

CHRISTINE NOELLE-KARIMI

THE PEARL IN ITS MIDST
Herat and the Mapping of Khurasan
(15th–19th Centuries)

ÖSTERREICHISCHE AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN
PHILOSOPHISCH-HISTORISCHE KLASSE
DENKSCHRIFTEN, 463. BAND

VERÖFFENTLICHUNGEN ZUR IRANISTIK
HERAUSGEGEBEN VON BERT G. FRAGNER UND FLORIAN SCHWARZ

NR. 74

CHRISTINE NOELLE-KARIMI

THE PEARL IN ITS MIDST

Herat and the Mapping of Khurasan
(15th–19th Centuries)

Verlag der
Österreichischen Akademie
der Wissenschaften



Wien 2014

OAW

Vorgelegt von w. M. BERT G. FRAGNER in der Sitzung am 21. Oktober 2011

Umschlaggestaltung:
Bettina Hofleitner, unter Verwendung des Bildes
“Thousand Roofs” (2013), courtesy of Sultan Masoud Karimi

Diese Publikation wurde einem anonymen, internationalen
Peer-Review-Verfahren unterzogen.

This publication has undergone the process of anonymous, international
peer review.

Die verwendeten Papiersorten sind aus chlorfrei gebleichtem Zellstoff hergestellt,
frei von säurebildenden Bestandteilen und alterungsbeständig.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

ISBN 978-3-7001-7202-4

Copyright © 2014 by
Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften
Wien

Druck und Bindung: Prime Rate kft., Budapest

Printed and bound in the EU

<http://hw.oeaw.ac.at/7202-4>

<http://verlag.oeaw.ac.at>

Contents

Acknowledgements	ix
Abbreviations	xi
Note on Transliteration	xix
Introduction	1
The Secondary Sources	4
Setting the Stage: Khurāsān in the Course of History	6
1. The Seat of Government: Herat during the Timurid Period	15
Sources on Timurid Khurāsān	16
The City of Herat	17
The Friday Mosque (Masjid-i Jāmi‘)	19
The Citadel of Ikhtiyār al-Dīn (Qal‘a-yi Ikhtiyār al-Dīn)	20
The City Walls (bāra) and Markets (bāzār)	21
The Immediate Environs of Herat	24
The Districts North of the Harī Rūd	25
The Districts South of the Harī Rūd	28
The Province of Herat	29
Kurūkh (Kurukh)	30
Harāt-Rūd	31
Bādghīs	32
Murghāb	33
Ghūr	34
Gharjistān	35
Sākhar-Tūlak	36
Isfizār (Sabzavār-i Harāt, Present-Day Shindand)	36
Shāfilān (Shāhfīlān), Azāb, Dāman-i Kūh	36
Khvāf	36
Bākharz	37
Kūsūya (Present-Day Kuhsān)	38
Fūshanj (Present-Day Zindajān)	39
Jām	39
Zāva-Mahvilāt	40
Conclusion	40
2. The Guarded Domains: Khurāsān under Safavid and Afsharid Auspices	45
Herat In the Safavid Era	45
The Sources	46
Shifting Regional Alignments	48
The Safavid Administration	55
A Glimpse of the Seventeenth Century: The Travelogue of Ibn Valī	60
Pastures and Trade routes: Patterns of Movement and Control	60
The Local Population	69
The Multān Connection: the Abdālī Afghāns between Mughal and Safavid Interests	74
Conclusion	83
The Afsharid Period	84

