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1. INTRODUCTION

The story of the Persian document which forms the subject of the present article is not devoid of romance. It was discovered in 1896 by the well-known Bosnian scholar Šafvet-beg R. Bašagić, in the possession of a local noble, Nuri-beg Čengić of Ustikolina. This family is said to be immigrants in Bosnia; their forefathers must have come as officials of the Ottoman Empire, then received fiefs and settled in the country. The fārmān in question being kept in the family archives, and evidently connected with the ancestors of the Čengić, points to the origin of the family from far-away Kurdistan.

A facsimile of the interesting document was published by Bašagić, first accompanied by an article in Serbian, and then by a German translation of the latter. On the whole the work of the late Bosnian scholar quite satisfactorily served its immediate purpose, if we take into consideration the difficulties the author must have had, working as he was in a provincial town, where a knowledge of Persian was certainly no common attainment. He was successful in deciphering the complicated dīvānī script and in explaining its general meaning.

However, he did not try to give a transcript of the original, and in difficult places his interpretation is only a paraphrase, with some obvious misunderstandings.

The interest of the farmān from the historical and diplomatic point of view would alone justify a new attempt at its interpretation. But its chief importance is in the light it throws on the legal and economic conditions of the time, and in this field the lacunae of our knowledge are particularly appalling.

As a result of the constant shifting of the capitals in Persia and the adjoining lands, as well as of a long series of invasions, no archives of older times have survived. Apart from the collections of official correspondence, our only hope is that single documents, kept in public libraries or in private hands, will be duly published. Among them the Čengiċ farmān will ever occupy an honourable place.

2. Persian Text

الحكم لله

الناصر لدين الله أبو المظفر قاسم جهانگیر سوزوميز

(1) حمد وسپاسی که واقفان مواقف قربت و اختصاص

(2) و عارفان معارف کال محبت واخلاص درمقام

(3) تحمید و تمجید و اداه حقیقت توحید قیام و اشتغال تمایند مرآن

پادشاهی را که بندکان صادق النيه و خالص العبودیه را

1 See my article "Geographical Factors in Persian Art" in BSOS., ix/3, pp. 621-652.

2 See the MS. collection of the twelfth to thirteenth century documents described by Baron V. Rosen, Collections scientifiques, 1886, pp. 146-159; Bahā al-dīn's al-Tavassul ilā al-tarassul (towards A.D. 1182-4), recently published in Tehran (1315/1936); the collection of Jalāyir documents by Muḥammad Hindūshāh, Dustūr al-kāṭib (cf. Melioransky in Zapiski V.O., xiii/1, 1900, pp. 015-023), Feridūn-bey (died in 991/1583), Mūshehē'ât-i Şelâfi, printed in Stambul A.H. 1264-5, Abul-Qāsim Ev-oghli Ḥaydar, Nuska-yi jami'a (about 1052/1642), cf. Rieu, Persian Catalogue, p. 388, Turkish Catalogue, p. 83, etc.


4 Written inside the tribal tamghā of the Bāyandur clan, vide infra.
LINES 13–19 OF ABUL-QĀSIM'S FARMĀN.
الهدى إلى العهد بوفر عواطف واحسان وصنوف لطائف انعام
وامتنان مخصوص كردياند وعافكما ما كيف خلاص عقيدة
(5) وصفاء طويت را ببدائع عنايت ومرحبت وصنائع رأفت
وعاطفة مزيد تشريف كرمت فرمود
وصلات صوات ناميات وتحف تحيتات زآكات نثار
باركاه (6) أمت پناهى كف منشور فائض النور جلالتتش بتوقيع رفاع
لوالآك لما خلقته الألفلاك مويشح وملطف مزين ومحلى
است وبر آل واصحاب او اجمن باد
(7) أمّا بعد حون مكتون خاطر خطير وغزون ضمير
منير در أعظام شان واعتلاء مكان عاليجنب امارت ماب
ايلت ايلاب حكومت مناب (8) سعادت نصاب رفعت قباب
معالي انساد نصفت دثار مكرمت شمار امير أعظم اكرم
اختيار الأمراء العظام في الايام قدوة (9) تولاقة الكرام بين
الأئام ركن الدولة القاهرة بين السلطنة المظفرية كثلا للملّة
والامارة والحكومة والإيالة والسعادة والدين استندر بيك
(10) مصروف ومعطف است وحسن اهتمام وتوهج خاطر
هيايون در براءة او درجة كال داشت الكاء إكل كه اوجاق
اوست وأتيح وهمين را (11) در بسته در وجه سبورغال
هوايدى (9) وانعم سرمدي عاليجنب مشار اليه شفت
This short line which closes the right column is only a custodian for the top line of the left column.
و مضامین مسطوره در الصدر را از شایسته تنبیه و تبدیل مصنوع و مرور شنیدن (20) و بهمراه حکم هایون بنقیدم رسانیده تنبیه و تبدیل بقاعد آن راه ندهند و از مضمون آیه کریمه فرم بدلیه بعد ما سیمّه (21) فی ایها ایسه علی الذین بیدلانه تکلیف و بجنب بوته خلاف کنند (را) در معرض سخت و لمنت الیه (22) و خطاب و عتاب بادشاهی دانند از جوانب همک برینجمه مقرّر شناسند و من سیفی، ای ابطال فدامانه لمعنی الله والملاءکه والناس اجمن (23) برینجمه عمل تمایند وچون بتوقیع رفع مطاع خورشید ارتفاع که فهیرست ایواب سعادت وبهروزی و خاتمه اعمال ابته و فیروزی است (24) مخصوص و موضع و مصنّح و منقّح و معلّی و مزین و محلّی گردد اعتیاد تمایند کتب بالامر العالی أعلاه الله تعالى وخلد نفاده ولا زال مطاعًا متبعًا منيعًا (25) بهوسق حرزم دار السلطنت ماردین در الخامس من شهر الله شعبان المعظم لسنّة تلاش و تسیعیة

(verso)

به‌هم‌هایون بوقوف حضرت صدرارت پناهی اسلام

ملادی برساند مقرب الحضرت زین الابن (؟) علی مسکی (؟؟)

پروانشی
3. **ENGLISH TRANSLATION**


*(in Turkish): Our word.*

*(inside the tamgha): COMMAND BELONGS TO GOD.*

(1) Praise and thanks that those who are cognizant of the stations of nearness and proximity, (2) and those who are initiated in the knowledge of perfect love and devotion, (3) are engaged in praises and lauds and in rendering its due to the truth of Unity, with regard to the Sovereign who distinguishes His servants of truthful intentions and sincere submission, by an abundance of attention and kindness and all manner of pleasantness, favours and contentment, (all the time) (4) from their cradles to their prescribed term; and Who increases the honour of grace of the hermits abiding in the hermitages of sincere opinions (5) and pure intentions, by means of wonders of benefaction and mercy, and works of tranquillity and special attention.

(And also) let purses of ascending prayers and gifts of pure congratulations be strewn upon the palace (6) of the Refuge of the Community whose patent of greatness, light-radiating, has been bejewelled, elevated, adorned and embellished by the exalted ratification (of the words): BUT FOR THEE I SHOULD NOT HAVE CREATED THE HEAVENS; as well as upon all his family and associates.

(7) And after. Inasmuch as the secret thought of (our) high mind and the treasures of (our) illuminant heart are spent and turned towards heightening the rank and elevating the station of his High Excellency Isfandiyār-beg, the Home of Principality, the Refuge of Government, the Lieutenancy of Administration, (8) the Solidity of Happiness, the Cupola of Greatness, the Expression of Highness, wrapt in justice, clad in generosity, the highest and noblest amir, the Pride (9) of the princes of his days, the Leader of the venerable vālis among men, the Pillar of the mighty State, the Right Hand of the victorious Sultanate—(all this) in a perfect degree (kamālan) for the sake of the Community, Principality, Administration, Government, Felicity (?) and Religion; (10) and inasmuch as (our) August

---

1 The difference of constructions in Persian and English allows us to indicate only approximately the lines of the original.

2 Instead of ‘ahd one would expect the usual rhyme word lāhd “the mortal shroud”.

3 *Tawqī*. See on the term F. Taeschner, *Tawquir* in El. (chiefly with regard to Turkey and Egypt). I translate it, as convenient, “ratification,” “confirmation,” and even “royal seal”.

---
interest and attention with regard to him were perfect, we have
deigned to grant to, and bestow upon the aforesaid Excellency the
territory of Igil which is his native home (ojaq), as well as Bāghin
and Hēnī, (11) all together in the guise of the soyūrghāl (styled)
eternal (huwā abadī) and of a perpetual grant.

So that the mālevajihāt and the whole of the treasury taxes of
the mentioned place should be stricken off and attributed (13) to
the aforesaid High Excellency, as a tarkhān, and be considered among
(the grants) from which the pen (of the collector) is raised and the
feet (of the officials) removed.

Let the financial agents, the managers of (state) business and
offices (?) and the clerks of more important and (usual) affairs (14)
of those parts know that such is the rule, and let them recognize that,
with regard to the aforesaid Excellency, all these benefactions con-
stitute an eternal and lasting grant and a bestowal perpetual and
incontestable.

Let them register this grant (15) in the books of lasting (deeds)
and not include it in the land-survey and measurement. Henceforth,
they shall not, absolutely and on any account, present drafts (for
payment) of

(a) ikhrājāt (p) bīqār
(b) khālisāt (q) shikār
(c) 'avāridāt (r) sāvari
(d) shanāqīs (s) dārīghākī
(e) shiltāqāl (16) (t) rusūm-i 'ummāl (17)
(f) taurjihāt (u) haqq al-sa'ī-y-i mubāshir
(g) qasamāt (v) rasm al-ṣadāra
(h) tauzī'āt (w) rasm al-vizāra
(i) 'alafa (x) 'iddī
(j) 'ulūfa (y) nauruzī
(k) qonalghā (z) pishkash
(l) ulāgh (aa) salāmana
(m) ulām (bb) valijilik (vānjilik ?)
(n) taghār (ce) yāpūjilik (?)
(o) 'arh (dd) gāpūjilik

and other official (?) (18) and unofficial services (taklīfāt) and demands.

