿAbbāsī*, which went on to be considered the definitive account of the history of the dynasty up to the death of Shah ʿAbbās in 1038/1629. In a sense, then, the apparent effort of Ṭahmāsb's court to limit the coverage of Sām Mīrzā's biography in the "official record" really did succeed. But this takes us well into the realm of speculation.

The dilemma of encountering silence where we would legitimately expect to find commentary, and even direct contradictions in cases where the authors do provide accounts, is unique to the Safavid narrative histories. For other categories of sources, there should be less of an expectation that Sām Mīrzā will be mentioned in the first place, and accordingly, little need to consider possible explanations if his name tends not to occur. And this is what we have seen. The available Ottoman and Uzbek histories contain, as far as I have found, no discussion of Sām Mīrzā in relation to events after the mid 1530s. On the Mughal side, there are a couple of bits of information in the *Akbarnāmah*—mention of Sām Mīrzā's participation in the welcoming of Humāyūn to the Safavid court in 951/1544, and an anecdote about the death in 1007/1599 of a certain Mīr ʿĀrif Ardabīlī, who was allegedly Sām's son. But these are slim pickings.

Again, while it may be disappointing to find so little about our prince in sources from outside the Safavid context, it is not particularly surprising or difficult to explain. The latest event in Sām Mīrzā's life for which we can say that there is relatively broad coverage is the reception of Humāyūn. It is probably not a coincidence that this same event was the last occasion of international relevance in which Sām is known to have taken part. Why would an Ottoman or Mughal chronicler pay attention to his later activities, or even be aware of them? My sense is that the multiple execution in 975/1567 might have been shocking enough to merit mention in a non-Safavid-focused history, *if* word had spread widely. As we have seen, however, Shah Ṭahmāsb and his inner circle seem to have taken pains to limit public knowledge, let alone discussion, of the killing. Sām Mīrzā was evidently a noteworthy figure for the Ottomans and Uzbeks only through the 1530s, and for the Mughals up to the point of

Humāyūn's period of refuge. It would be helpful if more could be found. Perhaps further commentary on Sām in texts from the broader region will come to light at some point.

In regard to the other categories of sources treated in the first chapter—*taẕkirah*s and travel narratives—our expectations should not be much higher. The problem with biographical anthologies is that, even when a notice on a given individual is provided, the likelihood that it will include detailed information is quite low. What we tend to find, instead, are brief sketches of biographical anecdata and laudatory remarks, followed by selected lines of poetry. In this context, one might hope to find a number of entries devoted to Sām Mīrzā in *taẕkirah*s written during his lifetime or in the decades following his death, and perhaps to gain general insight into his legacy. Again, this is roughly what we have seen. It is a bit surprising that Sām is absent in certain anthologies from the relevant period, in which it would have been reasonable (and helpful to us) for him to be included. The clearest example here is the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār va zubdat al-afkār* of Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī, a massive *taẕkirah* authored between *ca*. 975/1567–8 and 1016/1607. Kāshānī was working on his anthology at precisely the right time for our purposes. The scope of the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār* is comprehensive, with sections devoted to both older and more recent poets, and the notices are often quite long. This would have been an ideal context in which to find discussion of Sām Mīrzā from a more literary-historical perspective—but he is absent. It may be that Kāshānī opted to avoid commenting on some political figures; in any case, the omission is unfortunate.

Another important *taẕkirah* covering this period in which Sām Mīrzā is not given an entry is the *Khayr al-bayān* of Malik Shāh Ḥusayn Sīstānī, written between 1017/1608–9 and 1036/1627. Apart from these texts that yielded no results, the anthologies of the period that *do* include the prince exhibit the

aforementioned problems of brevity and vagueness. The *Majmaʿ al-khavāṣṣ* of Ṣādiqī Beg Afshār, a Turkic *taẕkirah* usually dated to 1016/1607, has a cursory notice on Sām Mīrzā, which notes only that he was once governor of Khurāsān, and that he was then granted the custodianship of the shrine in Ardabīl and engaged in literary pursuits. Ṣādiqī gives no indication of Sām's later imprisonment and execution. This is interesting, given that the preceding entry in the *Majmaʿ al-khavāṣṣ* is for Alqāṣ Mīrzā, and it features a frank description of his capture and killing. It is also worth keeping in mind that Ṣādiqī Beg was a longtime official at the Safavid court, serving Shah ʿAbbās for the first decade of his reign. This is another author who was in a position to know what befell Sām Mīrzā but apparently chose to avoid the subject—as we saw with chroniclers like Ḥasan Rūmlū and Iskandar Beg. (The question of purposeful discretion is usually less applicable with *taẕkirah*s, but Ṣādiqī Beg represents a special case.)

A slightly longer notice on Sām is found in the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn va ʿaraṣāt al-ʿārifīn* (1024/1615) of Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī. This anthology was written at greater remove from the rule of Ṭahmāsb, both temporally and geographically (the author having migrated to India). In Awḥadī's characterization of Sām Mīrzā, we can detect at least hints of the idea that the prince suffered injustice. He is described as having exceeded his brothers (including the king?) in artistic pursuits and intelligence. The biographical portion of the entry closes with a strange anecdote about Sām's request, when he was facing death, that a certain qur'anic verse be inscribed on his tombstone. This should probably be considered apocryphal, but, knowing what we know about the events of Sām Mīrzā's final years, it is difficult not to perceive significant undertones in Awḥadī's notice. At any rate, we find nothing more explicit in the discussion of the prince in these *taẕkirah*s from the initial generations after his passing.

A much later text, the *Riyāż al-shuʿarāʾ* (1161/1748) of ʿAlī Qulī Khān "Vālih" Dāghistānī, has an entry on Sām Mīrzā that is candid but clearly historically inaccurate. The author claims that Sām was imprisoned as part of the fallout of the rebellion of Alqāṣ Mīrzā (which ended in 956/1549), and that he was later among those put to death during the short reign of Ismāʿīl II (984–5/1576–7). As has been suggested in the first chapter, this conflated narrative is expedient, in that it allows Sām to be portrayed as a wronged party, without laying blame at the feet of Shah Ṭahmāsb. But it is not clear that such considerations would have made any difference to Vālih, writing nearly two centuries after the fact. The simpler explanation is that he was poorly informed or unconcerned with historical fact. Overall, we can say that the body of surviving *taẕkirah*s is of modest use, at best, for the study of Sām Mīrzā's biography. The number of notices that I found is disappointingly small, and in those few cases, the fact that comes across most clearly is related not to Sām's life, but rather to his literary work: it is plain that the *Tuḥfah* was well known and highly regarded among later anthologists. Ṣādiqī Beg, Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī, and Vālih Dāghistānī all speak to the work's influence.

Our very last group of sources exists for a single text: the account of Michele Membré, a Cypriot who was sent to the court of Shah Ṭahmāsb as an emissary of Venice in 946–7/1539–40. (His full voyage did not end until 948/1542, owing to a difficult passage back to Europe; the aforementioned dates refer to his stay in Iran.) Membré happened to visit the Safavids, and to embed himself closely with high-ranking Qizilbāsh officials at the imperial encampment, at a particular time in Sām Mīrzā's life that is not documented explicitly in any other source. This was just a few years after Sām returned to court in 943/1537, disgraced after multiple failures to defend Harāt and an unauthorized campaign on Qandahār, and tainted by association with certain figures in the Shāmlū. According to Qāżī Aḥmad

Qumī—who includes a general description of this period in his "obituary" for Sām Mīrzā—the prince was compelled for over a decade to remain within the royal encampment (*urdū-yi humāyūn*), under conditions resembling a kind of house arrest. Only in 956/1549 would Ṭahmāsb grant Sām an actual position and allow him to live independently.

Michele Membré gives a firsthand account of the situation at the Safavid court at this time. As we have seen, he strongly corroborates the idea that Sām Mīrzā was in a disfavored position around the turn of the 1540s. He even includes anecdotes about a (seemingly) mocking nickname that had been given to Sām by Shah Ṭahmāsb: "the Emperor of Constantinople." (This is, undoubtedly, a reference to the earlier scheming on the part of a few defectors to the Ottoman court to have Sām Mīrzā installed as a puppet ruler after a notional *coup d'état*.) In the end, Membré's brief comments about the prince paint a more emphatic picture of his subdual than one might imagine based on the descriptions in Safavid histories. To find such useful material in a Venetian travel narrative was a pleasant surprise, after the frustration of sifting through sources of other kinds. It may be worth noting that I reviewed the accounts of multiple foreigners who traveled through Safavid territory during Sām Mīrzā's life—including the English merchant Anthony Jenkinson, and the Ottoman admiral Sīdī ʿAlī Raʾīs—but did not find anything else of direct relevance.

Key points from Chapter 2

The second chapter, which is far shorter in its current incarnation than the first, is concerned mainly with collating all of the information about Sām Mīrzā that has been identified, and threading it into a single narrative of his life. At the end of this process, we are left with a number of insights into

the evolution of the Safavid polity across the early and mid tenth/sixteenth century. There is, most obviously, the matter of the killing of five princes (four of them children or adolescents) at Qahqahah in 975/1567. This event is not unknown to researchers focusing on early Safavid history, especially in Persian-language scholarship, but it has received modest attention to date. And no prior study has gone to comparable lengths to investigate the details of the execution and its aftermath. The broader context of what took place at Qahqahah is the apparent effort by Shah Ṭahmāsb's court in the years after the Treaty of Amasya to consolidate authority, to neutralize any perceived domestic threat, and to pursue an unusual set of policies under the banner of religious austerity. It remains to be appreciated in the scholarly literature on early Safavid history just how much forceful repression of members of the ruling family was involved in this process.

The Safavids in 975/1567 reached the point of executing young princes who had little to no involvement in political affairs. This was even before the purge that accompanied the accession of the Ottoman Murad III in 982/1574. Setting aside the interesting parallels in the challenges of dynastic politics faced by the two houses, it seems clear that the 975/1567 execution should be borne in mind when we consider the violence of the one-year reign of Shah Ismāʿīl II. He was *at Qahqahah* when Sām Mīrzā and the four others were put to death. In fact, if the details given by Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī are to be believed, it was fear of conspiracy between co-inmates Sām and Ismāʿīl that drove Ṭahmāsb to order the killing. We need not argue that Ismāʿīl was inspired by his father's actions to have a number of his male relatives eliminated. What is certain is that there was a very direct precedent.

Other insights result from analyzing earlier periods in Sām Mīrzā's biography. For example, there is the question of how he found himself in such a compromised position by the mid 1530s, having spent

his upbringing in Khurāsān with members of the Shāmlū tribe. Sām was unique among the four sons of Shah Ismāʿīl in being left for an extended span of time in the nominal governorship of the same far-flung province, with *lalah*s from a single extended family. The prince is even reported to have been married to one of the daughters of Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū (d. 941/1534) during these years. When Sām Mīrzā's position began to collapse, there were several problems simultaneously or in quick succession: the failure to defend Harāt against the Uzbeks; the alleged treachery of Ḥusayn Khān, leading to his execution; the plotting of defectors at the Ottoman court to have Sām installed as a replacement for Ṭahmāsb, which reached the point of theoretical approval by Sultan Süleyman (though it is doubtful that Sām was even aware of this at the time); and, finally, the rogue campaign on Qandahār instigated by Aghzīvār Khān Shāmlū.

One interpretation of this confluence of events is that Sām Mīrzā was a rebellious prince. This is more or less the perspective that we find in Martin Dickson's study of the period. (Of course, we also know that Shah Ṭahmāsb had grown suspicious of his brother; hence the decision to confine him to the royal encampment for the subsequent decade.) It is, however, worth contemplating what Sām Mīrzā's alternatives may have been, given that he was entangled in a certain sphere of influence from the age of four. This serves as a vivid case study of the dynamic involving Safavid princes and the Qizilbāsh factions that surrounded and manipulated them—which would continue to have a decisive impact until at least the rise of young Shah ʿAbbās in the 1580s.

Another aspect of the "Ṭahmāsb era" that comes into focus in this study is the transition from a style of rule that was relatively forgiving of missteps on the part of members of the dynasty—sometimes surprisingly so, as in the case of Alqāṣ Mīrzā—to a concern with possible threats that led

to nearly across-the-board imprisonment, and even to the garrotting of children. I have repeatedly emphasized a *darker perspective* on the second half of Ṭahmāsb's reign, and the importance of these years (962–84/1555–76) for any analysis of the disarray that ensued in the late 1570s and throughout the 1580s. The first part of Chapter 1 includes brief commentary, for example, on the fiscal difficulties that plagued the Safavids, which were exacerbated by Shah Ṭahmāsb's idiosyncratic decree, *ca*. 972/1565, that the *tamghā* taxes should no longer be collected. It was rarely (if ever) a simple matter for the Safavid administration to bring in sufficient revenue to meet obligations such as paying the army, but in this arena, as well, the later decades of Ṭahmāsb's rule seem to have been marked by acute problems. Studying the career of Sām Mīrzā, insofar as it demands an understanding of the vicissitudes of Safavid dynastic politics in the tenth/sixteenth century, provides an entry point to a frank assessment of the post-Amasya period. It is likely that further research focusing specifically on the challenges faced by the central court (and its attendant policies) in the 1560s and '70s would be able to develop this perspective more thoroughly.

Finally, there is the historiographical dilemma raised by the case of Sām Mīrzā. Does it, or does it not, have some deeper implication that details about this prince are so difficult to pin down in the Safavid chronicles? Can the issue be dismissed by pointing to the generally troublesome nature of the sources, and by presuming that the later developments in Sām Mīrzā's life simply were not a priority for court-aligned historians? We have at least sketched the beginnings of an argument to the contrary, highlighting two factors. First, the paucity of attestation for certain events, such as Sām's appointment to Ardabīl, and indeed his death, is eyebrow-raising even by the standards of Safavid historiography. Second, in addition to the apparent reticence of chroniclers in commenting on Sām Mīrzā's later

years, we have the *conflicting* accounts of what took place at Qahqahah (not to mention the reaction at court). The idea is that the combination of these two problems strengthens the impression of something more serious than the typical lacunae in the sources. Is this reasonable? In what way could such an argument be made persuasively? I hope to return to this part of the project in future work.

Shifting gears

We enter the second half of the dissertation with a solid understanding of the circumstances that gave birth to Sām Mīrzā's major surviving work, the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. During what seems to have been a peaceful interlude in his ill-starred life, Sām managed to author a biographical anthology of poets (*taẕkirah*) that would guarantee his legacy for generations to come. He completed the text around 957/1550, not long after moving to Ardabīl, where he served (if only in name) as local governor and custodian of the Safavid shrine. Given his elevated social position, he presumably had access to a fair amount of information about poets who were active at this time, throughout Iran and beyond. If the account of Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* is to be believed, Sām made his home in Ardabīl into a gathering-place for men of culture, and this would have helped him as he collected biographical anecdata and selections of verse for over seven hundred individuals. (Of course, as we have seen, the time frame of the *Tuḥfah* stretches back to the turn of the tenth/sixteenth century, and the impact of Sām Mīrzā's early years in Harāt is also clear.)

With this context in place—early Safavid history, the trajectory of Sām's career, and the immediate and material background of his written work—there could be any number of ways to move forward with a study of the *Tuḥfah* itself. What I have done for the purposes of this project is to try to approach

four different questions, across two chapters. The main topics are as follows: First, what do we need to know in order to begin to contextualize the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* from the perspective of Persian literary history? Second, if we consider this text as a whole and attempt to read it on its own terms, what are the resulting impressions? (The sections addressing these issues make up Chapter 3.) Third, what would constitute a set of "best practices" for making use of *taẕkirah* sources, such that their value as coherent works of literature is not cast aside? Fourth, and finally, if we construct a rough periodization of the Persian biographical anthology, from the origins of the genre in the sixth/twelfth and seventh/thirteenth centuries to the heights that it reached by the midpoint of the Safavid-Mughal period, where and how should the *Tuḥfah* be situated? (The sections that treat these broader questions make up Chapter 4.) It will be enough, at present, to review a few points from each of the four subchapters.

Key points from Chapter 3

The first part of Chapter 3 is meant simply to provide a kind of background for the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* that is lacking in the study of Sām Mīrzā's career—starting with a general introduction to Persian *taẕkirah*s. Much of this is elementary, but the issue of terminology, at least, remains worthy of careful discussion. What we tend to have in mind when we use the term *taẕkirah* is a biographical anthology of poets. (It is understood that "poets" should be taken in a broad sense. Many *taẕkirah*s, including the *Tuḥfah*, contain notices on individuals whose primary work and fame lay in other domains. As long as there is some verse attributed to them, however, it can be quoted in their entries. Poetry is used as a consistent device, allowing for a genre of biographical and anthological literature in which figures

from a variety of backgrounds are brought together.) This raises the question of how it came to be that *taẕkirah* was applied as a generic label.

As others have noted, the earliest works in Persian that are similar *in content* to what we call a *taẕkirah* of poets have no apparent connection to the term. The examples that we have highlighted are the *Chahār maqālah* (*ca*. 551/1156) of Niẓāmī ʿArūżī—the second chapter of which focuses on court poets—and the *Lubāb al-albāb* (*ca*. 618/1221) of Sadīd al-Dīn ʿAwfī. The latter text has generally been considered the first true Persian *taẕkirah*. But this would be news to ʿAwfī, whose reference point in classical Arabic literature was rather the *ṭabaqāt* genre. (To add further confusion to this story, we *do* have works in Arabic that include the word *tadhkirah* in their titles—perhaps most famously that of Ibn Ḥamdūn, d. 562/1167—but there it is used in a few different senses, none of which is a direct match for what would develop in Persian.) Almost simultaneously with the *Lubāb al-albāb*, the first well-known Persian text to bear the label *taẕkirah* was authored: the *Taẕkirat al-awliyā*ʾ of Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār (d. *ca*. 618/1221). But this, of course, is a work devoted to the hagiography of Sufi saints.

So we find the terminological situation in Persian literature in the early centuries to be effectively reversed. There is at least one text that clearly meets the definition of a biographical anthology of poets, but it is not called a *taẕkirah*; and there is at least one famous *taẕkirah*, but it does not concern poets. The decisive turn came in the late ninth/fifteenth century, when three prominent literary figures in Timurid Harāt authored anthologies that would prove hugely influential in the subsequent period. These are the *Bahāristān* (892/1487) of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (in which the seventh chapter addresses the lives of poets), the *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarā*ʾ (892/1487) of Dawlatshāh Samarqandī, and (in Turkic) the *Majālis al-nafāʾis* (896/1491) of ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī. It is worth emphasizing that the appearance

of the trio of Timurid works represents as much a reinvention as a continuation of a pre-existing genre. While the *Lubāb al-albāb* survived, it did not spur the authorship of many similar texts in the seventh/thirteenth and eighth/fourteenth centuries. We cannot even determine with confidence to what extent Jāmī, Dawlatshāh, and Navāʾī could have been familiar with ʿAwfī's work. In any event, the popularity of these new anthologies was immediate and profound. The title chosen by Dawlatshāh, *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ*—itself a clear reference to ʿAṭṭār—was soon adopted as the name of a thriving genre, in both Persian and Turkic. There seems to be a real disconnect in the terms and categories of anthological writing, between the earlier centuries and the post-Timurid era.

Apart from introductory comments on Persian *taẕkirah*s and their importance, this subchapter offers general information about the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*, touching on its composition process, organization, codicology, modern publication history, and more. One of the points to which special attention is paid is the dating of the work. How is it that we reach the conclusion that Sām Mīrzā completed the *Tuḥfah* in 957/1550 or within a short period thereafter? The text is not dated explicitly, as we find in some other *taẕkirah*s. Sām could have added a note to his introduction or conclusion, indicating that he finished writing at such-and-such time; but he has not done so. The next simplest approach for us to follow is to look for dates mentioned in the text, or specific events whose circumstances we know from other sources. Here, we see that there are two notices in the first chapter of the *Tuḥfah* (devoted to members of various ruling families), which both cite 957/1550 as the "current year." One of the notices is for the Ottoman Sultan Süleyman. The other is for the Mughal Humāyūn, and Sām includes details that tie his description to a certain historical juncture. He indicates that Humāyūn has retaken Kabul and is ruling from there—a situation that persisted until 962/1555, when the exiled king

managed to return to Delhi. I have suggested that, if Sām Mīrzā continued to work on his *taẕkirah* beyond the first half of the 1550s (as both Rukn al-Dīn Humāyūn Farrukh and Aḥmad Mudaqqiq Yazdī argue), he most likely would have updated the entry on the Mughal ruler, given the drastic change in his position.

In any case, 957/1550 is the latest year mentioned anywhere in the *Tuḥfah*. There is also a handful of notices in which individuals are described as having died in 956/1549. (One of these is the author's brother, Bahrām Mīrzā.) The affirmative textual evidence gives us no reason to suspect that the composition process extended much past 957/1550. We have also considered what Sām Mīrzā does *not* cover in this work. For example, there is a cursory entry on Muḥtasham Kāshānī (d. 996/1588) in the final chapter, but he is characterized as a young textile merchant (*bazzāz*) who has only recently gained attention for his poetry. And there is no mention in the *Tuḥfah* of Vaḥshī Bāfqī (d. 991/1583), another famous poet of the second half of the Ṭahmāsb era, who was a few years younger than Muḥtasham. Vaḥshī presumably had not developed a reputation by the time that Sām Mīrzā was writing. This type of "counterfactual evidence" is less persuasive, but it is worth asking what we might expect to find in a *taẕkirah* whose period of coverage extended into the later 1550s or beyond. There is no solid support for the idea.

A number of other issues are addressed in the background discussion of the *Tuḥfah*, including its distinctive chapter organization, based on a social class hierarchy in descending order. But we need not rehash every point in these concluding notes. The second section of Chapter 3 is where we truly delve into the content of Sām Mīrzā's work. This is the longest subchapter in the dissertation—in terms of the amount of prose, and even more dramatically if we take into account the accompanying

appendix, a spreadsheet that collects key information from every notice in the *taẕkirah*. The basic question, again, is what picture emerges if we make the effort to read a biographical anthology from start to finish, striving to let the text speak on its own terms.

As has been acknowledged several times above, this study is not meant to argue that *taẕkirah*s were commonly read in their entirety, or that such an approach should be standard among researchers today. It is, if anything, easier to imagine that the original audiences of Persian anthologies in the early modern period made use of these texts in ways that are similar to what we find in modern scholarship. One can assume that people often went to *taẕkirah*s with certain motivations, such as looking for the notice on a given poet, and that they felt comfortable skipping from section to section, reading bits and pieces. Still, even if the cover-to-cover approach seems likely to have been unusual in the past (as it is now), there is a great deal that we can learn about the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*—and, by extension, about other Persian anthologies of the period—by studying the text in an open-minded and comprehensive manner. Reading the *Tuḥfah* in its entirety and tabulating data from its seven hundred notices is, in effect, a more extreme version of a way of utilizing *taẕkirah*s that I *do* advocate. That is, we should be able to appreciate them as literary works in their own right.

And what do we find here? Again, this is the largest and probably the most complex discrete section in the dissertation. The topics that are covered range from statistical observations derived from the spreadsheet, to a more involved argument about the overall impression given by Sām Mīrzā and the manner in which he cultivates a rapport with the reader. For the moment, we can review just a couple of the key insights that have been gained. First, it is useful to be able to substantiate certain tendencies in the text of the *Tuḥfah*, having gone to the trouble of collating detailed information. We

can see, for example, that some reference to the geographic origins of poets is made in almost ninety percent of the notices. (This includes geographic *nisbah*s.) With regard to the typical length of entries in the *taẕkirah*, we noted that Sām Mīrzā has little to say about most of the individuals that he discusses, while there is a small number of exceptional cases in which the biographical sketches or quoted lines are significantly more extensive. This can be quantified, for example, by observing that the *median* length of notices is lower than the *mean* length—*i.e.*, that the "average" would be inflated by outliers. The *Tuḥfah* is far from the only Persian anthology for which it would be helpful to consider this pattern of a large number of shorter notices, against a smaller set of subjects that the author has evidently deemed worthy of special consideration.

Second, I have argued that our broader understanding of the history of Persian poetry in the late Timurid and early Safavid-Mughal periods can be enriched by studying aspects of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* that emerge only after sustained reading. One approach that proved fruitful was to look for mention of *javāb-gūʾī* (or *tatabbuʿ*) throughout the anthology. It was hardly surprising to find a number of passages in which poets are described as having composed responses to works by Jāmī. But there are other, less expected trends that come into focus. Sām Mīrzā shows that there was something of a vogue, in this era, to write *javāb*s to a *qaṣīdah* of Amīr Khusraw (d. 725/1325) known as the *Daryā-yi abrār*. He quotes four examples, one of which is by ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī. (In fact, Jāmī also has a response to the *Daryā-yi abrār*, known as *Lujjat al-asrār*; but it is not mentioned in the *Tuḥfah*.) It seems as though this work by Khusraw, while it was always well known, became a popular source for adaptation among poets around the turn of the tenth/sixteenth century—perhaps driven by the examples of Jāmī and Navāʾī. A more obscure case is a *qaṣīdah* by Kātibī Nīshāpūrī Turshīzī (d. *ca.* 839/1435–6), whose *radīf*

is *gul*. Sām Mīrzā refers to the poem on two separate occasions in a way that suggests that the reader should be familiar with it (*i.e.*, "the *'gul' qaṣīdah* of Kātibī").

We have also explored one case in which a poet is presented as a fairly important figure, although his name would be recognizable to few specialists today. Umīdī Tihrānī (d. 925/1519) is quoted several times in different sections of the *Tuḥfah*. Sām has furthermore taken care to include notices on other, less famous members of Umīdī's family, and to note the relation in these instances. From the information available, it appears that the significance of this poet for Sām Mīrzā is related to his work as a panegyrist to Safavid officials during the reign of Shah Ismāʿīl. It is, in any case, interesting to find discussion of a figure that suggests a high profile, while he is nearly unkown in modern scholarship on the period (let alone popular awareness). We have acknowledged that the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* presents one subjective perspective on Persian literary culture from the late ninth/fifteenth century to the mid tenth/sixteenth. What Sām Mīrzā tells us may be taken with a grain of salt—especially where it touches on a subject of obvious personal interest, *e.g.*, praise of the Safavid dynasty. At the same time, this is a valuable perspective. Sām was in a position to hold extensive knowledge of the poetry that was composed within the Safavid realm during his life. It would be difficult to think of some aspect of this period that we recognize as important, but which is missed entirely in the *Tuḥfah*. When a literary trend or development is suggested by Sām Mīrzā, it is worthy of consideration. Ideally, we could strengthen our analysis by juxtaposing the accounts of a variety of early modern anthologists, on the basis of detailed studies of individual texts. But that will be an arduous, longer-term project.

A third part of this subchapter that ought to be noted is the argument that, in a complete reading, the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* comes across as a work of *adab* literature. I freely admit that it may seem strange to

advance such an interpretation, and there are clear objections that could be made. For example, if it is unlikely—or, at best, debatable—that *taẕkirah*s tended to be read in a sustained manner, then how is it reasonable to focus on an aspect of the *Tuḥfah* that manifests itself most palpably with a broad perspective on the text? What precedent is there for reading Persian anthologies as *adab*? How is the term defined here? By way of defending this approach, I can only emphasize that it represents my best effort to explain the impression given by the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* if it is considered holistically. Furthermore, I have endeavored to clarify what I mean by *adab*, and to cite examples from Sām Mīrzā's text that demonstrate the relevant characteristics.

The basic idea is that the *Tuḥfah* is able to perform diverse functions simultaneously—to carry multivalences and ambiguities that would make it infeasible to articulate the nature of the work in a straightforward manner—and that this is facilitated through the rapport that Sām cultivates with the reader. We have highlighted three so-called "indicators of *adab*ness" that are found in this *taẕkirah*. First, the content offers a mixture of edification and entertainment, which, in certain passages, are tightly bound to each other. Is the purpose of the *Tuḥfah* primarily to collect and preserve information about noteworthy poets of the author's lifetime, or to offer engaging anecdotes? The answer is clearly both of these factors—perhaps in addition to others. As we have seen, there are sections of the *Tuḥfah*, in particular the first part of the fifth chapter, in which Sām Mīrzā comes closer to "playing it straight." He discusses poets who have some merit and reputation, fulfilling the goal that he has announced in his preface. There are other sections, in particular the seventh chapter, which seem to be motivated almost exclusively by curiosity and amusement. The focus shifts to poetasters from lower social classes, some of whom are openly mocked for their incompetence. Significantly, we also

encounter passages that exhibit both characteristics—documentation of the careers of important figures, in tandem with puns, humorous stories, and the like. We have analogized this property of the *Tuḥfah* to a paradigm in Arabic *adab* literature known as *al-jidd wa-al-hazl*, or "jest and earnest." The two facets are inseparable for good reason: their interplay strengthens the effect of the text.

A second aspect of this *taẕkirah* that calls to mind *adab* is Sām Mīrzā's frequent use of what I have termed "inside references." At numerous points in the work, there is an expectation placed on the reader to possess certain background knowledge in order to catch the different layers of meaning that are embedded. This can be as simple as recognizing a pun based on a qur'anic verse, or knowing the style of the *Shāhnāmah* well enough to see the absurdity in a bungled imitation thereof. Much of the humor in the *Tuḥfah* relies on this kind of shared understanding (as is the case with humor anywhere). One of the anecdotes that we have reviewed, for example, involves a joke that appears to liken the bellowing of a camel to the sound of Arabic poetry. Another memorable story hinges on a courtier's lewd repurposing of the traditional Arabic saying *al-nās ʿalá dīn mulūkihim* ("people follow the religion of their rulers").

Specific to the literary sphere, Sām Mīrzā's comments on instances of *javāb-gūʾī* or *tatabbuʿ* often make it clear that the reader should be familiar with the original material. Sometimes only the *javāb* is quoted—especially if the source poem is famous enough to have acquired a title of its own. We have also discussed passages whose meaning relies on knowledge of Iranian society in the early Safavid period. Examples here include the repeated mention of the Sayfī *sayyid*s of Qazvīn, and allusions to cultural differences between "Turks and Tajiks" in the sixth chapter. To the extent that the reader has the requisite background and education to appreciate the finer points of entries in the *Tuḥfah*, he or

she will be drawn into Sām Mīrzā's world. A rapport develops between author and reader, on the basis of a common cultural framework (one of the senses of the word *adab*).

Our third and final "indicator of *adab*ness" relates again to the ambiguities of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* and the difficulty of applying simple labels to the work. In particular, Sām Mīrzā shows that he does not feel compelled to restrict the topics that he discusses in order to keep the content of his *taẕkirah* closely aligned with a certain political, religious, or ethical agenda. This is not to say that Sām is devoid of convictions; overall, he comes across as a devout Shiʿi and a staunch supporter of his family's rule. At the same time, he has made the very deliberate decision to include notices on sworn enemies of the Safavids, such as ʿUbayd Allāh Khān (d. 946/1540) and Sultan Süleyman. And the *Tuḥfah* is stuffed with matter-of-fact descriptions of the behavior of men whom Sām describes as "libertine" (*lavand*). Jokes are made about their alcoholism, abuse of cannabis, prolific pederasty, and more.

The author does not exactly endorse these behaviors, but he does not condemn them, either. It is clear that Sām Mīrzā is at least capable of finding amusement in a depraved anecdote, for example, about the man who moved to Transoxiana so that he could more easily find boys to sleep with. (This seeming neutrality is interesting to consider, in light of what we find about Sām in the Safavid chronicles—most notably the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*—which emphasize his piety.) There are entries whose subjects are lauded for their virtuous conduct, including poets who composed works in praise of the Twelve Imams (*manqabat*). Again, it is not that Sām Mīrzā's confessional affiliation or political loyalties could be brought into question. He manages, rather, to effect an air of cultivated detachment, to express interest in the full range of social activities of men who enjoyed poetry.

While the third chapter of the dissertation is intended as a study of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* that is comprehensive and has a fair degree of depth, there are aspects of the text that we have touched on in general terms, without doing justice to them. Of course, the possibilities for analyzing this work are effectively boundless, but one additional approach ought to be noted here, since I decided to separate it from this project and have it published as an article (in a forthcoming edited volume).[2] The seventh chapter of the *Tuḥfah*, as we know, is devoted to amateur poets from humble class backgrounds. This is where Sām Mīrzā reaches the bottom rung of his literary microcosm of society, and it represents the single most unusual part of the anthology. I have not been able to find another Persian *taẕkirah* that sets aside space to discuss the poetry—in many cases, the *bad* poetry—of small-time merchants, laborers, mendicants, *etc*. Several of the notices from this section of the *Tuḥfah* have been described in the current study, since they fit nicely with the *adab* interpretation. But a more dedicated analysis will also be useful, and this is what I have moved to a stand-alone paper, which attempts a reading of the last section of the *taẕkirah* from a subaltern studies perspective.

It should also be emphasized that any future projects that I pursue with reference to Sām Mīrzā's work will benefit from the data collected in the "master spreadsheet"—some of which has not yet been utilized. On a final note for Chapter 3, we might ask to what extent the conclusions drawn in this study are applicable to other anthologies from the early modern period. This is a complicated question that could lead to various answers, but one particularly clear implication of our work on the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* is that we need to continue to think carefully about what *taẕkirah*s really are, why they were written, how they were read, and so forth. We know what to *call* a text like the *Tuḥfah*, but how

---

2. The paper, titled "Speaking for the Subaltern in an Early Safavid *Taẕkira*," is under review, for publication in a volume edited by Andrew J. Newman, to be published by Routledge.

productive is this designation? Do we understand *taẕkirah*s as well as might be imagined, given how comfortable we are making use of them as reference sources? The viability of "anthology as *adab*" as a framework beyond the case at hand remains to be seen, but it represents one attempt at addressing a legitimate problem.

Key points from Chapter 4

The goal of Chapter 4 is to collect some of the broader ideas about Persian anthologies that I have developed over the course of research for the dissertation. Here, again, the material is organized in two subchapters. The first of them concerns the responsible and effective utilization of *taẕkirah*s as sources for Persian literary history, and in particular, the factors of which we should be aware when citing a given text. It may not be reasonable or historically accurate to demand that a researcher take the time to read entire swaths of an anthology before culling certain bits of information from it; but there are easy steps that we can take to come closer to treating *taẕkirah*s as works of literature in their own right. With just a modest understanding of the overall structure of a text, its style, the degree of internal variation, the circumstances of its composition, the author's potential agendas, *etc.*, we can contextualize and more effectively interpret the passages that we need. This subchapter highlights five aspects of a *taẕkirah*, the consideration of which would represent a good starting point for using it as a source. They are as follows: basic details about the author's background; the context in which the text was written (including patronage, if applicable); the scope of the anthology and the manner in which it is organized; the average length of notices, and the typical balance between biographical sketches and poetry selections; and, finally, relationships of influence between one *taẕkirah* and other works in

the genre that preceded and followed it. (The relevance of this last point is that anthologists are often quite clear about the inspiration that they have taken from earlier authors.)