Nādir Shāh and the Abdālīs.....	87
Nādir Shāh’s Mode of Government and Its Local Effects.....	90
Impressions of Khurāsān in the Eighteenth Century.....	93
Conclusion.....	98
3. Herat as an Afghan Dominion.....	101
The Sources.....	102
The Formation of the Sadūzai State.....	104
Ideological Foundations.....	104
Qandahār as Durrānī Capital.....	107
Aḥmad Shāh’s Sphere of Influence.....	109
Administrative Divisions.....	116
Herat as a Sadūzai Province.....	117
The Circumstances in Shāh Rukh Afshār’s Realm.....	121
The Configurations of Power under Aḥmad Shāh’s Successors.....	127
Conclusion.....	139
4. Herat in the Nineteenth Century.....	143
An Overview of the Political Developments.....	143
Nineteenth-Century Sources on Khurāsān.....	146
Sunnī-Shī‘ī Demarcations.....	153
The Population of Herat in the Early Nineteenth Century.....	153
Encounters in the Eighteenth Century.....	154
Sūfī Islām.....	155
The Qājār Sieges.....	159
The Impact of Amīr ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Khān’s Anti-Shī‘ī Policies.....	167
The Ūymāq.....	169
The Sunnī Hazāras of Qal‘a-yi Nau.....	172
The Jamshīdīs.....	176
The Fīrūzkūhīs.....	178
The Tāymanīs.....	180
Herat and its Hinterland in the Nineteenth Century.....	181
Kurukh.....	187
Ghūriyān.....	187
Kūsūya (Kuhsān).....	187
Bādghīs.....	188
Isfizār (Sabzavār-i Harāt).....	189
Farāh.....	189
Administrative Divisions and Borders.....	190
Staking Claims: The Portrayal of Afghān-Qājār Encounters in Persian Historiography.....	194
Prelude: Āqā Muḥammad Enters Khurāsān.....	196
The Drama Unfolds: Faṭḥ ‘Alī Shāh’s Campaign to Khurāsān in 1214–15/1800.....	197
Concluding Act: ‘Abbās Mīrzā Nā‘ib al-Salṭana before the Gates of Herat.....	200
Conclusion.....	201
5. Qājār Khurāsān.....	205
The Setting in the Early Nineteenth Century.....	205
The Tribal Framework.....	206
The Qājār Mode of Government.....	209
The Tribal Aristocracy of Khurāsān.....	211

The Za‘farānlū Kurds of Khabūshān.....	211
The Shādillū Kurds of Bujnūrd.....	212
The Khuzaima Arabs of Qāyin.....	213
The Zangū’ī Arabs of Ṭabas (Gīlakī).....	214
The Qarā’īs of Turbat-i Ḥaidarīya.....	214
The Qājār Administration of Khurāsān.....	216
The Government of Muḥammad Valī Mīrzā (1218–1231/1803—1816).....	218
The Government of Ḥasan ‘Alī Mīrzā Shujā‘ al-Salṭana (Muḥarram 1232– Jumādā II 1242/December 1816–January 1827).....	220
The Government of Aḥmad ‘Alī Mīrzā (Rajab 1245–Rajab 1247/January 1830–December 1831).....	223
The Government of ‘Abbās Mīrzā Nā’ib al-Salṭana (Rajab 1247–Jumādā II 1249/December 1831–October 1833).....	224
The Government of Allāhyār Khān Āṣaf al-Daula Qājār Develū (1250–1263/1834–1847).....	225
The Government of Sulṭān Murād Mīrzā Ḥusām al-Salṭana and Farīdūn Mīrzā Farmānfarmā (1266–1275/1850–1858).....	230
Khurāsān in the Late Nineteenth Century.....	234
Conclusion.....	237
6. The Emergence of Fixed Boundaries.....	243
The Shrinking Frontier: Astarābād, Sarakhs and Marv.....	243
The Principality of Khīva (Khvārazm) and Its Relationship with Iran.....	246
The Turkmen Phenomenon.....	248
The Russian Expansion in Central Asia.....	250
Astarābād.....	252
Akhal.....	259
Sarakhs.....	262
Marv.....	266
Conclusion.....	280
The Frontier Achieved: Sīstān.....	281
Conclusion.....	290
Concluding Remarks.....	293
Herat and Khurāsān in Early Modern Perceptions.....	293
Modern Notions of Territoriality.....	296
Index.....	303
Glossary.....	329
Bibliography.....	337

Appendix A: Genealogical Tables

Appendix B: Maps

سفری کردم وقتی به هری

به هری وقتی کردم سفری¹

To all my fellow travelers...