1 Hukmi va ghayr-i hukmī “based on orders” and “not based on orders”
(i.e. resulting from a custom, etc.).
They shall not approach him with cupidity or requests; they shall withdraw their pens and their steps from the (said lands). Let them spare no trouble for the maintenance of this grant (donation), nor request (19) every year a new order, paper (parvânacha) or decree (nishân). They shall consider the contents incorporated in the text (of the present document) as preserved and protected against the blemish of change and alteration. So let them carry it out (20) in conformity with the August order, introduce into its dispositions no changes or alterations and be warned by, and removed from, the tenor of the sacred verse (Qor‘ān, ii, 177): IF ANY ALTER IT AFTER HAVING HEARD IT THE GUILT OF IT RESTS (21) ON THOSE WHO ALTER IT; VERILY ALLAH IS THE ONE WHO HEARS AND KNOWS. Let them know that he who acts contrary (to the present) will be subject to God’s wrath and curse as well as to (22) the king’s censure and reproof. On (all) sides, let all know that such is the order established and (23) let them act in conformity with the words: WHOEVER STRIVE TO ABOLISH IT, LET THEM BE CURSED BY GOD, ANGELS AND MEN, BY THEM ALL. And as soon as (this document) has become (24) adorned, explicit, confirmed, clarified, exalted, embellished and beautified by the royal seal (tauqī),—the exalted, the one to be obeyed, the high as the sun,—let them rely upon it!

Written by the high order, may God Almighty exalt it, may He prolong its validity to eternity, may it never cease to be obeyed and followed and may it remain unimpeachable (manī).

(25) In the Jausaq of Ḥarzam of the Seat of Government Mārdin, on the fifth day of the divine month Sha‘bān the Exalted, in the year nine-hundred-and-three.

Verso: Let them submit it to the August Seal, with the knowledge of His Eminence, the Refuge of Presidency (ṣadārat), the Shelter of Islam.


4. THE AQ-QOYUNLU OF MĀRDĪN

The document dated 5 Sha‘bān, 903/29 March, 1498, was issued by the ruler of Mārdin Qāsim [b.] Jahāngir [b. ‘Ali b. Qara-ʾOthmān] of the Aq-qoyunlu (“White Sheep”) tribe. I have tried to assess

1 Vide supra, p. 932, n. 3.

2 In قاسم جهانگیر we evidently have a Persian construction Qāsim-i Jahāngir, i.e. Qāsim, (son) of Jahāngir.
the historical importance of this Turcoman dynasty in two special articles¹ and here need only explain the origin of the Mardin branch. Qasim's father Jahangir was the eldest brother of Uzun-Hasan but the latter (857–882/1453–1478) became the most famous representative of the dynasty. He gradually conquered Armenia, Georgia, and Iran down to the gates of Herat and the Persian Gulf. After numerous affrays between the two brothers, Jahangir (in 1453) lost to Uzun-Hasan even the original home of the family, Diyarbakr, and had to content himself with Mardin. The local history of Mardin² at that time becomes obscure and we do not even know the date of Jahangir's death. His only inscription, referring to the repeal of some taxes on the butchers, has no indication of the year.³ In 1473 (= A.H. 878) Giosafà Barbaro⁴ visited Mardin and was put up at the hospice built by Ziangirbei (Jahangir). Although coins were struck in Mardin in the name of Uzun-Hasan (in 875/1470) and of his son Ya'qūb (ruled 884–892/1478–1487), we need not take it for a direct intervention of the more powerful branch in the affairs of Mardin, but rather for a voluntary homage of the local rulers to the acknowledged heads of the family. The date of the madrasa of Qasim b. Jahangir in Mardin is said to be 884/1479.⁵ If true, this prince had probably succeeded his father some time before A.D. 1479. After Ya'qūb b. Uzun-Hasan's death,⁶ ' Ala al-daula, prince of the Zulqadar (< Dulghadir) Turcomans and master of Albistan and Mar'ash, overran Diyarbakr but the Aq-qoyunlu must have kept Mardin.⁷ Our firman was issued by Qasim b. Jahangir in 903/1498 and, by its high-flown style, bears witness to the pomp affected at the small court of Mardin.


³ Von Oppenheim, "Inschriften aus Syrien etc." in Beiträge z. Assyriologie, vii/1, p. 68 (deciphered by M. van Berchem).


⁵ Ismail Hakkı, Anadolu beylikleri, plates 45 and 46. This may be identical with the tekye of Qasım-Pādīshāh mentioned by Niebuhr, Reisebeschreibung, Copenhagen, 1778, ii, 391–8.

⁶ The true date, as recorded in the special Ta'rīkh-i Aminī, Bib. Nat., Anc. fonds persan 101, fol. 206v, is 11 Safar, 896/24 December, 1490.

⁷ Hakluyt Society, ibid., 148, according to the anonymous Venetian merchant, 'Ala al-daula established his rule over three towns of Diyarbakr (out of six): Urfa, Kharput, and Amid (the latter being the provincial capital).
Under the miscellaneous events of 907/1501–2 the Aḥsan al-tavārikh of Ḥasan-i Rūmlū enumerates the names of twelve princes who “in this year (sic) raised in Iran the standard of I and no one else”. Among them is mentioned Qāsim-beg b. Jahāngīr-beg b. ‘Ali-beg in Diyarbakr.1 The dates of the madrasa (1479 ?), and quite especially of our firman (1498), show that for a number of years before 1501 Qāsim was ruler of the region Mārdīn-Diyārbakr. Ḥasan-i Rūmlū’s date cannot be taken too strictly, unless it refers to some particular solemn proclamation on the side of Qāsim.

Ahmed Tewhid, in his Catalogue, p. 472,2 tentatively and without any explanations, places in front of Qāsim’s name the date of 908/1502, but on none of the coins quoted as belonging to this prince (Nos. 1047–1069) are the dates distinguishable, and only on one of them can the name of the mint (Āmid, i.e. Diyarbakr) be read. Qāsim’s coins described by S. Lane Poole, The coins of the Turks, Class XXVI, 1883, Nos. 38–42, also lack dates. On one of them (half effaced) this prince is called: . . . Sultan . . . a’zam al-akbar Mīr Qāsim khān al-Muzaffar.

The item in Zambaur’s Manuel de chronologie, p. 258, according to which Qāsim ruled “from about 893 to 908”, does not seem to be based on any solid facts.

Baṣagić, in his article, says that after the death of Ya’qūb b. Uzun-Ḥasan (1490, v.s.) his possessions were split up and divided. “Diyārbakr and the neighbouring provinces were taken possession of by Sultān Abul-Muzaffar Qāsim who from 1488 (read: 1490 ?) to 1502 ruled independently over Northern Mesopotamia, with his capital in Mārdīn.” In view of what we know of the Zulqadar activities this statement is surely exaggerated. As the source of his information, Baṣagić quotes a book called Fusul-i hall-wa-’aqd, being an abridgment of Kanz al-akhbār and written in 1007/1599. These indications leave no doubt that the work in question is the one by Muṣṭafā b. Ahmad ‘Āli, who himself wrote this short epitome of his greater work devoted to the rise and fall of Islamic dynasties.3 The Fusūl exists in two copies at the British Museum, but neither of them contains the passage quoted by Baṣagić.4

[Additional note.—According to the Jahān-ārā, Br. Mus. Or. 141, f. 194a, Rustam beg b. Maqsūd b. Uzun-Ḥasan was put on the throne (in V. 1492) by the son of Amīr Ayba-sultān. The chief general of the deposed king (Baysunquʿr b. Yaʿqūb b. Uzun-Ḥasan), Sulaymān beg,
fled to Diyarbakr and there was killed by Ayba-sultan’s eldest brother Nūr-‘Alī beg. The Syriac chronicle edited by Behnsch, Vratislaviae, 1838, completes this story by a most welcome detail. Nūr-‘Alī rebelled against Rustam and the latter sent against him an army which put him to flight. Then “Qāsim-beg, maternal (?) uncle (‘avunculus’) of the prince who had led the army, took possession of Mārdīn and Ḥiṣn-Kayfä. The Marvādī (?),¹ who were in the castle of Mārdīn, were hard pressed and many of them were led into captivity”.

These are the very last words of the Chronicle (which ends under the year A.G. 1804 = A.D. 1491-2). The author was well informed on the situation in Upper Mesopotamia and had just returned from Jerusalem via Hezrom (Ḥarzam ?) and Āmid. Consequently there is every reason to think that Qāsim-beg’s independent rule in Mārdīn was an indirect repercussion of Rustam’s victory over Baysunqur and Sulaymān and that he began to reign in 1492 (A.H. 897-8).

According to the Fārs-nāma-yi Nāṣirī, part i, p. 86, after the murder of Ahmad Pādshāh Aq-qoyunlu (in 903/1497), his relative Alvand-mīrzā fled to Diyarbakr where he was proclaimed king by “the vālí of Diyarbakr Qāsim-beg”. The latter took over the conduct of state affairs (sāltanat) and Alvand, greatly annoyed, left his camp for Tabrīz and deposed his brother Muḥammadī (905/1499). This is another feature of Qāsim b. Jahāṅgīr’s career. In any case our farman shows that in 903 Qāsim behaved as an independent ruler.]