By this point, it would pose no difficulty for us to answer all of the above questions in the case of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. We know about Sām Mīrzā's position as a Safavid prince, and the level of access that he had to poets and intellectuals—incuding during his upbringing in Harāt, when he got to know prominent figures in what was effectively still the Timurid cultural sphere. We know that the *Tuḥfah* was authored around 957/1550, shortly after Sām was allowed to settle in Ardabīl, and that it was a project that he carried out for his own reasons, rather than at the request of someone else. We understand the scope of this *taẕkirah*—broad in many ways, including the seriousness of the poets included, but relatively narrow in terms of the period of coverage—and have discussed the social-class organizational framework at some length. We have seen that notices in the *Tuḥfah* tend to be quite short, which allows for a work of moderate size to cover more than seven hundred individuals. (The brevity of the entries also means that there is no clear bias in favor of biographical discussion or lines of poetry. In many cases, Sām Mīrā provides the minimum amount of each component.) As for the question of influence, it is treated in greater depth in the second half of Chapter 4 (summarized below), but a number of relevant points have already been noted. Sām is explicit in his preface that he wanted to produce a *taẕkirah* that could serve as a continuation of the work of Jāmī, Dawlatshāh, and Navā'ī. And the *Tuḥfah*, in turn, was a model and an important source of data for later anthologists like Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī and Vālih Dāghistānī.

With these elements of context in place, there would be additional insight to gain for almost any notice that we cite. Examples that have been discussed above include the entry on the poet Hilālī

Astarābādī (d. 936/1529), with whom Sām Mīrzā socialized in Harāt in the 1520s; and the brief (but complimentary) mention of Muḥtasham Kāshānī (d. 996/1588), whose placement in the seventh chapter offers a sense of how far he ultimately rose from humble origins. It would not require a great deal of time or effort to develop this type of general understanding for any *taẕkirah*. The *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* is, of course, our prime example, but a number of others are noted. When we turn to anthologies from later in the Safavid-Mughal period, there are new factors that become important, such as authors' positions vis-à-vis stylistic trends in the *ghazal* form. The idea is that the key points relating to a text, whatever they may be, are given consideration.

Finally, in the second part of the fourth chapter, we address the development of the *taẕkirah* genre and situate the *Tuḥfah* in that process. It would be far too ambitious to attempt a thorough account of how the Persian literary anthology grew from its origins in the sixth/twelfth and seventh/thirteenth centuries to the heights of sophistication and popularity that it reached in the early modern era. But we can at least begin to sketch a periodization. What we cover in this subchapter is the rough story up to the early eleventh/seventeenth century. (The endpoint that I determined is around the close of the reign of Shah ʿAbbās in Iran, and of Jahāngīr in India. This is a largely a matter of convenience, but it does seem to be the case that there was something of a lull in the production of Persian *taẕkirah*s in the middle decades of that century, which serves as a juncture at which to stop.) To consider this long of a historical period, however cursorily, is daunting; but it bears repeating that the evolution of the *taẕkirah* did not take place continually over the early centuries. It was only with the appearance of the late Timurid anthologies that the genre took on a life of its own, with new works written frequently and often with reference to one another. We can treat the first few *taẕkirah*s or *taẕkirah*-like texts—*i.e.*,

the *Chahār maqālah* (*ca*. 551/1156), the *Manāqib al-shuʿarāʾ* of Abū Ṭāhir Khātūnī (early sixth/twelfth century; not extant), and the *Lubāb al-albāb* (*ca*. 618/1221)—effectively as a separate matter.

Our true period of concern, then, is approximately a century and a half, between the 1480s and the 1620s. This stretch of time saw most of the key developments that would ever take place for the Persian literary anthology. By the opening decades of the eleventh/seventeenth century, not only had a significant number of *taẕkirah*s been authored, but there were works focusing on different niches; there was clearly a sense of separation between discussing great poets of past eras and documenting the careers of more recent figures; there were at least the beginnings of identifying certain "schools" of lyric style and expressing preferences among them; and a couple of these anthologists were working at a monumental scale that would occasionally be matched, but not exceeded, in later generations.

Among the so-called "special-interest *taẕkirah*s," we have cited texts such as the *Javāhir al-ʿajāʾib* and the *Rawżat al-salāṭīn*, both by Fakhrī Haravī (d. after 974/1566–7), and the *Maykhānah* (1028/1619) of Fakhr al-Zamānī Qazvīnī. The question of addressing recent and contemporary poets, rather than rehashing material covered in earlier anthologies, is, of course, central to the design of the *Tuḥfah*. Sām Mīrzā was not the only *taẕkirah* author to take this approach, but he was arguably the first. On the issue of stylistic judgments, I have suggested that a shift can be discerned in works written in India during the reign of Jahāngīr, including the aforementioned *Maykhānah* and the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn* (1024/1615) of Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī, with their use of terms like *ṭarz-i vuqūʿ* ("incidentalism") and *tāzah-gūʾī* ("fresh speech"). The *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn* can also be counted, along with the *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār* (1016/1607–8) of Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī, in the class of "monumental *taẕkirah*s," any one of which will occupy several volumes in a modern printed edition.

There can be no disputing that the genre continued to evolve through the early modern era, but the fundamentals were established by Jāmī, Dawlatshāh, and Navāʾī, and in the wave of growth and experimentation that they inspired. In our periodization, Sām Mīrzā is cast as one of the first authors who, having absorbed the models provided by the Timurid *taẕkirah*s, endeavored to break new ground. He recognized that he could add value by gathering information about the great poets of his lifetime. He took the idea of organization by social class, which had seen limited use in earlier works (notably the *Majālis al-nafāʾis*), and developed it into a complete framework of his own. And he made a highly original decision to include notices on people from humble backgrounds—if perhaps in a derogatory manner. Both chronologically and in terms of its content, the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* stands at the midpoint between, *e.g.*, the *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ* and the *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn*. To illuminate this period of development is the main point of the second section of Chapter 4. One topic that has not been addressed at length, and deserves further attention, is the shared history of the *taẕkirah* in Persian and Turkic. The reality is that it was the same group of texts, produced in the same milieu of Harāt in the late ninth/fifteenth century, that spurred the genre in both languages. Navāʾī's influence in Persian was extensive, as was Dawlatshāh's in Turkic. This is a perspective that I hope to incorporate more fully in upcoming projects.

Final thoughts

I have characterized this dissertation as a collection of essays on related themes, all of which are connected to the life or work of Sām Mīrzā. There is no single, overarching argument. Rather, a few stories are told—of the Ṭahmāsb era and Sām's turbulent career, of problems in the Safavid chronicle

tradition, of the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* and the development of the Persian *taẕkirah*—and new insights are elucidated where possible. We can find ways of bringing all of these threads together. For example, we have discussed the extent to which Sām Mīrzā spent his life as a pawn in a volatile system that he could not control, whereas he authored an anthology that takes the form of a microcosm of society, according to his design and priorities. This is literary world-building in contrast to, and perhaps as an escape from, the vagaries of political conflict. The *Tuḥfah* may also be viewed as emblematic of a moment in Persianate culture when it was clear that the dominance of certain traditional models (*e.g.*, circles of court panegyrists) was receding, but the path forward had yet to come into focus. This sense of a world in flux is just as applicable to Safavid and regional history in the tenth/sixteenth century as it is to literature. Sām Mīrzā was caught in the middle in multiple senses. Ultimately, there is no avoiding the fact that different sections of the dissertation engage with different questions. My hope is that some of the material, at least, will prove useful.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Manuscripts

Fażlī Beg Khūzānī Iṣfahānī. *Afżal al-tavārīkh*. Vol. 2. British Library, MS Or. 4678, dated 1049/1639. See Rieu, *Supplement*, no. 56, pp. 37–8.

Malik Shāh Ḥusayn Sīstānī. *Khayr al-bayān*. British Library, MS Or. 3397, dated 1041/1631. See Rieu, *Supplement*, no. 108, pp. 76–8.

Muḥammad Yūsuf Munshī. *Tażkirah-i Muqīm Khānī*. Kitāb-khānah-i Majlis-i Sinā, MS 1651, dated 1236/1821.

Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī. *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*. Tehran, Kitāb-khānah-i Majlis-i Shūrā, MS 336, dated 1050/1640.

Sām Mīrzā Ṣafavī. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. British Library, MS Add. 24,362, dated 969/1561–2. See Rieu, *Catalogue*, vol. 1, p. 368.

———. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. British Library, MS Or. 3490, dated 976/1569. See Rieu, *Supplement*, no. 103, p. 71.

———. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. University of Manchester, John Rylands Library, Persian MS 317, dated 977/1570.

Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī. *Khulāṣat al-ash'ār va zubdat al-afkār*. India Office Library, MS 3112, dated 993/1585.

Published texts

'Abdī Beg Shīrāzī. *Takmilat al-akhbār*. Edited by 'Abd al-Ḥusayn Navā'ī. Tehran: Nashr-i Nay, 1369 SH / 1990 CE.

Abū al-Fażl 'Allāmī. *The Akbarnāma of Abu-l-Fażl*. 3 vols. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Calcutta: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1902–39.

Afūshtah'ī Naṭanzī, Maḥmūd ibn Hidāyat Allāh. *Naqāvat al-āśār fī żikr al-akhyār*. Edited by Iḥsān Ishrāqī. Tehran: Bungāh-i Tarjumah va Nashr-i Kitāb, 1350 SH / 1971 CE.

Amīn ibn Aḥmad Rāzī. *Haft iqlīm*. 3 vols. Edited by Javād Fāżil. Tehran: ʿAlī Akbar-i ʿIlmī, 1340 SH / 1961 CE.

Amīnī Haravī, Ṣadr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm. *Futūḥāt-i shāhī*. Edited by Muḥammad Riżā Naṣīrī. Tehran: Anjuman-i Āṡār va Mafākhir-i Farhangī, 2004.

Amīr Maḥmūd ibn Khwāndamīr. *Īrān dar rūzgār-i Shāh Ismāʿīl va Shāh Tahmāsb-i Ṣafavī*. Edited by Ghulām Riżā Ṭabāṭabāʾī. Tehran: Bunyād-i Mawqūfāt-i Duktur Maḥmūd Afshār Yazdī, 1370 SH / 1991 CE.

———. *Tārīkh-i Shāh Ismāʿīl va Shāh Ṭahmāsb-i Ṣafavī: ẕayl-i Tārīkh-i Ḥabīb al-siyar*. Tehran: Nashr-i Gustarah, 1370 SH / 1991 CE.

ʿAṭṭār, Farīd al-Dīn. *Taẕkirat al-awliyāʾ*. Translated by Paul E. Losensky as *Memorial of God's Friends*. New York: Paulist, 2009.

ʿAwfī, Sadīd al-Dīn Muḥammad. *Matn-i kāmil-i Lubāb al-albāb*. Edited by Saʿīd Nafīsī. Tehran: Kitāb-khānah-i Ibn Sīnā, 1335 SH / 1957 CE.

Būdāq Munshī Qazvīnī. *Javāhir al-akhbār: bakhsh-i tārīkh-i Īrān az Qarāqūyūnlū tā sāl-i 984 H.Q.* Edited by Muḥsin Bahrām-nizhād. Tehran: Āyinah-i Mīrāṡ, 2000.

Chaghatai, M. A., ed. *A Treatise on the Art of Calligraphy* (*Rihan-i-Nastaʿliq*). Lahore, 1941.

Dawlatshāh Samarqandī. *Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ*. Edited by Fāṭimah ʿAlāqah. Tehran: Pizhūhishgāh-i ʿUlūm-i Insānī va Muṭālaʿāt-i Farhangī, 2007.

Devereux, Robert. "Judgment of Two Languages: *Muḥākamat al-lughatain* by Mīr ʿAlī Shīr Nawāʾī." Pts. 1 and 2. *The Muslim World* 54, no. 4 (October 1964): 270–87; 55, no. 1 (January 1965): 28–45.

Edirneli Sehî. *Âsar-ı eslâfdan Tezkire-yi Sehî*. Edited by Mehmet Şükrü. Istanbul: Matbaa-ı Âmidî, 1325 AH / 1907–8 CE.

Fakhrī Haravī, Sulṭān Muḥammad. *Taẕkirah-i Rawżat al-salāṭīn, va Javāhir al-ʿajāʾib, maʿa dīvān-i Fakhrī Haravī*. Edited by Sayyid Ḥusām al-Dīn Rāshidī. Hyderabad: Sindhī Adabī Būrd, 1968.

Fażlī Beg Khūzānī Iṣfahānī. *A Chronicle of the Reign of Shah ʿAbbas*. 2 vols. Edited by Kioumars Ghereghlou and Charles Melville. Cambridge: Gibb Memorial Trust, 2015. [This represents vol. 3 of the *Afżal al-tavārīkh*.]

Gelibolulu Mustafa Âli. *Künhü'l-ahbar*. 2 vols. Edited by Ahmet Uğur, Mustafa Çuhadar, Ahmet Gül, and İbrahim Hakkı Çuhadar. Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi, 1997.

Ghaffārī, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad. *Tārīkh-i jahān-ārā*. Edited by Ḥasan Narāqī. Tehran: Kitāb-furūshī-i Ḥāfiẓ, 1343 SH / 1964 CE.

Hakluyt, Richard. *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques, and Discoveries of the English Nation*. 3 vols. London, 1598–1600.

Ḥasan Rūmlū. *A chronicle of the early Ṣafawīs, being the Aḥsanu't-tawārīkh of Ḥasan-i-Rūmlū*. 2 vols. Edited and translated by C. N. Seddon. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1931–34.

———. *Aḥsan al-tavārīkh*. Edited by ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn Navāʾī. Tehran: Bungāh-i Tarjumah va Nashr-i Kitāb, 1349 SH / 1970 CE.

Ḥayātī Tabrīzī, Qāsim Beg. *A Chronicle of the Early Safavids and the Reign of Shah Ismāʿīl* (*907–930/1501–1524*). Edited by Kioumars Ghereghlou. New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society, 2018.

Horn, Paul. "Die Denkwürdigkeiten des Šâh Ṭahmâsp I. von Persien." Pts. 1 and 2. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 44, no. 4 (1890): 563–649; 45, no. 2 (1891): 245–91.

Ibn Ghalbūn, Ṭāhir ibn ʿAbd al-Munʿim. *Kitāb al-Tadhkirah fī al-qirāʾāt*. 2 vols. Edited by ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Buḥayrī Ibrāhīm. Cairo: al-Zahrāʾ lil-Iʿlām al-ʿArabī, 1990.

Ibn Kathīr, Ismāʿīl ibn ʿUmar. *al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah*. 15 vols. in 8. Beirut: Maktabat al-Maʿārif, 1990.

Iskandar Beg Turkmān Munshī. *The History of Shah ʿAbbas the Great*. 3 vols. in 2. Edited and translated by Roger M. Savory. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1978–86.

———. *Tārīkh-i ʿĀlam-ārā-yi ʿAbbāsī*. 2 vols. Edited by Īraj Afshār. Tehran: Amīr Kabīr, 1350 SH / 1971 CE.

Jalāl al-Dīn Munajjim. *Tārīkh-i ʿAbbāsī, yā, rūz-nāmah-i Mullā Jalāl*. Edited by Sayf Allāh Vaḥīdniyā. Tehran: Vaḥīd, 1366 SH / 1987 CE.

Jāmī, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān. *Bahāristān va rasāʾil-i Jāmī*. Edited by Aʿlá Khān Afṣaḥzād, Muḥammad Jān ʿUmar'uf, and Abū Bakr Ẓuhūr al-Dīn. Tehran: Mīrāṡ-i Maktūb, 2000.

———. *Kullīyāt*. Cawnpore: Maṭbaʿ-i Nāmī Munshī, 1890.

Junābadī, Mīrzā Beg. *Rawżat al-Ṣafavīyah*. Edited by Ghulām Riżā Ṭabāṭabāʾī Majd. Tehran: Bunyād-i Mawqūfāt-i Duktur Maḥmūd Afshār Yazdī, 1378 SH / 1999 CE.

Kastamonulu Latîfî. *Tezkiretü'ş-şu'arâ ve tabsıratü'n-nuzamâ*. Edited by Rıdvan Canım. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı, 2000.

Kātibī Nīshāpūrī. *Dīvān-i Kātibī Nīshābūrī Turshīzī: ghazalīyāt*. Edited by Taqī Vaḥīdiyān Kāmyār, Saʿīd Khū-Muḥammadī Khayrābādī, and Mujtabá Javādī-niyā. Mashhad: Āstān-i Quds-i Rażavī, 1382 SH / 2003–4 CE.

Kāzarūnī, Abū al-Qāsim ibn Abī Ḥāmid. *Sullam al-samāvāt*. Edited by ʿAbd Allāh Nūrānī. Tehran: Mīrāṡ-i Maktūb, 1386 SH / 2008 CE.

Khwāndamīr, Ghiyāṡ al-Dīn. *Tārīkh-i Ḥabīb al-siyar fī akhbār afrād al-bashar*. 4 vols. Edited by Muḥammad Dabīr Siyāqī, with an introduction by Jalāl al-Dīn Humāʾī. Tehran: Kitāb-furūshī-i Khayyām, 1362 SH / 1983 CE.

Lütfi Paşa. *Tevarih-i Âl-i Osman*. Istanbul: Matbaa-yi Âmire, 1341 AH / 1922–3 CE.

Malik Shāh Ḥusayn Sīstānī. *Iḥyāʾ al-mulūk: shāmil-i tārīkh-i Sīstān az advār-i bāstānī tā sāl-i 1028 H.Q.* Edited by Manūchihr Sutūdah. Tehran: Bungāh-i Tarjumah va Nashr-i Kitāb, 1966.

Membré, Michele. *Mission to the Lord Sophy of Persia* (*1539–1542*). Translated by A. H. Morton. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 1993.

Naṣrābādī, Muḥammad Ṭāhir. *Taẕkirah-i Naṣrābādī*. Edited by Aḥmad Mudaqqiq Yazdī. Yazd: Dānishgāh-i Yazd, 1378 SH / 1999–2000 CE.

Navāʾī, ʿAlī Shīr. *Mecâlisü'n-nefâyis*. 2 vols. Edited by Kemal Eraslan. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, 2001.

Navāʾī, ʿAlī Shīr, Fakhrī Haravī, and Ḥakīm Shāh Muḥammad Qazvīnī. *Taẕkirah-i Majālis al-nafāʾis*. Edited by ʿAlī Aṣghar Ḥikmat. Tehran: Kitāb-furūshī-i Manūchihrī, 1363 SH / 1984 CE.

Niẓāmī ʿArūżī. *Chahár maqála* (*"Four Discourses"*). Rev. ed. Translated by E. G. Browne. London: Luzac & Co., 1921.

———. *Chahār maqālah*. Edited by Muḥammad Muʿīn. Tehran: Dānishgāh-i Tihrān, 1955.

Nūr Allāh Shūshtarī. *Kitāb-i mustaṭāb-i Majālis al-muʾminīn*. 2 vols. Edited by Sayyid Aḥmad ʿAbd Manāfī. Tehran: Kitāb-furūshī-i Islāmīyah, 1377 SH / 1998–9 CE.

———. *Majālis al-muʾminīn*. Edited by Ḥājj Mullā Amīn Ṭihrānī. Tehran, 1299 AH / 1881 CE.

Peçevi, İbrahim. *Tarih-i Peçevi*. 2 vols. Istanbul, 1283 AH / 1866 CE.

Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī. *Gulistān-i hunar*. Edited by Aḥmad Suhaylī Khwānsārī. Tehran: Bunyād-i Farhang-i Īrān, 1352 SH / 1973 CE.

———. *Gulistān-i hunar*. Translated by Vladimir Minorsky as *Calligraphers and Painters*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1959.

———. *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*. 2 vols. Edited by Iḥsān Ishrāqī. Tehran: Dānishgāh-i Tihrān, 1980–.

Qazvīnī, ʿAbd al-Nabī Fakhr al-Zamānī. *Taẕkirah-i Maykhānah*. Edited by Aḥmad Gulchīn-i Maʿānī. Tehran: Ḥājj Muḥammad Ḥusayn Iqbāl va Shurakāʾ, 1340 SH / 1961 CE.

Rāqim Samarqandī, Mīr Sayyid Sharīf. *Tārīkh-i Rāqim*. Edited by Manūchihr Sutūdah. Tehran: Bunyād-i Mawqūfāt-i Duktur Maḥmūd Afshār Yazdī, 1380 SH / 2001 CE.

Rižā Qulī Khān Hidāyat. *Majmaʿ al-fuṣaḥāʾ*. 2 vols. in 6. Edited by Maẓāhir Muṣaffā. Tehran: Amīr Kabīr, 1957–61.

Ṣādiqī Beg Afshār. *Taẕkirah-i Majmaʿ al-khavāṣṣ*. Edited and translated by ʿAbd al-Rasūl Khayyāmpūr. Tabrīz: Akhtar-i Shamāl, 1327 SH / 1948 CE.

Sām Mīrzā Ṣafavī. *Kitāb-i Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (*ṣaḥīfah-i panjum*). Edited by Mawlavī Iqbāl Ḥusayn. Patna: printed at Shanti Press, Allahabad for Patna University, 1934.

———. *Taẕkirah-i Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. Edited by Aḥmad Mudaqqiq Yazdī. Yazd: Sāmī, 2009.

———. *Taẕkirah-i Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. Edited by Rukn al-Dīn Humāyūn Farrukh. Tehran: ʿIlmī, n.d.

———. *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī*. Edited by Vaḥīd Dastgirdī. Tehran: Armaghān, 1314 SH / 1936 CE.

Sayfī Qazvīnī, Yaḥyá ibn ʿAbd al-Laṭīf. *Lubb al-tavārīkh*. Edited by Mīr Hāshim Muḥaddiṡ. Tehran: Anjuman-i Āṡār va Mafākhir-i Farhangī, 2007.

Sharaf Khān Bidlīsī. *Chèref-nâmeh, ou, Fastes de la nation kourde*. 2 vols. in 4. Translated by François Bernard Charmoy. Saint Petersburg: Commissionnaires de l'Académie impériale des sciences, 1868–75.

———. *Sharafnāmah, tārīkh-i mufaṣṣal-i Kurdistān*. Edited by Muḥammad ʿAbbāsī. Tehran: ʿAlī Akbar-i ʿIlmī, 1964.

Sīdī ʿAlī Raʾīs. *Mirʾāt al-mamālik*. Translated by Ármin Vámbéry as *The Travels and Adventures of the Turkish Admiral Sidi Ali Reïs*. London: Luzac & Co., 1899.

Siyāqī Niẓām. *Futūḥāt-i humāyūn*. Facsimile of a manuscript copy, with commentary by ʿAbbās Zaryāb Khuʾī. *Bar-rasī-hā-yi tārīkhī* 8, nos. 1–2 (1973): 207–77.

———. *Futūḥāt-i humāyūn*. Edited by Ḥasan Zandīyah. Qum: Pizhūhishgāh-i Ḥawzah va Dānishgāh, 2014.

Ṭahmāsb I, Shah of Iran. *Taẕkirah-i Shāh Ṭahmāsb*. Qum: Maṭbūʿāt-i Dīnī, 1383 SH / 2004 CE.

Tārīkh-i alfī: tārīkh-i hazār-sālah-i Islām. 8 vols. Edited by Aḥmad Tattavī, Āṣaf Khān Qazvīnī, and Ghulām Riżā Ṭabāṭabāʾī Majd. Tehran: Shirkat-i Intishārāt-i ʿIlmī va Farhangī, 1382 SH / 2003–4 CE.

Tārīkh-i Qizilbāshān. Edited by Mīr Hāshim Muḥaddiṡ. Tehran: Bihnām, 1361 SH / 1982 CE.

Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī Balyānī. *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn va ʿaraṣāt al-ʿārifīn*. 8 vols. Edited by Ẕabīḥ Allāh Ṣāḥibkārī and Āminah Fakhr Aḥmad. Tehran: Mīrāṡ-i Maktūb, 2010.

———. *Taẕkirah-i ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn va ʿaraṣāt al-ʿārifīn*. 7 vols. Edited by Muḥsin Nājī Naṣrābādī. Tehran: Asāṭīr, 1388 SH / 2009 CE.

Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī. *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār va zubdat al-afkār*. 8 vols. Edited by ʿAbd al-ʿAlī Adīb Barūmand, Muḥammad Ḥusayn Naṣīrī Kahnamūʾī, ʿAlī Ashraf Ṣādiqī, Ruqayyah Bāyrām Ḥaqīqī, Nafīsah Īrānī, Sayyid ʿAlī Mīr Afżalī, Muḥammad Dabīr Siyāqī, and Mahdī Malik Muḥammadī. Tehran: Mīrāṡ-i Maktūb, 2005–17.

Vālih Dāghistānī, ʿAlī Qulī Khān. *Taẕkirah-i Riyāż al-shuʿarāʾ*. 5 vols. Edited by Muḥsin Nājī Naṣrābādī. Tehran: Asāṭīr, 1384 SH / 2005–6 CE.

Yamanī, Niẓām al-Dīn. *Laṭāʾif-i Ashrafī fī bayān ṭavāʾif-i ṣūfī*. Delhi: Nuṣrat al-Maṭābiʿ, 1298 AH / 1880–81 CE.

Secondary sources

Books and theses

Abisaab, Rula Jurdi. *Converting Persia: Religion and Power in the Safavid Empire*. London: I.B.Tauris, 2004.

Abrahams, Simin. "A Historiographical Study and Annotated Translation of Volume 2 of the *Afżal al-Tavārīkh* by Fażlī Khūzānī al-Iṣfahānī." PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 1999.

Adle, Chahryar. "*Fotuhât-e Homâyun*, 'Les Victoires augustes,' 1007/1598, relation des évènements de la Perse et du Turkestan à l'extrême fin du XVIe s." PhD diss., Sorbonne, 1976.

Alshaar, Nuha, ed. *The Qur'an and Adab*. Oxford University Press, 2017.

Arjomand, Saïd Amir. *The Shadow of God and the Hidden Imam: Religion, Political Order, and Societal Change in Shi'ite Iran from the Beginning to 1890*. University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Babayan, Kathryn. *Mystics, Monarchs, and Messiahs: Cultural Landscapes of Early Modern Iran*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Bosworth, C. E. *The History of the Saffarids of Sistan and the Maliks of Nimruz*. Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda, 1994.

———. *The New Islamic Dynasties*. Edinburgh Universiy Press, 1996.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Browne, E. G. *A Literary History of Persia*, vol. 3, *The Tartar Dominion* (*1265–1502*). Cambridge University Press, 1920. Page references are to the 1928 reprint.

———. *A Literary History of Persia*, vol. 4, *Modern Times* (*1500–1924*). Cambridge University Press, 1924. Page references are to the 1969 reprint.

Csirkés, Ferenc P. "'Chaghatay Oration, Ottoman Eloquence, Qizilbash Rhetoric': Turkic Literature in Ṣafavid Persia." PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2016.

Dickson, Martin B. "Sháh Ṭahmásb and the Úzbeks: The Duel for Khurásán with 'Ubayd Khán, 930–946/1524–1540." PhD diss., Princeton University, 1958.

Dirāyatī, Muṣtafá, ed. *Fihrist-vārah-i dast-nivishtah-hā-yi Īrān*. 12 vols. Tehran: Kitāb-khānah, Mūzah, va Markaz-i Asnād-i Majlis-i Shūrā-yi Islāmī, 2010.

Doerfer, Gerhard. *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. 4 vols. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1963–75.

Dudney, Arthur. "A Desire for Meaning: Khān-i Ārzū's Philology and the Place of India in the Eighteenth-Century Persianate World." PhD diss., Columbia University, 2013.

Eaton, Richard M. *India in the Persianate Age, 1000–1765*. London: Allen Lane, 2019.

Ethé, Hermann. *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office*. Vol. 1. Oxford: printed for the India Office by H. Hart, 1903.

Fleischer, Cornell H. *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Âli* (*1541–1600*). Princeton University Press, 1986.

Floor, Willem M. *The Economy of Safavid Persia*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2000.

Green, Nile, ed. *The Persianate World: The Frontiers of a Eurasian Lingua Franca*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2019.

Guillory, John D. *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation*. University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Gulchīn-i Maʿānī, Aḥmad. *Kārvān-i Hind: dar aḥvāl va āṡār-i shāʿirān-i ʿaṣr-i Ṣafavī kih bih Hindūstān raftah-and*. 2 vols. Mashhad: Āstān-i Quds-i Rażavī, 1369 SH / 1990–91 CE.

———. *Maktab-i vuqūʿ dar shiʿr-i Fārsī*. Tehran: Bunyād-i Farhang-i Īrān, 1348 SH / 1969–70 CE.

———. *Tārīkh-i taẕkirah-hā-yi Fārsī*. 2 vols. Tehran: Dānishgāh-i Tihrān, 1969–71.

Hinz, Walther. *Islamische Masse und Gewichte*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Jackson, Peter, and Laurence Lockhart, eds. *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 6, *The Timurid and Safavid Periods*. Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Keshavmurthy, Prashant. *Persian Authorship and Canonicity in Late Mughal Delhi: Building an Ark*. London: Routledge, 2016.

Khafipour, Hani. "The Foundation of the Safavid State: Fealty, Patronage, and Ideals of Authority (1501–1576)." PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2013.

Khalil, Atif. *Repentance and the Return to God: Tawba in Early Sufism*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2018.

Kuşoğlu, M. Oğuzhan. "Sâdıkî-i Kitâbdâr'ın *Mecma'ü'l-havâs* adlı eseri." PhD diss., Marmara Üniversitesi, 2012.

Levi, Scott C. *The Indian Diaspora in Central Asia and Its Trade*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Losensky, Paul E. *Welcoming Fighānī: Imitation and Poetic Individuality in the Safavid-Mughal Ghazal*. Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda, 1998.

Matthee, Rudolph P. *Persia in Crisis: Safavid Decline and the Fall of Isfahan*. London: I.B.Tauris, 2012.

———. *The Politics of Trade in Safavid Iran: Silk for Silver, 1600–1730*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.

———. *The Pursuit of Pleasure: Drugs and Stimulants in Iranian History, 1500–1900*. Princeton University Press, 2005.

Mazzaoui, Michel M. *The Origins of the Ṣafawids: Šīʿism, Ṣūfism, and the Ġulāt*. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1972.

Mitchell, Colin P. *The Practice of Politics in Safavid Iran: Power, Religion, and Rhetoric*. London: I.B.Tauris, 2009.

Newman, Andrew J. *Safavid Iran: Rebirth of a Persian Empire*. London: I.B.Tauris, 2006.

Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale. Vol. 4. Paris: Imprimerie de la République, year 7 of the French Republican calendar / 1798–9 CE.

Orfali, Bilal. *The Anthologist's Art: Abū Manṣūr al-Thaʿālibī and His "Yatīmat al-dahr."* Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Pamuk, Şevket. *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Pārsādūst, Manūchihr. *Shāh Tahmāsb-i Avval*. Tehran: Intishār, 1998.

Pertsch, Wilhelm. *Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, vol. 4, *Verzeichniss der persischen Handschriften*. Berlin: A. Asher & Co., 1888.

Posch, Walter. *Osmanisch-safavidische Beziehungen* (*1545–1550*)*: der Fall Alḳâs Mîrzâ*. 2 vols. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2013.

Quinn, Sholeh A. *Historical Writing during the Reign of Shah ʻAbbas: Ideology, Imitation, and Legitimacy in Safavid Chronicles*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2000.

Rieu, Charles. *Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum*. 3 vols. London: British Museum, 1879–83.

———. *Supplement to the Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum*. London: British Museum, 1895.

Rizvi, Kishwar. *The Safavid Dynastic Shrine: Architecture, Religion and Power in Early Modern Iran*. London: I.B.Tauris, 2010.

Ruffle, Karen G. “Verses Dripping Blood: A Study of the Religious Elements in Muhtasham Kashani’s *Karbala-nameh*.” MA thesis, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 2001.

van Ruymbeke, Christine. *Kashefi’s “Anvar-e Sohayli”: Rewriting “Kalila and Dimna” in Timurid Herat*. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Rypka, Jan. *History of Iranian Literature*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1968.

Ṣafā, Ẕabīḥ Allāh. *Tārīkh-i adabīyāt dar Īrān*. 5 vols. in 8. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Firdawsī, 1956–91.

Şahin, Kaya. *Empire and Power in the Reign of Süleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Ṡavāqib, Jahānbakhsh. *Tārīkh-nigārī-i ʿaṣr-i Ṣafavīyah va shinākht-i manābiʿ va maʾākhiẕ*. Shīrāz: Navīd-i Shīrāz, 2001.

Savory, Roger M. *Iran under the Safavids*. Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Schmidt, Jan. *Pure Water for Thirsty Muslims: A Study of Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī of Gallipoli’s “Künhü’l-aḫbār.”* Leiden: Oosters Instituut, 1991.

Sharma, Sunil. *Mughal Arcadia: Persian Literature in an Indian Court*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017.

Shiblī Nuʿmānī. *Shiʿr al-ʿajam*. 5 vols. Translated by Muḥammad Taqī Fakhr Dāʿī Gīlānī. Tehran: Ibn Sīnā, 1334–39 SH / 1955–60 CE.

Simpson, Marianna Shreve, and Massumeh Farhad. *Sultan Ibrahim Mirza’s “Haft awrang”: A Princely Manuscript from Sixteenth-Century Iran*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997.

Spooner, Brian, and William L. Hanaway, eds. *Literacy in the Persianate World*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.

Sprenger, Aloys. *A Catalogue of the Arabic, Persian, and Hindu’sta’ny Manuscripts of the Libraries of the King of Oudh*. Calcutta: J. Thomas, 1854.

Trausch, Tilmann. *Formen höfischer Historiographie im 16. Jahrhundert: Geschichtsschreibung unter den frühen Safaviden, 1501–1578*. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2015.

Walmsley, Nicholas. "'O Navāʾī!': Imitation, Innovation, and the Invention of a Central Asian Literary Icon, 1500–1900." PhD diss., Indiana University, 2016.

Articles and chapters

Allouche, Adel. "Amasya, Treaty of." *Encyclopædia of Islam, THREE*. Accessed April 27, 2020. https://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_27753.

Anooshahr, Ali. "The Rise of the Safavids According to Their Old Veterans: Amini Haravi's *Futuhat-i Shahi*." *Iranian Studies* 48, no. 2 (2015): 249–67.

Bacqué-Grammont, Jean-Louis. "Études turco-safavides I: Notes sur le blocus du commerce iranien par Selîm Ier." *Turcica* 6 (1975): 68–88.

Bashir, Shahzad. "Shah Ismaʿil and the Qizilbash: Cannibalism in the Religious History of Early Safavid Iran." *History of Religions* 45, no. 3 (February 2006): 234–56.

Beers, Theodore S. "The Biography of Vahshi Bāfqi (d. 991/1583) and the *Tazkera* Tradition." *Journal of Persianate Studies* 8 (2015): 195–222.

———. "*Taẕkirah-i Khayr al-bayān*: The Earliest Source on the Career and Poetry of Ṣāʾib Tabrīzī (d. *ca*. 1087/1676)." *Al-ʿUṣūr al-Wusṭā* 24 (2016): 114–38.

Bernardini, Michele. "Hātefi, ʿAbd-Allāh." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated March 20, 2012. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/hatefi.

———. "Helāli Astarābādi Jagatāʾi." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated March 22, 2012. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/helali-astarabadi-jagatai-mawlana-badr-al-din.