Acknowledgements

In a famous anecdote, the twelfth-century author Nizāmī ‘Arūzī describes how the Samanid king Abū Naṣr b. Aḥmad became so enthralled by the pleasant climate, delightful landscape and, above all, delicious fruits of Herat that only a potent *qaṣīda* by the famous poet Rūdakī persuaded him to depart and return to his capital, Bukhārā. This experience is not limited to Samanid times, and certainly not to royal circles. When I visited Herat for the first time in 1979, I was likewise captivated by this lively city, despite the first, noticeable ravages of communist rule. Little did I know that I would eventually dedicate a book to this region and to the rich historical past I merely caught a whiff of at the time. The present work has grown out of a Habilitationsschrift submitted at the University of Bamberg in 2008. I am grateful to the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for its generous support of my research, which took me to the India Office Library in London, the Kitābkhāna-yi Āstān-i Quds in Mashhad, and the libraries of the Bunyād-i Īrānshināsī, Dā’irat al-Ma’ārif-e Buzurg-i Islāmī, Kitābkhāna-yi Dānishgāh-i Tehran, Kitābkhāna-yi Majlis-i Shūrā-yi Islāmī, Kitābkhāna-yi Millī-yi Īrān, and the Sāzmān-i Asnād-i Millī in Tehran.

At first sight, the endeavor to produce the history of a city from the fifteenth to the nineteenth centuries may seem like a linear undertaking, conjoining local fortunes to the ebb and flow of empires. Yet, I soon realized that the fate of Herat could only be understood in relation to neighboring and encompassing regional entities. What began as the tale of a city ended as an attempt to capture notions of space by tracing reflections of its ecological, political, sacred and sensual dimensions in the contemporaneous Persian sources. With these ingredients in place, the process of maturation took place in two congenial scientific environments, the Institutes of Iranian Studies at the University of Bamberg and at the Austrian Academy of Sciences in Vienna.

Throughout my research and writing, I have greatly profited from the expertise of a number of respected colleagues in the field. Bert Fragner, Birgitt Hoffmann, Lorenz Korn, Wilfried Krings, Robert D. McChesney, Beatrice Manz and Jürgen Paul have inspired and accompanied my inquiry into early modern regionalism. Lutz Rzehak generously shared his rich collection of Russian sources and rendered invaluable assistance in their perusal. Iraj Afshar, Susan Asili, Zahir Bhalloo, Yuri Bregel, Asif Fikrat, Bernt Glatzer, Benjamin Hopkins, Ralph Kauz, Nobuaki Kondo, Şevket Küçüküşeyin, Irene Schneider, Mohammad Bagher Vosoughi, Yusuf Wazirzada, Andreas Wilde and William Wood directed me to relevant source materials. Andreas Drechsler of the Bamberg University Library, Winfried Riesterer of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek at Munich and Kornelia Kellner of the Library of the Academy of Sciences in Vienna graciously responded to all my book requests. Michael Stoller of Afghanistan Digital Library kindly granted permission to reproduce the proclamation of Amīr ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Khān. The remaining maps were drawn by Günter “Geo” Müller, who patiently accompanied my transition from textual and mental spaces to cartography. To all of them I express my deep gratitude.

¹ Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, *Asās al-iqtibās*.

The latest and crucial phase in the completion of this book would not have been possible without the input and support of my colleagues at the Institute of Iranian Studies in Vienna. Special thanks go to Florian Schwarz for bringing together such a great team, for creating a work atmosphere conducive to collaborative and cutting-edge research, and for his willingness to engage in numerous discussions ranging from broad concepts of mental mapping to the minutiae of cartography and transliteration. Giorgio Rota kindly shared his expertise on Safavid administrative and military affairs with me. Amr Ahmed patiently pondered complex textual passages and variant readings. I am greatly indebted to Justine Landau for her close scrutiny of my text and for sharing my excitement about the field of inquiry opening up in the overlapping realms of historiography and literature. Throughout the formatting process, I have benefitted from the technical advice of Velizar Sadovski and Sibylle Wentker. Bettina Hofleitner attended to the final phase in producing this book. The genealogical charts, the index, and the cover bear the imprint of her diligence and aesthetic sense. Finally, I would like to thank Masoud Karimi for bearing with me through the lengthy process of writing and publishing this work, for his unique artistic contribution to the cover, and for being such a loving and caring companion for all these years.