In 913/1507 Shāh Ismā‘īl led his army against the Zulqadar Turkomans of Albistan (north of Mar‘ash). He travelled thither via Khoy and Qaysariya and on returning took Kharberd (Kharput). The governor of Diyarbakr at that time was Amīr-beg Mūsullū (Mausil-lu) who had been there on behalf of the Aq-qoyunlu “for a number of years”. He came to Albistan to see the Shāh and submitted to him, but when Khān Muḥammad Ustājlū was sent to occupy Diyarbakr (Āmid), Amīr-beg’s brother Qaytmas-beg called in the Zulqadar amirs. Only when the latter were defeated by Khān Muḥammad, Āmid was surrendered by an act of treason.² Mārdīn shared the fate of Āmid, but the Venetian merchant who visited it shortly after the events says that it was occupied “without bloodshed or resistance”.³ The name of Qāsim b. Jahāṅgīr is no longer mentioned at this occurrence. The Persians remained in control of the region till 922/1516, when they were succeeded by the Ottomans.

¹ “Marvadenses” according to Behnsch’s Latin translation? [In Syriac māroḥā means simply “the rebels” (Ch. Rabin.)]
³ Hakluyt Society, op. cit., p. 149. In 1507 this merchant joined Shāh Ismā‘īl’s army at Arzinjān and accompanied it to Albistan, though he was not present at the expedition to Diyarbakr. He must have visited the latter region in 1510, see op. cit., pp. 145, 147.
5. The Princes of Egil

No less obscure are the fortunes of the family to which the addressee of the farman belonged. His name, as it appears from the text, was Kamāl al-dīn Isfandiyār-beg, lord of Igil (Egil). Sharaf al-dīn’s Kurdish chronicle Sharaf-nāma 1 contains a special chapter on the Bulduqānī rulers of this fief.

In Kurdistan we have to distinguish between three different classes of population: (1) the agricultural ra‘iyat, often representing the ancient inhabitants of the country, (2) the ‘ashīrat (military caste), which sometimes is the later layer of conquerors from outside, and (3) the rulers’ dynasties, mostly outsiders of noble origin, religious chiefs, etc.

Of the ra‘iyat under the amīrs of Egil the Sharaf-nāma says nothing except that, in the paragraph treating of the Chārmük branch of the family, mention is made of the “kharaj of the infidels” which the Ottoman government were collecting directly. Probably very many of the Egil subjects were Armenians. On the other hand, all the area between Egil, Chārmük, and Pālū forms the southern part of the territory in which Zāzā dialects are (or were!) spoken. It is not quite clear whether this population was regarded as “subjects” or as “the ‘ashīrat”. The author of the Sharaf-nāma calls the ‘ashīrat of Egil M.rdāsī and further, loc. cit., 177, connects it with the Mirdāsī dynasty of Banū-Kilāb Arabs which ruled in Aleppo in 414-472/1032-1079. According to Sharaf al-dīn, these Arabs came to Egil after the defeat of Ṣālīḥ b. Mirdās by the Fāṭimids in 420. This theory is subject to some doubt and is perhaps based only on some similarity of names. As regards the dynasty of Egil, the same source attributes to it an ‘Abbāsid origin. The great ancestor Pir Mānsūr was a saintly

1 Ed. Veliaminof-Zernof, St. Petersburg, 1860, i, 178-183.
2 The Zāzā dialects are not considered now as being Kurdish proper. They are more connected with the northern and western dialects of Persia, see Mann-Hadank, Mundarten der Zāzā, Berlin, 1932.
3 Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 277, does not give any details.
4 It is quite possible that *Mrd-āsī is a parallel formation to Kurdāsī in a proverb quoted by H. Makas, Kurdistanische Texte aus der Gegend von Mardin, Leningrad, 1926, p. 93: Kurdī Kurdāsī, pēra mā-kā tu nāsī; ham tē u ham do-zvā u ham do-zvāzī, “a Kurd is a true Kurd; do not make his acquaintance; he comes, eats and wants (more).” Possibly -āsī is a suffix corresponding to the Persian -āsā “like, similar to”. *Mrd-āsī would then mean “the one like a mard”, in the sense of “a true mard”. Mard in Iranian languages means “a man, homo, vir”, but after all it may also mean “a Mard”, one of the ancient people Māpōa. If the term M rdāsī refers to the Zāzā, the proposed etymology may eventually lead to further speculation as to the origins of the enigmatic Zāzā.
man who first lived in Ḥakkārī (east of Van) but later came to Egil and settled in the village of Pirān. The Mirdāsī tribes gathered round the family. Manṣūr’s grandson Pir Badr seized the castle of Egil, but “some Seljuk Sultān” took it from him and he had to flee to Mayyafāriqīn and take refuge under the protection of Amīr Ḥisām al-dīn (?). Under Alp-Arslan (455–466/1063–1072) Amīr Artīq 1 took Mayyafāriqīn and Pir Badr perished in the affray.

The background of the tradition may be true, but the details are somewhat shaky. At the period in question, the Marwānid rulers of Mayyafāriqīn were Niẓām al-dīn Abūl-Qāsim Naṣr, A.H. 453–472, and Naṣīr al-daula Abūl-Muẓaffar Manṣūr, A.H. 472–8. It was Niẓām al-dīn’s brother Ṣaʿīd who first brought in Seljuk troops in 455, but Mayyafāriqīn was not taken and Ṣaʿīd had to content himself with Āmid. Niẓām al-dīn was presented to Alp-Arslan and kindly received by the latter. In 477/1084 Ibn Jahīr, then in the employ of the famous vazīr Niẓām al-mulk, led a Seljuk army to Mayyafāriqīn. In 478 Artīq brought new reinforcements, and finally (after the arrival of another general, al-Kūhyārī) the town was taken in Jumādā i, 478/August, 1085, and the Marwānids lost their power.2 Probably the death of Pir Badr is to be associated with this event but the latter took place under Malik-shāh and not under Alp-Arslan.

Egil was left without a ruler and the hopes of the Mirdāsī tribe were transferred to the child which Pir Badr’s spouse was about to bear. The latter proved to be a boy and someone wanting to express his satisfaction in a covered way (ba-vad’-i ramz) said in Turkish: Choq shukilr Ichudaya ki istadiigimizi bulduq, “Many thanks to God, we have found what we wanted.” Thereupon the child was surnamed Amīr Bulduq 3 and brought up by the Mirdāsī grandees. When he came of age all the tribes recognized his authority and he became his father’s successor in the government and possession of Egil, and in the leadership of the tribes.

He was succeeded by his eldest son Amīr Ibrahīm and the latter by his son Amīr Muḥammad. This prince had three sons of whom

1 The reading Ortoq is erroneous.
2 See Amedroz in JRAS., 1903, 123–154.
3 All this naturally sounds like a legend. Bulduq means in Turkish “a foundling” (> Arabic bunduq) but is also used as a personal Turkish name (cf. a parallel name Taṭīq). On the other hand, under 513/1119, Ibn al-Aṭhir, x, 393, mentions in the neighbourhood of Basra two Ghuz tribes, respectively called Ismāʿīli and Bulduqi (sic). Could not at least the mother of the founder of the Bulduqānī dynasty have been of Turkish origin, which would also explain the Turkish phrase quoted in the Sharaf-nāma ?
the eldest 'Īsā (or, according to Sham‘i, Ghaybī) continued the dynasty at Egīl. The second son, Timūr-tāsh, became, during his father’s lifetime, the governor of Bāghin and its neighbourhood and from him came the special branch of princes of Pālū. The third Ḥusayn, also during his father’s lifetime, was put in possession of the Bardinch castle and the district of Charmūk and founded the branch of the latter fief.

With the support of the Mirdāsī tribe, Daulat-beg, son of Amīr 'Īsā (Ghaybī), became his successor at Egīl, and in his turn was succeeded by his son 'Īsā (Ghaybī) II. This ruler had two sons: Isfandiyār and Shāh Muḥammad; the latter, though apparently the younger of the two, became his father’s successor “in view of his merits” (istiḥqāq). Of his four sons (Qāsim beg, Maṃsūr beg, Isfahān beg, Amīrān beg), Qāsim inherited the rights and became so prominent that, after the rise of the Turcoman dynasty of Aq-qoyunlu, he was appointed to be the tutor of the royal prince and became known as Lālā Qāsim. In 913, when the Šafavīds occupied Diyarbākr, Qāsim resisted them. Egīl was occupied by Khān-Muḥammad UstājĪ, and for seven years governed by some Qizil-bash called Maṃsūr beg. After the battle of Chaldiran, Qāsim was reinstated at Egīl by Sulṭān Śelim. It is even said that he was instrumental in capturing Āmid (Diyārbākr) from the Persians and in giving it over to the Ottomans.

Under the new sovereigns, the family still carried on. In the reign of Sulṭān Sulaymān, Qāsim was succeeded by his nephew Murād ibn 'Īsā (Ghaybī) II who built over his uncle’s grave a hospice known as Khān-i Sharbaṭīn (near Aukhān, at one day’s march from Diyarbākr).

The sons of Murād, ‘Alī-khān and Qāsim-beg II, ruled for short periods one after the other at Egīl. Qāsim II left two sons, Jaʿfar and Ghadaṅfar, the former of whom was confirmed by Sulṭān Śelim II in 980/1572 and was still in power in 1005/1596.

Towards 1095/1684 a Turkish translation of the Sharaf-nāma was prepared by a Sham‘i, at the instigation of his patrons, Muṣṭafā-beg of Egīl and Muḥammad Qūjūr (Qojur ?) beg of Pālū, and owing to this happy circumstance we possess two supplements continuing the local history for about another century.