Binbaş, İlker Evrim. "The Anatomy of a Regicide Attempt: Shāhrukh, the Ḥurūfīs, and the Timurid Intellectuals in 830/1426–27." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 23, no. 3 (June 2013): 391–428.

Bland, Nathaniel. "On the earliest Persian Biography of Poets, by Muhammad Aúfi, and on some other Works of the class called *Tazkirat ul Shuârá*." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 9 (1847): 111–76.

Borjian, Habib. "Ḡojdovān." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated December 15, 2001. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/gojdovan.

Bregel, Yuri E. "Abu'l-Khayrids." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated July 21, 2011. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/abul-khayrids-dynasty.

de Bruijn, J. T. P. "Fāryābi, Ẓahir-al-Din Abu'l-Fażl Ṭāher." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated January 24, 2012. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/faryabi-zahir-al-din-abul-fazl-taher.

Dabīr Siyāqī, Muḥammad, and Bert G. Fragner. "ʿAbdi Širāzi." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated July 15, 2011. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/abdi-sirazi-1513-80-poet.

Dale, Stephen F. "India under Mughal Rule." In *The New Cambridge History of Islam*, vol. 3, *The Eastern Islamic World, Eleventh to Eighteenth Centuries*, edited by David O. Morgan and Anthony Reid, 287–93. Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Donner, Fred M. "Periodization as a Tool of the Historian with Special Reference to Islamic History." *Der Islam* 91, no. 1 (May 2014): 20–36. https://doi.org/10.1515/islam-2014-0003.

Eslami, Kambiz. "Golestān-e honar." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated February 14, 2012. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/golestan-e-honar.

Esteʿlami, Mohammad. "Taḏkerat al-awliāʾ." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated July 20, 2004. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/tadkerat-al-awlia-2.

Feuillebois, Ève. "ʿAwfī, Sadīd al-Dīn." *Encyclopædia of Islam, THREE*. Accessed April 29, 2020. https://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_25041.

Fleischer, Cornell H. "Alqās Mirzā." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated August 2, 2011. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/alqas-alqasb-alqas-mirza-safawi.

Fotoohi, Mahmoud. "Taḏkera-ye Naṣrābādi." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated August 30, 2011. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/tadkera-ye-nasrabadi.

Fragner, Bert G. "Social and Internal Economic Affairs." In *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 6, *The Timurid and Safavid Periods*, edited by Peter Jackson and Laurence Lockhart, 491–567. Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Geevers, Liesbeth. "Safavid Cousins on the Verge of Extinction: Dynastic Centralization in Central Asia and the Bahrāmī Collateral Line (1517–1593)." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 58 (2015): 293–326.

van Gelder, Geert Jan. "Mixtures of Jest and Earnest in Classical Arabic Literature." Pts. 1 and 2. *Journal of Arabic Literature* 23, no. 2 (1992): 83–108; 23, no. 3 (1992): 169–90.

Ghereghlou, Kioumars. "Chronicling a Dynasty on the Make: New Light on the Early Ṣafavids in Ḥayātī Tabrīzī's *Tārīkh* (961/1554)." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 137, no. 4 (2017): 805–32.

———. “Ḥayāti Tabrizi, Qāsem Beg.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated June 28, 2016. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/hayati-tabrizi.

———. “Sayfi Qazvini.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated August 26, 2015. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/sayfi-qazvini.

———. “Sistāni, Mirzā Šāh-Ḥosayn.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated August 1, 2016. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/sistani-shah-hosayn.

Halm, Heinz. “Bayhaqī, Ẓahīr-al-Dīn.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated December 15, 1988. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/bayhaqi-zahir-al-din-abul-hasan-ali-b.

Heinrichs, W. P., J. T. P. de Bruijn, and J. Stewart-Robinson. “Ta<u>dh</u>kira.” *Encyclopædia of Islam, Second Edition*. Accessed April 29, 2020. https://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_COM_1140.

Hidayet Hosain, M. “Nūr Allāh.” *Encyclopædia of Islam, Second Edition*. Accessed April 29, 2020. https://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_5981.

Hinz, Walther. “Schah Esmaʿil II. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Safawiden.” *Mitteilungen des Seminars für orientalische Sprachen* 36 (1933): 19–100.

Jabbari, Alexander. “The Making of Modernity in Persianate Literary History.” *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 36, no. 3 (2016): 418–34.

Khaleghi-Motlagh, Djalal. “Abu Ṭāher Ḳātuni.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated July 21, 2011. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/abu-taher-katuni.

Kirmani, W. “ʿAli-Qoli Ḵān Wāleh.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated August 2, 2011. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/ali-qoli-khan-waleh-dagestani.

Lewis, Franklin D. “Golestān-e Saʿdi.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated February 14, 2012. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/golestan-e-sadi.

———. “Ḥāfeẓ viii. Ḥāfeẓ and Rendi.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated March 1, 2012. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/hafez-viii.

———. “To Round and Rondeau the Canon: Jāmī and Fānī’s Reception of the Persian Lyrical Tradition.” In *Jāmī in Regional Contexts: The Reception of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī’s Works in the Islamicate World, ca. 9th/15th – 14th/20th Century*, edited by Thibaut d’Hubert and Alexandre Papas, 463–567. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Losensky, Paul E. "ʿAbdī Shīrāzī." *Encyclopædia of Islam, THREE*. Accessed April 29, 2020. https://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_26282.

———. "Jāmi i. Life and Works." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated April 10, 2012. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/jami-i.

———. "Moḥtašam Kāšāni." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated May 5, 2014. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/mohtasham-kashani.

———. "The Palace of Praise and the Melons of Time: Descriptive Patterns in ʿAbdī Bayk Šīrāzī's *Garden of Eden*." *Eurasian Studies* 2, no. 1 (2003): 1–29.

———. "Ṣā'eb Tabrizi." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated July 20, 2003. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/saeb-tabrizi.

———. "Sāqi-nāma." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated July 15, 2009. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/saqi-nama-book.

———. "Vaḥši Bāfqi." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated July 20, 2004. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/vahshi-bafqi.

Matīnī, J. "ʿAwfī, Sadīd al-Dīn." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated August 18, 2011. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/awfi-sadid-al-din.

Matthee, Rudolph P. "Safavid Dynasty." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated July 28, 2008. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/safavids.

Matthee, Rudolph P., and Hiroyuki Mashita. "Kandahar iv. From the Mongol Invasion through the Safavid Era." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated April 20, 2012. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/kandahar-from-the-mongol-invasion-through-the-safavid-era.

Mazzaoui, Michel M. "Najm-e Ṯāni." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last modified July 20, 2002. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/najm-e-ani.

McChesney, Robert D. "Four Sources on Shah ʿAbbas's Building of Isfahan." *Muqarnas* 5 (1988): 103–34.

———. "A Note on Iskandar Beg's Chronology." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 39, no. 1 (January 1980): 53–63.

Melville, Charles. "Afżal al-tawāriḵ." *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated July 28, 2011. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/afzal-al-tawarik.

———. “Ḥamd-Allāh Mostawfi.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated March 6, 2012. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/hamd-allah-mostawfi.

Melvin-Koushki, Matthew. “Dawlatshāh Samarqandī.” *Encyclopædia of Islam, THREE*. Accessed April 29, 2020. https://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_25930.

Memon, M. U. “Amin Aḥmad Rāzi.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated August 3, 2011. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/razi-amin-ahmad.

Mikkelson, Jane. “Of Parrots and Crows: Bīdil and Ḥazīn in Their Own Words.” *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 37 (2017): 510–30.

Minorsky, Vladimir. “Iran: Opposition, Martyrdom, and Revolt.” In *Unity and Variety in Muslim Civilization*, edited by G. E. von Grünebaum, 183–206. University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Mitchell, Colin P. “Ṭahmāsp I.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated July 15, 2009. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/tahmasp-i.

Newman, Andrew J. “Davāni, Jalāl-al-Din Moḥammad.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated November 18, 2011. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/davani.

———. “The Myth of the Clerical Migration to Safawid Iran: Arab Shiite Opposition to ʿAlī al-Karakī and Safawid Shiism.” *Die Welt des Islams* 33 (1993): 66–112.

Nūrānī Viṣāl, ʿAbd al-Vahhāb. “Dar-bārah-i Umīdī Tihrānī.” *Adabistān* 46 (1372 SH / 1993 CE): 10–14.

Pellat, Charles. “*Adab* ii. *Adab* in Arabic Literature.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated July 22, 2011. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/adab-ii-arabic-lit.

Qasemi, Sharif Husain. “Faḵri Heravi, Solṭān-Moḥammad.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated January 20, 2012. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/fakri-heravi.

Reinert, Benedikt. “Sām Mīrzā.” *Encyclopædia of Islam, Second Edition*. Accessed April 28, 2020. https://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_COM_0990.

Roemer, H. R. “Ḥosayn Bāyqarā.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated March 23, 2012. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/hosayn-bayqara.

———. “The Safavid Period.” In *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 6, *The Timurid and Safavid Periods*, edited by Peter Jackson and Laurence Lockhart, 189–350. Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Ṣafā, Ẕabīḥ Allāh. “Dawlatšāh Samarqandi.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated November 18, 2011. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/dawlatsah.

Savory, Roger M. “Ḳāsim-i Anwār.” *Encyclopædia of Islam, Second Edition*. Accessed April 29, 2020. https://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_3986.

Schwartz, Kevin L. “The Local Lives of a Transregional Poet: ‘Abd al-Qâdir Bîdil and the Writing of Persianate Literary History.” *Journal of Persianate Studies* 9 (2016): 83–106.

Shafīʿī Kadkanī, Muḥammad Riżā. “Persian Literature (Belles-Lettres) from the Time of Jāmī to the Present Day.” In *History of Persian Literature from the Beginning of the Islamic Period to the Present Day*, edited by George Morrison, 135–206. Leiden: Brill, 1981.

Soucek, Priscilla P. “ʿAbd-al-Bāqi Yazdi.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated July 14, 2011. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/abd-al-baqi-yazdi-safavid-official-and-poet-killed-at-calderan-august-1514.

———. “ʿAbdallāh Morvārid.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated July 15, 2011. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/abdallah-morvarid-d-1516-timurid-court-official-poet-scribe-and-musician.

———. “Āqā Mirak.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated August 9, 2011. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/aqa-mirak.

Thackston, Wheeler M. “Homāyun Pādešāh.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated March 23, 2012. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/homayun-padesah.

Veinstein, G. “Ḳafes.” *Encyclopædia of Islam, Second Edition*. Accessed April 27, 2020. https://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_8740.

Walsh, J. R. “The Revolt of Alqās Mīrzā.” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 68 (1976): 61–78.

Wickens, G. M. “Anwār-e sohayli.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated August 5, 2011. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/anwar-e-sohayli.

———. “Bahārestān (1).” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated August 23, 2011. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/baharestan-spring-garden.

Yarshater, Ehsan. “The Indian Style: Progress or Decline?” In *Persian Literature*, edited by Ehsan Yarshater, 249–88. Albany, NY: Bibliotheca Persica, 1988.

Yūsufī, Ghulām Ḥusayn. “Čahār maqāla.” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Last updated December 15, 1990. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/cahar-maqala.

Other materials

International Journal of Middle East Studies. “IJMES Translation and Transliteration guide.” Accessed April 27, 2020. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/international-journal-of-middle-east-studies/information/author-resources/ijmes-translation-and-transliteration-guide.

Library of Congress. “Arabic romanization table.” Accessed April 27, 2020. https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/romanization/arabic.pdf.

———. “Persian romanization table.” Accessed April 27, 2020. https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/romanization/persian.pdf.

Appendices

A note on the appendices

The appendices that follow pertain to various parts of the dissertation. First, there are four timelines, which provide general historical background on our period of focus, *i.e.*, the late ninth/fifteenth to the early eleventh/seventeenth century. Two of the timelines concern Safavid Iran, while the other two address the Ottoman and Mughal realms. This material is perhaps most relevant to Chapter 1, which sets the broader context for Sām Mīrzā's life. But the timelines may also be useful in reference to other chapters, or even as stand-alone resources. Please note that they are meant to be viewed in color.

The next two appendices (nos. 5 and 6) are based on the chronicle *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* (999/1591), by Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī, which is the most important source for Sām Mīrzā's biography. Appendix 5 is simply a table of all of the points in the history at which the prince is mentioned. (Page numbers refer to the edition of Iḥsān Ishrāqī.) While working with the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, I found that it is one of the most detailed and accurate of all Safavid chronicles in its reporting of dates. The annals tend to begin with a note about Nawrūz, indicating where the king and his encampment were located at the time of observance, and the full date, including the day of the week. Also noteworthy is that Qāżī Aḥmad maintains a relatively good concordance between the Islamic calendar and the "animal years" derived from the Chinese zodiac. This work is a valuable source in general for chronological problems in early Safavid history. (For example, Robert D. McChesney relies on the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* in his article on the date of accession of Shah ʿAbbās.) And so I thought it would be useful to create a table of Qāżī Aḥmad's annals, from the beginning of Ṭahmāsb's reign to the end of the book, noting the dates that he mentions for Nawrūz and showing how they would convert to the Julian calendar. Please note

that Appendix 6 is meant to be viewed in color. There is a stretch of years during which the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* does *not* indicate the correct animal years. Qāżī Aḥmad has made an error in 952 AH (*i.e.*, 1545–6 CE), the entirety of which fell within a year of the snake. There was no Nawrūz in 952; rather, it fell late in Dhū al-Ḥijjah of 951 (1545), then early in Muḥarram of 953 (1546). (With a lunar Islamic year being about eleven days shorter than a solar year, such as that marked by Nawrūz, the former will be "swallowed" by the latter roughly three times per century. We still see this between the Islamic and Gregorian calendars. Most recently, 2007 began in the Islamic year 1427, and ended in 1429. The next occurrence of this phenomenon will be in 2040.) But Qāżī Aḥmad garbles the skip, causing his reporting of animal years to be off by one—an error that is not corrected until nine annals later. The *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* is, however, still among the Safavid chronicles that display the fewest problems with the twelve-animal cycle.

Appendix 7 is our spreadsheet of all entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (per the edition of Rukn al-Dīn Humāyūn Farrukh), while Appendix 8 presents a few summary statistics. This is discussed at length in Chapter 3. Please note that the large spreadsheet has been formatted for 11" x 17" paper. It can also be viewed in digital form at the following URL, which I will keep active for as many years as possible: https://www.theobeers.com/dissertation/tuhfah-spreadsheet/. The digital version will likely be easier to use, and it can be updated if any fixes are needed.

Finally, Appendices 9, 10, and 11 contain lists of *taẕkirah*s, narrative sources for Safavid history, and noteworthy poets of this time period, respectively. They are simply resources that I assembled for my own benefit during the research process, and which might be of use to the reader.

Appendix 1: Timeline of early Safavid history

Labeling key:

Change in political leadership — Foreign wars, conquests, treaties, embassies, *etc.*

Cultural and intellectual developments — Broader historical context

All years are given in the Julian/Gregorian calendar. (In only one case below do the two systems differ meaningfully. The inauguration of Shah Ṭahmāsb's new palace complex at Qazvīn took place on 17 Rabīʿ al-Awwal 966, i.e.*, 28 December 1558 in the Julian calendar, or 7 January 1559 in proleptic Gregorian. Hence the year is listed as 1558/9.) Certain items of direct relevance to Sām Mīrzā's biography are bolded.*

1487	Birth of the Safavid Ismāʿīl b. Ḥaydar
1488	Ḥaydar killed in battle; sons (incl. Ismāʿīl) imprisoned by the Āqquyūnlū Yaʿqūb
1490	Death of Yaʿqūb; Āqquyūnlū disintegration accelerates
1492	Death of poet ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī at Harāt
1493–4	Ḥaydar's sons released, then rearrested, by Yaʿqūb's successor, Rustam; they escape to Ardabīl, where young Ismāʿīl becomes head of the Safavid order
1499	Ismāʿīl's official "emergence" and start of bid for major political power and territory
1501	Ismāʿīl enthroned as Shah at Tabrīz
1501	Death of Timurid statesman and poet ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī at Harāt
1502	Death of philosopher Jalāl al-Dīn Davānī at Shīrāz (just before Safavid conquest)
1503	Safavid conquest of Fārs, ʿIrāq-i ʿAjam (including Iṣfahān)
ca. 1504	Nūr al-Dīn ʿAlī Karakī leaves Jabal ʿĀmil in Lebanon for Safavid lands; he is the first of many important Arab Twelver Shiʿi scholars to join the Safavid project
1506	Death of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Bāyqarā, last functional Timurid ruler (excl. Mughals)
1507	Harāt taken by the Uzbeks under Muḥammad Shībānī Khān
1507	Capture of Hormuz (and control of Persian Gulf) by the Portuguese
1510	Safavid victory over Uzbeks at Marv; Uzbeks driven out of Khurāsān (temporarily); this marks the completion of early Safavid territorial gains
ca. 1510	Shaykh Karakī officially recognized by Shah Ismāʿīl
after 1510	The painter Kamāl al-Dīn Bihzād (d. *ca.* 1535–6) moves to Tabrīz from Harāt
1512	Accession of Ottoman Sultan "Yavuz" Selim I
1512	At Ghujduvān, Uzbeks under ʿUbayd Allāh Khān defeat a joint Safavid-Timurid force led by Ẓahīr al-Dīn Bābur and Ismāʿīl's lieutenant (*vakīl*), "Najm-i Ṡānī"; for Safavids, their first serious defeat; for Bābur, the end of efforts to rule in the Timurid heartland
1514	Birth of Ṭahmāsb b. Ismāʿīl
1514	Decisive Ottoman victory over Safavids at the Battle of Chāldirān
1516	Ṭahmāsb, two years old, sent to "govern" Harāt with a Mawṣillū guardian (*lalah*)
1517	Ottoman victory at Rīdānīyah; Mamluk Sultanate dissolved, territories subsumed
1517	**Birth of Sām Mīrzā b. Ismāʿīl**
1520	Death of Selim I, accession of "Kanunî" Süleyman I
after 1520	Work begins on the "Houghton *Shāhnāmah*" (completed in 1530s or '40s)

1521	**Ṭahmāsb taken back to Tabrīz, placed under tutorship of "Dīv Sulṭān" Rūmlū; Sām Mīrzā made "governor" of Harāt, with Shāmlū *lalah*s**
1524	Death of Shah Ismāʿīl; accession of Ṭahmāsb
1524–36	Continual power struggles among Qizilbāsh tribes, which take time to be settled by a gradually maturing Ṭahmāsb; per Newman, this is the Safavids' "first civil war"
1526	Bābur wins the First Battle of Panipat; beginning of Mughal Empire (conventionally)
1528–30	**In campaigns on Khurāsān, Uzbeks under ʿUbayd Allāh Khān besiege Harāt, at one point forcing Sām Mīrzā and his *lalah*, Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū, to abandon the city**
1529	Hilālī Astarābādī, famous poet and literary mentor to Sām Mīrzā, put to death by the Uzbeks during their period of control over Harāt
1530	Death of Bābur; accession of his son, Humāyūn
1532	Further titles of honor bestowed on Shaykh Karakī by Shah Ṭahmāsb
1532–3	In another campaign through Khurāsān, the Uzbeks push as far west as Ray
1534 *	**Ṭahmāsb has Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū executed; modern scholars consider this event an indication of the young king's rise to power in his own right**
1534 *	Shah Ṭahmāsb's first "repentance" (*tawbah*)
1534–6	First major Ottoman invasion, under Süleyman, of Safavid territories
1535	Death of poet Ahlī Shīrāzī
1535–7	**Further (though final) Uzbek campaigns on Khurāsān; meanwhile, Sām Mīrzā and his men mount an unauthorized, unsuccessful siege of Mughal-held Qandahār; Ṭahmāsb comes to clean up the mess, installs a new governor in Harāt; Sām Mīrzā's political career is effectively over**
***ca.* 1537–49**	**Sām Mīrzā is housed in the imperial army camp under Qizilbāsh guard**
1539	**Arrival of the Venetian envoy Michele Membré at Ṭahmāsb's court; he will stay for almost a year, and notices Sām Mīrzā as the king's disfavored brother**
1540 *	Death of Uzbek ʿUbayd Allāh Khān; end of serious threat to Safavids in the northeast (until the 1580s)
1540	Ṭahmāsb begins a series of consequential invasions of the Caucasus
1540	Humāyūn Pādshāh is forced to flee Delhi (initially to Lahore)
1544	**Humāyūn goes to Iran for assistance, is received by numerous dignitaries incl. Shah Ṭahmāsb and Sām Mīrzā**
1546–9	**Ottoman-sponsored rebellion of Alqāṣ Mīrzā b. Ismāʿīl; after defeat in 1549, Alqāṣ and his two sons are incarcerated at the fortress of Qahqahah**
1549	**Sām Mīrzā asks Ṭahmāsb to resettle him; he is sent to Ardabīl as "governor" and custodian of Safavid shrine, but seemingly with little power**
1550	Murder of Alqāṣ Mīrzā at Qahqahah
***ca.* 1550**	***Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* written in Ardabīl**
1553	Süleyman launches a final, largely failed campaign against Safavids (to last until 1555)
1555	Treaty of Amasya brings respite from Ottoman-Safavid conflict (until 1578)
1555	Humāyūn retakes Delhi
1555	English Muscovy Company is chartered
ca. 1555–6	Ṭahmāsb's second "repentance" (*tawbah*)

1556	Death of Humāyūn Pādshāh; accession of his son, Akbar (to rule until death in 1605)
1557	Ismāʿīl Mīrzā b. Ṭahmāsb (future Shah Ismāʿīl II) is recalled from governorship of Harāt and imprisoned at Qahqahah; to stay there until Ṭahmāsb's death
1558–62	Ottoman prince Bayezid (son of Süleyman) flees to the Safavid court in the wake of a failed bid for power at home; he is, at length, turned over to Ottomans, executed
1558/9 *	Safavid capital officially established at Qazvīn (having earlier been at Tabrīz), with long-awaited completion of a new palace and garden complex
1562	**Sām Mīrzā is removed from Ardabīl, jailed at Qahqahah (with his two sons)**
1562–3	Trader Anthony Jenkinson of the Muscovy Company passes through Iran during his second expedition, receives an audience with Shah Ṭahmāsb
1566	Death of Sultan Süleyman; accession of his son, Selim II
1567	**Death of Sām Mīrzā, along with his sons and Alqāṣ's, under disputed circumstances**
1568	Ṭahmāsb sends his illustrated *Shāhnāmah* (later "Houghton") as a gift to Selim II in honor of his recent accession
1569	Maʿṣūm Beg, member of Safavid extended family and close adviser to Ṭahmāsb, killed by Ottomans for Shiʿi proselytism among Turkmen in northern Syria
1574	Death of Sultan Selim II; accession of his son, Murad III (to rule until death in 1595)
1576	Death of Shah Ṭahmāsb; accession of his son, Ismāʿīl II
1577	Death of Shah Ismāʿīl II (unclear circumstances); accession of Sulṭān Muḥammad "Khudābandah" b. Ṭahmāsb; next decade marked by power struggles, disarray
1578–90	New Ottoman incursions into Safavid territory (the first since 1555)
1583	Death of poet Vaḥshī Bāfqī
1585	Tabrīz captured by the Ottomans; they will hold it until 1603
1587 *	Muḥammad Khudābandah cedes power to Shah ʿAbbās I (to rule until death in 1629)
1588	Death of poet Muḥtasham Kāshānī
1590	New treaty signed with Ottomans; terms highly unfavorable to Safavids; ʿAbbās to break the agreement later and reclaim much of the lost territory
1591	Dawn of the second millennium of Islamic history
1591	Death of poet ʿUrfī Shīrāzī at Lahore, in the service of the Mughal Akbar
1591	**Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī completes his chronicle, *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh***

Several dates above are marked with asterisks. This is to call attention to the fact that they are correct *(as best can be determined from sources), while incorrect years are often cited in scholarship. For events surrounding the accession of Shah ʿAbbās I, discrepancies have resulted from a long-recognized problem with Iskandar Munshī's chronology.*

The main sources for this timeline are Andrew J. Newman's Safavid Iran; *Roger M. Savory's* Iran under the Safavids; *H. R. Roemer's chapter, "The Safavid Period," in vol. 6 of* The Cambridge History of Iran; *and a number of articles from* Encyclopædia Iranica. *Several dates were confirmed through reference to more specific works of scholarship, and to primary sources.*

Appendix 2: Timeline of the reign of Shah ʿAbbās I

Labeling key:

Change in political leadership | Foreign wars, conquests, treaties, embassies, *etc.*

Cultural and intellectual developments | Broader historical context

All years are given in the Julian/Gregorian calendar. (In none of these cases would the two differ.)

1571	Birth of ʿAbbās, third son of Sulṭān Muḥammad "Khudābandah" b. Ṭahmāsb
1576	Death of Shah Ṭahmāsb; accession of his son, Ismāʿīl II, after a power struggle
1577	Death of Ismāʿīl II under murky circumstances
1578	Accession of Sulṭān Muḥammad following further disarray
1578	New Ottoman invasions of Safavid territories (to continue until 1590)
1579	Qizilbāsh assassination of Khayr al-Nisāʾ Begum, a.k.a. Mahd-i ʿUlyā, influential wife of Muḥammad Khudābandah and mother of ʿAbbās
1580	Death of poet and historian ʿAbdī Beg "Navīdī" of Shīrāz
1581	First attempt to enthrone ʿAbbās, by a faction of Ustājlū and Shāmlū
1582	Papal reform of the Julian calendar, leading to the Gregorian calendar
1583	Assassination of Tajik *vazīr* Mīrzā Salmān, key backer of crown prince Ḥamzah Mīrzā
1583	Death of poet Vaḥshī Bāfqī
1585	Murshid Qulī Khān Ustājlū seizes Mashhad, takes custody of young ʿAbbās
1585	Tabrīz captured by Ottomans; they will hold it until 1603
1586	Assassination of Ḥamzah Mīrzā, until this point heir apparent
1587 *	New Uzbek invasion of Khurāsān (the first in decades)
1587 *	Muḥammad Khudābandah hands power to ʿAbbās, after the latter's march to Qazvīn
1588	Death of poet Muḥtasham Kāshānī
1588 *	Execution of Murshid Qulī Khān, once ʿAbbās' guardian and prime supporter
ca. 1588	It *may* be that Shah ʿAbbās begins his concerted effort to grow the ranks of *ghulām*s and promote them to high positions, after having Murshid Qulī Khān executed
1590	New treaty signed with Ottomans; terms highly unfavorable to Safavids; ʿAbbās to break the agreement later and reclaim much of the lost territory
1590	Shah ʿAbbās puts down rebellion of Yaʿqūb Khān Ẕū al-Qadr, governor of Fārs, and has him executed; this is often seen as the end point of the "second civil war" period
ca. 1590	ʿAbbās' spiritual authority is challenged by groups of Sufis, Nuqṭavīs
ca. 1590s	Construction projects begin in Iṣfahān to prepare the city to become the capital
1591	Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī completes his chronicle, *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*
1591	Death of poet ʿUrfī Shīrāzī at Lahore, in the service of the Mughal Akbar
1591	Dawn of the second millennium of Islamic history
ca. 1592	Birth of poet Ṣāʾib Tabrīzī (d. *ca.* 1676)
1595	Qandahār is surrendered once again to Mughal forces
1595	Death of the Ottoman Murad III; accession of his son, Mehmed III, who has *nineteen* of his brothers and half-brothers executed to secure power

1595/6	Allāhvirdī Khān, a *ghulām* leader, becomes governor of Fārs
1598	Arrival of the Shirley (also spelled Sherley) brothers, Robert and Anthony, in Iran
1598	Death of Uzbek leader ʿAbd Allāh Khān, leaving Abū al-Khayrid dynasty in disarray
1598	Recapture of Hārat from the Uzbeks
1598	Transfer of the Safavid capital from Qazvīn to Iṣfahān (conventionally)
ca. 1598	Birth of Muḥsin Muḥammad "Fayż-i Kāshānī" (later a prominent scholar, d. 1679)
1600	Charter of the British East India Company
1601	Shah ʿAbbās makes a pilgrimage from Iṣfahān to Mashhad on foot
1602	Charter of the Dutch East India Company
1603	Construction of the Shaykh Luṭf Allāh Mosque begins in Iṣfahān (completed 1619)
1603	ʿAbbās launches offensive to retake territories lost to Ottomans, including Tabrīz
1603	Death of the Ottoman Mehmed III; accession of his son, Ahmed I
1605	Armenian deportees from Julfā resettle in "New Julfā," on the outskirts of Iṣfahān
1605	Death of the Mughal Akbar; accession of his son, Salīm, a.k.a. Jahāngīr
1607	Completion of the Allāhvirdī Khān Bridge, a.k.a. *Sī-u-sih pul*, in Iṣfahān
1607	Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī completes his massive *taẕkirah* of poets, *Khulāṣat al-ashʿār*
1607	Ṣādiqī Kitābdār, prominent intellectual and miniaturist, completes his Turkic *taẕkirah* of (largely Persian) poets, *Majmaʿ al-khavāṣṣ*
1611	Construction of the "Shāh Mosque" begins in Iṣfahān (completed 1629)
ca. 1611	Jalāl al-Dīn Yazdī, court astrologer (*munajjim*) to ʿAbbās, completes his chronicle
1613	British East India Company establishes a trading post at Surat, Gujarat
1615	Execution of Shah ʿAbbās' eldest son, Muḥammad Bāqir, a.k.a. Ṣafī Mīrzā
1615	Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī, an Iranian émigré to India, completes his landmark *taẕkirah* of poets, *ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn*
1617	Arrival of the Italian traveler Pietro della Valle in Iṣfahān
1617	Death of the Ottoman Ahmed I, followed by several years of instability at that court
1618	Shah ʿAbbās bans (or attempts to ban) the export of specie from Iran
1618	Treaty of Sarāb between Ottomans and Safavids; essentially restores terms of Amasya
1618	Beginning of the Thirty Years' War in Europe
1619	ʿAbbās institutes a royal monopoly on the trade of Iranian silk
ca. 1620s	European travelers (*e.g.*, Kotov) begin to report the presence of numerous Punjabi Khatri merchants in Iran, especially in Iṣfahān
1621	Death of Bahāʾ al-Dīn ʿĀmilī, a.k.a. Shaykh Bahāʾī, prolific author, poet, Shiʿi scholar, chief architect of Iṣfahān
1622	Recapture of Hormuz from the Portuguese in a joint English-Persian operation
1623	Beginning of new Ottoman-Safavid wars (to continue until 1639)
1624	Baghdad and the Iraqi shrine cities are recaptured by the Safavids
1626	Death of poet Ṭālib Āmulī, early exemplar of the "fresh style" (*shīvah-i tāzah*)
1627	Death of the Mughal Jahāngīr; accession of his son, Khurram, a.k.a. Shāh Jahān
1628	Arrival in Iran of British traveler and memoirist Thomas Herbert
1629	Death of Shah ʿAbbās; accession of his grandson, Sām Mīrzā, a.k.a. Ṣafī
1629	Iskandar Beg Munshī completes his renowned history, *ʿĀlamʾārā-yi ʿAbbāsī*

1630	Ottomans go on the offensive again and sack Hamadān
1631	Death of Mīr Dāmād, leading philosopher, theologian, jurist
1635/6	Death of philosopher Mullā Ṣadrā of Shīrāz
1639	Fażlī Iṣfahānī completes his underappreciated chronicle, *Afżal al-tavārīkh*
1640/41	Death of philosopher Abū al-Qāsim Findiriskī

The dates provided for events surrounding the accession of Shah ʿAbbās, and marked with asterisks, are correct (*as best can be determined from the sources*)*. Please note that incorrect years have often been cited in scholarship, resulting from a long-recognized problem with Iskandar Munshī's chronology.*

The main sources for this timeline are Andrew J. Newman's Safavid Iran; *Roger M. Savory's* Iran under the Safavids; *and numerous articles in* Encyclopædia Iranica—*especially the one on Shah ʿAbbās, also by Savory. A number of dates were confirmed through reference to more specific works of scholarship, and a few through checking primary sources.*

Appendix 3: Timeline of Ottoman history, 1453–1623 CE

Labeling key:

Change in political leadership	Foreign wars, conquests, treaties, embassies, *etc.*
Cultural and intellectual developments	Broader historical context

All years are given in the Julian/Gregorian calendar. (In none of these cases would the two differ.)