Abbreviations

ARCHIVAL RECORDS

IOL	India Office Library, London
NAI	National Archives of India, Delhi
KA	Letter from Kabul Agent
KD	Kabul Diary
KM	Letter from the Kabul Munshi
MA	Letter from Mashhad Agent

PERSIAN SOURCES

<i>‘Abbās-nāma</i>	Muḥammad Ṭāhir Vaḥīd Qazvīnī, <i>‘Abbās-nāma, yā sharḥ-i zindagānī-yi 22 sāla-yi Shāh ‘Abbās-i thānī (1052-1073/1642-1663)</i> , ed. Ibrāhīm Dihgān. Arak 1329/1951.
Abīvardī	Ḥusain Abīvardī Faiżī, fl. late 9 th /15 th century, “Chār takht,” ed. Īraj Afshār, <i>Farhang-i Īrān Zamīn</i> 15 (1347/1968): 5–160.
Aḥmad Shāh, <i>Nāma</i>	Aḥmad Shāh Durrānī, <i>Nāma-yi Aḥmad Shāh Bābā ba-nām-i Sulṭān Muṣṭafā thālith-i ‘uthmānī</i> , ed. Ghulām Jīlānī Jalālī, Kabul 1346/1967.
AM	Amīr Maḥmūd b. Khvānd Amīr, <i>Shāh Ismā‘īl-i avval va Shāh Ṭahmāsp-i avval</i> , 957/1550, ed. Ghulām Rizā Ṭabāṭabā‘ī Majd, <i>Īrān dar rūzgār-i Shāh Ismā‘īl-i avval va Shāh Ṭahmāsb-i ṣafavī</i> , Tehran 1370/1991.
<i>Ashraf al-tavārīkh</i>	Muḥammad Taqī Khān Nūrī, <i>Ashraf al-tavārīkh</i> , 1231/1816, Vol I, ed. Sūsan Aṣīlī, Tehran 1386/2007.
AT	Ḥasan Bēg Rūmlū, <i>Aḥsan al-tavārīkh</i> , 985/1577, ed. C. N. Seddon, <i>A Chronicle of the Early Safawis Being the Ahsanu’t-tawarikh of Hasan-e Rumlu</i> , Baroda 1931.
Barnābādī	Muḥammad Rizā Barnābādī, <i>Tadhkira</i> , 1815, ed., transl., annot. Nataliya N. Tumanovich, <i>Tazkire (Pamyatnie zapiski). Faksimile rukopisi, izdanie teksta, perevod c persidskovo, vvedenie i primechaniya</i> , Moscow 1983.
<i>Bayān-i vāqi‘</i>	‘Abd al-Karīm b. ‘Āqibat Maḥmūd Kashmīrī, <i>Bayān-i vāqi‘</i> , 1156/1743–44, ed. K. B. Nasīm, Lahore 1970.
Boukhary	Mir Abdoul Kerim Boukhary, <i>Histoire de l’Asie Centrale: Afghanistan, Boukhara, Khiva, Khoqand depuis les dernières années du règne de Nadir Chah, 1153 jusqu’en 1233 de l’hégire, 1740–1818 A.D.</i> , transl. and ed. Charles Schefer, repr. Amsterdam 1970 [Paris 1876].