1 According to another version he was a cousin of Amīr Muḥammad.
2 The Tāriḵ-i Aminī, f. 55a, mentions the governors of Arghana, Hēnī, Attāq, Egīl, Bāghin, Silvān, Charmūk, Rūbā, etc., who paid homage to Yaʿqūb b. Uzun-Ḥasan on his arrival in Diyarbākr in 883/1478, but does not give their names.
3 This is an obvious mistake. Murād must have been the son of Maṃsūr, or Isfahān, or Amīrān.
We learn that Ja'far-beg was succeeded by his son Mu'min-beg and the latter by his three sons, in succession to one another: Murād 'Ali, Mūsā, and Muṣṭafā. The last-named ruler served under Qaplan Muṣṭafā-pāšā of Diyarbakr during the Russian campaign of 1089/1678, and distinguished himself at Chihirin (Chigirin in the Ukraine).

The addressee of the farman of 903/1498, Isfandiyār-beg, whose father's name is omitted in the text, seems to be identical with Isfandiyār b. 'Īsā (Ghaybī) II, b. Daulat-beg b. 'Īsā (Ghaybī) I, b. Ibrāhīm b. Bulduq. Isfandiyār-beg's nephew Qāsim b. Ṣhāh-Muḥammad was in charge of an Aq-qoyunlu prince whose name is omitted in the Sharaf-nāma. From the fact that Qāsim resisted the Šafavīs in 913 and was active after the battle of Chaldiran (920/1514), chronologically the date 903 is quite possible for his uncle Isfandiyār. As the Sharaf-nāma merely mentions his name and vaguely refers to the preferment of his brother, it would seem that there was some irregularity in his career. Curiously enough the farman of 903/1498 lacks the seal mentioned in the endorsement and consequently may represent the original draft of his instalment as a vassal, later replaced by another document in favour of some other person. As neither Isfandiyār nor his direct descendants are mentioned any more in the annals, it would be possible to suppose that the dissatisfied addressee tried his luck under some other skies. This may be the cause of the expatriation of the Čengić-begs' ancestors.

If we accept the local tradition, as recorded by Bašagić, op. cit., p. 8, the family appeared in Bosnia towards the middle of the sixteenth century (?). The name Čengić is said to be a corruption of Čangrlić (?), derived from the town of Changri,1 where the family is supposed to have possessed a fief before coming to the Serbian lands. If, indeed, on the way from Egil to Bosnia, the ancestors of the Čengić spent some time at Changri, that sojourn must have lasted under 50 (?) years.

6. Geographical Considerations

The geographical facts recorded in the farman admit of the following conclusions. The lord of Mārdin could hardly have disposed of the fiefs lying beyond and to the north of Diyarbakr if he had had no control over the latter.2 Indeed, we know that Qāsim struck coins at Āmid, and in 903 this town must have been in his possession.

1 Ancient Gangra, on a left affluent of the Qızıl-ırmaq, halfway between Ankara and Kastamuni.
2 Amir-beg, vide supra, p. 937, may have been his representative.
Jausaq Ḥarzam, "the Kiosque (or fortress) of Ḥarzam," is probably the royal camp. Mārdīn itself, in view of its crowded situation on a rock, was hardly suitable for stationing troops. Ḥarzam lies at 10 km. to the west of this town and is mentioned by historians in connection with Saladin's unsuccessful attempt to occupy Mārdīn in 579/1183 (Ibn al-Athir, xi, 323, 324).

The hereditary fief of Egil occupied a considerable area. The castle of Egil lies on the southern bank of Arghana-su above its confluence with the Upper Tigris (Zibene-su). Ḥīnī (sometimes spelt in Arabic Ḥānī) lies at the source of Ambar-chay which flows parallel to the Zibene-su, to the east of it. As regards Bāghin, two places of this name are known: the one (ancient Armenian Palin) is situated in the basin of the Murād-su (Eastern Euphrates), on the latter's northern affluent Peri-chay; the other Bāghin lay between Pālū and Arghana, and it is more probable that the latter is meant in our case, as the former lay too far north and must have belonged to the Pālū branch of the Balduqānī family.

7. FORM OF THE DOCUMENT

The chart, disposed in two columns, contains twenty-five lines of text and is written in dīwānī script, which is bold and clear, although the reading of its numerous ligatures and dotless words requires considerable exercise. The king's title (right top) and the Arabic quotations are in gold.

From the diplomatic point of view, the document (perhaps called ḥukm "order", see addition p. 960) consists of (A) the king's titles and tamghā, (B) the text of the grant, and (C) the endorsement on the verso.

A. The king's name (Qāsim) is accompanied by that of his father (Jahāngīr) and is preceded by the title (laqab): Nāṣir li-dīnī 'llāhi, and the kunya: Abul-Muẓaffar. An interesting feature of the title is the tamghā, i.e. tribal sign of the Aq-qoyunlu:

1 Egil corresponds to ancient ʿĪyγελաνγή, Armenian Angel; on this region cf. Hübßchmann, "Die altarmenischen Ortsnamen," in Indogerm. Forschungen, xvi, 1904, pp. 293, 303.

2 I presume that it is identical with Barin, on the left affluent of the Arghana-su which joins the latter north of Astvatsatsin; see Lynch's Map of Armenia.
This tamghā belongs to the Turkish Oghuz clan called after Bāyandur, one of the four sons of Kök-khan (himself one of the six sons of the legendary Oghuz-khan). In Rashid al-din's enumeration of tamghās, onghons (totems), and parts of meat allotted to each of the Oghuz clans,¹ the tamghā of Bāyandur looks like the part of the Arabic letter ﯾ above the line (i.e. without its tail). This tamghā figures also on Aq-qoyunlu coins ² where it has a more stylized form:—

Another curious detail in our Persian text is the use, after the ruler's name, of the Turkish formula: sözümiz "our word", in obvious imitation of Chengizid documents.³

B. The chart proper may be summarized in the following scheme:—

(a) praises to God for his kindness to his faithful servants (ll. 1–4) and to Muḥammad (ll. 5–6);

(b) the king's kind intentions towards Isfandiyār beg (ll. 7–9) find their expression in the soyūrghāl (ll. 10–11) by which Isfandiyār beg becomes a tarkhān free from taxation (ll. 12–13);

(y) instructions to the administrative agents in the above sense (l. 14);

(δ) a detailed enumeration of thirty kinds of taxes from which Isfandiyār-beg is exempted (ll. 15–18);

(e) additional recommendation to the officials to conform with the disposition of the decree, under threats of punishment and curse (ll. 19–24);

(ζ) confirmation of the authenticity of the decree, with the date and place of its issue (ll. 24–5).

C. The endorsement made by the parvānachī (registrar?) ⁴ that the document should be submitted to the royal seal with the knowledge of the Şadr.

¹ Ed. Berezin, Trudi V.O., vol. vii, p. 35. In Br. Mus. Or. 7628, fol. 425–6, these signs are unfortunately missing.
² See Lane Poole, op. cit., p. 187, Ahmed Tewhid, op. cit., 472–519, and the coin photographed in Hinz, Iran's Aufstieg, to face p. 104.
³ Cf. the yarlıgh of Toqtamīsh-khan of the Golden Horde to the Polish king Yagailo (795/1392) and the numerous documents emanating from the khanats of Crimea edited by Velyaminov-Zernov, St. Petersburg, 1864.
⁴ In Bukhara, one of the duties of the parvānachī was to stick the farman into the grantee's turban; see A. Semenov, A Sketch of the Land-taxes in the former Khanate of Bukhara, Tashkent, 1929, p. 14 (in Russian).
8. Legal and Economic Aspects of the Document

I hope to give in another place a fuller bibliography of studies (still very scarce!) on social and economic conditions of the Middle East. Here I shall only explain my references to some special works in Russian and Turkish, which otherwise would not be clear (Russian titles are translated into English).


The act incorporated in the present chart is given the name of *soyūrghāl* ¹ "grant, bestowal", the absolute character of which is particularly insisted upon. The word *soyūrghāl* (l. 12) is accompanied by an unusual qualificative term written in cursive. I tentatively transcribe it هوابدی (hw in the beginning is clear, and the ending دی is necessary for a rhyme with the following *sarmādī*). My learned friend M. Qazvīnī has called my attention to the term هوجاری standing in a similar position in Sultan Ya'qūb's farmān (*vide infra*). I do not think that the two qualifications are variants (or misreadings) of one single unknown term, but I am inclined to take them for parallel constructions: *huwa abādī* "this [document] is eternal", and *huwa jārī* "this [document] is current, lasting". The terms may refer to some formula of endorsement used in the chanceries. This supposition is supported by the fact that the word *abādī* "eternal" is said to be frequent in Caucasian official practice, cf. Petrushevsky, op. cit., 55, note 1. In line 14 our grant is again called "perpetual and eternal" and it is added (l. 19) that it needs no periodical confirmation.

¹ From Mongol *soyurkhal* "hereditary grant", Vladimirtsov, op. cit., 115. I do not think Hinz, op. cit., 107, is right in restricting the meaning of the term and in interpreting it as "prebend" (*Pfründe, Kirchenlehen*). Both our document and that of Qara-Yūsuf clearly show that the term had a much larger sense. Moreover, western European terms, useful as parallels, are dangerous as "equivalents".
Like Qara-Yūsuf’s farman (v. i., p. 952), but unlike that of Shāh Sulṭān-Ḥusayn (v. i., p. 958), our nishān does not contain any indications as to the counterpart of Isfandiyār-beg’s obligations towards the suzerain. The amir of Egil is called tarkhān,¹ i.e. immune from the intervention of the suzerain’s agents. The chart uses an Arabic expression marfū’ al-qalam maqṣūr al-qadam (l. 11), later (l. 18) repeated in Persian garb, which forms a parallel to the medieval European formula sine introitu judicium. The vassal’s lands are also excluded from the cadastral survey. Consequently our document is a typically feudal act by which the suzerain delegates to the grantee a part of his sovereign rights, within a defined territory.