1453	Conquest of Constantinople by "Fatih" Mehmed II
1468	Conquest of most lands of the Karamanids (the last Anatolian *beylik* to pose a real threat to the Ottomans)
ca. 1470	Death of Kritoboulos, Greek historian of Mehmed II's Byzantine conquests
1473	Defeat of the Āqquyūnlū Uzun Ḥasan; the Ottomans will not have another serious rival in the east/southeast until the rise of the Safavids
1475	Conquest of the Crimean Peninsula
1481	Death of Sultan Mehmed II; accession of his son, Bayezid II
1482	Cem Sultan, another son of Mehmed II, and Bayezid II's rival for succession, is sent into exile; later transferred to papal custody (1489); finally dies in Naples (1495)
1484	Death of Aşıkpaşazade, author of the *Tavārīkh-i Āl-i ʿUṡmān* and witness to the fall of Constantinople, among other events
1492	Nasrid Granada falls to Castilian forces, marking the formal end of the Reconquista; the Ottomans offer to receive refugees, including a large number of Jews
1492	Christopher Columbus launches his first (unwitting) voyage to the "New World"
1497–9	Portuguese explorer Vasco da Gama travels to India, circumnavigating the Cape of Good Hope
1499	Ottoman naval war against Venice (to continue until 1503)
ca. 1500	First general Ottoman legal code (*qānūn-nāmah*) to supplement/supplant *sharīʿah*
1509	Struggle for power among Bayezid's sons, Korkut, Ahmed, and Selim
1509	Death of Necâtî, the first great Ottoman Turkish lyric poet
1512	Deposition of Sultan Bayezid II; accession of his son, "Yavuz" Selim I
1514	Defeat of the Safavids at the Battle of Chāldirān
1516–17	Conquest of Mamluk Egypt and Syria
1517	Martin Luther posts (perhaps not literally) his *Ninety-Five Theses* in Wittenberg
1518	Khayr al-Dīn "Barbarossa" accepts Ottoman suzerainty in his North African lands; he will eventually become chief admiral of the Ottoman navy
1519	The first of the Celalî revolts—popular uprisings by disposessed *sipahi*s, "restless Turkmen," overtaxed peasants, *et al.*
1520	Death of Sultan Selim I; accession of his son, "Kanunî" Süleyman I
1520	Death of Idris Bitlisi, Āqquyūnlū and, later, Ottoman court historian, author of the *Hasht bihisht* (a major Persian-language history of the Ottoman dynasty)
1521	Accumulation of power between Habsburgs Charles V (King of Spain, Duke of Burgundy, Holy Roman Emperor) and Ferdinand ("King of the Romans" in Austria)

1521	Conquest of Belgrade marks the start of Ottoman control over Hungary, continually contested by the Habsburgs and others
1522	Ottomans capture Rhodes, strengthening their hold on the eastern Mediterranean
1526	Battle of Mohács; Ottoman victory leads to partition of Hungary
1529	First Siege of Vienna (unsuccessful), marking the maximum extent of Ottoman expansion into Europe
1534	Death of Kemalpaşazade, historian and chief Ottoman religious official
1534	Henry VIII separates the Church of England from Rome
1534–6	Süleyman's first eastern campaign
1535	Capture of Tunis by Charles V
1536	Alliance between Sultan Süleyman and French King Francis I (against Habsburgs)
1538	Barbarossa defeats European coalition forces at the Gulf of Prevesa
1538	Ottomans capture Aden, establish a base to counter the Portuguese
ca. 1540s	Süleyman I begins to claim the caliphate
1540	Peace settlement with Venice; concession of some territories to Ottomans
1540	Death of Hungarian King Szapolyai (Süleyman's vassal) precipitates a new crisis
1543	Death of Copernicus, foundational figure in the European Scientific Revolution
1545	Abū al-Suʿūd (d. 1574) is named chief *muftī*, highest Ottoman religious official; he works toward synthesis of civil and religious law (*qānūn* and *sharīʿah*, resp.)
1545	The Council of Trent opens (to meet intermittently until 1563)
1547	Five-year truce between Ottomans and Habsburgs, involving tribute from the latter
1548–9	Süleyman's second eastern campaign (associated with the rebellion of Alqāṣ Mīrzā)
1551	Ottoman capture of Tripoli, Libya
1553	Süleyman launches a final, largely failed campaign against Safavids (to last until 1555)
1555	Peace of Amasya between Ottomans and Safavids
1556	Abdication of Charles V, followed by a new split between the Austrian and Spanish branches of the Habsburg dynasty
1556	Death of the great Azerbaijani Turkic (and Persian) poet Fuzûlî
1557	Completion of the Süleymaniye Mosque, designed by Mimar Sinan (d. 1588)
1558–62	Ottoman prince Bayezid b. Süleyman flees to the Safavid court in the wake of a failed bid for power at home; is later turned over to Ottomans, executed
1559	Habsburgs and French (Valois) make peace at Cateau-Cambrésis, hampering Ottoman influence in Western Europe
1564	Birth of the Italian polymath Galileo (d. 1642)
1566	Death of Sultan Süleyman I; accession of his son, Selim II
1568–9	Abortive plans by grand *vazīr* Sokollu Mehmed Pasha (d. 1579) to build canals from the Mediterranean to the Red Sea, and from the Don River to the Volga
1570–71	Ottoman annexation of Cyprus (Famagusta being the last city to fall, in Aug. 1571)
1571	Defeat of Ottomans at the Battle of Lepanto, ending their period of naval dominance in the Mediterranean
ca. 1572	Birth of poet/satirist Nefʿi, whose acerbic wit would lead to his execution in 1635
1574	Recapture of Tunis by the Ottomans (for the last time)

1574	Death of Sultan Selim II; accession of his son, Murad III
1574/5	Completion of the Selimiye Mosque in Edirne, also designed by Mimar Sinan
1578	Start of new eastern campaign (coinciding with post-Ṭahmāsb Safavid chaos)
1581	Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, Habsburg ambassador to Istanbul, publishes a book about his time in Ottoman lands
1582	Papal reform of the Julian calendar, leading to the Gregorian calendar
1585	Silver *akçe* is debased to close a public deficit, provoking riots among soldiers
1590	Renewed peace with the Safavids (now ruled by Shah ʿAbbās I)
1591	Dawn of the second millennium of Islamic history
1593	Beginning of the "Long Turkish War" against Habsburgs (to continue until 1606)
1595	Death of Sultan Murad III; accession of his son, Mehmed III, who has *nineteen* of his brothers and half-brothers executed to secure power; this shocking event may be one catalyst for succession reform beginning in the early seventeenth century
1595	Beginning of a new series of Celalî revolts (to last until 1610)
1600	Death of Mustafa Âlî, noted bureaucrat and historian (see Fleischer's book)
1600	Death of the poet Bâkî, *sulṭān al-shuʿarāʾ*, panegyrist to Süleyman I
1601	Death of the Danish astronomer Tycho Brahe
1603	Death of Sultan Mehmed III; accession of his son, Ahmed I
1617	Death of Ahmed I; accession of his (reputedly) mentally ill *brother*, Mustafa I; from this point on, rule generally passes to the eldest eligible male, with potential rivals kept in palace confinement (*kafes*)
1618	Deposition of Sultan Mustafa I in favor of Ahmed I's son, "Genç" Osman II
1618	Beginning of the Thirty Years' War in Europe
1622	Murder of Sultan Osman II by Janissaries; reinstatement of Mustafa I
1623	Second deposition of Mustafa I, this time in favor of another son of Ahmed I, Murad IV (to reign until 1640)
1623	Beginning of new Ottoman-Safavid wars (to continue until 1639)

The two initial sources for this timeline were Colin H. Imber's chapter, "The Ottoman empire (tenth/sixteenth century)," in The New Cambridge History of Islam; *and Norman L. Itzkowitz's classic,* Ottoman Empire and Islamic Tradition. *Reference was also made to numerous scholarly encyclopædia articles.*

Appendix 4: Timeline of early Mughal history (birth of Bābur – death of Jahāngīr)

Labeling key:

Change in political leadership | Foreign wars, conquests, treaties, embassies, *etc.*
Cultural and intellectual developments | Broader historical context

All years are given in the Julian/Gregorian calendar. (*In none of these cases would the two differ.*)

1483	Birth of Ẓahīr al-Dīn Bābur
1490	Death of the Naqshbandī Sufi leader Khwājah Aḥrār
1494–5	Bābur becomes ruler of Farghānah after the death of his father, ʿUmar Shaykh Mīrzā
1497	Bābur conquers Samarqand for the first time; holds it only a few months
1498	Vasco da Gama lands in Calicut, Kerala
1501	Muḥammad Shībānī Khān takes Samarqand, beginning a series of acquisitions
1504	Bābur conquers Kabul; it will mostly be his base of operations until 1526
1506	Death of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Bāyqarā; effective end of Timurid rule in Iran, Central Asia
1507	Muḥammad Shībānī Khan takes Harāt
1510–11	Death of Muḥammad Shībānī triggers temporary collapse of Abū al-Khayrid rule, loss of most territories to Safavids (under Ismāʿīl I) and Timurids (under Bābur)
1512	Resurgent Uzbeks expel Bābur from Central Asia (permanently, as it turns out)
1519	Bābur has by now decided to invade India
1519	Death of Bābā Faghānī, an innovative and influential *ghazal* poet
1526	Bābur defeats Ibrāhīm Lōdī at the First Battle of Panipat and establishes himself in Delhi and Agra; this is usually considered the founding of the Mughal Empire
1528	The Bahmanid Sultanate of the Deccan falls apart; some of its successor states make Shiʿism their official creed
1530	Death of Bābur Pādshāh; accession of his son, Humāyūn (b. 1508)
1537	Humāyūn launches a campaign against the Sūr Afghan clan in Bihar
1539	Death of Guru Nānak, founder of Sikhism
1539–40	Humāyūn driven from power by Afghans and his own brothers; begins long exile
1544–5	Humāyūn goes to Safavid Iran for support, is granted an army (for a price…)
1545	Humāyūn manages to retake Qandahār and Kabul
1553	Humāyūn finally defeats and captures his refractory brother, Mīrzā Kāmrān
1555	Humāyūn Pādshāh retakes Lahore and Delhi
1555	On his return to India, Humāyūn is accompanied by Iranian artists Mīr Sayyid ʿAlī and ʿAbd al-Ṣamad, key figures in the development of Mughal painting
1556	Humāyūn dies after falling down stairs; accession of his young son, Akbar (b. 1542)
1556	Portuguese missionaries take a Gutenberg-style printing press to Goa (the first in Asia)
1560–61	Akbar begins to assume power, dismissing regent Bayram Khān and defeating Afghans
1562	Akbar marries Rajput princess, Jodha Bai (who bears Salīm, a.k.a. Jahāngīr, in 1569)
1562	The famous musician Miyān Tānsēn (d. 1586) is called to Akbar's court
1562–70	Construction of Humāyūn's Tomb in Delhi

mid 1560s	Akbar Pādshāh fights off challenges to his rule by Uzbeks, other Timurids
1564	Abolition of the *jizyah* (according to Abū al-Fażl ʿAllāmī)
1567	Akbar begins to conquer further Rajput territories
1571	The new city of Fatḥ'pūr Sīkrī becomes capital of the empire
1572	Mughal conquest of Gujarat
1574	Formal institution of *mansab'dārī-jāgīr'dārī*, a sort of feudal administrative system
1575	Akbar's ecumenical debates begin
1575	Bābur's daughter Gulbadan Begum leads a pilgrimage to Mecca
late 1570s	From this point forward, Mughal coinage is highly standardized
1577	A massive, fourteen-volume illustrated *Ḥamzah'nāmah* is completed
1578	Akbar bans animal slaughter on certain days, becomes quasi-vegetarian
1579	Akbar asserts the right of *ijtihād* and final say in all Islamic matters
1581	Akbar inaugurates his *dīn-i ilāhī*; all of these religious reforms prove unpopular
1584	The Iranian poet ʿUrfī Shīrāzī (d. 1591) migrates to India
1585	Capital moved from Fatḥ'pūr Sīkrī to Lahore
1589	Death of Todar Mal, Akbar's influential Hindu minister/general
1589/90	Translation of Bābur's memoirs into Persian by ʿAbd al-Raḥīm "Khān-i Khānān"
1591	Dawn of the second millennium of Islamic history
1591–9	Akbar Pādshāh begins to take over the Deccan (capturing Aḥmadnagar in 1599)
1595	Death of Fayżī, major court poet and adviser to Akbar
1600	Charter of the British East India Company
1602	Charter of the Dutch East India Company
1602	Rebellion of Akbar's son, Salīm, a.k.a. Jahāngīr (b. 1569)
1602	Murder of Abū al-Fażl ʿAllāmī, not long after completion of his *Akbar'nāmah* and *Ā'īn-i Akbarī* (our most important narrative sources on Akbar's reign)
1603	Death of Gulbadan Begum, daughter of Bābur and author of important memoirs
1605	Death of Akbar Pādshāh; accession of his son, Jahāngīr
1606	Guru Arjan (fifth Sikh Guru, of ten) executed at the order of Jahāngīr
1607	Jahāngīr promulgates his "Twelve Decrees," including ban on alcohol production
1611	Jahāngīr marries Nūr Jahān, his influential Iranian wife
1613	British East India Company establishes a trading post at Surat, Gujarat
1619	Arrest of Aḥmad Sirhindī, Naqshbandī scholar and self-proclaimed *mujaddid*
ca. 1620s	European travelers (*e.g.*, Kotov) begin to report the presence of thousands of Punjabi Khatri merchants in Iran, especially in Iṣfahān
1622	Rebellion of Jahāngīr's son, Khurram, a.k.a. Shāh Jahān (b. 1592)
1625	Arrival of the Iranian poet Ṣā'ib Tabrīzī in Mughal-ruled Kabul
1627	Death of Jahāngīr Pādshāh; accession of his son, Shāh Jahān

This timeline was mostly sourced from Stephen F. Dale's chapter, "India under Mughal Rule," in The New Cambridge History of Islam, *plus the articles on the first four Mughal rulers (Bābur, Humāyūn, Akbar, Jahāngīr) in* Encyclopædia Iranica.

Appendix 5: Mentions of Sām Mīrzā in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* (ed. Ishrāqī)

Page	Year(s) AH	Month(s) AH	Year(s) CE	Month(s) CE	Animal sign(s)	Event(s)
148	927	Summer	1521	Summer	Snake	Sām sent with Dūrmīsh Khān to remove Amīr Khān Mawṣillū from Harāt
155	930	Rajab	1524	May	Monkey	Mentioned in a list of Ismāʿīl's offspring, after the latter's death
156	930	Summer	1524	Summer	Monkey	Sām and Dūrmīsh Khān are sent to govern Harāt
158	931	Summer (prob.)	1525	Summer (prob.)	Rooster	Sām and Dūrmīsh Khān fend off a brief Uzbek invasion
163	932	N/A	1526	N/A	Dog	Dūrmīsh Khān dies, Ḥusayn Khān Shāmlū becomes Sām's guardian
165	932	N/A	1526	N/A	Dog	One of Sām's amirs tries (unsuccessfully) to save Khwājah Ḥabīb Allāh's life
184	935	Muḥarram	1528	September	Rat	Sām and Alqāṣ (and their men) are given the right and left flank at the Battle of Jām
188	935	Muḥarram	1528	Sept. – Oct.	Rat	Sām and Ḥusayn Khān return to govern Harāt after victory
192	935–6	Summer–fall	1529	Summer–fall	Ox	Sām, Ḥusayn Khān, and entourage escape Harāt under new Uzbek invasion
213	937	Spring–summer	1531	Spring–summer	Rabbit	Sām and Ḥusayn Khān return to court; "Takkalū Disaster" and aftermath take place
214	937	Spring–summer	1531	Spring–summer	Rabbit	Sām and Ḥusayn Khān return to court; "Takkalū Disaster" and aftermath take place
226	940–41	N/A	1533–4	N/A	Snake–Horse	Sām reappointed to the governorship of Harāt, with Aghzīvār Khān Shāmlū
235	941	Fall–winter	1534–5	Fall–winter	Horse	Ṭahmāsb hears worrisome news about Sām & Aghzīvār, has Ḥusayn Khān executed
236	941	Fall–winter	1534–5	Fall–winter	Horse	Ṭahmāsb hears worrisome news about Sām & Aghzīvār, has Ḥusayn Khān executed
240	941	Shaʿbān	1535	February	Horse	Sām & Aghzīvār hear of Ḥusayn Khān's death; they rebel and leave Harāt
241	941	Winter	1535	Winter	Horse	Uzbeks hear that Harāt has been abandoned, begin new invasion
242	941	Spring	1535	Spring	Sheep	Ottomans are informed of Sām's revolt (by Ghāzī Khān Takkalū), support his "claim"
251	941	Winter	1535	Winter	Horse	Recap of Sām & Aghzīvār's leaving Harāt, stopping in Farāh, going to Qandahār
252	941–2	N/A	1535–6	N/A	Sheep	Sām & Co. carry out a long siege of Qandahār, eventually defeated by Mughals
253	941–2	N/A	1535–6	N/A	Sheep	Sām & Co. carry out a long siege of Qandahār, eventually defeated by Mughals
254	942	Winter	1536	Winter	Sheep	Sām has Shāmlū rebels killed, apologizes to Ṭahmāsb, goes to Ṭabas to lie low
266	943	Winter–spring	1537	Winter–spring	Monkey–Rooster	Sām is taken back to (the itinerant) court while Ṭahmāsb is still on campaign
270	943	Spring	1537	Spring	Rooster	Ṭahmāsb conquers Qandahār, taking revenge for the earlier defeat of Sām
307	951	N/A	1544–5	N/A	Dragon–Snake	Sām and Bahrām take part in welcoming the Mughal Humāyūn
308	951	N/A	1544–5	N/A	Dragon–Snake	Sām and Bahrām take part in welcoming the Mughal Humāyūn
389	964–5	N/A	1557	N/A	Snake	Sām makes the pilgrimage to Mashhad and is well entertained there
391	964–5	N/A	1557	N/A	Snake	Sām, Bahrām, Alqāṣ compared unfavorably to Ibrāhīm by Muḥammad Khān Takkalū
550	975	Jumādá II	1567	December	Rabbit	Obituary for Sām Mīrzā (described in depth elsewhere)
551	975	Jumādá II	1567	December	Rabbit	Obituary for Sām Mīrzā (described in depth elsewhere)
552	975	Jumādá II	1567	December	Rabbit	Obituary for Sām Mīrzā (described in depth elsewhere)
553	975	Jumādá II	1567	December	Rabbit	Obituary for Sām Mīrzā (described in depth elsewhere)
554	975	Jumādá II	1567	December	Rabbit	Obituary for Sām Mīrzā (described in depth elsewhere)

Appendix 5: Mentions of Sām Mīrzā in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* (ed. Ishrāqī)

Page	Year(s) AH	Month(s) AH	Year(s) CE	Month(s) CE	Animal sign(s)	Event(s)
555	975	Jumādá II	1567	December	Rabbit	Obituary for Sām Mīrzā (described in depth elsewhere)
556	975	Jumādá II	1567	December	Rabbit	Obituary for Sām Mīrzā (described in depth elsewhere)
557	975	Jumādá II	1567	December	Rabbit	Obituary for Sām Mīrzā (described in depth elsewhere)
765	927	Summer	1521	Summer	Snake	Recap of Dūrmīsh Khān's being sent to Khurāsān as Sām's guardian
938	923	Shaʿbān	1517	September	Ox	Bahrām (20 Shaʿbān) and Sām (21 Shaʿbān) are born almost simultaneously
942	936–7	N/A	1529–31	N/A	Ox–Tiger	Sām and Ḥusayn Khān delay their return to court (see Dickson, 195f.)
943	936–7	N/A	1529–31	N/A	Ox–Tiger	Sām and Ḥusayn Khān delay their return to court (see Dickson, 195f.)
945	940–41	N/A	1533–4	N/A	Snake–Horse	Sām reappointed to the governorship of Harāt, with Aghzīvār Khān Shāmlū
947	941	Shaʿbān	1535	February	Horse	Sām & Aghzīvār hear of Ḥusayn Khān's death; they rebel and leave Harāt
948	941	Shaʿbān	1535	February	Horse	Sām & Aghzīvār hear of Ḥusayn Khān's death; they rebel and leave Harāt
949	941–2	N/A	1535–6	N/A	Horse–Sheep	Recap of Sām & Aghzīvār's leaving Harāt, stopping in Farāh, besieging Qandahār
950	943	Winter–spring	1537	Winter–spring	Monkey–Rooster	Sām is taken back to (the itinerant) court while Ṭahmāsb is still on campaign
983	969	Winter	1562	Winter	Rooster	Sām is imprisoned at Qahqahah (incorrectly filed on p. 417?)
992	975	Jumādá II	1567	December	Rabbit	Notes on Sām's obituary (pp. 550–57)

Appendix 6: Annals in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* (ed. Ishrāqī)

Page	Regnal yr.	Animal sign	Start yr. AH	Start mo.	Start date	Start day	Start yr. CE	Start mo. CE	Start date CE	Start day CE
152	N/A	Monkey	930	Jumādá I	5		1524	March	11	Friday
157	1	Rooster	931	Jumādá I	16	Saturday	1525	March	11	Saturday
162	2	Dog	932	Jumādá I	27	Friday	1526	March	11	Sunday
169	3	Pig	933	Jumādá II	9	Tuesday	1527	March	13	Wednesday
172	4	Rat	934	Jumādá II	19	Sunday	1528	March	11	Wednesday
178	5	Ox	935	Jumādá II	30	Thursday	1529	March	11	Thursday
195	6	Tiger	936	Rajab	10	Friday	1530	March	10	Thursday
213	7	Rabbit	937	Rajab	22	Sunday	1531	March	11	Saturday
217	8	Dragon	938	Shaʿbān	3	Saturday	1532	March	11	Monday
222	9	Snake	939	Shaʿbān	14	Tuesday	1533	March	11	Tuesday
227	10	Horse	940	Shaʿbān	25	Wednesday	1534	March	11	Wednesday
241	11	Goat	941	Ramaḍān	7	Friday	1535	March	12	Friday
254	12	Monkey	942				1536			
262	13	Rooster	943				1537			
272	14	Dog	944				1538			
278	15	Pig	945	Shawwāl	21	Wednesday	1539	March	12	Wednesday
288	16	Rat	946	Dhū al-Qaʿdah	2	Thursday	1540	March	10	Wednesday
293	17	Ox	947	Dhū al-Qaʿdah	12	Friday	1541	March	10	Thursday
295	18	Tiger	948	Dhū al-Qaʿdah	24	Saturday	1542	March	11	Saturday
295	19	Rabbit	949	Dhū al-Ḥijjah	5		1543	March	12	Monday
299	20	Dragon	950	Dhū al-Ḥijjah	17	Tuesday	1544	March	12	Wednesday
307	21	Snake	951	Dhū al-Ḥijjah	27	Wednesday	1545	March	11	Wednesday
313	22	Horse (Snake)	952							
315	23	Goat (Horse)	953	Muḥarram	8	Thursday	1546	March	11	Thursday
318	24	Monkey (Goat)	954	Muḥarram	18	Friday	1547	March	10	Thursday
323	25	Rooster (Monkey)	955	Muḥarram	30	Sunday	1548	March	11	Sunday
337	26	Dog (Rooster)	956	Ṣafar	11	Monday	1549	March	11	Monday
343	27	Pig (Dog)	957	Ṣafar	22	Tuesday	1550	March	12	Wednesday

Appendix 6: Annals in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* (ed. Ishrāqī)

Page	Regnal yr.	Animal sign	Start yr. AH	Start mo.	Start date	Start day	Start yr. CE	Start mo. CE	Start date CE	Start day CE
347	28	Rat (Pig)	958	Rabīʿ I	4	Thursday	1551	March	12	Thursday
352	29	Ox (Rat)	959	Rabīʿ I	15	Friday	1552	March	11	Friday
361	30	Tiger (Ox)	960	Rabīʿ I	25	Saturday	1553	March	11	Saturday
367	31	Tiger	961	Rabīʿ II	7	Sunday	1554	March	12	Monday
375	32	Rabbit	962	Rabīʿ II	17	Monday	1555	March	11	Monday
383	33	Dragon	963	Rabīʿ II	28	Wednesday	1556	March	11	Wednesday
387	34	Snake	964	Jumādá I	5		1557	March	6	Saturday
393	35	Horse	965	Jumādá I	20	Friday	1558	March	10	Thursday
401	36	Goat	966	Jumādá II	1	Saturday	1559	March	11	Saturday
406	37	Monkey	967	Jumādá II	10	Monday	1560	March	8	Friday
417	38	Rooster	968	Jumādá II	21	Friday	1561	March	9	Sunday
428	39	Dog	969	Rajab	5	Wednesday	1562	March	11	Wednesday
436	40	Pig	970	Rajab	16	Thursday	1563	March	11	Thursday
441	41	Rat	971	Rajab	27	Saturday	1564	March	11	Saturday
447	42	Ox	972	Shaʿbān	8	Sunday	1565	March	11	Sunday
450	43	Tiger	973	Shaʿbān	19	Thursday	1566	March	11	Monday
456	44	Rabbit	974				1567			
462	45	Dragon	975	Ramaḍān	10	Thursday	1568	March	9	Tuesday
558	46	Snake	976	Ramaḍān	22	Friday	1569	March	10	Thursday
563	47	Horse	977	Shawwāl	2	Tuesday	1570	March	10	Friday
566	48	Goat	978	Shawwāl	14	Sunday	1571	March	11	Sunday
570	49	Monkey	979	Shawwāl	25	Tuesday	1572	March	11	Tuesday
572	50	Rooster	980	Dhū al-Qaʿdah	6	Wednesday	1573	March	10	Tuesday
581	51	Dog	981	Dhū al-Qaʿdah	17	Thursday	1574	March	10	Wednesday
587	52	Pig	982	Dhū al-Qaʿdah	27	Friday	1575	March	10	Thursday
590	53	Rat	983	Dhū al-Ḥijjah	8	Friday	1576	March	9	Friday
592	54		984							
644	N/A	Ox	984	Dhū al-Ḥijjah	20	Monday	1577	March	10	Sunday

Appendix 6: Annals in the *Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh* (ed. Ishrāqī)

Page	Regnal yr.	Animal sign	Start yr. AH	Start mo.	Start date	Start day	Start yr. CE	Start mo. CE	Start date CE	Start day CE
667	N/A	Tiger	986	Muḥarram	1	Monday	1578	March	10	Monday
690	N/A	Rabbit	987	Muḥarram	13	Wednesday	1579	March	12	Thursday
705	N/A	Dragon	988	Muḥarram	23	Thursday	1580	March	10	Thursday
714	N/A	Snake	989	Ṣafar	5	Saturday	1581	March	11	Saturday
723	N/A	Horse	990	Ṣafar	16	Sunday	1582	March	12	Monday
736	N/A	Goat	991				1583	March		
759	N/A	Monkey	992	Rabīʿ I	8	Wednesday	1584	March	10	Tuesday
773	N/A	Rooster	993	Rabīʿ I	19		1585	March	11	Thursday
814	N/A	(Dog)	994	Rabīʿ I	30	Thursday/Friday	1586	March	11	Friday
851	N/A	Pig	995	Rabīʿ II	11	Saturday	1587	March	11	Saturday
881	2	Rat	996	Rabīʿ II	21	Sunday	1588	March	10	Sunday
890	3	Ox	997	Jumādá I	4	Tuesday	1589	March	11	Tuesday
906	4	Tiger	998	Jumādá I	14	Wednesday	1590	March	11	Wednesday

Green highlighting: data that is missing or likely/clearly incorrect, e.g., Qāżī Aḥmad's mistake between 951 and 953 AH and its subsequent effects
Blue highlighting: errors that can be fixed (and have been, here) by reading the text slightly differently, e.g., Jumādá II for Jumādá I

For the sake of consistency, all converted dates here are Julian (rather than switching to Gregorian as of October 1582).

Appendix 7: Entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (ed. Humāyūn Farrukh)

No.	Ch.	Name	Start p.	End p.	Ll. bio.	Ll. poe.	Geographic origin	Date(s)	Profession(s)	Other notes
1	1	Ḥażrat Shāh Ismāʿīl Ṣafavī "Khaṭāʾī"	8	11	65	1	"Emerged" from Gīlān and Lāhījān	Born in 892; died in 930; etc.	Sovereign	Descent listed to Mūsá al-Kāẓim; conquests summarized; quotes from Awḥadī, Ẓahīr, Umīdī; etc.
2	1	Bahrām Mīrzā	11	12	14	2	N/A	Died in Ramaḍān 956	Safavid prince	Had good nastaʿlīq; also interested in music; SM laments that he died too young
3	1	Sulṭān Muḥammad Mīrzā	12	13	14	1	N/A	N/A	Safavid prince	SM praises him effusively; lines by Jāmī quoted
4	1	Sulṭān Ḥasan	13	14	11	2	Gīlān and Lāhījān (inferred)	Died in 903	Safavid governor	Governor of Gīlān and Lāhījān; of the Kārkiyā family; a Ḥusaynī sayyid
5	1	Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā	14	16	25	9	N/A	Took power, 875; died, 911	Sovereign	Great patron of the arts; Timurid and Chinggisid descent mentioned; two Turkic lines quoted
6	1	Badīʿ al-Zamān Mīrzā	16	18	22	2	N/A	Defeated, 913; died, 920	Timurid prince	Son of SHB (no. 5); co-regent for a brief time; traveled all over, tried repeatedly to regain power
7	1	Farīdūn Ḥusayn Mīrzā	18	18	12	2	Ruled in Astarābād and Dāmghān	Killed by Uzbeks, 915	Timurid prince	Also a son of SHB (no. 5); tried to hold out after his father's death
8	1	Shāh Gharīb Mīrzā	18	19	4	1	N/A	N/A	Timurid prince	Also a son of SHB (no. 5); died young
9	1	Muḥammad Muʾmin Mīrzā	19	20	25	3	N/A	Defeated, 902; killed, 903	Timurid prince	Son of Badīʿ al-Zamān (no. 6); defeated by Muẓaffar Ḥusayn, killed at the order of Khadījah Begum
10	1	Bābur Pādshāh	20	21	15	1	N/A	Defeated, 904; died, 937; etc.	Sovereign	Timurid descent listed; briefly helped by Shah Ismāʿīl; made Agra his capital; quoted line is Turkic
11	1	Humāyūn Pādshāh	21	23	25	5	N/A	Afghan war, 944; now 957 (!)	Sovereign	Ruled from Qandahār to Bengal; gradually forced out, fled to Iran; praise poem for Ṭahmāsb quoted
12	1	ʿAskarī Mīrzā	23	23	8	1	N/A	N/A	Mughal prince	Another son of Bābur; governed Qandahār under Humāyūn, for a time
13	1	Sulṭān Yaʿqūb	23	25	22	2	Diyār Bakr	Acceded in 883; died in 896	Sovereign	Son of Uzun Ḥasan; of "pre-Islamic" Ughūz descent (!); betrayed the Safavids; supported poetry; etc.
14	1	Sulṭān Salīm	25	25	8	1	N/A	Died in 926	Sovereign	Long descent chain listed; ruled eight years, eight months, six days; SM is strongly critical
15	1	Sulṭān Sulaymān	25	27	42	1	N/A	Acceded in 926; now 957 (!)	Sovereign	Son of Salīm (no. 14); strange anecdote (of his accession?); invaded Iran a few times; etc.
16	1	Shaybak Khān	27	28	21	1	Turkistān	Conquests in 906, 913	Sovereign	Of Chinggisid descent; briefly served Timurids; wanted a Turkic Shāhnāmah; quoted line is Turkic
17	1	ʿUbayd Allāh Khān ibn Sulṭān Maḥmūd	28	29	9	1	N/A	N/A	Sovereign	Nephew of Shaybak Khān (no. 16); likened to ʿUbayd Allāh ibn Ziyād; had some good qualities
18	1	Shāh ʿĀdil	29	29	6	1	Ruled in Lār	Killed in 952	Safavid governor	From an extraordinarily long line of rulers; killed by knife (kārd) by an ignorant person (majhūl)
19	1	Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn	30	30	11	1	Governed Qandahār, Sind	N/A	Timurid, Mughal governor	Withstood Bābur's siege of Qandahār for three years (!), surrendered peacefully
20	2,1	Mīr ʿAbd al-Bāqī "Bāqī"	31	32	13	3	Yazd (not mentioned by SM)	Martyred in Rajab 920	Senior official (ṣadr, vakīl)	Descendant of Shāh Niʿmat Allāh; served Shah Ismāʿīl; killed at Chāldirān; SM quotes Umīdī
21	2,1	Mīr Qavām al-Dīn Ḥasan	32	33	6	2	Iṣfahān	Appointed co-ṣadr in 930	Judge (qāżī) in Iṣfahān	From a leading sayyid family; temporarily shared ṣadārat with Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad
22	2,1	Amīr Muʿizz al-Dīn Muḥammad "Fayżī"	33	34	12	7	Iṣfahān; buried in Karbalāʾ	Died in Baṣrah, 952	Religious official (ṣadr)	Sayyid; faqīh; made the pilgrimage to Mecca; seven years as Ṭahmāsb's ṣadr; retired to Mashhad
23	2,1	Amīr Muḥammad Amīr Yūsuf "Khulqī"	34	35	11	4	Shakar-āb of Ray; lived in Harāt	Martyred in Rajab 927	Religious official (ṣadr)	Learned sayyid; son of Mīr ʿIzz al-Dīn Yūsuf (?); served SHB, Shah Ismāʿīl; killed by Amīr Khān
24	2,1	Amīr Taqī al-Dīn Muḥammad	35	35	9	1	Worked in Harāt	Died in Jerusalem, 944	Religious official (ṣadr)	Son of Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn Ṣadr (?); was SM's ṣadr in Harāt; sayyid; famously generous
25	2,1	Mīrzā Sharaf-i Jahān	35	36	7	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	Son of Qāżī Jahān (?); SM suggests an improvement to one of the quoted lines
26	2,1	Mīr Qudsī	36	36	5	1	Karbalāʾ; family came to Sabzavār	N/A	N/A	Named Abṭahī Karbalāʾī; pious sayyid; takhalluṣ is Qudsī
27	2,1	Shāh Ṣafī	36	37	4	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	Brother of Shāh Qavām al-Dīn Nūrbakhshī (?); went on ḥajj
28	2,1	Amīr Hādī	37	38	7	4	N/A	N/A	Fmr. muḥtasib, mutavallī	Mūsavī sayyid; muḥtasib under Ṭahmāsb, then erred and was removed; mutavallī of Rażavī shrine
29	2,1	Amīr Ḥājj	38	39	13	5	Junābad (Gunābād)	N/A	N/A	Sayyid, ascetic; refused gifts from Amīr ʿAlī Shīr; SM quotes from Jāmī, Āhī; javāb of Amīr Khusraw
30	2,1	Mīrzā Qāsim "Qāsimī"	39	42	24	34	Junābād (Gunābād)	N/A	N/A	From a leading sayyid family; brother of local ruler; wrote maṡnavīs, incl. futūḥāt of Shah Ismāʿīl; etc.
31	2,1	Mīrzā Aṣghar "Fanāʾī"	42	43	3	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	Rażavī sayyid; descendant of Amīr Ghiyāṡ al-Dīn ʿAzīz (?)
32	2,1	Amīr Sayyid Sharīf	43	43	5	1	Apparently lives in Shīrāz	N/A	N/A	Descendant of Amīr Sayyid Sharīf Bāqī (?); from an important family; holds some position in Shīrāz
33	2,1	Shāh Ṭāhir	43	44	7	3	Kāshān; moved to India	Died in 952	Government official (vakīl)	Vakīl of the Niẓām Shāh (Burhān I), converted him to Shīʿism; tatabbuʿ of Anvarī
34	2,1	Qāżī Rūḥ Allāh	44	44	9	1	Qazvīn	Died in 948	Judge (qāżī)	Brother of Qāżī Jahān (?); Qazvīnī sayyid of Qāżī Sayf al-Dīn; knew a ton of poetry
35	2,1	Mīr ʿAbd al-Bāqī	45	45	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	Son of Qāżī Jahān (?); died young
36	2,1	Qāżī Maḥmūd	45	45	3	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	Son of Qāżī Rūḥ Allāh (no. 34); a serious student; still young; SM expresses hope for him
37	2,1	Mīr ʿAbd al-Karīm	45	45	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Grandson (dukhtar-zādah) of Qāżī Jahān (?); served Ṭahmāsb for a time
38	2,1	Mīr Ḥusayn	45	45	4	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Younger brother of Mīr ʿAbd al-Karīm (no. 37); son of Mīr ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīm (?); young, around twenty
39	2,1	Khalīfah Asad Allāh	46	46	3	2	Iṣfahān (inferred)	N/A	N/A	Descendant of Khalīfah Hidāyat Allāh Iṣfahānī (?); important sayyid family; serious student
40	2,1	Mīrzā Sulṭān Ibrāhīm Amīnī	46	47	13	4	Harāt (not mentioned by SM)	Killed by Uzbeks, 941	Religious official (ṣadr)	Ṣadr of SHB; author of several works, incl. Futūḥāt-i shāhī; SM asked him to explain a poem
41	2,1	Mīr Humāyūn	47	49	9	12	Isfarāyin; moved to ʿIrāq	N/A	Court service	Served Sulṭān Yaʿqūb; buried in Armak (?) of Kāshān
42	2,1	Qāżī Ikhtiyār	49	49	7	2	Turbat of Khurāsān	N/A	Qāżī al-qużāt of Harāt	Senior official under SHB; dedicated a maṡnavī to Shah Ismāʿīl; SM accuses him of stealing poetry
43	2,1	Mīr ʿAlī ʿArab	49	50	3	1	Karbalāʾ (inferred)	Died in 954	N/A	Brother of Mīr Ḥusayn Karbalāʾī (?); sayyid
44	2,1	Amīr Rāstī	50	50	3	1	Tabrīz; grew up in Khurāsān	N/A	N/A	Tabrīzī sayyid
45	2,1	Kamāl Ismāʿīl	50	50	4	3	Worked in Tabrīz	N/A	Muḥtasib, fmr. mutavallī	Sayyid; served as mutavallī of the Naṣrīyah in Tabrīz (?); now muḥtasib of the entire realm (?!)
46	2,1	Amīr ʿAzīz Allāh	50	51	5	4	Abhar; grew up in Qazvīn	N/A	Vazīr of Qāżī Jahān (?)	Abharī sayyid
47	2,1	Qāżī Muḥammad	51	51	5	1	Varāmīn; worked in Ray	N/A	Government official	Varāmīnī sayyid; son of Qāżī Shukr Allāh (?); formerly held some office (kalāntarī) in Ray
48	2,1	Qāżī ʿAṭāʾ Allāh	51	51	4	1	Varāmīn	N/A	Court service	Brother of Qāżī Muḥammad (no. 47); speaks his mind too much; served Ṭahmāsb; now in Varāmīn