- Chahār maqāla* Aḥmad b. ‘Umar b. ‘Alī Niẓāmī ‘Arūzī Samarqandī, *Chahār maqāla*, first half of 6th/12th century, ed. Muḥammad Qazvīnī, Muḥammad Mu‘īn, Tehran 1385/2006.
- Dhū al-qarnain* Fazlullāh Shīrāzī (Khāvarī), *Tārīkh-i dhū al-qarnain*, 1249/1834–35, ed. Nāṣir Afshārfar, 2 vols., Tehran 2001.
- DS Muḥammad Ibrāhīm b. Zain al-‘Ābidīn Naṣīrī, *Dastūr-i shahriyārān sālahā-yi 1105 tā 1110 h.q.; pādshāhī-yi Shāh Sulṭān Ḥusain Ṣafavī*, 1105–1110/1694–1698), ed. Muḥammad Nādir Naṣīrī Muqaddam, Tehran 1373/1994.
- Durra-yi nādīra* Muḥammad Mihdī Astarābādī, *Durra-yi nādīra*, ed. Sayyid Ja‘far Shahīdī, Tehran 1366/1987 [1341/1962].
- Dunbulī ‘Abd al-Razzāq b. Najaf Qulī Dunbulī, *Ma‘āthir-i sulṭānīya*, 1241/1825–26, ed. Fīrūz Manṣūrī, Tehran 1383/2004.
- Fāmī ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Fāmī Haravī (d. 546/1151–52), *Tārīkh-i Harāt*, facsimile ed., Tehran 1387/2008.
- FN Ḥasan Ḥusainī Fasā‘ī, *Fārsnāma-yi nāṣirī*, 1314/1896, ed. Manṣūr Rastgār Fasā‘ī, 2 vols., Tehran 1367/1988.
- Futūḥāt-i shāhī* Ibrāhīm Amīnī Haravī (d. 1535), *Futūḥāt-i shāhī (Tārīkh-i ṣafavī az āghāz tā sāl-i 920 h.q. [1514–15])*, written ca. 937/1531, ed. Muḥammad Rizā Naṣīrī, Tehran 1383/2004.
- Ganj-i dānish* Muḥammad Taqī Khān Ḥakīm, *Ganj-i dānish*, 1305/1887–88, ed. Muḥammad ‘Alī Ṣūtī, Tehran 1366/1987.
- Gītīgushā* Muḥammad Ṣādiq Mūsavī Iṣfahānī “Nāmī”, *Tārīkh-i gītīgushā*, ed. Sa‘īd Nafīsī, repr., Tehran 1366/1987 [1317/1938].
- Glory of the Shia World* Nūrullāh b. Muḥammad Ḥusain Iṣfahānī, *The Glory of the Shia World. The Tale of a Pilgrimage*, transl., ed. P. Sykes & Khan Bahadur Ahmad Khan, London 1910.
- Gulshan-i imārat* Nūr Muḥammad Nūrī, *Gulshan-i imārat*, ca. 1870, ed. Aḥmad ‘Alī Kuhzād, Kabul 1956.
- Gulshan-i murād* Abū al-Ḥasan Ghaffārī Kāshānī, *Gulshan-i murād (Tārīkh-i zandīya)*, 1206–07/1791–93, addenda up to 1210/1796 by his son Mīrzā Muḥammad Bāqir Kāshānī, ed. Ghulām Rizā Ṭabāṭabā‘ī Majd, n.p. 1369/1990.
- Ḥāfiz-i Abrū, *Cinq opuscules* Tauer, Felix, *Cinq opuscules de Hafiz-i Abrū concernant l’histoire de l’Iran au temps de Tamerlan*, Prague 1959.
- Ḥayāt-i afghānī* Muḥammad Ḥayāt Khān, *Ḥayāt-i afghānī*, Lahore 1867.

- HS Ghiyāth al-Dīn b. Humām al-Dīn Ḥusainī Khvānd Amīr, *Tārīkh ḥabīb al-siyar fī akhbār afrād al-bashar*. 1524, 4 vols., Tehran 1333/1954.
- Hudūd* *Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam, ‘The Regions of the World’. A Persian Geography 372 A.H.—982 A.D.*, transl. V. Minorsky, repr. Cambridge 1982 [1937].
- Iḥyā’ al-mulūk* Malik Shāh Ḥusain b. Malik Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Shāh Maḥmūd Sīstānī, *Iḥyā’ al-mulūk*, 1028 or 1031/1618–19 or 1621–22, ed. Manūchīhr Sutūda, Tehran 1344/1966.
- IM Iskandar Bēg, Munshī, *Tārīkh-i ‘ālamārā-yi ‘abbāsī* (1616, 1628–29), ed. Muḥammad Ismā‘īl Rizvānī, 3 vols., Tehran 1377/1998.
- IM (Savory) *History of Shah ‘Abbas the Great*, transl. Roger M. Savory, 2 vols., Boulder 1978; Vol. 3: Index, comp. Renée Bernhard, New York 1986.
- IM, *Dhail* Iskandar Bēg, Munshī, *Dhail-i Tārīkh-i ‘ālamārā-yi ‘abbāsī*, ca. 1634, ed. Suhailī Khvānsārī, Tehran 1317/1938.
- Irshād al-zirā‘a* Qāsim b. Yūsuf Abū Naṣrī Haravī, *Irshād al-zirā‘a*, 921/1515, ed. Muḥammad Mushīrī, repr., Tehran 2536/1977 [1346/1967–68].
- Isfīzārī Mu‘īn al-Dīn Muḥammad Zamchī Isfīzārī, *Rauzāt al-jannāt fī auṣāf madīnat Harāt*, 897–899/1491–93, ed. Sayyid Muḥammad Kāzīm Imām, 2 vols., Tehran 1338–9/1959–60.
- IT ‘Alī Qulī Mīrzā I‘tizād al-Saltāna, *Iksīr al-tavārīkh (Tārīkh-i qājārīya az āghāz tā 1259 h.q. [1843])*, ed. Jamshīd Kiyānfār, Tehran 1370/1991.
- JN Muḥammad Mihdī Astarābādī, *Tārīkh-i jahāngushā-yi nādirī*, 1171/1757–58, ed. Tehran 1368/1989.
- Junābadī Mīrzā Bēg b. Ḥasan Ḥusainī Junābadī, *Rauzat al-ṣafāvīya*, 1036/1627, ed. Ghulām Rizā Ṭabāṭabā‘ī Majd, Tehran 1378/1999.
- Kāzīm Muḥammad Kāzīm Marvī, *Nāma-yi ‘ālamārā-yi nādirī*, 1166/1752–53, ed. Muḥammad Amīn Riyāḥī, 3 vols., Tehran 1364/1985, 1369/1990.
- Khulāṣat al-akhbār* (I‘timādī) Ghiyāth al-Dīn b. Humām al-Dīn Ḥusainī Khvānd Amīr (d. 942/1535–36), *Khulāṣat al-akhbār fī bayān aḥvāl al-akhyār*, 905/1499, partial ed. Gūyā I‘timādī, *Faṣlī az Khulāṣat al-akhbār*, Kabul 1345/1966.
- Khuld-i barīn* Muḥammad Yūsuf Vāla Iṣfahānī, *Khuld-i barīn*, 1078/1667–68, ed. Muḥammad Rizā Naṣrī, Tehran 1382/2003.