Quite especially, the independence of the vassal is proclaimed with regard to taxation. It is true that the chart does not record any right of the beneficiary to introduce alterations into the system of taxation, but all the taxes belonging to the state or duties collected by the government agents are surrendered to the vassal. In the first place are mentioned “the mālvajihat and all the taxes going to the treasury”. The second part of the formula covers all the cases, and does not seem to be something outside the mālvajihat. The latter ² is a well-known term which figures in numerous documents.³ It is usually spelt in one word but must be composed of māl-va-jihāt. In the Bahār-i ‘Ajam Dictionary, māl-va-jihāt is explained: naqd-va-jins-va-ashūb-va-ashyā. Consequently the term consists of māl (“property, cash, money”) and jihāt (which must refer to taxes other than money ?).⁴ The term might suggest that at least a part of mālvajihat was payable in cash, but we know for certain that, for example, in Transcaucasia (Ganja, etc.), māljihāt referred to the annual rent in kind amounting to one-tenth, and even three-tenths, of the agricultural produce payable to the divān (treasury), or to the local feudal lords. At some places (Qubba), a corresponding rent was called dah-yak (“the tithe”) or bahra “the part”.⁵

Apart from the basic taxes (l. 12), the beneficiary was exempted from a number of other levies of which thirty are enumerated by

¹ From Mongol darikhan, “a manumitted slave, a freedman,” cf. Vladimirtsov, op. cit., 69, 93.
² Often māljihāt or in the combination mālvajihat-va-vujāhāt.
⁴ Cf. also the use of the term jihāt in Sulṭān Ya‘qūb’s farman, vide infra, p. 953.
⁵ Kolonialnaya politika, ii, 432; ibid., i, 439, with reference to the lands belonging to the state, bahra is fixed at one-fifth of the crops and māljihāt at one-tenth.
name. Of many of them only tentative explanations are possible. We must not forget that such terms often change their sense locally. Therefore in our case we cannot confidently utilize the rich material available for India.\textsuperscript{1} Ottoman Turkish documents also use a special terminology.\textsuperscript{2} Historical research of the social and economic conditions in Persia is still only beginning. The facts available for Transcaucasia\textsuperscript{3} are more numerous and well sifted, but they mostly refer to the nineteenth century, or at least to the time after the collapse of Nādir-shāh's power (A.D. 1747). Some of the data of our document have no explanations yet and we may only take stock of them and quote the available parallels, \textit{v.i.}, under (f).

We shall now consider the taxes and services one by one.

\textbf{(a) Ikhrājāt}, in modern parlance, would designate the occasional expenses and disbursements, as for the entertainment of officials and their retinue, etc. This interpretation is supported by Juvaynī, i, 23\textsuperscript{e}: \textit{ikhrājāt-i šādir wa-vārid} “the expenditure for the outgoing and incoming (travellers)”, and i, 24\textsuperscript{i}: \textit{maṣāliḥ-va-ikhrājāt-i har yāmī “the paraphernalia and the expenditure (?) of each post-station”}.

\textbf{(b) Khālisāt}, in the sense which the term has had in Persian down to our own time, means “government lands” administered by special officials or rented to private persons (whose tendency was to perpetuate their lease and to transform it into some kind of possession). In Transcaucasia the \textit{khālisā} were the lands belonging to the begs and colonized by the latter; the ownership in this case was comparable to a freehold property (\textit{Kolonialnaya politika}, i, 103; ii, 53). Neither of these interpretations is of much help in establishing the meaning of the fiscal term.

\textbf{(c) 'Avāridāt “additional or extraordinary payments and duties”}.\textsuperscript{4} In Transcaucasian practice the term referred to the compulsory services (mowing, reaping, building, etc.) of the whole village community for the benefit of the landlord, who in this case provided the food for the workers. This obligation for the owner ceased if the work was of general utility (building canals, bridges, etc.), cf. below under

\textsuperscript{1} Cf. \textit{A'in-i Akbarī}, book iii, a'\textit{ins 5 and 11.}

\textsuperscript{2} See even such an old document as the \textit{Qānūn-nāma} of Sulṭān Muhammad II, drawn up soon after A.D. 1453; cf. Kraelitz-Greifenhorst in \textit{Mitt. zur Osman. Geschichte}, i, 1921–2, pp. 13–48.

\textsuperscript{3} We must realize that, in Mongol times, all the lands from Transcaucasia to Upper Mesopotamia (Mārdīn !) were parts of the same kingdom (\textit{ulūs-i Hūlāgū} governed from Tabriz. Consequently, similarities in the administrative terminology and institutions of the whole region are quite natural.

\textsuperscript{4} Cf. the \textit{yarliq} of Temir Qutlug (800/1398), in \textit{Zapiski V.O.}, iii, 1888, p. 37.
The collective work comprised under ‘avārid was in addition to the regular service due to the landlord for a definite number of days in the year, see Kolontalnaya politika, ii, 57 and 426.

(d) Shanqis, a plural form of sing. shanqasa which is explained in Arabic dictionaries as istiqsā “to proceed to extremities”. The Rāhat al-sudūr, ed. M. Iqbal, 388, 507, describing the oppression of a Hamadan ruler, says va-tannūr-i shanqasa chinān garm shud ki Hamadān va-navāhi-yi ān bīsūkht. This passage suggests for shanqasa the sense of “extortions” in general. I wish to place here on record the existence in Kurdistan of a village called Shanakhsa (on the Lesser Zāb, near Ālān) which may reflect a popular pronunciation of the term in question.

(e) Shīltāqūt, is derived from the Mongol siltaghan, siltag “cause”, which, similarly to the Persian bahāna, must have acquired the sense of “pretext”, and finally was used as “arbitrary intervention, oppressions”.

(f) Taǔījīhāt. According to Johnson’s Persian Dictionary (probably with special reference to India) taǔījīh, in a technical sense, means “rolls” and taǔījīh-nivīs “keeper of description rolls”. In the present enumeration this sense may be more appropriate than that attested in Transcaucasia (Shekki) where taujī (*taǔījīh) meant taxes in cash, Petrushevsky, 57, Kolontalnaya politika, 402. [There may have been confusion between taujīh, pronounced in Persian touʒī(h), and the Turkish term tāvūji “messenger”. This latter word is attested in Bukhārā with reference to “levies for sending messengers”, Semenov, op. cit.; cf. also J. Deny, J.A., July, 1932, pp. 161–2.]

(g) Qasamāt (?). The term may refer to oaths, either in the sense of “fees for administering oaths” or in the sense of the obligation for a vassal to be witness in trials and to take the oath, but more probably the reading is qismāt “divisions”, with reference to the remuneration of the estimators (qismdlār) whose task was to define the part of the harvest to be collected as mālījīhāt. Cf. Kolontalnaya politika, i, 454.

1 In the Mafatīḥ al-‘ulūm (end of the tenth century A.D.), ed. van Vloten, 1895, p. 119, shanāqīsa is explained as qaum min al-jund “a detachment of troops” (?). The origin of the word is not clear. My friend Shaykh M. Gomaa suggests that šanqs (similarly to šīb, šīl, šībr, šīlb) may belong to the rare saf’al form of verbs (?).

2 In Zamakhshari’s Muqaddimāt al-adab, ed. Poppe, Leningrad, 1938, p. 333, Mongol siltaq (sic) is explained in Turkish as bahāna!

3 Whatever the meaning of this explanation, we learn from the Tadhkira that, in Šafavīd time, šābiḥ-taujīh was the Auditor General whose business was to check (ham-qalam) the expenditure accounts.
(h) *Tauzi’at*, “distribution, partition,” but in what particular case? The term may be a match of (g).

(i) *‘Alafa*, in the sense of “food, or victuals of soldiers” is attested in Arabic, see Lane’s *Dictionary*, p. 2131. Among the Turks *‘alafa* must have had the meaning of “the keep” allotted to an official or a guest, which gave rise to the Russian loan-word *alafa*, *lafa*. The Russian traveller A. Nikitin, who was in India A.D. 1468–1472, says, p. 338, that in the Port of Shibait (?) “they give the Khorasanians a tenka a day for their *alafa*”, cf. also ibid., p. 339.

(j) *‘Ulufa* “forage”, cf. Juvayni, i, 22, in the description of the Mongol post service: *yām-va-ulāgh-va-*’ulufāt “post stations, relay horses, and forage”.

(k) *Qonalgha*. The word is spelt without dots but the probability of our reading is enhanced by the fact that in the *Bābur-nāma*, ed. Ilminsky, 465, *‘ulāfa-va-qonalgha* are coupled with reference to the hospitality to be extended to ambassadors. *Qonalgha*, a Mongol form from Turkish verb *qonmaq* “to be put up”, means “lodging (for the night)”. Cf. Barthold in *Zap. V.O.*, xv, 269.


(m) *Ulām* is not found in the dictionaries. The word *ulāgh* is usually mentioned together with *yām* “post station” (see under (j)). The word *yām*, naturally expected in our text; not being found in it, one might surmise that *ulām* stands for *yām* (?), i.e. “the duty to keep post stations”. Some light on the meaning of our *Yl* (clearly written) is thrown by Rashid al-din, ed. Blochet, 50, who says that, when the time of a royal hunt came, the Mongols used to inform the troops all around *ulām-ulām*. Blochet in his Appendix, p. 28, explains that in Mongol this expression means “progressivement, d’une façon continue”. Such is indeed the indication of Kowalewsky’s Mongol dictionary, p. 300, but originally the meaning may have been more concrete, such as “stage by stage”, etc. Some derivations of the word clearly show its connection with the service of messengers: *ulam-jilaq-chi* means “celui qui transmet ou remet, postillon [sic]”. Consequently the *ulam* service in our document is quite naturally coupled with the *ulāgh*. The combination of the two must refer to the “post-and-messenger service”.