Appendix 7: Entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (ed. Humāyūn Farrukh)

No.	Ch.	Name	Start p.	End p.	Ll. bio.	Ll. poe.	Geographic origin	Date(s)	Profession(s)	Other notes
49	2,1	Mīr Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn Khalqī	51	52	3	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	Son of Mīr Ḥakīmī Ṭabīb (?); has a dīvān of ghazals
50	2,1	Mīrak Khurd	52	52	3	2	N/A	Died in Harāt, 932	N/A	Relative of Amīr Muḥammad Yūsuf (?)
51	2,1	Sayyid Ḥasan Qāżī "Ḥazīn"	52	53	4	1	Astarābād; lived in Harāt	Martyred in 939	Fmr. judge (qāżī)	Astarābādī sayyid; served as qāżī of Harāt; killed under ʿUbayd Khān (in Harāt?) for being Shīʿī
52	2,1	Mīr Ḥasan Findiriskī	53	53	4	2	Findirisk of Astarābād	N/A	N/A	Sayyid; SM is highly complimentary of his poetry
53	2,1	Amīr Khwānd-zādah Hāshim = Mīr Ṭabl-i Bāz	53	54	13	2	Tirmiẕ	N/A	Court service	Tirmiẕī sayyid; served Humāyūn, accompanied him to Iran; left for the Ḥijāz; takhalluṣ is Dilīrī; etc.
53,5	2,1	Shāh Qāsim a.k.a. Budalā "Vāqifī"	54	54	4	1	Ṭayyib-ābād	Went on ḥajj two years ago	N/A	Important sayyid of ʿIrāq; apparently famous; SM may have corresponded with him; second no. 53
54	2,1	Mīr ʿAbd al-Bāqī a.k.a. Maqbūlī	54	55	12	1	Iṣfahān	N/A	Shrine custodian (mutavallī)	Iṣfahānī sayyid; mutavallī, Imām-zādah Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn; noted chef; javāb, "Subḥat al-abrār"; etc.
55	2,1	N/A					N/A	N/A	N/A	This number seems to have been skipped by accident...
56	2,1	Amīr ʿĀshiq Turbatī	55	55	4	1	Turbat	Died in Turbat, 945	N/A	Was uneducated (ʿāmmī); lived to ninety; enthusiastic about poetry in old age
57	2,1	Mīr ʿAlī Akbar	55	55	2	1	Mashhad (inferred)	N/A	Fmr. muḥtasib	Son of Amīr Hādī Mashhadī (?), who was also a muḥtasib
58	2,1	Amīr Faṣīḥ al-Dīn Muḥammad	55	56	4	2	Lives in Tabrīz	N/A	Muḥtasib	Brother of Mīr Rāstī (no. 44); worked in nawkarī-i Turkān (?); now in Tabrīz, mutavallī-i Naṣrīyah (?)
59	2,1	Amīr Yusrá mashhūr bi-Mīr Nāqah	56	56	4	1	Mashhad; lives in Shīrāz	N/A	N/A	Confusing anecdote involving an exchange of insults with Mawlānā Ḥusayn Kāshī
60	2,1	Amīr Vāqifī	56	56	5	1	Nīshāpūr; moved to Tabrīz	N/A	N/A	Spent forty years at the shrine complex of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib (where?)
61	2,1	Sayyid Māyilī	56	56	2	1	Kāshān	N/A	N/A	Legitimate (ṣaḥīḥ al-nasab) sayyid of Kāshān; wrote a tatabbuʿ of Amīr Khusraw's "Daryā-yi abrār"
62	2,1	Mīr Murtażá	56	56	1	1	Kāshān (inferred)	N/A	N/A	Son of Amīr Māyilī (no. 61)
63	2,1	Amīr Rāzī (?)	56	57	2	1	Isfarāyin	N/A	N/A	N/A
64	2,1	Amīr Bīkhudī	57	57	4	1	Hamadān	N/A	N/A	Heavy user of ḥashīsh (bang); funny story about his going to the mosque stoned
65	2,1	Amīr Ramzī Sabzavārī	57	57	2	1	Sabzavār (presumably)	N/A	Geomancer (rammāl)	Sometimes reads others' poetry as his own; SM doubts the quoted line is his
66	2,1	Amīr Abū al-Fatḥ Junābadī	57	57	2	1	Gunābād (presumably)	N/A	Local leader (khudā)	N/A
67	2,1	Amīr Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad Uskūʾī	57	58	12	1	Uskū of Tabrīz	N/A	N/A	Served Ṭahmāsb with his brothers (nos. 68–70); they were unsophisticated (rūstāʾī), fell out of favor
68	2,1	Amīr Qamar al-Dīn Maḥmūd	58	58	3	1	Uskū of Tabrīz (inferred)	N/A	N/A	Among the Uskūʾī brothers; a decent dancer
69	2,1	Amīr Niẓām al-Dīn Aḥmad	58	58	4	1	Uskū of Tabrīz (inferred)	N/A	Key-holder (kilīd-dār)	Was key-holder (kilīd-dār) of Ṭahmāsb's library, before he and his brothers fell from grace
70	2,1	Abū al-Maḥārim	58	59	7	1	Uskū of Tabrīz (inferred)	N/A	N/A	Worst of the Uskūʾī brothers; caused them all to be punished (ʿaẕāb); shamelessly stole a poem
71	2,1	Amīr Vālihī Astarābādī	59	59	2	1	Astarābād (presumably)	N/A	Butcher (qaṣṣāb)	Known for his generosity (sakhāvat)
72	2,1	Amīr Riżāʾī	59	59	2	1	Hazār-jarīb; lived in Simnān	N/A	Judge (qāżī) in Simnān	From a sayyid family of Hazār-jarīb
73	2,1	Mīr Mursal	59	59	2	1	Sāvah	N/A	Textile merchant (bazzāz)	N/A
74	2,1	Amīr Aṣīlī	60	60	2	1	Qum	N/A	N/A	Qumī sayyid
75	2,1	Mīr Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad	60	60	2	1	Kirmān	N/A	N/A	From a leading family in Kirmān (buzurg-zādah)
76	2,1	Mīr Quraysh	60	60	3	2	Kāshān	N/A	N/A	Good at geomancy (raml); describes himself as a libertine (lavand)
77	2,1	Amīr Zindah-dil	60	60	2	1	Sāvah	N/A	N/A	Hermit-like (abdāl-vash) and crazy (dīvānah-ṭawr)
78	2,1	Amīr Murādī	60	60	2	2	Astarābād	N/A	N/A	Composed a lot of hajv
79	2,1	Amīr Hāshimī Bukhārāʾī	60	61	2	1	Bukhārā (presumably)	N/A	Fmr. court official	Served as ṣadr for rulers of Bukhārā
80	2,1	Sayyid ʿAbd al-Khāliq	61	61	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	Nūrbakhshī; has a dīvān of ghazals
81	2,1	Mīr ʿAbd al-Ṣamad "ʿAṭāʾī"	61	61	2	1	Kāshān	N/A	N/A	A master (ustād) in painting and taẕhīb (illuminating?)
82	2,1	Sayyid Murtażá Zarkash	61	61	5	1	Kāshān; later went to Gīlān (?)	N/A	N/A	Kāshānī sayyid; crazy; once sent people on a fruitless treasure hunt
83	2,1	Amīr Ḥusayn ʿAbdal	62	62	1	1	Kāshān	N/A	N/A	One of the old poets of Kāshān
84	2,1	Mīr Muḥammad Shiḥnah	62	62	1	1	Kāshān (inferred)	N/A	N/A	One of the old poets of Kāshān
85	2,1	Amīr Sayyid Muẓaffar Ṭabīb	62	62	3	1	Kāshān	N/A	Physician (ṭabīb)	Has treatises in medicine, and one in ethics titled Akhlāq-i Hāshimī; has a dīvān of ghazals
86	2,1	Sayyid Haybat Allāh	62	62	2	1	Kāshān	N/A	Merchant/trader (tijārat)	Known for his arrow-making (tīr-garī) and good handwriting
87	2,1	Sayyid Yaʿqūb	62	62	2	1	Qumī family; born in Kāshān	N/A	Tailor (khayyāṭ)	N/A
88	2,1	Amīr ʿAbd Allāh	62	63	3	1	Kāshān (apparently)	N/A	N/A	Son of aforementioned Amīr ʿAbd al-Ṣamad (no. 81); famous for knowing others' poetry
89	2,1	Sayyid ʿAbd al-Ṣamad	63	63	3	1	Ray (perhaps)	N/A	Fmr. judge (qāżī)	Among the sayyids of Qāżī Sayf al-Dīn; family of judges in Ray; vaṣī of Qāżī ʿAbd Allāh (no. 88?)
90	2,1	Mīr ʿAzīz Qalandar	63	63	3	1	Kāshān	N/A	N/A	Famous for hajv, drunkenness, shamelessness, etc.
91	2,1	Qāżī Masʿūd	63	63	3	1	Ray (apparently)	N/A	Judge (qāżī) in Ray	Son of Qāżī Sayyid ʿAbd Allāh (no. 88?)
92	2,1	Mīr ʿAyn al-Qużāt	63	64	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Nephew of the aforementioned Qāżī ʿAbd Allāh (no. 88?)
93	2,1	Amīr Jaʿfar Ṣādiqī	64	64	2	1	Qazvīn (perhaps)	N/A	N/A	Among the sayyids of Qāżī Sayf al-Dīn; gūshah-nishīn
94	2,1	Amīr Muṭīʿī	64	64	3	3	Tūn	N/A	Merchant/trader (tijārat)	Something about his unwillingness to share poetry without being paid (?)
95	2,1	Sayyid Muḥammad ʿAvāmil "Muttaqī"	64	65	4	1	Ray	N/A	N/A	A sayyid of Ray; old; named after a grammatical treatise (!); composes poetry in his sleep (?)

Appendix 7: Entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (ed. Humāyūn Farrukh)

No.	Ch.	Name	Start p.	End p.	Ll. bio.	Ll. poe.	Geographic origin	Date(s)	Profession(s)	Other notes
96	2,1	Amīr ʿInāyat Allāh	65	65	2	2	Ray	N/A	Shrine custodian (mutavallī)	Mutavallī of the shrine of Imām-zādah ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīm in Ray; used to compose poetry
97	2,1	Amīr Nūr Allāh	65	65	2	1	Ray (inferred)	N/A	Fmr. shrine caretaker	Son of Amīr ʿInāyat Allāh (no. 96); worked with father at shrine (apparently)
98	2,1	Amīr Sayyid	65	66	7	1	Ray (inferred)	N/A	N/A	Brother of no. 97; writes bad poetry; funny vużūʾ story; quoted line is actually by Darvīsh Dihakī (!)
99	2,1	Amīr Hidāyat Allāh "ʿAẓīmī"	66	66	2	1	Ray (inferred)	N/A	N/A	A sayyid of "the aforementioned city," presumably Ray
100	2,1	Sayyid ʿAlī Shāh	66	66	2	1	Ray (inferred)	N/A	N/A	Son of Amīr ʿInāyat Allāh (no. 96); has a lot of poetry memorized
101	2,1	Sayyid Shāh Mīr "Shāhakī"	66	66	2	2	Qumī; lives in Ray	N/A	N/A	His father was from a sayyid family of Qum
102	2,1	Mīr Ibrāhīm	66	66	2	1	Ray (inferred)	N/A	N/A	Brother of Amīr Hidāyat Allāh (no. 99)
103	2,1	Amīr Ḥāmid	67	67	1	1	Qum or Ray (inferred)	N/A	N/A	Brother of Sayyid Shāh Mīr (no. 101)
104	2,1	Amīr ʿAjabī	67	67	1	1	Ray	N/A	N/A	An indigent sayyid of Ray
105	2,1	Sayyid Ḥusayn Vāʿiẓ "Fayżī"	67	67	2	1	Shirvān	N/A	Perhaps a preacher (vāʿiẓ)?	Shirvānī sayyid
106	2,1	Amīr Zuhrī (?)	67	67	2	1	Iṣfahān	N/A	N/A	Iṣfahānī sayyid; drunk
107	2,1	Amīr Żiyāʾī Nīshāpūrī	67	67	2	1	Nīshāpūr (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Was a pious sayyid
108	2,1	Amīr Fażlī Hamadānī	67	67	2	1	Hamadān	N/A	Grocer (baqqāl)	N/A
109	2,1	Amīr Ibrāhīm Ḥusayn Mukhtār	68	68	3	1	Sabzavār	N/A	N/A	Sabzavārī sayyid; brother of Mīr Muḥammad Qāsim (?); drunk
110	2,1	Mīr Zaynī	68	68	3	2	Badakhshān	N/A	N/A	Badakhshānī sayyid
111	2,1	Amīr Musayyab (Muṣīb?)	68	68	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Rażavī sayyid
112	2,1	Mīr Nāṭiqī	68	68	1	1	Qazvīn	N/A	N/A	Qazvīnī sayyid
113	2,1	Amīr Saʿd al-Mulk "Sāyilī"	68	69	3	2	Qazvīn	N/A	Prayer leader (imām)	Ḥusaynī sayyid of Qazvīn
114	2,1	Amīr Ḥusayn	69	69	2	1	Qazvīn (inferred)	N/A	N/A	A sayyid of "the aforementioned city," presumably Qazvīn
115	2,1	Mīr Qālabī (?)	69	69	5	1	Iṣfahān; later lived in Shīrāz	N/A	Textile decoration (?)	While young, worked in qālabak-zanī; famous for dirty poetry; killed in Khurāsān
116	2,1	Mīrzā Muḥsin	69	69	3	1	Astarābād (apparently)	N/A	N/A	Son of Mīr Qāsim Najafī; sometimes among the "siyah-pūshān" (?); killed Shihāb Zargar (?)
117	2,1	Amīr Shams Piyādah	69	70	8	1	Kāshān	N/A	Military officer (sipāhī-garī)	Ḥusaynī sayyid; father ran shrine of Bābā Shujāʿ al-Dīn; went with Ṭahmāsb on foot (piyādah); etc.
118	2,1	Mīr Ḥaydar	70	70	2	1	Sabzavār	N/A	N/A	Among the ḥuffāẓ of Sabzavār
119	2,1	Mīr Mūsá	70	70	2	1	Qazvīn (perhaps)	N/A	N/A	Among the sayyids of Qāżī Sayf al-Dīn
120	2,1	Amīr Quraysh	70	70	2	1	Astarābād	N/A	N/A	Astarābādī sayyid
121	2,1	Amīr Saʿd al-Ḥaqq "Naṣībī"	70	71	3	2	Yazd	N/A	N/A	Nūrbakhshī sayyid (?)
122	2,1	Amīr Qurbī (?)	71	71	3	1	Gīlānī; lives in Qazvīn	N/A	N/A	Ḥusaynī sayyid; fell hopelessly in love with a boy
123	2,1	Sayyid Bāqir	71	71	2	1	Simnān	N/A	N/A	Simnānī sayyid
124	2,1	Mīr ʿAlī Kiyā	71	71	2	1	Qazvīn	N/A	N/A	Among the Sayfī sayyids of Qazvīn; still young
125	2,1	Mīr Fidāʾī	71	72	2	3	Astarābād	N/A	N/A	Among the kharrāṭī sayyids of Astarābād (?); named Amīr ʿImād
126	2,1	Mīr Shakvá	72	72	2	1	Shīrāz	N/A	N/A	Sayyid; good at ṣaḥḥāfī (bookbinding?) and lājvard-shūʾī (washing lapis lazuli?)
127	2,1	Amīr Muʿizz al-Dīn Ḥusayn Mūsavī	72	72	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Has good ideas (takhayyulāt) in poetry
128	2,1	Sayyid ʿAlī Kamūnah	72	72	2	1	N/A	N/A	Court service	Nephew of Sayyid Muḥammad-i Ṡānī (?); in the service of Shah Ṭahmāsb
129	2,1	Mīr Abū al-Makārim "Ḥāżirī"	72	72	5	1	Mashhad	N/A	N/A	From a leading family (nuqabāʾ) of Mashhad; still young, perhaps twenty; javāb of Jāmī
130	2,1	Mīr Afżal Khwāb-bīn	72	73	4	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	Son of Sulṭān ʿAlī Khwāb-bīn, who could see people at will in his dreams; has a dīvān of ghazals
131	2,1	Amīr ʿAbd al-Karīm	73	73	2	2	Iṣfahān (perhaps)	N/A	N/A	Brother of Mīr Maqbūlī (no. 54?); knows some geomancy (raml)
132	2,1	Mīrzā Ibrāhīm Qānūnī	73	73	3	2	N/A	N/A	Musician (apparently)	Plays qānūn in the style of Khwājah ʿAbd Allāh (?)
133	2,1	Mīr Sharīfī	73	74	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Expert in the science of music
134	2,1	Āqā Mīrak Naqqāsh	74	74	7	1	Iṣfahān	N/A	Painter for Ṭahmāsb	Sayyid; famous artist; javāb of Jāmī; SM asked him to explain the quoted line
135	2,1	Mīr ʿAlī Kātib	74	74	5	2	Harātī; grew up in Mashhad	Moved to Transoxiana in 935	Calligrapher (apparently)	Sayyid; served Mawlānā Sulṭān ʿAlī in Mashhad; perhaps *taken* to Transoxiana (by Uzbeks?)
136	2,1	Mīr Riżāʾī	74	75	3	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	Rażavī sayyid; young; has a dīvān of ghazals; has qaṣīdahs on manqabat
137	2,1	Mīr Ḥabīb Allāh Qupūzī	75	75	3	1	Harāt (perhaps)	N/A	Musician	Son of Mīr Sar-birahnah, a ṣadr of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Mīrzā; but he played qupūz
138	2,1	Mīr Ṣafī	75	75	3	1	Nīshāpūr	N/A	N/A	Sayyid; writes excellent nastaʿlīq
139	2,2	Qāżī Mīr Ḥusayn "Manṭiqī"	76	76	9	2	Yazd; born in Maybud	N/A	Scholar	Studied with Davānī in Shīrāz; SM makes a vaguely sectarian comment
140	2,2	Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Davānī	76	77	10	4	Davān	Died in 908	Philosopher	Wrote "Sharḥ-i tajrīd va tafrīd"; chronograms quoted for death of Sulṭān Abū Saʿīd, birth of Davānī
141	2,2	Mawlānā Ḥusayn Ardabīlī	77	78	9	2	Ardabīl (presumably)	Died in 905	Court/personal service	Served Ḥaydar Ṣafavī; spent time in Khurāsān; finally returned home to work at the shrine
142	2,2	Mawlānā Muḥammad Abū Ṭālib Jurjānī "Ḥazīnī"	78	78	7	1	Jurjānī; later years in Kāshān	Died in 945	N/A	Spent a long time at the ʿatabāt
143	2,2	Amīr Fayż Allāh "Ḥājibī"	79	80	12	8	Baghdād; lived in Kāshān, Shīrāz	N/A	Army judge (qāżī-i muʿaskar)	Of Barmakid descent; spent time at the ʿatabāt; studied at various places, also incl. Tabrīz

Appendix 7: Entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (ed. Humāyūn Farrukh)

No.	Ch.	Name	Start p.	End p.	Ll. bio.	Ll. poe.	Geographic origin	Date(s)	Profession(s)	Other notes
144	2,2	Mawlānā Sulṭān Muḥammad Astarābādī "Ṣidqī"	80	81	13	10	Astarābād; lived mostly in Kāshān	Died in Kāshān, 952	Scholar, poet	Unlucky fellow; SM has a great quote about fate; wrote a sāqī-nāmah
145	2,2	Mawlānā Qāżī Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Muʿallim	82	82	7	1	Lāhījān of Gīlān	N/A	Ṣadr, teacher of princes	Served as ṣadr under Ismāʿīl; taught Safavid princes except for SM; still alive, past ninety (!)
146	2,2	Mawlānā Rukn al-Dīn Masʿūd	82	82	5	1	Shīrāz; moved to Kāshān	Died in 946	Physician (ṭabīb)	Studied medicine with Ṣadr al-Dīn ʿAlī (Shīrāzī); was Ṭahmāsb's physician for a time
147	2,2	Mawlānā Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn	82	83	6	2	N/A	Died in 953	Physician (ṭabīb)	Son of Rukn al-Dīn Masʿūd (no. 146); SM praises his qualities in all areas
148	2,2	Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Ṭabīb	83	83	4	1	Iṣfahān; spent time in Gīlān	N/A	Physician (ṭabīb)	Studied medicine with Ṣadr al-Dīn ʿAlī Shīrāzī; served Shah Ismāʿīl
149	2,2	Mawlānā Sharaf al-Dīn ʿAlī Bāfqī	83	84	9	3	Bāfq of Kirmān (!)	N/A	Poet	SM praises his javāb of Jāmī
150	2,2	Qāżī ʿAbd al-Khāliq Karah-rūdī	84	84	4	1	Qum	N/A	Judge (qāżī)	Despite being a judge, devotes a lot of his time to dirty poetry
151	2,2	Mawlānā ʿIzz al-Dīn Jabalī (Jibillī?)	84	85	5	4	Qazvīn	N/A	N/A	From an established Qazvīnī family; anecdote involving his madḥ of the ruler of Gīlān
152	2,2	Mawlānā Amān Allāh	85	85	2	1	Qazvīn	Died in 950	N/A	Of the Ḥijāzīyah class in Qazvīn (?); known as Mawlānā Amān Jān
153	2,2	Mawlānā Ẕū al-Nūn	85	86	6	3	Khiyāraj (?) of Qazvīn	N/A	Physician (ṭabīb)	Nephew of Adham Munshī; studied medicine with ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Muḥammad; with SM ten years; etc.
154	2,2	Ḥakīm Khabbāz "Ṭabʿī"	86	86	3	2	Iṣfahān	N/A	N/A	Named ʿInāyat Allāh
155	2,2	Mawlānā Ṣunʿ Allāh	86	87	4	1	Kāshān; lives in Tabrīz	Poem about 944 event	Physician (ṭabīb)	Wrote a qaṣīdah with chronograms for the 944 conquest of Shirvān
156	2,2	Mawlānā ʿAbd al-ʿAlī Tūnī	87	87	3	1	Tūn (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Pious, known for eschewing sinning
157	2,2	Mawlānā Khalīl Allāh Munajjim	87	87	6	3	Kāshān	N/A	Astral scientist (munajjim)	Strange anecdote involving Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn, Amīr Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Ṣadr Astarābādī
158	2,2	Mawlānā Shāh Qulī	87	88	2	2	Khalkhāl of ʿIrāq	N/A	N/A	N/A
159	2,2	Mawlānā Ṭālib Gīlānī	88	88	3	1	Gīlān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Studied medicine; wrote a treatise on poetry
160	2,2	Mawlānā Ashraf	88	88	2	1	Ardabīl of ʿIrāq	N/A	N/A	Has good handwriting
161	2,2	Shaykh Fażl Allāh	88	88	2	2	Shīrāz	N/A	N/A	Takhalluṣ is Valī
162	3	Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn	89	90	20	1	Iṣfahān	Killed in 929	Qābiż (collector?), vazīr	Vazīr under Shah Ismāʿīl (?); killed by fmr. rikāb-dār; Salmān Sāvajī quoted; javāb of Jāmī; etc.
163	3	Khwājah Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Tabrīzī	90	91	7	2	Tabrīz (presumably)	Killed in 930	Vazīr	Served Ismāʿīl, and briefly Ṭahmāsb; burned to death after machinations by Dīv Sulṭān
164	3	Malik Maḥmūd Jān Daylamī	91	91	6	1	Qazvīn	N/A	Vazīr	Of the Dayālimah (?); claims descent from Mālik al-Ashtar; served Yaʿqūb, then Ismāʿīl
165	3	Shāh Mīr	92	92	5	2	Qazvīn (inferred)	N/A	N/A	Son of Malik Maḥmūd Jān (no. 164); student of Ḥājjī Maḥmūd Tabrīzī (?)
166	3	Jalāl al-Dīn Amīr Beg	92	92	5	2	Naṭanz of ʿIrāq	N/A	N/A	Related to Muḥammad Kajajī (?); perhaps the brother of Shāh Mīr (no. 165); confusing notice
167	3	Khwājah Ghiyāś al-Dīn	93	93	3	2	Lived in ʿIrāq-i ʿArab	N/A	N/A	Brother of Kh. Amīr Beg Muhr-dār; sent a hajv to a poet who praised him in a qaṣīdah (?)
168	3	Khwājah Ghiyāś al-Dīn Batakchī	93	93	3	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Brother of Kh. Muẓaffar; son (descendant?) of Kh. Fakhr al-Dīn Batakchī
169	3	Khwājah Darvīsh	93	93	6	1	N/A	N/A	Court/personal service	Brother of Kh. Ghiyāś al-Dīn Batakchī (no. 168); incredible, dirty anecdote involving Kupak Mīrzā
170	3	Mīrzā Aḥmad	93	94	4	1	Daylam (perhaps)	N/A	N/A	Among the Dayālimah; spent his life drinking, pursuing romance; his friends' names are mentioned
171	3	Khwājah ʿInāyat Allāh	94	94	2	2	Daylam (perhaps)	N/A	Administrative service	Another member of the same ṭāʾifah, i.e., the Dayālimah
172	3	Sayf al-Dīn Maḥmūd Rajāʾī	94	95	8	4	Iṣfahān	N/A	Administrative service	Javāb of Umīdī; SM called him khush-lahjah; son of Kamāl al-Dīn Ismāʿīl (?); excellent at hajv
173	3	ʿAbdī Beg	95	96	10	7	Shīrāz	N/A	Court service	SM praises him (hindsight is 20/20!); an excellent poet focusing on maśnavī; javābs of the Khamsah
174	3	Shāh Ṣadr	96	96	2	1	Daylam (perhaps)	Died in 955	N/A	Descendant of Shāh ʿInāyat Allāh Daylamī
175	3	Amīr Farāmarz "Ilāhī"	96	96	4	2	Daylam (perhaps)	N/A	N/A	From a leading family of the Dayālimah (?); partied hard and died young
176	3	Maqṣūd Beg	96	97	6	2	Shīrāz; born in Tabrīz	N/A	Administrative service	Excellent in inshāʾ; works in the daftar-khānah-i humāyūn; knows a lot about poetry
177	3	Khwājah Hidāyat Allāh	97	98	5	9	Kāshān	N/A	Court service	A specialist in tazrīq poetry; works at the royal stable; wrote a Laylī u Majnūn
178	3	Khwājah Shaykh Muḥammad	98	98	2	1	Lives in Iṣfahān	N/A	N/A	Son of Khwājah Qavām al-Dīn Muḥammad Żaʿīf
179	3	Khwājah Malik	98	98	2	1	Iṣfahān	N/A	N/A	Skilled in ʿilm-i siyāq
180	3	Khwājah Murshid	98	98	3	1	Shīrāz (inferred)	N/A	N/A	Son of Khwājah Mīrak Shīrāzī, who held a senior position in the dīvān-i aʿlá
181	3	Masʿūd Beg	98	98	2	1	Shīrāz (inferred)	N/A	N/A	Younger brother of Khwājah Murshid (no. 180); good at poetry and siyāq
182	3	Mīrzā Adham	99	99	2	1	Shīrāz (inferred)	Died in Ardabīl, 956	N/A	A brother of the preceding two
183	3	Amīr Hāshim	99	99	3	1	Qazvīn (inferred)	N/A	Court service	Descendant of Amīr Khwājagī Qazvīnī; killed in Shirvān
184	3	Khwājah Ḥabīb Allāh	99	99	1	1	Qazvīn (inferred)	N/A	N/A	Descendant of Khwājah Fatḥ Allāh Qazvīnī
185	3	Hidāyat Allāh Ẓahīr (Ẓuhayr?)	99	99	2	1	N/A	N/A	Administrative service	Brother of Shāh Ṣadr (no. 174)
186	3	Mīrak Mīr ʿUbayd	99	100	1	1	Daylam (perhaps)	N/A	N/A	Descendant of Mīr Qāsim Daylamī
187	3	Shāh Qāżī	100	100	2	1	N/A	N/A	Administrative service	Son of Shāh Ṣadr (no. 174); "dar umūr-i dīvānī vāqif ast..."
188	3	Shāh ʿInāyat Allāh	100	100	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Also a son of Ṣadr Qāżī (no. 174?)
189	3	Jamshīd Beg	100	100	1	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Also a son of Shāh Ṣadr (no. 174) (?)
190	3	Bahrām Beg	100	100	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Also a descendant of Shāh Ṣadr (no. 174); "he attributes this line to himself..."
191	3	Khwājah Ḥaydar ʿAlī "Ẕawqī"	100	100	2	1	Jurpādaqān (Gulpāyagān)	N/A	Court service (?)	Serves Turks in some capacity

Appendix 7: Entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (ed. Humāyūn Farrukh)

No.	Ch.	Name	Start p.	End p.	Ll. bio.	Ll. poe.	Geographic origin	Date(s)	Profession(s)	Other notes
192	3	Shaykh Kamāl	101	101	5	1	Qazvīn (inferred)	N/A	N/A	Good-looking; son of Shāh Mīrzā ibn Malik Maḥmūd Jān Daylamī, longtime mayor of Qazvīn
193	3	Khwājah Khalīl	101	101	5	1	Ḥillah; born in Nakhchovān	N/A	Goldsmith, govt. official	Was an influential leader in Nakhchuvān; muʿammā for the name Uvays quoted
194	3	Mīr ʿAbd al-Bāqī	101	101	1	1	Daylam (perhaps)	N/A	N/A	Descendant of Amīr Farāmarz Daylamī (no. 175)
195	3	Mawlānā Nafīs	101	101	2	1	Qazvīn	N/A	N/A	"Az avāsiṭ al-nās" (an average guy?); libertine, drunk
196	4,1	Khwājah Murvārīd "Bayānī" (shortened)	102	107	32	39	Harāt; father from Kirmān	Died in Rajab 922	Timurid official, poet	Allegedly met Ismāʿīl, wrote of his reign; vā-sūkht poem quoted; SM admits lack of objectivity; etc.
197	4,1	Khwājah Muḥammad Muʾmin	107	108	12	6	Harāt (probably)	Died in India, 948	Court service	Son of Murvārīd (no. 196); SM's teacher, with him in Harāt, Shīrāz; invented afshān-i bīkhtah (?); etc.
198	4,1	Khwāndamīr Muʾarrikh	108	109	5	1	Harāt	N/A	Historian (muʾarrikh)	Grandson of Mīrkhwānd; wrote Khulāṣat al-akhbār, Ḥabīb al-siyar; a muʿammā of his is quoted
199	4,1	Shaykh-zādah-i Lāhījī (ibn Shakh Muḥ.) "Fidāʾī"	109	110	11	7	Lāhījī; born in Shīrāz	N/A	N/A	Father was Nūrbakhshī khalīfah; drank with Shah Ismāʿīl and Najm Zargar; SM quotes Umīdī
200	4,1	Qāżī ʿAbd Allāh Yaqīnī	110	110	4	1	Lāhījān (inferred)	N/A	N/A	Dāmād of Shaykh-zādah-i Lāhījī (no. 199); killed through political machinations in Gīlān
201	4,1	Malik Qāsim Naqqāsh Shīrāzī	110	111	6	2	Shīrāz (presumably)	Died in 947	Painter (muṣavvir)	Claimed descent from Shāh Shujāʿ Kirmānī; did not enjoy the favor of the Safavids (?)
202	4,1	Khurāsān Khān	111	111	4	1	Lār	N/A	Local notable (az aʿyān...)	Student of Davānī; traveled extensively, in India and elsewhere
203	4,1	Mawlānā Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī	111	112	9	2	N/A	Died in 939	N/A	Son of Ḥusayn Vāʿiẓ (Kāshifī, or no. 105?); anecdote about his being neither Sunnī nor Shīʿī
204	4,1	Mawlānā Faqīh	112	112	7	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	Has written out most of the works of Jāmī; nicknamed Dawlat-khwājah (a confusing notice)
205	4,1	Mawlānā Sulṭān ʿAlī Mashhadī	113	113	4	3	Mashhad (presumably)	N/A	Calligrapher	Supposedly a very famous calligrapher
206	4,1	Ḥāfiẓ ʿAlī	113	113	4	1	Ghūriyān (?) of Harāt	N/A	N/A	Composed several javābs of the "qaṣīdah-i maṣnūʿ" of Salmān Sāvajī
207	4,1	Mawlānā Ḥusayn ʿAlī Farrāsh	113	113	3	2	Harāt	N/A	Poet	N/A
208	4,1	Qāżī Mīrak Khālidī	114	114	5	1	Qazvīn	N/A	Judge (qāżī) in Qazvīn	SM suggests an improvement to the quoted line
209	4,1	Qāżī Lāghar Sīstānī	114	115	13	3	Sīstān	N/A	Judge (qāżī) in Sīstān	Named Aḥmad; other judge in the area was fat (farbih); story about the thieving nature of Sīstānīs
210	4,1	Mīrzā Kāfī	115	115	6	1	Urdūbād of Āẕarbāyjān	N/A	Secretary (munshī)	Munshī for Ṭahmāsb; SM adds a line of verse in praise of him
211	4,1	Mīrak Kūr "Mīrzā Qāsim"	115	117	15	9	Harāt (probably)	Killed in Harāt, 932	Military officer (sipāhī-garī)	Served Durmish Khān; killed by "Turk" in Kh. Ḥabīb Allāh's house (no. 184); javāb *by* Shawqī Yazdī
212	4,1	Qāżī ʿĪsá	117	118	10	4	Sāvah; grew up in Qazvīn	Killed in 896 (per MY)	Aqquyūnlū court service	Son of Khwājah Shukr Allāh, mustawfī of Ḥusayn Beg; longtime aide to Sulṭān Yaʿqūb
213	4,1	Shaykh Najm Yaʿqūbī	118	119	8	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	Cousin of Qāżī ʿĪsá (no. 212); a friend of Mīr ʿAlī Shīr; story involving a king (which king?)
214	4,1	Qāżī Ṣafī al-Dīn ʿĪsá-i Śānī	119	120	7	1	N/A	N/A	Fmr. judge (qāżī)	Related to Qāżī ʿĪsá (no. 212); served as judge in the royal army camp (muʿaskar)
215	4,1	Qāżī Nūr Allāh	120	120	5	3	N/A	N/A	Judge (qāżī)	Also related to Qāżī ʿĪsá (no. 212); sent by Shah Ismāʿīl as a messenger to Shaybak Khān
216	4,1	Qāżī Muḥammad Ghaffārī "Viṣālī"	120	121	17	3	N/A	Died in 932	Fmr. judge (qāżī) in Ray	Cousin of Qāżī ʿĪsá (no. 212); javāb of *his* poem by Mīrzā Shāh Ḥusayn (which one?) is quoted
217	4,1	Qāżī Aḥmad	121	121	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Son of Rashīd Qāżī (?); part of SM's retinue
218	4,1	Mawlānā Muḥammad Sharafī	122	122	6	6	Yazd	N/A	Court service (apparently)	Related to Sharaf al-Dīn ʿAlī Yazdī; serves as "jumlat al-mulk" (?) of Shāh Nūr al-Dīn Niʿmat Allāh
219	4,1	Khwājah Quṭb al-Dīn Khwarshāh	122	123	4	2	Yazd	N/A	Farming (zirāʿat)	Stayed out of politics; takhalluṣ is Bayānī
220	4,1	Malik Abū Isḥāq	123	123	2	1	Kirmān	N/A	N/A	From an important family (buzurg-zādah) in Kirmān
221	4,1	Mīr Maḥmūd Gīlānī	123	123	2	2	Gīlānī; works in Lāhījān	N/A	Official (amīr)	Serves Khān Aḥmad, governor of Lāhījān
222	4,1	Ayyūb-i Abū al-Barakah	123	124	7	2	Harāt; went to ʿIrāq, Shirvān	N/A	Court service (apparently)	Served Shaykh Shāh (?) in Shirvān; was renowned for his audacity and humor
223	4,1	Abū al-Barakah Pidar	124	125	6	4	Kash of Transoxiana	N/A	Local notable (az aʿyān)	Father of Ayyūb-i Abū al-Barakah (no. 222); story about ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī reading one of his poems
223,5	4,1	Qāżī Salām Allāh Kāshī	125	125	3	1	Kāshān (presumably)	Died in 931	N/A	Unnumbered entry
224	4,1	Khwājah Tāj al-Dīn Mukhtaṣṣ	125	125	3	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	Young; takhalluṣ is Navāʾī; apparently moved to India
225	4,1	Mawlānā Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Kāshī	125	125	3	1	Kāshān	N/A	Teacher (mudarris)	Known for falling in love with a Kirmānī woman (?); javāb of Amīr Shaykham Suhaylī
226	4,1	Khwājah Luhrāsb	126	126	3	1	Tihrān (inferred)	N/A	Fmr. governor of Tihrān	Brother of Mawlānā Umīdī; wrote a munāẓarah on Turk vs. Gīlak (?), and a Chughundur-nāmah
227	4,1	Mawlānā Ghiyāś al-Dīn Aḥmad Nīshāpūrī	126	126	6	1	Nīshāpūr (presumably)	N/A	Judge (qāżī)	Was a judge in Mashhad and Harāt; SM is upset because he "usurped" the takhalluṣ of Sāmī
228	4,1	Mawlānā Muḥammad Qarshī (?)	126	126	3	1	Biyārjumand	N/A	Served Nūrbakhshīs	N/A
229	4,1	Qāżī Shihāb Marandī	126	127	2	1	Marand (presumably)	N/A	N/A	N/A
230	4,1	Khalīfah Sadīd Gīlānī	127	127	3	1	Gīlān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Was involved in some conflict with the Kārkiyā rulers during the time of Khān Aḥmad
231	4,1	Qāżī Yaḥyá	127	127	3	4	Lāhījān (perhaps)	N/A	N/A	Part of the Lāhījīyah Nūrbakhshī group (?)
232	4,1	Mawlānā Nūr Allāh	128	128	4	1	Harāt	N/A	N/A	Part of SM's retinue
233	4,1	Mawlānā Muḥammad (plus patronymic)	128	128	3	2	Astarābād (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Son of Mawlānā Sulṭān Muḥammad Astarābādī; died young
234	4,1	Muḥammad Ḥusayn	128	128	1	1	Astarābād (inferred)	N/A	N/A	Also a son of Mawlānā Sulṭān Muḥammad
235	4,1	Khalīfah ʿAlī Mīrak	128	129	5	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Son of Khalīfah Muḥammad Ḥayāt (?); capable of composing highly unusual poetry
236	4,1	Mawlānā Fażlī	129	129	2	1	Qazvīn	N/A	N/A	One of the mullā-zādahs of Qazvīn
237	4,1	Khwājū-yi Simnānī	129	130	9	1	Simnān (presumably)	N/A	Prince (of some sort)	Malik-zādah; around fifteen years old; SM likes him, hopes he'll become like Khwājū-yi Kirmānī
238	4,1	Shaykh Jamāl al-Dīn	130	130	2	2	Khalkhāl of ʿIrāq	N/A	N/A	Takhalluṣ is Yaqīnī

Appendix 7: Entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (ed. Humāyūn Farrukh)

No.	Ch.	Name	Start p.	End p.	Ll. bio.	Ll. poe.	Geographic origin	Date(s)	Profession(s)	Other notes
239	4,1	Mawlānā Shaykh Aḥmad	130	130	4	1	Qazvīn; family from Khalkhāl	N/A	N/A	Spent time in Shīrāz serving the ʿallāmah Mīr Ghiyāš al-Dīn Manṣūr Dashtakī
240	4,1	Malik-zādah Khwāfī	130	131	14	1	Khwāf	N/A	Local ruler	A refractory local ruler who had to be defeated and captured at the order of Ṭahmāsb
241	4,1	Qāżī Sanjānī	131	133	16	10	Sanjān (presumably)	Died in 941	Poet	Son of Shāh Sanjān; wrote multiple mašnavīs, including one in the style of "Makhzan al-asrār"
242	4,2	Mawlānā Shāh Maḥmūd "Mukhliṣ"	133	134	5	5	Nīshāpūr	N/A	N/A	Student of Sulṭān ʿAlī Mashhadī in calligraphy
243	4,2	Mawlānā ʿAbdī	134	134	4	2	Nīshāpūr (inferred)	Died in the last two years	N/A	Uncle (khāl) of Shāh Maḥmūd (no. 242); student of Sulṭān ʿAlī Mashhadī; was old, died recently
244	4,2	Mawlānā Anīsī	134	134	4	1	Khwārazm	N/A	Court service	Served Sulṭān Yaʿqūb; was compared to Mawlānā Sulṭān ʿAlī Mashhadi in calligraphy
245	4,2	Mawlānā ʿAbd al-Karīm Pādshāh	135	135	5	2	Khwārazm (inferred)	N/A	N/A	Brother of Mawlānā Anīsī (no. 244); poor, but a king in his own mind; had funny signatures
246	4,2	Khwājah Ḥāfiẓ Bābā Jān	135	136	6	2	Turbat of Khurāsān	Died in Tabrīz, 944	N/A	Good at calligraphy, zar-fashānī (gilding?), music, etc.
247	4,2	Mawlānā Malik	136	136	3	1	Qazvīn (some say Tabrīz)	N/A	N/A	Writes excellent nastaʿlīq; good in other scripts, as well as music and poetry
248	4,2	Mawlānā Ibrāhīm	136	136	3	1	Astarābād	N/A	Secretary (munshī)	Writes good nastaʿlīq; worked for a time at the shrine of Imam Riżā
249	4,2	Mawlānā Ismāʿīl	136	136	2	1	Astarābād (inferred)	N/A	N/A	Son of Mawlānā Ibrāhīm (no. 249); writes decent nastaʿlīq
250	4,2	Mawlānā Sulṭān Muḥammad	137	137	2	1	Astarābād (inferred)	N/A	N/A	Son of Mawlānā Ibrāhīm (no. 249)
251	4,2	Mawlānā Ṣadr Khiyābānī	137	137	2	1	Khiyābān of Tabrīz (?)	N/A	N/A	Takhalluṣ is Najātī; writes decent nastaʿlīq
252	4,2	N/A					N/A	N/A	N/A	This number seems to have been skipped by accident...
253	4,2	Mawlānā Ḥāfiẓ Majlisī	137	137	3	1	Tabrīz	N/A	Musician (possibly)	Also a ḥāfiẓ; plays the qānūn and shuturghū
254	4,2	Dūst Muḥammad Kūshvānī	137	138	4	2	Kūshvān, village of Harāt	N/A	N/A	Takhalluṣ is Kāhī; writes good nastaʿlīq; sometimes works in ṣaḥḥāfī (bookselling?)
255	4,2	Mawl. Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn = Takaltū Khān Qiṣṣah-khwān	138	138	7	1	Shīrāz	N/A	Storyteller (qiṣṣah-khwān)	Was close to Ṭahmāsb and greatly favored by him
256	4,2	Mawlānā Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn Qiṣṣah-khwān	138	139	7	4	Born in Iṣfahān	Died in 942	Storyteller (qiṣṣah-khwān)	With SM twelve years, Ṭahmāsb eight; became opium addict; son of Kamāl al-Dīn Ghiyāš Fārsī (?)
257	4,2	Quṭb al-Dīn Aḥmad	139	139	2	1	N/A	N/A	Storyteller (qiṣṣah-khwān)	Currently serving Ṭahmāsb; brother of Mawlānā Kamāl al-Dīn Qiṣṣah-khwān (no. 256)
258	4,2	Ustād Dūst Muḥammad ʿŪdī	139	140	4	2	Harāt; also worked in Gīlān	Died in Harāt, 949	Musician (sāzandah)	Served Ṭahmāsb for a time
259	4,2	Muḥibb ʿAlī Nāʾī	140	140	11	2	Harāt	N/A	Musician (nāʾī)	Was with SM; now with Sayyid Manṣūr Kirmānī (?); funny anecdote involving a camel
260	4,2	Mawlānā Āshuftah Qiṣṣah-khwān	140	141	2	1	Astarābād	N/A	Storyteller (qiṣṣah-khwān)	N/A
261	4,2	Mawlānā Qāsim ʿAlī Qiṣṣah-khwān	141	141	2	1	Mashhad	N/A	Storyteller (qiṣṣah-khwān)	N/A
262	4,2	Ḥāfiẓ Khū-girih (MY: Ḥāfiẓ Chirkin)	141	141	6	1	Tabrīz	Died in 936 (chronogram)	N/A	A colorful figure; takhalluṣ is Firāqī; exchanged hajv, incl. with Zaynī; was it Zaynī who died in 936?
263	4,2	Mawlānā Khurūs	141	141	2	1	Mashhad; born in Kāshān	N/A	N/A	Was with SM from childhood (his or SM's?)
264	4,2	Mawlānā Majnūn Chap-nivīs	142	142	9	5	ʿIrāq	N/A	Calligrapher	Excelled in khaṭṭ-i chap (?); invented new script called tū-amān (?); wrote a work dedicated to SM
265	5,1	Mawlānā ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī	143	152	55	79	Kharjird of Jām	Born 23/8/817; died 1/898	Poet, scholar, Sufi	Javāb of "Jalāʾ al-rūḥ" (?); mention of Risālah-i takmilah (?); lines mentioning older poets; etc.
266	5,1	Mawlānā Hilālī Chaghatāʾī	152	160	36	68	Astarābād; lived mostly in Harāt	Killed by Uzbeks, 936 (MY)	Poet	Spent time with SM; promoted by Navāʾī; odd apologia for his character; quote from Ḥāfiẓ; etc.
267	5,1	Mawlānā ʿAbd Allāh Hātifī	160	164	42	37	Jām (son of Jāmī's sister)	Met Ismāʿīl, 917; died in 927	Poet	Javāb of Firdawsī; help from Jāmī; encounter with Shah Ismāʿīl; chronogram for his death; etc.
268	5,1	Khwājah Āṣafī	165	166	6	12	Living in Harāt at time of death	Died in 920	Poet	Father was vazīr of Sulṭān Abū Saʿīd; has dīvān of ghazals, mašnavī in meter of Makhzan al-asrār
269	5,1	Mawlānā Banāʾī	167	170	37	15	Harāt; also worked in ʿIrāq, Transox.	Killed under Najm-i Šānī, 918	Poet, nadīm	Father was architect (→ takhalluṣ); also calligrapher, musician; has poetry in Marvī; javāb of Ḥāfiẓ
270	5,1	Mawlānā Niẓām al-Dīn Niẓām	171	173	9	14	Astarābād	Died in 921	Poet	Specialized in muʿammā, then praise of Ahl al-Bayt; has a mašnavī, Bilqīs u Sulaymān
271	5,1	Mawlānā Umīdī	173	176	19	28	Tihrān (of Ray); studied in Shīrāz	Killed (by Nūrbākhshīs?), 925	Poet	Expert in qaṣīdah; named Arjāsb; student of Davānī; served Shah Ismāʿīl; quote from Afżal Nāmī
272	5,1	Bābā Faghānī	176	177	10	9	Shīrāz; later Abīvard; d. in Mashhad	Died in 925	Poet	Worked under Sulṭān Yaʿqūb; alcoholic
273	5,1	Mawlānā Ahlī Shīrāzī	177	179	11	10	Shīrāz (presumably)	Died in Shīrāz, 942	Poet	Skilled prosodist; tatabbuʿ of Salmān's "qaṣīdah-i maṣnūʿ"
274	5,1	Mawlānā Lisānī	179	182	8	28	Shīrāz; lived at Baghdād, Tabrīz	Died in Tabrīz, 941	Poet	Few good ghazals, but they're very good; SM spent lots of time with him; conflict with student
275	5,1	Mawlānā Ḥayratī	182	183	5	8	Tūn (but also known as Marvī)	N/A	Poet	Famous for satires, incl. those traded with Vaḥīdī Qumī
276	5,1	Khwājah Masʿūd Qumī	184	184	8	5	Qum; died in Khurāsān	N/A	Poet	Has a famous mašnavī on tīgh u qalam; wrote a verse history for Sulṭān Ḥusayn Bāyqarā
277	5,1	Mawlānā Shahīd Qumī	184	186	7	7	Qum; moved to Khurāsān, then Hind	Died in Gujarat, 935	Poet	Malik al-shuʿarāʾ for Sulṭān Yaʿqūb; full of himself; died at a very advanced age
278	5,1	N/A					N/A	N/A	N/A	This number seems to have been skipped by accident...
279	5,1	Darvīsh Dihakī	186	187	10	4	Dihak of Qazvīn	N/A	Poet	Worked under Sulṭān Yaʿqūb; Jāmī liked a maṭlaʿ by him
280	5,1	Mawlānā Qāżī ʿAlāʾī	187	188	13	5	Karah-rūd of Qum	Died in Iṣfahān, 936	Judge, secretary, poet	Munshī under Turkmen; later in Iṣfahān, Tabrīz; known for manāqib; tażmīn of miṣrāʿ by Lisānī
281	5,1	Ahlī Khurāsānī	188	191	16	29	Turshīz; lived in Khurāsān, Tabrīz	N/A	Poet, nadīm	Was associated with Farīdūn Ḥusayn Mīrzā; moved to Tabrīz after fall of Timurids
282	5,1	Shawqī Yazdī	191	193	11	13	Shīrāz (presumably)	N/A	Secretary, poet	Son of Kh. Rashīd; good khaṭṭ; worked for SM; favors qaṣ.; jav./taż. of Umīdī; jav. of Kātibī's "gul" qaṣ.
283	5,1	Bābā Naṣībī	193	194	6	9	Gīlān; moved to Tabrīz	Died in Tabrīz, 944	Ḥalvā-furūsh, poet	Introduced to Sulṭān Yaʿqūb by Bābā Faghānī
284	5,1	Mawlānā Riyāżī Zāvahʾī	194	195	9	4	Zāvah of Khurāsān	Died in 921	Judge, poet	Lost job as judge; made lots of chronograms; MT, fatḥ-i Khurāsān, 917; worked for SHB, Ismāʿīl
285	5,1	Alif-i Abdāl (?)	195	197	19	5	Balkh; ended up in Iṣfahān	N/A	Poet, nadīm	Takhalluṣ Muṭīʿī, later Alif-i Abdāl; nadīm of Sulṭān Yaʿqūb; colorful character; has dirty poetry
286	5,1	Mawlānā Gulkhanī	197	198	12	3	Evidently lived in Harāt	N/A	N/A	Khwāhar-zādah of Shahīdī Qumī; something of a scoundrel; killed in a Timurid-Uzbek war

Appendix 7: Entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (ed. Humāyūn Farrukh)

No.	Ch.	Name	Start p.	End p.	Ll. bio.	Ll. poe.	Geographic origin	Date(s)	Profession(s)	Other notes
287	5,1	Mawlānā Ḥayrānī	198	199	9	7	Qum; also known as Hamadānī	N/A	Poet, nadīm	Memorized 100k lines; nadīm of Sulṭān Yaʿqūb; has several maṡnavīs; died in Hamadān
288	5,1	Mawlānā Mānī Shīrāzī	199	200	10	11	Shīrāz (presumably)	N/A	Farmer, soldier, poet	Reached a high rank under Shah Ismāʿīl; killed by Amīr Najm Zargar; buried in Surkhāb, Tabrīz
289	5,1	Mānī Mashhadī	201	202	7	11	Mashhad (presumably)	Killed in Mashhad, 923	Poet, fmr. bowl-maker	Father was a bowl-maker (kāsah-gar); poet for Muḥammad Muḥsin Mīrzā; killed by Uzbeks
290	5,1	Ḥaydar Kulīchah-paz	202	204	7	16	Harāt	N/A	Poet, merchant, fmr. baker	Started as baker (kulīchah-paz); prolific poet; uneducated (ʿāmmī), doesn't understand own poetry
291	5,1	Mawlānā Nargisī	204	206	9	10	Abhar; lived mostly in Harāt	Died in Qandahār, 938	Shaykh-zādah, poet, muḥtasib	Mentioned in Majālis; weird anecdote with Hātifī; wrote javāb of "Makhzan al-asrār"
292	5,1	Dūst Muḥammad Jānī	206	207	11	12	Sabzavār	Died in Harāt, 939	Poet	Poor and very humble; SM praises his qaṣīdahs in particular
293	5,1	Āgahī Khurāsānī	208	209	11	6	Apparently lived in Harāt	N/A	Poet, secretary	Of questionable character; favors qaṣīdah; known for dirty satire; javāb, Khusraw's "Daryā-yi abrār"
294	5,1	Mawlānā Aḥmad Ṭabasī = Aḥmad Tūnī (?)	209	211	29	3	Ṭabas or Tūn (presumably)	Died in Harāt, 932	Poet, fmr. tutor of Ṭahmāsb	Had his hand and tongue cut off, became a better poet for it (a very odd story)
295	5,1	Shāh Ḥusayn Kākhī (MY: Kājī)	211	211	4	3	Awbah (?) in Khurāsān	N/A	Poet (presumably)	A muʿammā by him is quoted
296	5,1	Mawlānā ʿAlī Fayżī	211	211	2	1	Khurāsān	N/A	Poet	SM says he's famous, has a whole dīvān, etc. but gives no detail and quotes just one line
297	5,1	Żiyāʾ Urdūbādī	212	212	5	1	Urdūbād; moved to Khurāsān	N/A	Poet	Often recited poetry before Navāʾī; wrote qaṣīdahs with lots of riddles (lughz)
298	5,1	Mawlānā Abdāl	212	216	28	21	Iṣfahān; moved around a lot	N/A	Poet, fmr. perfumer	Javāb of Kātibī's "gul" qaṣīdah; spent time with SM; fascinating stories
299	5,1	Shāh Ḥusayn Siyāqī	216	217	9	3	Iṣfahan	Died near Dāmghān, 941	Poet, "fruit-seller"	Called mīvah-furūsh b/c father was fruit-seller; known for hajv, incl. of Mīr Hindī
300	5,1	Mawlānā Sharīf	217	219	11	9	Tabrīz (not mentioned by SM)	Died in Ardabīl, 956	Poet	Student of Lisānī; famously betrayed his teacher; died in Ardabīl while SM was there
301	5,1	Mawlānā Nikī	219	219	3	2	Iṣfahān	N/A	Poet (presumably)	Still young at time of writing; poor (darvīsh) and soft-spoken (kam-sukhan)
302	5,1	Mawlānā Sāyil	219	220	9	7	Nahāvand; moved to Hamadān	Died in 940	Poet (presumably)	Conflict with Ḥayratī (whose hajv of Sāyil is quoted)
303	5,1	Mawlānā Ḥusāmī Qarāgūlī	220	221	4	3	Khwārazm; grew up in Qarāgūl	N/A	Poet	SM describes him as among the best poets of Transoxiana
304	5,1	Mawlānā Mawālī Tūnī	221	221	5	5	Tūn (presumably)	Died in 949	Poet (presumably)	SM praises his personal traits and morals
305	5,1	Mawlānā Niṡārī Tūnī	221	222	6	5	Tūn (presumably)	N/A	Poet	Wrote maṡnavī titled Sarv u Taẕarv, in the meter of Shāh u Darvīsh
306	5,1	Mawlānā Mahdī Astarābādī	222	223	4	7	Astarābād (presumably)	Died in 924	Poet (presumably)	Brother of Mawlānā Niẓām (Naẓẓām?) Muʿammāʾī
307	5,1	Mawlānā Żamīrī Iṣfahānī	223	224	4	7	Iṣfahān (presumably)	N/A	Poet (presumably)	A talented young man, albeit a tortured soul; a good geomancer and astrologer
308	5,1	Mawlānā Żamīrī Hamadānī	224	225	12	5	Hamadān (presumably)	N/A	Poet	Son of Ḥayrānī Qumī; full of himself; wrote javāb of Umīdī; got in trouble with Ṭahmāsb
309	5,1	Mawlānā Hūshī Shīrāzī	225	226	6	3	Shīrāz (presumably)	N/A	Fake poet	Steals others' poetry and places his takhalluṣ, incl. a hilarious story involving a line by Jāmī
310	5,1	Mawlānā Partuvī Shīrāzī	226	226	3	2	Shīrāz (presumably)	N/A	Poet (presumably)	N/A
311	5,1	Mawlānā Afżal Nāmī	226	227	3	2	Tihrān	N/A	Poet (presumably)	Died at a young age; people speculated he was poisoned by Nūrbakhshīs
312	5,1	Mawlānā Vaḥīdī	227	228	11	8	Qum; later moved to Gīlān	Died in 942	Poet	Had rivalry with Ḥayratī; a shahr-angīz poem of his is quoted
313	5,1	Mawlānā Shihāb Muʿammāʾī	228	229	4	3	Harāt	N/A	Poet	Was very good in muʿammā
314	5,1	Mawlānā Zulālī Haravī	229	229	5	4	Harāt (presumably)	Died in Harāt, 931	Poet	Specialized in qaṣīdah
315	5,1	Mawlānā Halākī Hamadānī	229	231	9	9	Hamadān (presumably)	N/A	Poet	Father was a tailor; sought patronage but apparently didn't get much, despite talent
316	5,1	Mawlānā Ḥayratī Qazvīnī	231	231	2	2	Qazvīn	N/A	Poet	N/A
317	5,1	Mawlānā Hātifī Qazvīnī	231	231	2	2	Qazvīn	N/A	Poet	N/A
318	5,1	Mawlānā Hilālī Qazvīnī	231	232	3	1	Qazvīn	N/A	Poet	A hajv of Yaḥyá Qumī is quoted; SM says he will quote two lines but gives only one
319	5,1	ʿAzīz Ṭabbākh	232	232	2	1	Tabrīz	N/A	Cook, poet (?)	N/A
320	5,1	Mawlānā Maktabī Shīrāzī	232	232	4	4	Shīrāz (presumably)	N/A	Poet (presumably)	N/A
321	5,1	Rāzī Shūshtarī	232	234	10	10	Shūshtar	Died in Shīrāz, 938	Poet	Unusually good poet for a Shūshtarī; was more into satire and jokes (hazl) than other forms
322	5,1	Mawlānā Muḥyī Lārī	234	235	3	8	Lār (presumably)	N/A	Poet (presumably)	Student of Davānī
323	5,1	Bābā Ṣafāʾī	235	236	2	2	Qum	N/A	Poet (presumably)	Has written a lot of poetry, little of it good
324	5,1	Mawlānā Maḥvī	236	236	4	3	Bisṭām; must have moved to Harāt	N/A	Poet (presumably)	Was in the service of Khwājah ʿAbd Allāh Murvārīd
325	5,1	Khwājah Ṣūfī Ardistānī	236	236	2	2	Ardistān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Was a libertine, but also melancholy
326	5,1	Khwājah Mayram Siyāh	237	237	5	2	Harāt; moved to Transoxiana	N/A	Poet (presumably)	Drunk; moved to Transoxiana because it was a better locale for pederasty
327	5,1	Mīr Shāhakī (?) Iṣfahānī	237	237	3	2	Runān, village of Iṣfahān	N/A	Poet (presumably)	Relative of Amīr Yūsuf Runānī; SM compliments him as "a second Kamāl Ismāʿīl"
328	5,1	Maqṣūd ʿAbdal	237	237	2	2	Mashhad	N/A	Poet	N/A
329	5,1	Mawlānā Majd Ḥayrānī	238	238	4	2	N/A	N/A	Poet	Son of Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn Rāstī (?); known for poetry in praise of ʿAlī
330	5,1	Mīrzā Muḥammad Amīnī	238	239	6	5	Tabrīz	N/A	Goldsmith, poet	Young; thinks highly of himself; javāb of famous "āftāb" qaṣīdah; mention of tazrīq
331	5,1	Shaykh Rubāʿī	239	239	3	4	Mashhad	N/A	Poet (presumably)	Poor; specializes in rubāʿī
332	5,1	Mawlānā Adāʾī	239	240	2	5	Iṣfahān	N/A	Poet	Lots of rhyme errors in his poetry
333	5,1	Bayāżī Astarābādī	240	240	4	3	Astarābād; final years in Kāshān	N/A	Poet (presumably)	Mainly wrote dirty satire; a hajv of Khwājah Muẓaffar Batakchī (?) is quoted
334	5,1	Āgahī Yazdī	240	240	2	2	Yazd (presumably)	N/A	Tailor, poet	N/A

Appendix 7: Entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (ed. Humāyūn Farrukh)

No.	Ch.	Name	Start p.	End p.	Ll. bio.	Ll. poe.	Geographic origin	Date(s)	Profession(s)	Other notes
335	5,1	Mawlānā Ḥusaynī	240	241	5	6	Kāshān	Died in Kāshān, 941	Poet	Always had conflicts with people and ended up satirizing them
336	5,1	Mawlānā Fayżī	241	242	2	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	Brother of Ḥāfiẓ Bābā Jān; a ḥāfiẓ; good handwriting; described as young (may have died young?)
337	5,1	Mawlānā Anvār Hamadānī	242	242	4	4	Hamadān	N/A	Poet	Known among poets for kuʿūbat (I didn't understand this)
338	5,1	Mawlānā Ḥayātī	242	242	2	1	N/A	N/A	Secretary, scribe	His father was some kind of judges' assistant
339	5,1	Gulshānī Kāshānī	242	245	6	22	Kāshān; moved to Shūshtar	N/A	Musk-seller, poet, calligrapher	Had some work with the army camp (where SM met him?)
340	5,1	Mawlānā Adham Kāshānī	245	245	2	2	Kāshān	N/A	Poet	Better in ghazal than other forms
341	5,1	Qāyilī Sabzavārī	245	245	4	3	Sabzavār; now lives in Qazvīn	N/A	N/A	One of the lines was popularly misattributed to him, and he admitted it
342	5,1	Ẕihnī Naqqāsh	245	245	2	1	Yazd	N/A	N/A	Libertine (lavand)
343	5,1	Fużūlī Baghdādī	245	246	4	2	Baghdād	N/A	Poet	Best poet from Baghdād; Turkic and Persian lines quoted; mostly writes in praise of the Imams
344	5,1	Mawlānā ʿAbd Allāh Shihābī	246	246	4	1	Qazvīn	N/A	N/A	Was among the servants (mamālīk) of the Sayfī sayyids of Qazvīn
345	5,1	Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn ʿAlī	246	246	2	1	Ray	N/A	N/A	Shaykh-zādah
346	5,1	Sharīf Muḥammad	246	247	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	Nephew of Mawlānā Umīdī; takhalluṣ is Hijrī (?)
347	5,1	Kawkabī	247	247	3	2	Transoxiana	N/A	Poet	Something of an astral scientist; worked for an Uzbek ruler; killed in Khurāsān
348	5,1	Mawlānā Yār ʿAlī Tihrānī	247	247	3	1	Tihrān; moved to Shīrāz	N/A	Physician	N/A
349	5,1	Mawlānā Kāsib	247	247	2	2	Yazd	N/A	N/A	N/A
350	5,1	Khwājah Fānī Tabrīzī	248	248	5	2	Tabrīz	N/A	N/A	One of the wealthy and powerful (muḥtasham) men of Tabrīz
351	5,1	Mawlānā Panāhī	248	248	3	1	Darāb-jird (in Fārs)	N/A	N/A	One of the wealthy men of Darāb-jird, and its best poet
352	5,1	Mawlānā Murād	248	249	3	1	Qazvīn	N/A	N/A	Composed dirty satires
353	5,1	Mawlānā Riżāʾī	249	249	2	1	Dārāb-jird (sic)	N/A	N/A	N/A
354	5,2	Sharīf Muḥammad Ṣabrī	250	250	3	1	Tihrān	N/A	N/A	Still young, SM hopes he will be successful
355	5,2	Sīmāʾī	250	251	4	1	Mashhad	N/A	N/A	Copies a poet named Tītāl but isn't as good; SM doubts the quoted verse is by Sīmāʾī
356	5,2	Anṣārī Qumī	251	251	2	1	Qum (presumably)	N/A	Poet	Was among the poets of the time of Sulṭān Yaʿqūb
357	5,2	Mawlānā Khurdī (Khiradī? Juzvī?)	251	251	3	1	Qum	N/A	N/A	N/A
358	5,2	Mawlānā Qadīmī Naqqāsh	251	251	2	2	Gīlān	N/A	N/A	Good painter; "doesn't think himself less than others in poetry"
359	5,2	Mawlānā Mushfiqī Baghdādī	251	253	6	10	Baghdād (presumably)	N/A	Poet	Was like a son to Lisānī; javāb of Kamāl Khujandī
360	5,2	Mawlānā Jānibī	253	253	2	1	Tabrīz	N/A	Gil-kārī (gul-kārī?)	Either some kind of mason, or some kind of artist
361	5,2	Ghazālī	253	253	3	1	N/A	N/A	Silk-seller	Was known as "maymūn al-shuʿarāʾ" ("monkey of the poets"?)
362	5,2	Ṭufaylī	253	253	2	1	N/A	N/A	Dastār-bandī	Is (or was) among the slaves (mamlūkān) of Jahānshāh
363	5,2	Mawlānā Qawsī	254	254	2	1	Tabrīz	N/A	N/A	Uneducated (ʿāmmī), makes rhyme mistakes
364	5,2	Nūrī Tabrīzī	254	254	2	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	Drink-seller, honey-seller	Sells drinks in summer, honey in winter; has a lot of poetry memorized
365	5,2	Nāmī Tabrīzī	254	254	2	1	Tabrīz	N/A	N/A	Brother of aforementioned Qawsī; no one likes his poetry
366	5,2	Mawlānā ʿĀshiqī	254	256	10	13	Arnah (?) in Khurāsān/Sīstān	N/A	Poet, astral scientist	Also does voices (?); made the pilgrimage to Mecca on foot; javāb of Jāmī (w/ original quoted)
367	5,2	Mawlānā Darvīsh	256	256	2	1	Turbat in Khurāsān	N/A	N/A	"His takhalluṣ is appropriate for his situation" ("takhalluṣ bi-aṭvārash munāsib")
368	5,2	Mawlānā Futūḥī	256	257	2	1	Iṣfahān	N/A	N/A	N/A
369	5,2	Mawlānā Ṣabrī	257	257	4	3	Zavārah in ʿIrāq	N/A	Poet, fmr. judge	Father was a judge; he did the same, then gave it up for poetry
370	5,2	Mawlānā Adīmī (Dāyimī?)	257	257	2	1	Iṣfahān	N/A	N/A	One of the non-famous (ghayr-i mashhūr) poets of Iṣfahān
371	5,2	Mawlānā Vadāʿī	257	258	1	1	Khurāsān	N/A	N/A	N/A
372	5,2	Ṭāhirī Rāzī	258	258	1	1	Ray (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Son of Mawlānā Umīdī
373	5,2	Maʿānī Yazdī	258	258	4	1	Yazd (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Thinks he's a good poet, but he isn't; SM adds a joking line about lack of maʿānī in his poetry
374	5,2	Vafāʾī Sabzavārī	258	258	2	1	Sabzavār (presumably)	N/A	Vālā-bāfī (?)	I still haven't understood what this guy does...
375	5,2	Jafāʾī Astarābādī	258	259	5	1	Astarābād	N/A	N/A	Orphan; killed in a fight with a rival; SM adds a line about this fight
376	5,2	Fardī Tabrīzī	259	259	4	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	ʿAlāqah-bandī (?)	Again, I'm not sure what this guy does...
377	5,2	ʿIshqī Tabrīzī	259	259	2	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	Scribe (possibly)	N/A
378	5,2	Ṣabūḥī Shīrāzī	259	259	1	1	Shīrāz (presumably)	N/A	Belt-weaver (kamar-bāf)	N/A
379	5,2	Ḥāṣilī Tabrīzī	259	259	2	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	Silk-seller	N/A
380	5,2	ʿAzīzī Qazvīnī	259	260	2	2	Qazvīnī (?), works in Tabrīz	N/A	Furrier (pūstīn-dūz)	N/A
381	5,2	Gulshanī Shabistarī	260	260	2	1	Shabistarī (?), works in Tabrīz	N/A	Legal representative (?)	Works in vikālat and niyābat-i qużāt...
382	5,2	Faṣīḥī Tabrīzī	260	260	2	1	Tabrīz	N/A	Tikmah-bandī	Tikmah is some sort of gold-embroidered silk

Appendix 7: Entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (ed. Humāyūn Farrukh)