(n) *Taghār* or *taqār* is a well-known dry measure equal to 100 Tabriz maunds, cf. Rashid al-din, ed. Quatremère, p. 138, n. 17.
According to L. Budagov’s *Turkish Dictionary*, p. 361, 1 taghār = 750 Russian pounds = 675 pounds avoirdupois. However, in our text taghār must refer to a tax and not to a measure, and in this sense the word is found in the Armenian historian Kirakos (thirteenth century). Speaking of Mongol oppression he writes: “Voici quelques exemples entre mille. Arghoun [A.D. 1284–1291] avait imposé le mali et le khaphtchour, taxes auxquelles Houlavou [Hulagu, A.D. 1256–1265!] ordonna de joindre celle dite thaghar (βυάqυ ρ t’ayar). De tous les gens inscrits au registre royal on exigeait 100 litras de froment, 50 de vin, 2 de riz et de dzndzat, trois topars [probably tobra, torba “nose-bag”], deux cordes, un blanc (monnaie), une flèche, un fer à cheval, sans compter les autres présents, le vingtième animal et vingt stacs [*spitaki ‘white’, i.e. silver coins]. A celui qui n’avait pas ces choses on enlevait ses fils et ses filles, au lieu de la contribution.”  

In this badly formulated passage the concluding part seems to explain the two basic taxes mentioned in the beginning, viz. “20 white coins” must represent the tax called mali (*mal,* in its technical sense “money”), and “each twentieth animal” the well-known tax on animals, qopchur. Then t’ayar must refer to the taxes in kind enumerated in the central part of the passage. In Dulaurier’s translation, t’ayar is followed by the word “capitation”, which is apparently the translator’s own interpretation of the term. Originally taghār referred probably to the “100 litras of grain”, the word litra standing here for “maund” (*vide supra*). The remaining duties in kind may have been “understood” under the principal item. In our text, too, taghār must refer to some tax in kind, though the amount of the levy in 1498 was undoubtedly more moderate than at the time of Mongol conquest.

(*o*) Tarh is an obscure term. According to Barthold, *Manuche*, p. 401, in the formula farsh-va-tarh, found in Rashid al-dīn with reference to Ghazan-khan’s pious foundations, the word tarh has the meaning of “the whole of the sums assigned (to a foundation?)”. On the other hand, in another passage, Rashid al-dīn says that after Ghazan’s reforms “all the corn in the villages remains in the granaries, so that there is no need to give (it?) to people by means of tarḥ”. According to Barthold, the term would suggest in this case some allotment of subventions to the needy inhabitants (?). The passage,
as it stands, suggests some opposition between the system of granaries and some perfunctory way of getting rid of corn by means of "tarh." The term certainly conveys the idea of "quotas." Barthold admits that "tarh" may have been used also in collecting taxes in quotas.

(p) "Bigār" is the bounden service of the peasants, usually without pay. Juvaynī, i, 222n, describes a "bigār-i nafsī" referring to personal services: "if the man is not at home, his wife goes out in person and does the task." This duty more or less corresponds to the Ottoman "angariye ("corvée, réquisition, travail sans retribution"). Bašagić uses it in his translation, though it is not clear which Persian term is explained by it.

(q) "Shikār" must be some particular obligation with regard to the princely hunting, e.g. participation in the battues, such as Juvaynī describes in detail, i, 20; cf. Rashīd al-dīn, ed. Blochet, p. 50.

(r) "Sāvarī" was a Turkish term explained in Persian dictionaries as "presents" (tuhfa va pishkash); the numerous examples collected by Quatremère in his edition of the Matla' al-sa'dayn, in Notices et Extraits, xiv/1, p. 27, show that originally "sāvarī" meant "homage".

(s) "Dārūghakānī", in Turkish "darughalīq," is any payment in favour of the dārūgha, i.e. the lord's official (bailiff) stationed in a particular village. In towns dārūgha had many other special functions.

(t) "Rusūm-i 'ummāl" are the additional charges levied in a certain proportion to the basic taxes by the financial agents, as a fee for their services.

(u) "Haqq al-sa'y-i mubāshīr," "reward for the endeavours of a mubāshīr," i.e. a similar fee of a lesser official.

(v) "Rasm al-sadrā" are apparently the fees of the religious official called "sadr." In the endorsement of our farman (vide supra, p. 934), the apposition of the royal seal is subject to the "knowledge" of the "sadrārat-panāhī islām-malādīhī." This circumlocution stands certainly for the office of the Sadr, and points to the latter's religious character. In Šafavi times the business of the Sadr was to appoint qādīs, etc., see Tadhkira. On his emoluments see ibid., f. 85b.

(w) "Rasm al-vizāra," ditto of a vazīr.

1 In Mongol "chief," see Vladimirtsov, Obščestvenniy stroy Mongolov, 1934, p. 140.
2 The Manual of Šafavi administration (Tadhkira), of which I am preparing an edition, has an elaborate chapter on the distribution of the rusūm among the members of each department.
3 The term "haqq al-sa'y" is mentioned in the Tadhkira, f. 85a.
4 According to the Tadhkira, fol. 85b, the Grand Vazīr of the Šafavids had no salary but received grants (in'am) and collected fees (rasm al-vizāra).
(x) ‘Īdī and (y) naurūzī are the presents offered to the officials on the occasions of religious festivals and of the Persian New Year (21st March).

(z) Pishkash are all kinds of informal presents (but v.i., p. 954).

(aa) Salāmāna, presents offered by way of congratulation.

The last three items form a special group of Turkish terms similarly formed with the suffix -jilik. Regularly they would represent the names of professions (cf. arabā-jiliq “drivership”), but in our case it is possible to imagine that they refer to some professional services to be rendered to the suzerain. The most clearly written of the three is (dd) qāpūjilik, derived from qapu “door”. But even then we cannot decide whether the document has in view the service of “door-keepers” or that of “makers of doors”, or finally some duty on “building doors”. Our (cc) is dotless but, as it stands before qapujilik, it may be read yḍpjilik, from yapī “building, construction”; the whole would again mean either “help to the suzerain in his constructions” (as attested in Caucasian lands), or a duty to be paid on new buildings. Linguistically the parallel use of the forms qapu and yapī is curious. Both names are similarly formed but qapu (instead of yapī) is older in Turcoman dialects. Even the reading of (bb) is not certain: both valijilik and vānjilik have no clear meaning. The latter might mean “trading with Van”, but Van had no commercial importance in 1498.

On the whole, the long list of levies gives a curious picture of the vagaries obtaining in the financial life of a feudal Muslim principality. Very striking is the mixture of Mongol, Turkish, Arabic, and Persian terms, characteristic of the region of Mardin lying in high Mesopotamia and exposed to many invasions. However, it is quite possible that several of the levies had been long extinct and figured in documents only as conventional rhymes and embellishments, as was the case of the European feudal charts.

9. OTHER SIMILAR DOCUMENTS

The number of Persian grants published until now is extremely limited and we shall quote the contents of four other documents found in rather unexpected places and very helpful for establishing the chancery tradition. They are respectively dated A.D. 1417, 1488, 1559, and 1702.

1 For a nomad “the door” is a symbol of settled conditions. Sedentary Turkish tribes in Persia are called takhta-qapi “wooden doors”.

2 Perhaps to avoid a confusion with qapī “ferocious (animal)”. 
The nearest parallel to our document is the "nishān" which the founder of the Qara-qoyunlu dynasty Qara-Yūsuf addressed to the prince of Bitlis Amīr Shams al-dīn, in A.D. 1417. The document is much more sober in its style but is similarly arranged and does not mention the counterpart of obligations imposed to the beneficiary. The copy gives only the text proper of the farman.

(a) Qara Yūsuf addresses it to his sons, to the officials and dignitaries of Kurdistan and to the population of Bitlis, Akhlāt, Mūsh, and Khunūs (Khnis);

(b) the attachment and services of "the dear child" Shams al-dīn are praised;

(c) decision is taken to distinguish him with diverse signs of attention and soyūrghāls;

(d) the governorship of the said districts and "the mālvajīhāt and the taxes belonging to the divān" are once more (ba-tajjīd) confirmed to him;

(e) the officials, under threat of responsibility, must not interfere with his rights (madkhal na-sāzand va pīrāmūn na-gardand);

(f) the officials must consider Shams al-dīn their amīr and governor; their affairs must be submitted to his representatives;

(g) as soon as the document receives the royal endorsement (tauqī‘) it must be relied upon;

(h) dated 10 Rabi‘ i, 820/27 April, 1417.

The second document, slightly earlier than ours, was issued by Uzun-Ḥasan’s son Sūltān Ya‘qūb, at Tabrīz, A.D. 1488, and refers to taxes in Fārs. As regards its object, the grant considerably differs from our other documents. The king remits the taxes on the sources of revenue which a religious chief assigns as a vāqf for the upkeep of a madrasa and a shrine inscribed with the Sūltān’s name. All these circumstances may account for the peculiarities of the chart. The document is called yarlığh "order" and, curiously enough, the term soyūrghāl does not occur in the text. At this place, we concentrate

1 Quoted verbatim in the Sharaf-nāma, pp. 386-7.
2 With regard to the meaning of this word, it is curious that in Mongol and Turkish yarlığh was used with reference to the Qur’ān and "God’s words", see Melioransky, Zap. V.O., xv, p. 154.
only on the general contents and terminology of the lengthy farmān\(^1\) without touching on the subsidiary problems.

(a) The chart begins similarly to Qāsim b. Jahāngīr’s farmān. After the formula *al-hukm li ’llāh* comes the name of the king Amīr Abul-Muẓaffar Ya’qūb Bahādūr, followed by *sūzūmīz*. The copyist seems to have omitted the *tamghā* of the Bāyandur clan.