No.	Ch.	Name	Start p.	End p.	Ll. bio.	Ll. poe.	Geographic origin	Date(s)	Profession(s)	Other notes
383	5,2	Ṣāfī Shīrāzī	260	260	2	1	Shīrāz (presumably)	N/A	Poet	Another libertine
384	5,2	Khirāmī Tabrīzī	260	261	2	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	Man about town	Also a ḥāfiẓ
385	5,2	Ḥaqīrī Tabrīzī	261	261	2	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	Poet	A newly discovered, innovative poet
386	5,2	Faqīrī ʿIrāqī	261	261	2	1	ʿIrāq (presumably)	N/A	Cook	He makes yakhnī, supposedly a kind of meat stew
387	5,2	Ṣayrafī Kūr	261	261	3	1	Tabrīz	N/A	Money-changer	His poetry "doesn't call to mind Khusraw and Saʿdī and Ḥāfiẓ"
388	5,2	Āyatī Iṣfahānī	261	262	2	1	Iṣfahān (presumably)	N/A	Schoolmaster (maktab-dār)	Also writes good nastaʿlīq
389	5,2	Nāzukī Tabrīzī	262	262	1	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	Hat-embroiderer	N/A
390	5,2	Rafīqī Tabrīzī	262	262	3	1	Tabrīz	N/A	Singer (muṭrib)	Something bad or inelegant about his character (khar-ẓarīf va kaj-ṭabʿ)
391	5,2	Salāmī Iṣfahānī	262	262	3	1	Iṣfahān (presumably)	N/A	Qābiż-i urdū-bāzār (?)	Is a qābiż a tax or debt collector? Anyway, this guy eats so much opium that he's about to die
392	5,2	Ghazālī Abharī	262	263	2	1	Abhar (presumably)	N/A	Silk-seller	N/A
393	5,2	Maylī Tabrīzī	263	263	1	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	Saddle-embroiderer (?)	Master/teacher of the saddle-embroiderers (ustād-i takaltū-dūzān)
394	5,2	Khayrī Tabrīzī	263	263	1	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	Poet	One of the non-famous (ghayr-i mashhūr) poets
395	5,2	Nigāhī Nīshāpūrī	263	263	2	1	Nīshāpūrī, died in Tabrīz	N/A	N/A	Libertine, drunk
396	5,2	Junūnī Hamadānī	263	263	2	1	Hamadān (presumably)	N/A	Schoolmaster (maktab-dār)	Also a ḥāfiẓ
397	5,2	Mawlānā Ramīmī	264	264	2	1	Samarqand; lives in Tabrīz	N/A	Poet	N/A
398	5,2	Maḥzūnī Hamadānī	264	264	1	1	Hamadān (presumably)	N/A	Siyāq scribe (?)	N/A
399	5,2	Matīnī Tabrīzī	264	264	2	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	N/A	N/A
400	5,2	Yārī Tabrīzī	264	264	2	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	Khurdah-furūsh	He sells small goods? Also uneducated (ʿāmmī)
401	5,2	ʿIshqī Hamadānī	264	264	2	1	Hamadān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Thinks highly of himself
402	5,2	Mawlānā Badīhī Hamadānī	265	265	2	1	Hamadān (presumably)	N/A	Poet (presumably)	Specializes in extemporaneous verse (badīhah)
403	5,2	Mawlānā Ṭāyirī Mashhadī	265	265	2	1	Mashhad (presumably)	N/A	N/A	N/A
404	5,2	Mawlānā Hamdamī Hamadānī	265	265	2	2	Hamadān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Spent most of his time in the tavern
405	5,2	Zulālī Tabrīzī	265	266	3	2	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	N/A	He was encouraged as a young poet, but little came of it
406	5,2	Nabātī Tabrīzī	266	266	3	2	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	Engraver (?)	Works in naqqāshī, lājvard-shūrī (?)
407	5,2	Mawlānā Muḥsinī Ardabīlī	266	266	2	1	Ardabīl (presumably)	N/A	N/A	N/A
408	5,2	Mawlānā Rusvāʾī Hamadānī	266	266	3	2	Hamadān (presumably)	N/A	Fmr. scribe	Brother of Mawlānā Anvār; was humiliated in love, became a qalandar
409	5,2	Mawlānā Nuṭqī Shīrāzī	267	267	2	1	Shīrāz (presumably)	N/A	N/A	N/A
410	5,2	Mawlānā ʿAtīqī	267	267	2	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
411	5,2	Vafāʾī Mashhadī	267	267	2	1	Mashhad (presumably)	N/A	N/A	He was very slovenly (chirkīn)
412	5,2	Mawlānā Maqṣūd Kāshī	267	268	2	3	Kāshān	N/A	Siyāq scribe (?)	N/A
413	5,2	Mawlānā Khātamī Tabrīzī	268	268	2	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	Bookseller	Javāb of Darvīsh Dihakī
414	5,2	Mawlānā Sāyilī Harātī	268	268	2	1	Harāt	N/A	N/A	N/A
415	5,2	Mawlānā Ghayratī Astarābādī	268	268	2	1	Astarābād (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Had conflicts with a lot of people
416	5,2	Mawlānā Bikasī Simnānī	268	268	2	1	Simnān (presumably)	N/A	Linen-seller (karbās-furūsh)	N/A
417	5,2	Mawlānā Ḥażirī Simnānī	268	269	2	1	Simnān (presumably)	N/A	Trader	Travels around the world (presumably for business)
418	5,2	Bīkasī Shūshtarī	269	270	4	9	Shūshtar	N/A	Poet	Best poet from Shūshtar; good with muʿammā and ʿarūż; specializes in qaṣīdah
419	5,2	Mawlānā Vafāʾī Simnānī	270	270	3	3	Simnān	N/A	N/A	Son of a vazīr; writes good taʿlīq; good at siyāq
420	5,2	Mawlānā Mīrzāʾī	271	271	2	1	Sāvah	N/A	Builder (banāʾī)	N/A
421	5,2	Mawlānā Adāʾī Bukhārāʾī	271	271	2	1	Bukhārā (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Newly discovered poet
422	5,2	Mawlānā Ramzī Hamadānī	271	271	2	1	Hamadān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	N/A
423	5,2	Mawlānā Ḥaqīrī Hamadānī	271	271	2	1	Hamadān	N/A	Poet	N/A
424	5,2	Fatḥī Tabrīzī	271	272	4	1	Tabrīz	N/A	Musk-seller	Also served one of Shah Ismāʿīl's vazīrs
425	5,2	Mawlānā ʿIshqī Hamadānī	272	272	1	1	Hamadān (presumably)	N/A	Poet	One of the non-famous (ghayr-i mashhūr) poets
426	5,2	ʿAbdī Rashtī	272	272	1	1	Rasht	N/A	N/A	N/A
427	5,2	Fatḥī Qazvīnī	272	272	2	1	Qazvīn (presumably)	N/A	Vendor	N/A
428	5,2	Mawlānā Maʿrūf	272	272	2	1	Tabrīz	N/A	Poet	Said to be a former servant-boy (ghulām)
429	5,2	Mawlānā Qāniʿī Qazvīnī	272	272	3	1	Qazvīn (presumably)	N/A	Engraver (ḥakkāk)	An interesting note about the way to recite the quoted line
430	5,2	Mawlānā Mudāmī Iṣfahānī	272	273	3	1	Iṣfahān; moved to Shirvān	N/A	Poet	Supposedly killed in some war in Shirvān

Appendix 7: Entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (ed. Humāyūn Farrukh)

No.	Ch.	Name	Start p.	End p.	Ll. bio.	Ll. poe.	Geographic origin	Date(s)	Profession(s)	Other notes
431	5,2	Mawlānā Zaynī Gīlānī	273	273	1	1	Lāhījān	N/A	Poet	N/A
432	5,2	Mawlānā Bazmī Qazvīnī	273	273	2	2	Qazvīn (presumably)	N/A	Shoemaker (kafsh-dūz)	N/A
433	5,2	Mawlānā Shahī Shīrāzī	273	273	2	1	Shīrāz (presumably)	N/A	N/A	He has mawlavīyat, but not enough for it to be useful (?)
434	5,2	Mawlānā Jadīdī Qazvīnī	274	274	2	1	Qazvīnī (?); works in Tabrīz	N/A	Vendor (khurdah-furūsh)	N/A
435	5,2	Mawlānā Zāyilī	274	274	2	1	Sabzavār; worked in Harāt	N/A	Blacksmith (āhangar)	N/A
436	5,2	Mawlānā ʿIshqī Dargazīnī	274	274	2	1	Dargazīn (presumably)	N/A	Schoolmaster (maktab-dār)	A shahr-angīz of Tabrīz is quoted
437	5,2	Mawlānā Junūnī Gīlānī	274	274	2	1	Gīlān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Eats (or ate?) too much opium
438	5,2	Mawlānā Nidāʾī Yazdī	274	275	2	1	Yazd (presumably)	N/A	Poet (presumably)	Visited Mecca; wrote a work in verse titled Rawżat al-shuhadāʾ
439	5,2	Mawlānā Ḥasbī (?) Iṣfahānī	275	275	3	3	Iṣfahān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	An odd fellow, who wrote about the language of animals and birds and other strange things
440	5,2	Vafāʾī Ardabīlī	275	275	1	1	Ardabīl (presumably)	N/A	Poet (presumably)	A newly discovered poet
441	5,2	Kalīmī Gīlānī	275	275	2	1	Gīlān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Always working on his handwriting
442	5,2	Mawlānā Kishvarī Rūdbārī	275	276	2	1	Rūdbār of Qazvīn	N/A	N/A	Writes good naskh and taʿlīq; has composed a lot of poetry; SM quotes "best maṭlaʿ"
443	5,2	Qabūlī Yazdī	276	276	1	1	Yazd	N/A	Poet	N/A
444	5,2	Rūḥī Samarqandī	276	276	2	3	Samarqand (presumably)	N/A	Poet (presumably)	Famous for his qiṭʿahs
445	5,2	Mawlānā Zandī (Rindī?) Baghdādī	276	276	2	1	Baghdād (presumably)	N/A	N/A	N/A
446	5,2	Mawlānā Kuḥlī Shīrāzī	276	276	1	1	Shīrāz (presumably)	N/A	Kaḥḥāl (applier of eyeblack?)	"Dar kaḥḥālī bī-badal-i ʿālam būd"
447	5,2	Mawlānā Sāgharī Kāshānī	277	277	2	1	Kāshān (presumably)	N/A	Geomancer (rammāl)	Wrote a maśnavī about hashish (bang)
448	5,2	Mawlānā Fanāʾī Ṣifāhānī	277	277	2	1	Iṣfahān (presumably)	N/A	Siyāq scribe (?)	N/A
449	5,2	Nashāṭī Shūshtarī	277	277	2	1	Shūshtar (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Worked for Uzbek amīrs
450	5,2	Shaykhī Kirmānī	277	277	2	1	Kirmān (presumably)	N/A	Naqqāsh (engraver?)	May also have been a mullā
451	5,2	Salīmī (Sulaymī?) Fīrūzkūhī	277	277	2	1	Fīrūzkūh of ʿIrāq	N/A	Poet (presumably)	Works as a praise poet (maddāḥ)?
452	5,2	Mawlānā Khiżrī (Khażrī? Khażarī?) Astarābādī	277	278	2	1	Astarābād	N/A	N/A	Has poems about food (taʿrīf-i aṭʿimah)
453	5,2	Mawlānā Makhfī Rashtī	278	278	6	3	Rasht of Gīlān	N/A	N/A	Served Amīr Sulṭān Muḥammad; interesting poem about the girls of Rasht
454	5,2	Mawlānā ʿIshratī Qalandar	278	278	2	1	Unknown	N/A	N/A	N/A
455	5,2	Mawlānā Khurramī Iṣfahānī	278	279	4	1	Iṣfahānī; moved to Gīlān	N/A	N/A	Wrote shahr-āshūb of Gīlān, insulted people; tongue cut out; SM says he deserved it for other poetry
456	5,2	Mawlānā Vaṣfī Haravī	279	279	1	1	Harāt (presumably)	N/A	Poet	One of the old poets of Harāt
457	5,2	Fardī Tabrīzī	279	279	2	1	Tabrīz	N/A	Poet	Duplicate name with no. 376
458	5,2	Mawlānā Nāzukī Astarābādī	279	279	2	1	Astarābād (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Son of Ḥāfiẓ Saʿd; thinks highly of his own poetry
459	5,2	Mawlānā Ḥarīfī Nahāvandī	279	279	2	1	Nahāvand	N/A	Poet	Formerly served the Turks
460	5,2	Rūḥī Sāvajī	279	279	1	1	Sāvah (presumably)	N/A	Poet, trader (tājir)	N/A
461	5,2	Mashrabī Nīshāpūrī	279	280	2	1	Nīshāpūr (presumably)	N/A	N/A	A famous maṭlaʿ is quoted
462	5,2	ʿAhdī (Mahdī?) Qazvīnī	280	280	2	1	Qazvīn	N/A	N/A	Name is Mīr Murād; one of the Bū Kāʾīyah (?) of Qazvīn
463	5,2	Mawlānā Āzād Yazdī	280	280	2	1	Yazd (presumably)	N/A	N/A	N/A
464	5,2	Vāhibī Astarābādī	280	280	2	2	Astarābādī; works in Shirvān	N/A	Istīfā-yi shamākhī (?)	I haven't understood what his job is supposed to be...
465	5,2	Mawlānā Muʾminī Astarābādī	280	281	2	1	Astarābād	N/A	N/A	Described as "ṭālib-i ʿilm" (a term SM uses a lot)
466	5,2	Mawlānā Zaynī (Yārī?)	281	281	4	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Possibly black-skinned; exchanged a lot of satires; Ḥāfiẓ Saʿd Chirkin had a famous satire of him
467	5,2	Mawlānā Aḥmad Shīrāzī	281	281	2	1	Shīrāz (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Was supposedly eaten by cannibals during a drought/famine (!)
468	5,2	Mawlānā Ḥubbī (?) Nīshāpūrī	281	281	2	1	Nīshāpūr (presumably)	N/A	Poet	His takhalluṣ comes out differently in every MS/edition
469	5,2	Mawlānā Fatḥī Kūr Qazvīnī	281	282	2	2	Qazvīn	N/A	N/A	He was a real jerk, and died young
470	5,2	Mawlānā Nādirī Samarqandī	282	282	2	1	Samarqand (presumably)	N/A	N/A	N/A
471	5,2	Mawlānā ʿAlī Ḥālī Kāshānī	282	282	5	1	Kāshān	N/A	N/A	Described as a mawlá; got into a fight with his own father while trying to seduce a boy
472	5,2	Mawlānā Maḥmūd Khāmūshī Kāshānī	282	283	6	2	Kāshān; later years in Shīrāz	N/A	ʿAmal-dārī (?)	Javāb of Amīr Khusraw's "Daryā-yi abrār"; some attributed maṭlaʿ to Jāmī's son Żiyāʾ al-Dīn Yūsuf
473	5,2	Mawlānā Ṭufaylī Khujandī	283	283	4	2	Khujand (presumably)	N/A	Scribe of qur'anic text	Also a ḥāfiẓ
474	5,2	Mawlānā Shāhpūr Kāshānī	283	283	2	1	Kāshān	N/A	Poet	Described as ṣāḥib-dīvān
475	5,2	Mawlānā Jamālī Kāshānī	283	283	3	1	Kāshān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Son of Mawlānā Ḥājjī Shāh Ḥallāj Kāshānī; not a satirist, unlike his father
476	5,2	Mawlānā Aḥmad Kāfī Kāshānī	283	284	9	1	Kāshān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Served, studied under Qāżī Mīr Ḥusayn Kāshānī; alcoholic, tried to get clean; javāb of Jāmī
476,5	5,2	Mullā Jān Kāshī	284	284	5	1	Kāshān (presumably)	N/A	Calligrapher, teacher, author	Invented a calligraphy style called "shikastah basta"; prolific poet; this is the second no. 476
477	5,2	Mawlānā ʿIshqī Kāshānī	284	285	3	2	Kāshān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Former takhalluṣ was ʿĀmmī; he learned to read at age forty (!)

Appendix 7: Entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (ed. Humāyūn Farrukh)

No.	Ch.	Name	Start p.	End p.	Ll. bio.	Ll. poe.	Geographic origin	Date(s)	Profession(s)	Other notes
478	5,2	Mawlānā Niʿmatī Kāshānī	285	285	3	1	Kāshān (presumably)	N/A	Poet (presumably)	A very pious man; wrote a maśnavī in the meter of "Subḥat al-abrār"
479	5,2	Mawlānā Shawqī Kāshānī	285	285	2	1	Kāshān (presumably)	N/A	Poet	It seems his takhalluṣ is his real/only name?
480	5,2	Gulshanī Kāshānī	285	286	2	2	Kāshān (presumably)	N/A	Schoolteacher	N/A
481	5,2	Mawlānā Jamālī Karbās-furūsh Kāshānī	286	286	2	1	Kāshān (presumably)	N/A	Linen-seller (karbās-furūsh)	N/A
482	5,2	Mawlānā Ghiyāś Faṣīḥī Kāshānī	286	286	2	1	Kāshān (presumably)	N/A	Trader (tijārat)	N/A
483	5,2	Mawlānā Ḥadīśī Sāvah'ī	286	286	2	1	Born in Kāshān; Sāvah'ī family	N/A	N/A	A khwājah-zādah of Sāvah; most of his poetry is nonsense (yāvah)
484	5,2	Mawlānā Bayānī Astarābādī	286	286	2	1	Astarābād (presumably)	N/A	Geomancer (rammāl)	N/A
485	5,2	Mawlānā Ḥakīmī Tihrānī	286	287	3	1	Tihrān	N/A	N/A	Name is Mīr Muḥammad; father was local ruler of Tihrān (raʾīs va kad-khudā)
486	5,2	Mawlānā Maḥmūd Ṣabūrī Tihrānī	287	287	2	1	Tihrān	N/A	Scribe (kitābat)	N/A
487	5,2	Mawlānā ʿĀdatī Rāzī	287	287	2	1	Ray	N/A	Landowner (dihqān), poet	N/A
488	5,2	Mawlānā Khalqī (?) Tihrānī	287	287	2	1	Tihrān (presumably)	N/A	Court service (?)	He works on "muhimmāt-i dīvānī," but to no benefit
489	5,2	Mawlānā Ṣafāʾī Khurāsānī	287	287	2	1	Khurāsānī; lived in Yazd	N/A	Knifemaker (kārd-garī)	N/A
490	5,2	Mawlānā Surūdī Khwānsārī	287	288	3	3	Khwānsār of ʿIrāq	N/A	Khwānandagī (reciter?)	Former takhalluṣ was Amīnī; switched to Surūdī to match his activities (?)
491	5,2	Mawlānā Kalāmī Khāfī (?)	288	288	4	1	Khāf (?); moved to India	N/A	N/A	Cannabis made him crazy; he would get in physical fights with people who discussed his poetry
492	5,2	Mawlānā Nāzukī Hamadānī	288	289	8	10	Hamadān (presumably)	N/A	Poet (of a sort)	This is the guy who wrote a terrible javāb of the Shāhnāmah in one month (!)
493	5,2	N/A					N/A	N/A	N/A	This number seems to have been skipped by accident...
494	5,2	Mawlānā Fāżilī Ṭabasī	289	289	3	1	Ṭabas (presumably)	N/A	N/A	A ḥāfiẓ; sings and plays qānūn; also known as Khwājah Ṭabasī (?)
495	5,2	Mawlānā Duʿāʾī (?) Mashhadī	289	290	4	1	Mashhad	N/A	Poet	Always in conflict with people; demanded to be acknowledged as the best poet
496	5,2	Vafāʾī Tūnī	290	290	2	1	Tūn (presumably)	N/A	N/A	A student/scholar (ṭālib-i ʿilm); has good handwriting
497	5,2	Mawlānā Shūkhī Haravī	290	290	3	1	Harāt (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Good-looking; when he wanted to become a poet, his poet admirers wrote verses for him to use
498	5,2	Mawlānā Yūsufī Ṭabīb Khāfī	290	290	3	1	Khurāsān	N/A	Doctor	Supposedly wrote a treatise (in verse?) on medicine
499	5,2	Mawlānā Muʿizzī Lang (?)	290	291	9	1	Zavārah of Khurāsān	N/A	N/A	An agreeable fellow, but addicted to opium
500	5,2	Fayżī Yazdī	291	291	2	2	Yazd	N/A	Oil-presser (ʿaṣṣār)	Very poor
501	5,2	Mawlānā Quṭbī (?) Gunābādī	291	292	2	1	Gunābād (presumably)	N/A	Poet	Makes a lot of rhyme errors
502	5,2	Mawlānā Ghiyāś Qāfiyah'ī	292	292	9	3	Harāt	N/A	N/A	Avid rhyme-collector; mention of Durmish Khān as lalah; javāb of Khwājah Ḥabīb Allāh Sāvah'ī
503	5,2	Mawlānā Ghiyāśī Tūnī	292	293	2	1	Tūn (presumably)	N/A	Schoolmaster (maktab-dār)	Poor, darvīsh
504	5,2	Mawlānā Quṭbī (?) Tūnī	293	293	3	1	Tūn (presumably)	He and his father died in 935	N/A	Son of aforementioned Ghiyāśī (no. 503); javāb of his own father (!)
505	5,2	Mawlānā Nigāhī Haravī	293	293	2	1	Harāt	N/A	Scribe (kitābat)	Eats opium four times daily
506	5,2	Mawlānā ʿIshqī Tihrānī	293	293	2	1	Tihrān (presumably)	N/A	Poet	One of the nonsense poets (haẕayān-gū)
507	5,2	Mawlānā Afżal Sārānī Tihrānī	293	293	2	1	Sārān of Tihrān	N/A	N/A	Composes insult (hajv) and joke (hazl) poetry
508	5,2	Mawlānā Vāṣilī (?) Sārānī Tihrānī	294	294	2	1	Sārān of Tihrān	N/A	N/A	Apparently from a good family of the area (buzurg-zādah)
509	5,2	Mawlānā Raḥīmī Tihrānī	294	294	2	1	Tihrān	N/A	N/A	Has studied the astral sciences a bit
510	5,2	Mawlānā Ghafūrī Rāzī	294	294	2	1	Ray	N/A	N/A	Has some skill in reciting or singing (?)
511	5,2	Mawlānā Jānī Tihrānī	294	294	1	1	Tihrān	N/A	N/A	Mullā-zādah
512	5,2	Mawlānā Ḥafiẓī Tihrānī	294	294	2	1	Tihrān	N/A	N/A	His father is the architect of Tihrān (?); he himself is young, darvīsh, faqīr
513	5,2	Mawlānā Dihqānī Tihrānī	295	295	3	1	Tihrān (presumably)	N/A	Schoolmaster (maktab-dār)	Suffered from some kind of hunger sickness (?); supposedly ate his own clothes one time
514	5,2	Mawlānā Nīstī Rāzī	295	295	1	1	Ray (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Died young
515	5,2	Mawlānā Rūḥī Rāzī	295	295	2	1	Ray (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Brother of aforementioned Nīstī
516	5,2	Mawlānā Vafāʾī Rāzī	295	295	2	1	Ray (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Nūrbakhshī disciple (murīd)
517	5,2	Mawlānā ʿAbdī Tihrānī	295	296	2	1	Tihrān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	"This maṭlaʿ, unlike his other poetry, is good..."
518	5,2	Mawlānā Ṣaḥrāʾī Tihrānī	296	296	2	1	Tihrān (presumably)	N/A	Qābiż (tax or debt collector?)	Not a good poet
519	5,2	Mawlānā Ḥaqqī (?) Tihrānī	296	296	2	1	Tihrānī; works around Ray	N/A	Tomb/shrine custodian	"Mutavallī-i yakī az mazārāt"; described as "zabān-āvar" (talkative?)
520	5,2	Mawlānā Zayn al-Dīn Sulṭān Sāyilī (?) Tihrānī	296	296	3	2	Tihrān	N/A	N/A	Descended from kad-khudā of Tihrān; SM disapproves of his takhalluṣ (unclear why)
521	5,2	Mawlānā Khamūshī Rāzī	297	297	2	2	Ray	N/A	N/A	N/A
522	5,2	Mawlānā Hamdamī Tihrānī	297	297	2	1	Tihrān	N/A	Perfumer (ʿaṭṭār)	N/A
523	5,2	Mawlānā Luṭfī Tihrānī	297	297	2	1	Tihrān	N/A	N/A	His father was a money-changer (ṣarrāf) in Tihrān
524	5,2	Mawlānā ʿAṭāʾī Sabzavārī	297	298	4	1	Sabzavār (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Leads an ascetic lifestyle; poetry mostly in praise of the Ahl al-Bayt (manqabat); famous tarjīʿ-band
525	5,2	Mawlānā Āsī	298	298	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	A member of the Ās tribe (?)

Appendix 7: Entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (ed. Humāyūn Farrukh)

No.	Ch.	Name	Start p.	End p.	Ll. bio.	Ll. poe.	Geographic origin	Date(s)	Profession(s)	Other notes
526	5,2	Mawlānā Libāsī	298	298	1	1	Hamadān	N/A	Poet	N/A
527	5,2	Mawlānā Nūrī Nīshāpūrī	298	298	3	1	Nīshāpūr (presumably)	N/A	Kaḥḥāl (applier of eyeblack?)	Gave away a lot of money despite being poor; never wrote a praise poem
528	5,2	Mawlānā Kharābī Qumī	298	299	2	1	Qum (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Spent most of his time in graveyards (?!); libertine, drunk
529	5,2	Mawlānā Zārī Sabzavārī	299	299	2	1	Sabzavār (presumably)	N/A	Poet	N/A
530	5,2	Mawlānā Miṡālī Kāshānī	299	299	2	1	Kāshān (presumably)	N/A	Poet (presumably)	Wanted to complete a javāb of the Khamsah, but didn't make it
531	5,2	Mawlānā Miḥnatī Shīrāzī	299	299	2	1	Shīrāz (presumably)	N/A	Preacher (vāʿiẓ)	He would insert his poetry in sermons and get carried away, and people hated it
532	5,2	Mawlānā Mujalladī (?) Khurāsānī	299	299	3	1	Khurāsān	N/A	Bookbinder (mujallid)	N/A
533	5,2	Mawlānā ʿĀlī Samarqandī	299	300	2	1	Samarqand (presumably)	N/A	Poet	One of the non-famous (ghayr-i mashhūr) poets of Transoxiana
534	5,2	Mawlānā ʿĀkifī Samarqandī	300	300	1	1	Samarqand	N/A	N/A	N/A
535	5,2	Mawlānā ʿAbd al-Vahhāb Rashtī	300	300	3	3	Rasht of Gīlān	N/A	Scholar, astral scientist	N/A
536	5,2	Mawlānā Māyilī Rashtī	300	301	3	3	Rasht	N/A	N/A	Another high-status man of Rasht; composed humorous poetry
537	5,2	Mawlānā Sālikī Rashtī	301	301	4	3	Rasht; spent thirty years in Harāt	N/A	N/A	N/A
538	5,2	Mawlānā Fāżilī Rashtī	301	302	2	3	Rasht	N/A	Tailor (khayyāṭ)	SM also describes him as a bum (chapānī)
539	5,2	Mawlānā Kābulī Rashtī	302	302	3	1	Rasht	N/A	N/A	Was a wealthy man, turned to khayyāṭah-tābī (twisting thread?); qaṣīdah for governor of Gīlān
540	5,2	Mawlānā Ṣāyinī Rashtī	302	302	2	1	Rasht	N/A	Praise poet (apparently)	N/A
541	5,2	Mawlānā Ḥasan Mūyīnah-dūz Gīlānī	302	303	6	2	Gīlān	N/A	Haircloth-weaver (?)	A troublesome old man of almost eighty; claims to have a whole dīvān of ghazals (SM is skeptical)
542	5,2	Mawlānā Niʿmat Allāh Rashtī	303	303	3	4	Rasht; moved to Gurjistān	N/A	N/A	Left Gīlān for Gurjistān due to oppression from Amīrah Dībāj (sic)
543	5,2	Mawlānā Davānī Shīrāzī	304	304	2	3	Shīrāzī; lives in Harāt	N/A	Geomancer (rammāl)	N/A
544	5,2	Mawlānā Ghawghāʾī	304	304	4	3	Astarābādī; may live in Harāt (?)	N/A	N/A	Killed by a knife wound, from some young man with whom he had a confrontation
545	5,2	Mawlānā Mīr Sharīf	304	305	4	3	Harāt; may live there (?)	N/A	Musician (apparently)	Still young; SM hopes he will be successful
546	5,2	Mawlānā Abū Isḥāq	305	305	3	2	May live in Harāt (?)	N/A	N/A	Died young
547	5,2	Mawlānā Ṭāhir	305	305	2	3	Shirvānī; may live in Harāt (?)	N/A	Haircloth-weaver (?)	Again, the term is "mūyīnah-dūz"
548	5,2	Mawlānā Maḥmūd Tabrīzī	305	306	4	1	Tabrīzī; may live in Harāt (?)	N/A	Tikmah-bāfī, ʿalāqah-bandī	Tikmah is some sort of gold-embroidered silk; what is ʿalāqah-bandī?
549	5,2	Mawlānā Maḥmūd Sardārī	306	306	3	1	N/A; may have visited Harāt (?)	N/A	N/A	A shabby man (zhandah-pūsh); SM quotes a line about the drunkenness of Harāt
550	5,2	Mawlānā Furūghī Shīrāzī	306	306	1	1	Shīrāz (presumably)	N/A	N/A	N/A
551	5,2	Mawlānā Sharṭī Qazvīnī	306	306	2	1	Qazvīn (presumably)	N/A	Merchant/trader (tijārat)	N/A
552	5,2	Mawlānā Manẓarī Mā-varāʾ-al-nahrī	306	307	3	1	Transoxiana	N/A	N/A	Sometimes copies Ayyūb Abū al-Barakah; SM doubts the quoted line is by him
553	5,2	Mawlānā Bīkhudī Samarqandī	307	307	2	2	Samarqand	N/A	Poet	N/A
554	5,2	Żiyāʾī Bukhārāʾī	307	307	2	1	Bukhārā (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Darvīsh
555	5,2	Mawlānā Vāṣilī Bukhārāʾī	307	308	2	1	Bukhārā	N/A	Poet	N/A
556	5,2	Mawlānā Shamsī Shirvānī	308	308	2	1	Shirvān (presumably)	N/A	Saddler (sarrāj)	N/A
557	5,2	Mawlānā Rahāʾī	308	308	3	3	Tūrān; moved to Shirvān	N/A	Poet	Fell in love with Sulṭān Khalīl Mīrzā (?!)
558	5,2	Mawlānā Vāṣilī Tabrīzī	309	309	2	1	Tabrīz	N/A	Silk-seller, merchant	Died young
559	5,2	Mawlānā Girāmī Baghdādī	309	309	3	1	Baghdādī; moved to Shirvān	N/A	Court service	Acted badly while serving Takaltū Khān; Shah Ṭahmāsb ordered that his ear(s) be cut off
560	5,2	Mawlānā Hijrī (?)	309	309	3	1	Andijān	N/A	Poet	SM explains that Andijān is in Transoxiana
561	5,2	Mawlānā Bayānī Baḥrābādī	309	310	2	1	Sabzavār	N/A	Poet	N/A
562	5,2	Naẓarī (?) Qumī	310	310	2	1	Qum (presumably)	N/A	Storyteller, poet	Was briefly at Shah Ṭahmāsb's court
563	5,2	Mawlānā ʿUrfī Tabrīzī	310	311	2	13	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	Poet (presumably)	Wrote a maṡnavī on the format of ʿĀrifī's "Gūy u chūgān" (selection quoted)
564	5,2	Mawlānā Jārūbī Haravī	311	311	8	1	Harāt (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Would fall in love with anyone in power, including fifty-year-old Bābur (?!); javāb of Faghānī
565	5,2	Mawlānā Tazrīqī Biyārjumandī	311	311	4	1	Biyārjumand (presumably)	N/A	Hat embroiderer (tāj-dūz)	Composed mostly dirty poetry
566	5,2	Mawlānā Khāliṣī Tabrīzī	312	312	3	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Avaricious (zar-parast); hoarded money his whole life, died at ninety and left it behind
567	5,2	Mawlānā Muḥyī Varjirdī	312	312	2	1	Varjird of Hamadān	N/A	N/A	Poor (faqīr, gūshah-nishīn)
568	5,2	Mawlānā Maqṣadī Sāvajī	312	312	1	2	Sāvah	N/A	N/A	Mentioned in later taẕkirahs (see Dehkhoda)
569	5,2	Mawlānā Ṣayfī Sāvahʾī	312	312	2	1	Sāvah (presumably)	N/A	N/A	"Vaṣfash az takhalluṣ maʿlūm"
570	5,2	Mawlānā Qirāżī (?) Qazvīnī	313	313	2	1	Qazvīn	N/A	Poet	Uneducated (ʿāmmī); has a lot of poetry on the virtues of the Ahl al-Bayt (manqabat)
571	5,2	Mawlānā Bahārī Iṣfahānī	313	313	2	1	Iṣfahān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Thinks highly of his own poetry, though no one else does; brother of Mawlānā Adāʾī
572	5,2	Mawlānā Mastī Rāzī	313	313	4	1	Ray	N/A	N/A	Annoying beggar; he may have earned the takhalluṣ Mastī, but Hushyārī would now fit better
573	5,2	Mawlānā Qāżī Naʿīmī (Nuʿaymī?) Gunābādī	313	314	2	2	Gunābād (presumably)	N/A	Judge or scholar (presumably)	Skilled in siyāq

Appendix 7: Entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (ed. Humāyūn Farrukh)

No.	Ch.	Name	Start p.	End p.	Ll. bio.	Ll. poe.	Geographic origin	Date(s)	Profession(s)	Other notes
574	5,2	Mawlānā Aḥmad Fikrī Hamadānī	314	314	4	1	Hamadān; mostly lives in Harāt	N/A	N/A	"Bī-taʿayyun," but studied to a fair degree in fields such as tafsīr, numerology, and divination
575	5,2	Mawlānā Gharībī Astarābādī	314	314	1	1	Astarābād (presumably)	N/A	N/A	N/A
576	5,2	Mawlānā Fikrī Astarābādī	314	314	2	1	Astarābād (presumably)	N/A	Ṣaḥḥāf (bookseller?)	N/A
577	5,2	Mawlānā Fakhrī Qazvīnī	314	315	3	1	Qazvīn area (but born in city)	N/A	N/A	One of the "knowledge-seekers" (ṭālib-ʿilmān) of Qazvīn
578	5,2	Mawlānā Abū al-Makārim Qazvīnī	315	315	2	1	Qazvīn	N/A	Poet	N/A
579	5,2	Mawlānā Khwājah Fidāʾī Tabrīzī	315	315	2	2	Tabrīz	N/A	N/A	Khwājah-zādah; may appear in earlier/later taẕkirahs (see Dehkhoda)
580	5,2	Mawlānā Maʿrūf Rammālī Tabrīzī	315	315	2	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	Geomancer (rammāl)	N/A
581	5,2	Mawlānā Ẕātī Lārī	315	316	2	1	Lārī; lives in Tabrīz	N/A	Ṣaḥḥāf (bookseller?)	Quoted line in description of Tabrīz
582	5,2	Mawlānā Raḥmī Tabrīzī	316	316	4	4	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Committed a lot of sins; SM hopes Raḥmī will receive a lot of God's mercy (raḥm-i ilāhī)
583	5,2	Mawlānā Ẓarīfī Tabrīzī	316	316	2	2	Tabrīz	N/A	Vendor (khurdah-furūsh)	SM refers to the quoted lines as famous
584	5,2	Mawlānā Āgahī Tabrīzī	317	317	2	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	Needle-maker (sūzan-gar)	N/A
585	5,2	Mawlānā ʿAynī Shīrāzī	317	317	2	1	Shīrāz	N/A	Scribe (kātib)	Famous for writing quickly
586	5,2	Mawlānā Ṣafāʾī Tabrīzī	317	317	2	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	Paper-seller (kāghaẕ-furūsh)	N/A
587	5,2	Mawlānā Ẕihnī Tabrīzī	317	318	3	2	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	Poet	His father was known as a sīrāb-furūsh (?)
588	5,2	Mawlānā Pākī-Ghulām (?) Haravī	318	318	2	2	Harāt	N/A	Barber (sar-tarāsh)	N/A
589	5,2	Mawlānā Maḥmūd Mushkī Tabrīzī	318	318	3	2	Tabrīz	N/A	Poet	Popular among locals, especially in qaṣīdah and ghazal
590	5,2	Mawlānā Fanāʾī Mashhadī	318	319	2	2	Mashhad (presumably)	N/A	Fodder-seller (ʿallāf)	Better at poetry than others in his profession (?)
591	5,2	Mawlānā Shawqī Khabūshānī	319	319	2	2	Khabūshān (presumably)	N/A	Arrow-maker (tīr-gar)	N/A
592	5,2	Mawlānā Riżāʾī Gung (?) ʿIrāqī	319	319	3	1	ʿIrāq; moved to Rūm	N/A	Scribe (kātib)	Another fast writer; no news of him since he moved to Rūm
593	5,2	Mawlānā Panāhī Juvaynī	319	320	3	2	Juvayn of Khurāsān	N/A	Merchant/trader (tijārat)	Died of smallpox at age fifty
594	5,2	Mawlānā Shafīʿī Mashhadī	320	320	2	1	Mashhad	N/A	Poet	SM refers to the quoted line as famous
595	5,2	Mawlānā Qāniʿī Khabūshānī	320	320	2	2	Khabūshān; lived in Astarābād	N/A	N/A	SM specifies that Khabūshān is in Khurāsān
596	5,2	Mawlānā Zaynī Mashhadī	320	320	3	1	Mashhad; moved to ʿIrāq	N/A	N/A	Son of Darvīsh Rawghan-gar; went to ʿIrāq to study and died there
597	5,2	Mawlānā Hijrī (?) Kāshānī	321	321	3	1	Kāshān	N/A	Sword-maker (shamshīr-gar)	Has more than seven thousand lines in ghazals
598	5,2	Mawlānā Qārī Kāshānī	321	321	6	1	Kāshān	N/A	Teacher (mudarris)	Went crazy from love; later became a hermit; took takhalluṣ of Ḥayrānī
599	5,2	Mawlānā Yamīnī Simnānī	321	322	2	1	Simnān	N/A	Sword-maker (shamshīr-gar)	N/A
600	5,2	Mawlānā Ghāzī Qazvīnī	322	322	2	1	Qazvīn (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Ṭālib-ʿilm, faqīr, darvīsh (like so many others)
601	5,2	Mawlānā Fahmī Qazvīnī	322	322	2	1	Qazvīn (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Brother of aforementioned Ghāzī
602	5,2	Ghazālī Marvastī mashhūr bi-Chunbak (?)	322	323	5	1	Harāt; moved to ʿIrāq	N/A	Poet	Left Harāt in disgrace as a young man; took takhalluṣ of Ghazālī in ʿIrāq; what about Marvast?
603	5,2	Mawlānā Mudāmī Iṣfahānī	323	323	4	1	Iṣfahān	N/A	Court service	Named Ḥaydar Beg Sārūqchī; served Ṭahmāsb, now Navvāb Ibrāhīm Khān; different from no. 430
604	5,2	Mawlānā Khāvarī Tūnī	323	323	4	1	Tūn	N/A	Poet	Really bad poet (bi-ghāyat zabūn)
605	5,2	Mawlānā Shakībī Tabrīzī	323	324	2	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	Gold-embroiderer (zar-kash)	N/A
606	5,2	Mawlānā Jinnī (?) Qazvīnī	324	324	4	3	Qazvīn	N/A	Butcher (qaṣṣāb)	Uneducated (ʿāmmī); funny anecdote about a praise poem that wasn't properly rewarded
607	5,2	Mawlānā Ẕātī Kabābī Qumī	324	324	2	1	Qum	N/A	Poet	N/A
608	5,2	Mawlānā Niyāzī Qazvīnī (Mīkhchah-gar)	324	325	2	2	Qazvīn (presumably)	N/A	Nail-maker (mīkhchah-gar)	Spends his time on his work/trade (kāsibī)
609	5,2	Mawlānā Ātashī Shīrāzī	325	325	3	1	Shīrāz	N/A	Poet	Traded satires with Ṣabūḥī (no. 378)
610	5,2	Mawlānā Ghavvāṣī Khurāsānī	325	326	14	6	Khurāsān (presumably)	N/A	Vendor (khurdah-furūsh)	Crazy old man; prolific poet, with versions of Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Kalīlah va Dimnah, etc.
611	5,2	Mawlānā Yaqīnī Shirvānī	326	326	2	1	Shirvānī; lived in Shīrāz	N/A	N/A	N/A
612	5,2	Shawqī Shīrāzī	327	327	2	2	Shīrāz (presumably)	N/A	Praise poet (maddāḥ)	Served Qāsim Beg Parnāk (a ruler of Fārs)
613	5,2	ʿAlāʾ Beg Mushkī Tabrīzī	327	327	5	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	Musk-seller (mushk-furūsh)	SM suggests an improvement to the quoted line
614	5,2	Bābā Ṣafāʾī Qalandar Astarābādī	327	328	4	1	Astarābād	N/A	N/A	Would tell people that anyone he hung around would die or be killed within a month (?!)
615	5,2	Mawlānā Sulṭān Muḥammad Sabzavārī	328	328	3	1	Sabzavār	N/A	N/A	Composed praise poetry of Ahl al-Bayt; takhalluṣ is Nūshī
616	5,2	Mawlānā Darvīsh ʿAbdī Nīshāpūrī	328	328	2	2	Nīshāpūr (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Each quoted line is from a tarjīʿ
617	5,2	Mawlānā Mīrzā Aḥmad Tihrānī	328	328	2	1	Tihrān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Brother of Mawlānā Hijrī (no. 346); nephew of Mawlānā Umīdī Tihrānī (no. 271)
618	5,2	Mawlānā Ṣābir Rāzī	328	329	2	1	Ray	N/A	Preacher (khaṭīb)	N/A
619	5,2	Mawlānā Khwājah Abū al-Qāsim Tihrānī	329	329	3	2	Tihrānī; moved to Gurjistān	N/A	N/A	Forebears were wealthy, but left nothing to him
620	5,2	Mawlānā Ghiyāś Rāzī	329	329	2	1	Ray	N/A	Merchant/trader (tijārat)	Mullā-zādah
621	5,2	Mawlānā Qāniʿī Tihrānī	329	330	2	2	Tihrān (presumably)	N/A	Bureaucrat (umūr-i dīvānī)	Name is Mīrzā Aḥmad

Appendix 7: Entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (ed. Humāyūn Farrukh)

No.	Ch.	Name	Start p.	End p.	Ll. bio.	Ll. poe.	Geographic origin	Date(s)	Profession(s)	Other notes
622	5,2	Mawlānā Ḥusayn Rāzī	330	330	2	1	Ray	N/A	N/A	Writes decent nastaʿlīq
623	5,2	Mawlānā Mīr Ḥātim Rāzī	330	330	2	1	Ray (presumably)	N/A	N/A	From the Arab Banī Asad tribe; composes poetry in three languages; SM wishes he didn't (!)
624	5,2	Mawlānā Adham Rāzī	330	330	2	1	Ray	N/A	N/A	One of the unemployed (bī-taʿayyun) people of Ray (I'm still uncertain about this term)
625	5,2	Mawlānā ʿIzz al-Dīn Tihrānī	330	330	2	1	Tihrān	N/A	Schoolmaster (maktab-dār)	N/A
626	5,2	Mawlānā Abū al-Qāsim Khaṭīb Tihrānī	330	331	2	1	Tihrān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Son of Khaṭīb Tihrānī (is this supposed to be a name or a title?)
627	5,2	Mawlānā Ḥamd Allāh Tihrānī	331	331	2	1	Tihrān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	His father was rich, but he's poor, gūshah-nishīn
628	5,2	Mawlānā Qanbarī Rāzī	331	331	2	1	Ray	N/A	N/A	One of the zarrīn-kamarān (golden belts?) of Ray; takhalluṣ is Qanbarī
629	5,2	Mawlānā Niʿmat Tihrānī	331	331	2	1	Tihrān; from a Baghdādī family	N/A	Merchant/trader (tijārat)	N/A
630	5,2	Mawlānā Niẓām (Naẓẓām?) Tihrānī	331	332	2	1	Tihrān (presumably)	N/A	Shrine caretaker (ḥāfiẓ)	One of the caretakers of the shrine of Imām-zādah ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīm; also writes nicely
631	5,2	Shaykh ʿAlāʾ al-Dawlah Tihrānī	332	332	2	1	Tihrān/Ray	N/A	Shrine custodian (mutavallī)	Looked after the shrine of Imām-zādah Abū al-Ḥasan in Andarmān (a village of Ray)
632	5,2	Mawlānā Shaykh Jamāl al-Dīn Varjirdī	332	332	2	1	Varjird of Hamadān	N/A	N/A	Nūrbakhshī disciple (murīd)
633	5,2	Mawlānā Muḥammad Khiżr (?) Shāh Jurjānī	332	332	2	1	Jurjān	N/A	N/A	One of the wealthy men (mutamavvilān) of Jurjān
634	5,2	Mawlānā Ramażān Nabātī	332	333	2	1	Astarābād	N/A	Ṣaḥḥāf (bookseller?)	Takhalluṣ is Nabātī
635	5,2	Mawl. Khw. Fakhr al-Dīn Aḥmad Bakhshī Simnānī	333	333	2	1	Simnān	N/A	N/A	One of the leaders (arbāb) of Simnān
636	6	Amīr Niẓām al-Dīn ʿAlī Shīr "Navāʾī/Fānī"	334	338	67	6	N/A	Born in 844; died in 906	Statesman, scholar, poet	Quote from Banāʾī; tatabbuʿ of Daryā-yi abrār; chronograms by Ṣāḥib Dārā; rubāʿī for Jāmī; etc.
637	6	Amīr Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn Aḥmad "Suhaylī"	338	339	15	3	N/A	Died in 918	Govt. official, poet	Mentioned by Dawlatshāh; dedicatee of Kāshifī's "Anvār-i suhaylī"; Persian and Turkic dīvāns
638	6	Mawlānā Mīr Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ	339	340	4	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	Son of Amīr Nūr Saʿīd, a leading Chaghatāʾī amīr; grandson of Amīr Shāh Malik (!)
639	6	Mawlānā Mīr Āhī	340	342	4	13	N/A	N/A	Govt. official, poet	Chaghatāʾī Turk; served in the jargah-i umarāʾ under SHB; evidently a well-known poet
640	6	Amīr Ḥusayn ʿAlī Jalāyir "Ṭufaylī"	342	343	14	4	Spent later years in ʿIrāq	Died in 925	Govt. official, poet	Amīr under SHB; later served Najm-i Šānī; exchanged hajv with Umīdī (whose lines are quoted)
641	6	Ḥusayn Qulī Mīrzā	343	343	4	1	N/A	N/A	Court service	Shāmlū Turk; serves Humāyūn Pādshāh; father was stable-master for Shah Ismāʿīl
642	6	Āy Ghūt Mīrzā	344	344	8	3	N/A	Died in 956	Court service	Son of Bāyazid Sulṭān, grandson of Jānān Sulṭān; Ustājlū; historian (?); poet in Turkic and Persian
643	6	Yūsuf Beg	344	346	8	13	N/A	N/A	Court/personal service	Of the Chāvushlū Ustājlū; with SM twelve years; good poet in both languages (though he's a Turk)
644	6	Nāranjī Sulṭān Arasbārī Khwān	346	347	10	1	Arasbār of Kurdistān	N/A	Court/personal service	Served Bahrām Mīrzā (dating this entry to 956 at the latest?); strange anecdote about his honorific
645	6	Mawlānā Khayālī	347	348	8	3	N/A	Died in Qazvīn, 951	Court/personal service	Served Ṭahmāsb; javāb, ʿĀrifī's "Gūy u chūgān"; matched by few Turks in poetry; buried in Mashhad
646	6	Mīr Dūst Ṭārimī	348	349	13	1	N/A	N/A	Shrine caretaker	Served Bābur; had a dream, quit, moved to Mashhad to pray; ended up working at the shrine; etc.
647	6	Mīr Shāh ʿAlī	349	349	5	2	N/A	Died in 938	N/A	From a leading Chaghatāʾī family; SM was his archery student (literally?); javāb of Umīdī
648	6	Mīr Maqbūl Qumī	349	350	8	5	Turk, but settled in Qum	N/A	Military service	Served Sultan Yaʿqūb; known for eating and drinking a lot; nice line on fleeting youth and love
649	6	Mawlānā Humāʾī	351	351	3	2	Settled, died in Iṣfahān	N/A	N/A	He "quit" Turkic as a youth, and evidently focused on Persian poetry
650	6	Yūsuf Beg Tūshmāl	351	351	8	1	N/A	N/A	Parvānachī, tūshmāl	Of the Īv-ughlī Chaghatāʾī tribe; served Ismāʿīl, Ṭahmāsb; good calligrapher, Turkic and Persian poet
651	6	Allāh-Qulī	352	352	3	2	Works in Iṣfahān	N/A	Qābiż (tax or debt collector?)	A Turk, but more resembles the Tājiks; works as qābiż "bar Turkān" (?)
652	6	Būdāq Beg	352	352	3	1	N/A	N/A	Court service	Son of Ḥiṣār Beg Bahārlū, Ṭahmāsb's stable-master; Persian quoted "despite [his being] a Turk" (?)
653	6	Ṭufaylī Abdāl	352	353	4	2	Khurāsān	N/A	Court/personal service	Serves one of the Turk amīrs
654	6	Mawlānā Āqā Shawqī	353	353	2	1	N/A	N/A	Poet	N/A
655	6	Mawlānā Muṭīʿī Beg	353	353	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Turk by origin, but grew up among Tājiks; Persian line quoted
656	6	Mawlānā Vafāʾī	353	353	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Turk by origin; his forebears served Turk amīrs
657	6	Ḥājjī Āqā Lur	353	354	9	2	Luristān	N/A	Court service	Claims descent from atābaks of Luristān; full of himself; bad poet; lines by Bahrām Mīrzā quoted
658	6	Mīrzā Būdāq	354	354	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	"Although he is a Turk by origin, he has spent a lot of time among Tājiks"
659	6	Nigāhī Chaghatāʾī	354	354	3	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Chaghatāʾī Turk
660	6	Mawlānā Ummatī	355	355	4	3	N/A	Killed by highwaymen, 955	Court/personal service	Served the dārūghah of Ṭahmāsb's farrāsh-khānah (?); first takhalluṣ was Laʿlī
661	6	Mūsá Beg	355	356	4	1	Born in Tabrīz	N/A	Secretary (munshī)	Kurd by origin; works at Safavid shrine
662	6	Mawlānā Yartīlmīsh	356	356	3	5	N/A	N/A	Geomancer (rammāl)	One of the Chamish-gazak Turks (or Kurds?); irreligious (mulḥid-ṭawr); interested in the occult
663	6	Mawlānā Jadīdī	356	357	7	1	N/A	Died in 939	Court/personal service	From a leading family (mīrzā-zādah); served Najm-i Šānī, Ṭahmāsb; a humorous fellow
664	6	Mawlānā Ḥabībī Bargushādī	357	358	15	2	Bargushād of Āẕarbāyjān	N/A	Poet (malik al-shuʿarā!)	Served Yaʿqūb, Ismāʿīl; nicknamed Gurz al-Dīn Beg (?); former shepherd; incredible anecdote
665	6	Mawlānā Sawsanī	358	360	22	1	Spent time in Tabrīz	N/A	Fmr. qūrchī (guard)	Tries to pass off others' poetry as his own (including to SM!); incredible anecdotes
666	7	Mawlānā Aḥmadī	361	362	8	6	Seemingly based in Harāt	N/A	N/A	Known for composing satire and comic verse in an idiosyncratic style
667	7	Mawlānā Qāsim Qaranbū (?)	362	363	6	4	Lives in Harāt	N/A	N/A	Some kind of vagabond (chapānī); trades dirty satires with friends; was in Harāt when SM was there
668	7	Mawlānā Ḥasan Zār Nā-tavān	363	363	11	3	Originally from Ṭabas-i Gīlakī	N/A	Muhimm-sāzī (i.e., khidmat?)	Shaykh-zādah; went to ʿIrāq to ask officials for work; some kind of servant
669	7	Mawlānā Bīrah	364	364	10	4	Originally from Qum	N/A	N/A	Very bad poet; has satirized the people of Qum

Appendix 7: Entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (ed. Humāyūn Farrukh)

No.	Ch.	Name	Start p.	End p.	Ll. bio.	Ll. poe.	Geographic origin	Date(s)	Profession(s)	Other notes
670	7	Mawlānā Kirmānī	364	365	2	1	Kirmān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	His poetry seems to be gibberish
671	7	Mawlānā Ustād Nūrī Qufl-gar	365	365	10	2	N/A	N/A	Locksmith	In his seventies at least; his poetry is hilariously bad; "javāb" of Ḥāfiẓ
672	7	Mawlānā Ẓuhūrī Kirmānī	365	365	2	1	Kirmān (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Darvīsh, ʿāmmī, faqīr
673	7	Mawlānā Sākinī Qumī	366	366	2	1	Qum (presumably)	N/A	Ḥamāmī-garī	Son of a certain Anṣārī (also from Qum?), but not too bright
674	7	Mawlānā Shamālī Kāshānī	366	366	2	1	Kāshān (presumably)	N/A	Qiṣṣah-khwān	Also a maddāḥ and khavāṣṣ-gū (?)
675	7	Tazrīqī Ardabīlī	366	366	2	1	Ardabīlī; lives in Shamākhī	N/A	Broker (dallāl)	Composes insipid verse (bī-mazah)
676	7	Kalīmī Pīnah-dūz-ughlī	366	366	2	1	Tabrīz	N/A	N/A	Faqīr, ʿāmmī; composes poetry in both Persian and Turkic
677	7	Basmalī Kallah-paz	367	367	3	3	Lives in Qazvīn	N/A	Kallah-paz	In his seventies at least; has almost ten thousand verses of poetry
678	7	Mawlānā Ḥasan Mushtāqī Shīrāzī	367	367	4	2	Born and died in Shīrāz	Died in 950	Qiṣṣah-khwān	Really excellent qiṣṣah-khwān; also a decent poet
679	7	Mawlānā Pahlavān Muḥammad Yatīm Mashhadī	368	368	2	1	Mashhad (presumably)	N/A	Pahlavān (perhaps)	Brave, of noble disposition; "best of the orphans"; killed by dārūghah of Mashhad
680	7	Ustād Shujāʿ	368	368	3	1	N/A	N/A	Tāj-dūz	Buys poems
681	7	Mawlānā Lavandī	368	368	3	1	Varjird, near Hamadān	N/A	Qiṣṣah-khwān	ʿĀmmī; a libertine (lavand); has "wasted" ninety years of his life
682	7	Mawlānā Shaṭṭāḥī	368	368	3	1	Varjird, near Hamadān	N/A	N/A	Sole claim to fame is walking twenty farsangs from Varjird to Hamadān in one day
683	7	Gilū ʿAlī	368	369	2	1	Shīrāz	N/A	Barber	Among the gilūyān (?) of Shīrāz; possibly buys/steals poems
684	7	Ḥājjī Rawshanī	369	369	2	1	Baghdād	N/A	Kitābat (scribe?)	Faqīr, gūshah-nishīn
685	7	Pahlavān Mīrzā ʿAlī Bīldār Tabrīzī	369	369	3	2	Sabzavār (perhaps)	N/A	Shoveler	Pahlavān, bīldār, has an interesting voice; is in SM's retinue
686	7	Shāh-virdī Sabzavārī	369	369	2	2	Sabzavār (presumably)	N/A	Calligrapher	Perhaps related to the aforementioned Pahlavān ʿAlī (?); not a shoveler
687	7	Mawlānā Buhlūl Qazvīnī	369	369	2	1	Qazvīn (presumably)	N/A	Goldsmith	Bī-taʿayyun, lā-ubālī
688	7	Darvīsh ʿAbdī Tabrīzī	369	370	1	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Dīvānah-ṣifat
689	7	Valī Khayyāṭ Sāvajī	370	370	1	1	Sāvah	N/A	Tailor?	N/A
690	7	Ḥusayn Khālah Tūnī	370	370	2	1	Tūn (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Considers himself a student of Ḥayratī (also of Tūn)
691	7	Mawlānā Ḥāfiẓ Pīr ʿAlī Firāqī	370	370	2	1	From ʿIrāq	N/A	N/A	Darvīsh, faqīr
692	7	Ḥāfiẓ Mīrak Kāshānī	370	370	2	1	Kāshān (presumably)	N/A	Butcher	N/A
693	7	Mawlānā Nardī Astarābādī	370	371	3	1	Astarābād	N/A	Qiṣṣah-khwān	Also a chess player (narrād); has done a lot, none of it beneficial
694	7	Mawlānā Ḥāfiẓ ʿAṣṣār Qazvīnī	371	371	2	2	Qazvīn	N/A	Oil-presser (perhaps)	Also a Nūrbakhshī disciple
695	7	Khwājah ʿAlī Astarābādī "Bāzārī"	371	371	2	4	Astarābād (presumably)	N/A	Merchant (perhaps)	N/A
696	7	Khwājah Fatḥ Allāh Qazvīnī	371	371	2	1	Qazvīn	N/A	Trader	Also a Nūrbakhshī disciple
697	7	Ustād Shāh Qulī Naqqāsh Qumī "Alvānī"	372	372	3	1	Qum	N/A	Painter or engraver	Also a good geomancer; considers himself a great poet
698	7	Mawlānā Khalīl Tabrīzī	372	372	2	1	Tabrīz (presumably)	N/A	N/A	Was a philanthropist (khayyir) and scholar (ʿālim); built a mosque in Tabrīz
699	7	Qirdāsh Tabrīzī	372	372	3	1	Tabrīz	N/A	Chīnī-furūsh	Apparently a very attractive individual
700	7	Mawlānā ʿAbdal Kāshānī	372	372	2	1	Kāshān	N/A	Kāghaẕ-furūsh	N/A
701	7	Khwājah Muḥtasham Kāshānī	373	373	5	6	Kāshān (presumably)	N/A	Bazzāz	Still young and new to the scene, but SM thinks he has potential (!)
702	7	Mawlānā Ghiyāṡ al-Dīn Bāghbān Kanī	373	373	3	1	Kan, near Ray	N/A	Gardener	Thinks highly of his own poetry, but many of his verses are nā-mawzūn
703	7	Mawlānā Ḥusayn Abdāl Tabarrāʾī	373	374	3	1	Ḥillah	N/A	Court servant	Used to be wandering qalandar; now serves Ḥaẓrat-i Ṣāḥib-qirānī (Ṭahmāsb)
704	7	Mawlānā Maqṣūd Banā-yi Tabrīzī	374	374	4	2	Tabrīz	N/A	N/A	Son of prominent Tabrīzī architect; wrote verse to be inscribed on local palace
705	7	Mawlānā Dīv Ṭabasī	374	374	2	1	Ṭabas (presumably)	N/A	N/A	His character is evident from his name...
706	7	Khwājah Khurd	374	375	7	2	N/A	Died in 953	Pahlavān	Remembered as a famous pahlavān, bīldār, dancer; strange anecdote here
707	7	Ustād Qāsim Kamāngar Haravī	375	375	3	1	Harāt	N/A	Archer	Excellent archer, hunter, zih-gīr (bow-stringer?)
708	7	Mawlānā Maḥmūd Zih-gīr	375	375	3	1	N/A	N/A	Zih-gīr	Another bow-stringer (or bowstring maker)?
709	7	Pīrzādah Ḥusayn Iṣfahānī	375	376	2	1	Iṣfahān	N/A	N/A	A tikyah-dār; son of Najafī Qalandar; SM doubts he composed the quoted line
710	7	Dīvānah Naqqāsh Tabrīzī	376	376	2	1	Tabrīz	N/A	Painter or engraver (perhaps)	Rumored to have been a nadīm of Sultan Yaʿqūb
711	7	Khwājah Shāh Valī	376	376	2	1	Simnān	N/A	N/A	Has some connection to a certain Qāsim ʿAlī Sulṭān (?)

Appendix 8: Entries in the *Tuḥfah-i Sāmī* (ed. Humāyūn Farrukh) — Summary statistics

	No. entries	No. pp.	Median ll. bio.	Median ll. poe.	Pct. w/ geo. origin	Pct. w/ date(s)
Ch. 1	19	23	14	1	36,8%	73,7%
Ch. 2.1	119	45	3	1	84,0%	11,8%
Ch. 2.2	23	13	5	2	95,7%	34,8%
Ch. 3	34	13	3	1	79,4%	11,8%
Ch. 4.1	47	31,5	5	2	80,9%	19,1%
Ch. 4.2	22	9,5	4	1	95,5%	22,7%
Ch. 5.1	88	107	5	4	95,5%	30,7%
Ch. 5.2	282	84	2	1	98,2%	0,4%
Ch. 6	30	27	4,5	2	33,3%	26,7%
Ch. 7	46	16	2	1	91,3%	4,3%
Overall	710	369	3	1	88,5%	12,7%

Appendix 9: Selected noteworthy Persian (and Turkic) *taẕkirah*s

The table below contains basic information on a number of the most influential anthologies of poets (and, in some cases, of other kinds of individuals) from the span of the classical Persian tradition. This includes a couple of works written in Turkic, which is appropriate, given the deep ties and mutual influence between Persian and Turkic literature—connections that were arguably most pronounced in the tenth/sixteenth century.

This is adapted from a larger, more comprehensive spreadsheet of *taẕkirah*s that I have been assembling in recent years, partly, though not exclusively, for the dissertation project. Most of the anthologies that proved especially influential, starting with the *Chahār maqālah* and ending with the *Majmaʿ al-fuṣaḥāʾ*, are included here.

Title	Author	Date (CE)	Edition	Notes
Chahār maqālah	Niẓāmī ʿArūżī	*ca.* 1156	Muḥammad Muʾīn (Tehran, 1955)	Broader normative work on court officials; ch. 2 on poets
Taẕkirat al-awliyāʾ	Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār	*ca.* 1210	Nicholson & Qazvīnī (Tehran, 1982)	Major work of Sufi biography & hagiography
Lubāb al-albāb	Sadīd al-Dīn ʿAwfī	*ca.* 1221	Saʿīd Nafīsī (Tehran, 1957)	First dedicated anthology of Persian poets
Nafaḥāt al-uns	ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī	1478	Maḥmūd ʿĀbidī (Tehran, 1991)	Another major hagiographic work on Sufis
Bahāristān	ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī	1487	Afṣaḥzād *et al.* (Tehran, 2000)	Broad didactic text for author's son; ch. 7 on poets
Taẕkirat al-shuʿarāʾ	Dawlatshāh Samarqandī	1487	Fāṭimāh ʿAlāqah (Tehran, 2007)	Genre-defining anthology of (mostly) Persian poets
Majālis al-nafāʾis	ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī	1491	Hüseyin Ayan *et al.* (Ankara, 2001)	First Turkic anthology of poets; also influential in Persian
Majālis al-nafāʾis-i Fārsī	Ḥakīm Shāh Muḥammad Qazvīnī	1523	ʿAlī Aṣghar Ḥikmat (Tehran, 1945)	One of two Persian translations of Navāʾī; written in Istanbul
Tuḥfah-i Sāmī	Sām Mīrzā Ṣafavī	*ca.* 1550	Aḥmad Mudaqqiq Yazdī (Yazd, 2009)	Anthology of *recent* Persian poets, by a Safavid prince
Rawżat al-salāṭīn	Fakhrī Haravī	1553	Rāshidī (Hyderabad, 1968)	On royals who composed poetry; written in India
Javāhir al-ʿajāʾib	Fakhrī Haravī	1556	Rāshidī (Hyderabad, 1968)	Anthology of women poets; written in India

Haft iqlīm	Amīn b. Aḥmad Rāzī	1594	Javād Fażil (Tehran, *ca.* 1960)	Broad bio. & geo. encyc., incl. poets; written in India
Gulistān-i hunar	Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī	*ca.* 1596–7	Khwānsārī (Tehran, 1973)	Important anthology of painters & calligraphers
Majālis al-muʾminīn	Qāżī Nūr Allāh Shūshtarī	1601	Mullā Amīn Ṭihrānī (Tehran, 1881)	Anthology of notable Shiʿis, incl. scholars; written in India
Sullam al-samāvāt	Abū al-Qāsim Kāzarūnī	1605	ʿAbd Allāh Nūrānī (Tehran, 2008)	Another broader work; ch. 5 focuses on poets
Khulāṣat al-ashʿār va zubdat al-afkār	Taqī al-Dīn Kāshānī	1607	Barūmand, Kahnamūʾī *et al.* (Tehran, 2005–)	Largest ever (by volume) Persian literary anthology
Majmaʿ al-khavāṣṣ	Ṣādiqī Beg Afshār	1607	Khayyāmpūr (Tabrīz, 1948)	Turkic anthology of mostly Persian poets; written at Safavid court
ʿArafāt al-ʿāshiqīn va ʿaraṣāt al-ʿārifīn	Taqī al-Dīn Awḥadī	1615	Ẕabīḥ Allāh Ṣāḥibkārī *et al.* (Tehran, 2010)	Largest ever (by number of entries) Persian anthology; written in India
Maykhānah	Fakhr al-Zamānī Qazvīnī	1619	Gulchīn-i Maʿānī (Tehran, 1961)	Anthology of poets who composed *sāqī-nāmah*s
Khayr al-bayān	Malik Shāh Ḥusayn Sīstānī	1627	N/A; see British Library MS Or. 3397	General anthology of Persian poets, incl. many who migrated to India
Taẕkirah-i Naṣrābādī	Muḥammad Ṭāhir Naṣrābādī	1680	Aḥmad Mudaqqiq Yazdī (Yazd, 1999)	Important late Safavid anthology
Riyāż al-shuʿarāʾ	Vālih Dāghistānī	1748	Muḥsin Nājī Naṣrābādī (Tehran, 2005)	Another large, rich anthology of Persian poets; written in India
Ātashkadah	Āẕar Begdilī	1760	Ḥasan Sādāt Nāṣirī (Tehran, 1958–62)	Anthology written for Karīm Khān Zand
Majmaʿ al-fuṣaḥāʾ	Riżā Qulī Khān Hidāyat	1867	Maẓāhir Muṣaffā (Tehran, 1957–61)	Massive, influential summation of Persian *taẕkirah* tradition

Appendix 10: Selected narrative sources for early Safavid history

Listed chronologically by year of completion (*CE*)

1521	*Futūḥāt-i shāhī*, Ṣadr al-Dīn Amīnī
1524	*Ḥabīb al-siyar*, Ghiyāṡ al-Dīn Khwāndamīr
1542	*Lubb al-tavārīkh*, Yaḥyá Qazvīnī
1550	*Ẕayl-i Ḥabīb al-siyar*, Amīr Maḥmūd b. Khwāndamīr
1554	*Tārīkh-i Ḥayātī*, Qāsim Beg Ḥayātī Tabrīzī
ca. 1562	Memoirs of Shah Ṭahmāsb
1564/5	*Nusakh-i jahān-ārā*, Qāżī Aḥmad Ghaffārī
1570	*Takmilat al-akhbār*, ʿAbdī Beg Shīrāzī
1576/7	*Javāhir al-akhbār*, Būdāq Munshī Qazvīnī
1577	*Aḥsan al-tavārīkh*, Ḥasan Rūmlū (mostly not extant)
1591	***Khulāṣat al-tavārīkh*, Qāżī Aḥmad Qumī**
1598	*Naqāvat al-āṡār fī ẕikr al-akhyār*, Maḥmūd b. Hidāyat Allāh Afūshtah'ī Naṭanzī
1599	*Futụḥāt-i humāyūn*, Siyāqī Niẓām
ca. 1611	*Tārīkh-i ʿAbbāsī*, Jalāl al-Dīn Munajjim Yazdī (a court astral scientist)
1629	*ʿĀlam-ārā-yi ʿAbbāsī*, Iskandar Beg Munshī
1639	*Afżal al-tavārīkh*, Fażlī Khūzānī Iṣfahānī (still being edited by Melville, Ghereghlou?)

Appendix 11: Selected influential poets, late fifteenth – early seventeenth century

Listed chronologically by year of death (CE)

1492 ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī, a towering figure in Persian literature; most famous for his cycle of seven verse romances, the *Haft awrang*, but wrote in almost every form and genre

1501 Mīr ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī, noted statesman and intellectual during the reign of Sulṭān Ḥusayn Bāyqarā; wrote poetry in Persian and Chaghatāʾī Turkic, especially supporting the latter; also authored a highly influential *taẕkirah* of poets, the *Majālis al-nafāʾis* (in Turkic)

1519 Bābā Faghānī, an important *ghazal* poet and panegyrist to the later Āqquyūnlū sultans; seen as a forerunner of the "fresh" (*tāzah*) or "Indian" style of Persian lyric poetry

1521 Hātifī of Kharjird, nephew of Jāmī and author of a well-regarded *khamsah*

1529 Hilālī Astarābādī, known for *ghazal*s in the "incidentalist style" (*ṭarz-i vuqūʿ*); a friend and mentor to young Sām Mīrzā in Harāt; executed by the Uzbeks during one of their occupations of the city, purportedly on charges of Shiʿism

1534 Lisānī Shīrāzī, among the most influential poets of this era; spent much of his career in Tabrīz, under generous patronage from the early Safavid élite; especially famous for panegyrics to the Shiʿi Imams, and for advancing the *shahr-āshūb* ("disturber of the city") genre

1535 Ahlī Shīrāzī, versatile poet who showed technical excellence in a *mas̱navī* titled *Siḥr-i ḥalāl* (*tajnīs* in every line; scans in two meters; double rhyme)

1580 ʿAbdī Beg "Navīdī" Shīrāzī, important panegyrist and court historian under Ṭahmāsb and Sulṭān Muḥammad; author of chronicle *Takmilat al-akhbār* and three *khamsah*s on the model of Niẓāmī

1583 Vaḥshī Bāfqī, famous for *ghazal*s expressing love-anguish, and for an unfinished but admired response to Niẓāmī's *Khusraw va Shīrīn*, titled *Farhād va Shīrīn*

1588 Muḥtasham Kāshānī, a poet closely associated with Ṭahmāsb's court; most famous for an elegy on ʿĀshūrāʾ in the *tarkīb-band* form

1591 ʿUrfī Shīrāzī, earliest of the great Iranian poets to migrate to Akbar's court in India (in 1584)

1595 Fayżī of Agra, court poet and close advisor to Akbar; one of the great Persian poets native to India (and often linked in this regard with Amīr Khusraw, d. 1325)

1621 Bahāʾ al-Dīn ʿĀmilī, *i.e.*, Shaykh Bahāʾī, important Shiʿi scholar in service to the Safavids; wrote in Persian and Arabic, prose and poetry (esp. mystical lyric poems)

1626 Ṭālib Āmulī, perhaps the first exemplar of the "fresh style" (*shīvah-i tāzah*) *ghazal*

NB: The poetry of all of these individuals has been edited and published (at least in part).