(β) Let the governors, vazīrs, noyins, kātibs, mustaufīs, ‘āmils, mubāshīrs, and mutaṣaddīs, of the matters *sūzūmīz* and dīvānī, in the province of Fārs, in Shīrāz, Shabānkāra, Kurbāl, and Fasā, know

(y) that, whereas it is the duty of the king to exalt the sayyids and naqībs, who are the light of the eye of the saying “BUT FOR THEE” [*vide supra*, p. 932], and especially those who, among other acts of charity, succeed in raising pious foundations,

(δ) the most learned of the doctors of the time Sayyid Ṣadr al-dīn Muhammad\(^2\) founded, “in the days of our splendid reign and August caliphate” (*sic*), in the dār al-mulk of Shīrāz, a madrasa and a shrine (*buq’a*) adorned with (the inscription of) our titles and our name, and assigned to them as a *vaqf* the sources of revenue (*raqabāt*)\(^3\) enumerated below, of which the total (revenue ?) (*jam*)’ in the year of the Monkey (*bīchin-yīl*), as confirmed by the officials of the divan, is 242.783\(\frac{1}{2}\) dinars in current Tabriz coins.\(^4\)

(c) —Follows an enumeration of some fifty villages and sources of revenue with their value indicated in the *siyāq* numerals.—

(ζ) Therefore, in conformity with the previously issued farmān, . . .\(^5\) we have decreed that (the aforementioned officials, *vide supra* (β)) should consider these *raqabāt* and *jihāt*\(^6\) as exempted (from taxes)

---

\(^1\) Quoted verbatim in Hasan Fasā’ī’s excellent *Fārs-nāma-yi Naṣīrī*, Tehran, 1313, i, 81–3. The builder of the Mansūriya madrasa Ṣadr al-dīn Muḥammad Dashtaki was the author’s ancestor in the ninth generation. The madrasa is still extant, see Shīrāz-nāma, ed. Karimi, 1311/1932, Preface, p. 5.\(^5\)

\(^2\) See his biography in the *Fārs-nāma*, part ii, 135. He was born on 2 Sha’bān, 828/19 June, 1425, and on 12 Ramadān, 903/4 April, 1498, was killed by the “tyrannical heretics Bāyanduri Turcomans”, *cf. ibid.*, i, 86, first line.

\(^3\) On a high authority, I hear that, in a technical sense, *raqabāt* is used in Persia with regard to lands assigned to some pious foundation (*vaqf*) or belonging to the state-domains (*khālīṣāt*). These are all registered in the *daftar-i raqabāt*. *Cf. Arabic* ṭuqād “life-estate”.

\(^4\) This seems to be the amount of annual revenue and not the value of the estates; *cf. below* (under i) the amount of revenue from a single item. The year of the Monkey began on 23rd February, 1488 (S. H. Taqizadeh).

\(^5\) “And this *mithāl* with regard to (or over ?) the said madrasa.” Something fallen out in the copy. Perhaps the word : *ba-raqaba* as below, p. 954 (θ).

\(^6\) This distinction of *raqabāt* and *jihāt* is noteworthy: the latter apparently represents the amount of taxes due from the *raqabāt*. *Cf. above*, p. 945.
and withdrawn from their competence (mu‘āf-va-musallam-va-marfu‘-al-qalam) and should on no account importune the manager (mutavalli), his agents (gumāshīta), and the peasants and agriculturists of the said vaqf, with regard to

(a) māl
(b) manāl
(c) thimār "products"
(d) kharāj
(e) mavāshī "animals"
(f) marā‘ī "pastures"
(g) vuğḥ al-ayn
(h) jihat
(i) pishkash, both jam‘ī (in lump sums ?) and non-jam‘ī
(j) dūshallik, both by special order (hukmī) and appropriate to certain offices (istiṣvābī), levied on the khārijiyāt either in lump sum (jam‘ī) or in quotas (sihāmī)
(k) khārij-i sāliyāna
(l) rusūm-i dārūghakī
(m) cherīk
(n) shīlān-bahā
(o) ḥaqq al-ṭaqrīr
(p) vuğḥ-i ‘alamārī
(q) rasμ al-ḥimāya
(r) sāvarī
(s) other takālīf-i divānī
(t) tafāvut
(u) bāzādūd
(v) ḥarz
(w) masāḥat
(x) shumārā
(y) ta‘ḍil
(z) ṭarḥ
(aa) bīgār, etc.

(η) They shall "withdraw their pens and their feet" from the vaqf, not include it in the estimates (jam‘ī), exclude it from the budget (jam‘-i mamlakat), on no account place it on the rolls (nuskha ?), nor hover around it under pretexts of estimate, measurement, and increased value (tafdvut). They shall regard this notification (‘ārifā) as a "perpetual, lasting, and incontestable grant (in‘ām-i mu‘ābbad bar davām va-ihsān-i mukhallad-i mā-lā-ka‘lām), and, in the guise of huwa-jārī (بُث أر ابوجاجراي?), consider it as being exempted (from Government interventions) (mu‘āf-va-musallam-va-marfu‘-al-qalam”).

(θ) While we have "exempted" the said raqābāt, as such (ba-raqaba), for the benefit of the madrasa, we have decreed that the annual jihat used for the expenditure (ba-kharj . . . mujrā) of the said raqābāt should continue to be so in the following manner: follows a table in siyāq.¹

¹ The meaning seems to be that the Government duties having been appropriated to the vaqf, they will be used for the upkeep of the latter. The table in siyāq mentions 115,460 dinārs granted to Ghayth al-din Mansūr (father of Șadr al-din) on different occasions (qadimi, jadidi, mujaddad).
(i) A moiety of the arable lands of Lāhijī in the district of Kurbāl, formerly lay uncultivated (bā‘irāt), but the said Maulānā (Ṣadr al-din Muḥammad) brought them into a state of cultivation and gave (dāda) them to the dīvān. The total (jam‘ “total revenue” ?) of these lands, as confirmed by the divan officials and stated in writing by the mu‘mār (“architect, surveyor”) of Kurbāl in the past year was equal to 54,000 (?) dinārs of Tabrīz. We have decreed that those lands should be taken over (accepted ? bāz sitanand) from the said benefactor, as from the beginning of the said year, for the above mentioned sum, and be taken possession of (dabt) on behalf of the dīvān. The officials shall not importune either the said sayyid or the manager (of the vaqf) with regard to any profits or losses on this account. They shall take the situation as decreed, refrain from trespassing on the provisions of the present yarīgh, preserve the latter from the blemish of (wrong) interpretations and alterations, and not request every year a new nishān. They shall have full confidence in the royal seal (tauqī‘), consider praises and complaints (resulting from this matter) as highly momentous (‘azīm mu‘aththir), and not fail in the execution (of this order).

(k) Written in the capital of Tabrīz on the 7th of Dhul-qa‘da, 893/13th October, 1488.

(λ) In the accompanying text it is explained that the farman, written on “Khānbālīgh” paper, in good ta‘līq script, is sealed on its lowest edge (ākhir-i dāmanā) with the king’s signet ring; on its verso there are found the seals of ‘Īsā b. Shukrullāh, ‘Alī b. Shukrullāh, and some other amīrs and mustaufls.

The list of taxes in Sulṭān Ya‘qūb’s farman has many obscure points: (a), (b), (c), and perhaps (d) apparently correspond to mālvajihāt in Qāsim’s chart; (e) and (f) must represent Mongol qopchur; (d), (g): according to A. Z. Validi, op. cit., 19, kharāj and vujuh-al-‘ayn are found in Rashīd al-dīn, respectively for qopchur and tamghā (taxes levied on townsfolk) 2; (j) dūshallik (in this spelling) is found in the Tadhikra, with reference to some chancery fees, cf. also Shāh Tahmāsp’s farman (A.H. 939) quoted in Mustadrīk-i Wāsī‘īl, p. 433 ultima, dūshallikāt; (m) cherik (Mongol tserik “soldier”), which, as a term for “levy troops”, survived till the beginning of the twentieth century, stands here for the duty to supply such men;

1 Dinār-i tabrīzī-yi jinā “dīnārs payable in kind” ?
2 I should doubt this statement until further verification.
(n) as shilân means “entertainment at table, food, festival”; shîlân-bahâ may be some substitute for the entertainment (cf. khûn-bahâ “blood-wit”); (w), (v), (w) are the fees payable to surveyors; (x) ditto to the official counting the herds; (y) is “re-assessment”; (z) the fact that in this case tarh (v.s., p. 949) follows ta’dîl, may point to some similarity in the procedure (some kind of “re-adaptation”).

The third document (A.D. 1559) is embedded in the text of Shaykh Hûsayn’s genealogical history of the Şafavids (written after 1059/1649).2 The author, in his enumeration of the favours bestowed on his family by the Şafavids, quotes verbatim a certificate (al-wathîqa) which Sultan Haydar (father of Shâh Ismâ’il I) addressed in his own hand to the family of Shaykh Zâhid, in Rajab, 888/August, 1483. According to this statement certain arable lands (mazârî) called Jûra, Mâjûra, and Ürançâd (some confusion in the text!), “from the days of old down to the present,” had belonged to Shaykh Qutb al-dîn Zâhidî, and in the “day of partition” (rûz-i muqâsama) were allotted to the said shaykh, to the exclusion of his relatives. By virtue of the documents issued by the previous “sultâns” (of Ardabil), these lands came to the said shaykh as an heirloom. The governors and revenue agents (hukkâm-va-‘ummâl) of Mughanât 3 shall not fail to recognize the status in accordance with what has been couched in writing (hasab al-mastûr). In the margin Sultan Haydar drew in his own hand (tughrâ qalamî numûda): harrarâ-hu al-faqîr Haydar b. Junayd b. Shaykhshât b. Mûsâ (sic) al-Şafawi.

It is further explained that after the advent of the Şafâvi kings, Shâh Ismâ’il and Shâh Tahmâsp issued several orders concerning the exemption (mu’âfî) 4 of the lands of the family, and the soyûrghâl held by them. The author refers to Shâh Tahmâsp’s confirmation (hukm-i ta’lîd) to the effect “that even though the controllers (mumayyizân) find an increment of revenue (tafâvût) in the soyûrghâl

1 See Ahsan al-tavârikh, 17, 136: “daily one hundred sheep were killed in his kitchen for his shîlân,” and Silsilat al-nasab, p. 111. I wonder whether this word is not connected with Mongol shîlen “soup”, cf. Zamakhsharî, ed. Poppe, p. 333.
4 The Persian term mu’âf seems to be a mutilation of Arabic mu’awwaf “exempted”.
they shall not interfere with it”.¹ This document is then quoted verbatim. The copy seems to omit a part of the initial formula and the endorsement, and it is difficult to decide whether the order emanated directly from the Šah or was only issued “in his name”.

(a) The document begins with the words ḥādḥā al-ḥukm “this is the order”, and then farmān-i maymūn shud (“the felicitous order has been given”).

(β) By virtue of the royal order (ḥukm-i jahān-muṭā‘) the original mālvajihāt (mis-spelt b.lvajihāt) of the arable lands Jūra, Mājūra, and Urānqād belonging to the district (ulkā < Turkish ölğā) of Mughānāt had been conferred perpetually (mustamarr) as a soyurghāl (hereditary grant) to the sayyids, children of Shaykh Zāhid Gīlānī and no changes have been made in it (since).

(γ) “Our royal attention” towards the sayyids being perfect, we have decreed that our eldest brother Abūl-Fath Bahārām mīrzā,² his representatives (vakīl), the maliks of the said ulkā and the tenants (musta’jīrān) of the arable lands of Mughānāt should not address any requests (talāb) with regard to the increment and excess of revenue (tafāvut va-taufīr) from the lands granted as soyurghāl, nor collect poll-tax (sardna).

(δ) If there be any tafāvut for the past years, at present (and) in future, let the officials, in accordance with the original instruction (dastūr-i aṣl), consider it as settled by the “eternal soyurghāl and the perpetual grant” belonging to the sayyids.

(ζ) If any (part) of the said grant happens to be included in the tīyūl³ of Our eldest brother, this (inclusion ?) must be considered as cancelled.

(η) The officials shall clearly explain this situation, so that the accountants (mustaufī) of the supreme divān should exclude that part (vaḏ karda) from the tīyūl and, on the strength of the (present) order, credit it to the (sayyids’) soyurghāl, in due consideration (of the present order) and for the avoidance of disobedience which is punishable with censure (khīṭāb).

¹ This explanation is important for establishing the sense of tafāvut.
² Died on 19 Ramadān, 956/11 October, 1549, at the age of 33, see Akbān al-tawārikh, p. 342.
³ See my article Tiyūl in EI. Tiyūl is a non-hereditary attribution of the government taxes to the person on whom it is bestowed.
(θ) The dārūghās, maliks, and tūshmāls 1 of the said ulkā shall recognize (the legal position) accordingly, and under no pretext or custom (īsm-va rasm) present any drafts for payment (havālāt) of ikhrājāt, khārījīyāt, taqīyāt, and takhīfāt-i masdūda; they shall withdraw their pens and feet (from the said lands) and not hover around the latter (pīrāmīn nagardand). Anything they have already collected shall be restored (to the sayyids), without any excuses. The officials shall consider the matter as qadaghan ("taboo") and not ask every year for a renewed document. While undertaking (the execution of the order) they shall refrain from (provoking) complaints.

(ι) Let Shah Ghazi (?) recognize (the situation) in accordance with what has been couched in writing 2 and let (the officials) not interfere with the sphere (of the sayyids' soyūrghāl), nor hover around it, considering it as excluded from the lease (muqāta'a) of the maliks and tenants of the arable lands of Mughānāt.

(κ) Written on 25 Jumādā ii, 966/6 April, 1559. Final endorsement omitted (?).

(d)

The fourth document, first found and described by N. Khanikov, 3 is of considerably later date. It was issued in 1113/1702 by the Ṣafavid Shāh Sultān-Ḥusayn to Amīr Bāyandur-sultān, 4 governor of Qarājadag. Its contents are narrower than those of the charts quoted, but it is curious as indicating the counterpart of the obligations of a petty vassal, and the hereditary character of a soyūrghāl.

(a) Reflecting the sanctimoniousness of its times the document opens with a basmala and the names of God, Muḥammad, ‘Alī, and the twelve imāms. The king’s seal has a very elaborate form: Abul-Muṣaffar Shāh Sultān-Ḥusayn al-Ḥusaynī al-Ṯusavī al-Ṣafavī

1 Tūshmāl from Mongol tūsīmēl "a trusted person, a clerk". In Mughān the word may have survived among the Mongol settlers. In the sense of a "petty chief" it is still used in Luristān where Mongol influence in the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries was strong, see my articles Lur-i Buzurg, Lur-i Kūčik in EI.

2 This sentence looks somewhat disturbed. This may be an additional endorsement addressed to some local official.

3 "Lettre de M. Khanykov à M. Dorn (16 sept., 1856)," printed in Mélanges Asiatiques, St. Petersburg, 1857, iii/1, pp. 70–4. The text needs a careful revision. The essential part of it is reprinted in Petrushevsky, op. cit., 59 (several misprints).

4 Here sultān is used in the connotation of Ṣafavid times as a title of a middle rank official. In the Persian army until the reign of Rida-shāh sultān meant "captain". The Ottomans in order to dissociate themselves from this conception used with reference to Persians the spelling سلطان.
Bahādur-khān, banda-yi Shāh-i Vilāyat ("slave of the King of Sanctity"), i.e. of 'Ali), in the year 1113 (= 1701). (Device): “God suffices unto me.” (Couplet):—

“He who is not on good terms with 'Ali,
Whoever he be, I do not befriend him.
He who is not like dust on his threshold,
Let dust be on his head, even though he be an angel.”

(β) The governor of Qarāja-dagh� Amir Nizāman lil-imāra wal-hukūma (i.e. Nizām al-dīn) Bāyandur-sultān has lately reported as follows:—

(γ) In recognition (ba-izā’) of the services of Ilyās-khalīfa, a sum of 6 tomans 306½ dinārs had been granted him from the government revenue (mālvaiḥāt-va-vujūḥāt) of the Dizmār district; after his death, it was confirmed to his son Shams al-dīn khalīfa, on condition that, during the Shāh’s campaigns, he should provide seven men fully armed and equipped. Shams al-dīn having died heirless, the soyūrghāl, at Shams al-dīn’s recommendation, was given to his cousin (Maḥmūd Sultān), father of Bāyandur-sultān, from whom it was withdrawn to be given to someone called Ilyās-khalīfa (II) who affirmed that he was Shams al-dīn’s son. Then it passed to Burhān al-dīn khalīfa, Ilyās-khalīfa II’s son.

(δ) Burhān al-dīn having died heirless, Bāyandur has applied for the transference of the soyūrghāl to his own son, Sirājān (= Sirāj al-dīn) Muḥammad Qāsim-beg;

(ε) therefore, the soyūrghāl formerly having belonged to Maḥmūd-sultān is given to Qāsim-beg under the same condition, namely of providing (seven) men all ready (safarkash) to the Shāh’s call and orders (ba-jār-va-yāsāq-i shāhī);

(ζ) the headmen (katkhudā) and the peasants of Dizmār must every year remit the māljihāt, the vujūḥāt, and the government dues to the new beneficiary of the soyūrghāl;

(η) as before, the officials must “withdraw their pens and feet” from levying any taxes or ‘avārid, etc.

(θ) Let it be adorned with the royal seal (tauqī’-i waqf-i manī) and let them depend on it. Written in Isfahān in Dhul-Ḥijja, 1113 (May, 1702).

1 On the southern bank of the Araxes, to the north-east of Tabrīz. It consists of seven bulūks: Arvandul, Dizmār, Ḥasan-ābād, Ahar, Dīglā, Yāft, Vargahān, and Kalāyūbār.

2 Cf. lower down Sirājān and in Qāsim’s firman: Kamālān lil-milla.
In spite of some differences in details, our five documents equally contribute to the knowledge of the "immunity" (soyūrghāl) as practised in the Middle East in the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries A.D. The hereditary character of the institution stands out as against the conditions of a tiyūl which only temporarily conferred on the beneficiary the right to collect the Government taxes for his own benefit.

The persistence of the administrative tradition, as attested in our five documents, is very striking, and their comparative study enables us to clarify certain obscure details. The object of the present article is chiefly to explain Qāsim b. Jahāngīr's farman but, as a side issue, it is confidently hoped that it will form a sort of introduction to further research into social and economic conditions of Iran, without which our study of Persian history is bound to remain shallow and superficial. The collection and close analysis of documents similar to those which we have described is one of our most urgent tasks.

PS. The present article, written in the gloomy days of Sept.-Oct., 1938, is dedicated to my colleagues and friends in Prague.

Additions

p. 942, 1. 25. An allusion to Nu'um may be contained in the opening formula al-ḥukm lillāhi, cf. p. 959. Judging by pp. 952, 955, the term nishān may refer to the periodical confirmations of the original chart.


p. 944. The reading huwa abadī is confirmed by the farman of Shāh-Sulaymān (Br. Mus. Or. 4935): soyūrghāl-i abadī va ıhsān-i sarmadī (M. Minovi).

1 See my article Tiyūl in EI.