- Khūrmūjī Muḥammad Ja'far Khūrmūjī, *Tārīkh-i qājār. Ḥaqāyiq al-akhbār-i nāširī*, 1284/1867–68, ed. Ḥusain Khadīvjām, repr., Tehran 1363/1984 [1344/1965].
- KR Muḥammad Yūsuf Riyāzī, *Kulliyāt-i riyāzī (Baḥr al-favāyid)*, Mashhad 1906.
- Majma' al-tavārīkh* Muḥammad Khalīl Mar'ashī, *Majma' al-tavārīkh dar tārīkh-i inqirāz-i šafavīya va vaqāyi '-i ba' d tā sāl-i 1207 hijrī qamarī*, 1207/1792, ed. 'Abbās Iqbāl, repr., Tehran 1362/1983 [1328/1949].
- Mazārāt-i Harāt* Saljūqī, Fikrī (ed.), *Risāla-yi mazārāt-i Harāt*. Ḥiṣṣa-yi avval: Amīr Sayyid 'Abdullāh al-Ḥusainī Aṣīl al-Dīn Vā'iz-i Haravī, *Maqṣad al-iqbāl sulṭānīya va marṣad al-āmāl khāqānīya*, 864/1459–60, pp. 1–105; Ḥiṣṣa-yi duvvum ta'līf-i Maulānā 'Ubaidullāh b. Abū Sa'īd Haravī, 1198/1783–84, pp. 106–47; Ḥiṣṣa-yi sīvvum ta'līf-i Ākhundzāda Mullā Muḥammad Ṣadīq-i Haravī, 1350/1931–32, pp. 148–92; Part IV: Appendix by Fikrī Saljūqī, pp. 1–196. Kabul 1967.
- MB Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān I'timād al-Salṭana, *Mir'āt al-buldān*, 1294–97/1877–80, ed. 'Abd al-Ḥusain Navā'ī, Mīr Hāshim Muḥaddith, 4 vols., Tehran 1367/1988.
- Mihmānnāma* Faḏlullāh b. Rūzbihān Khunjī Iṣfahānī, *Mihmānnāma-yi Bukhārā*, 915/1509, ed. Manūchīhr Sutūda, Tehran 1341/1962.
- Mīr Khvānd Muḥammad b. Khāvandshāh b. Maḥmūd Mīr Khvānd, *Tārīkh rauzat al-šafā fī sirat al-anbiyā' va al-mulūk va al-khulafā'*, ca. 899/1493, ed. 'Abbās Parvīz, 8 vols., Tehran 1338/1959.
- MSh Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān I'timād al-Salṭana, *Maṭla' al-shams*, (1301–1303/1884–1886, facsimile ed., Tehran 1976.
- Muḥsin Muḥammad Muḥsin Mustaufī, *Zubdat al-tavārīkh*, ca. 1741–42, ed. Bihrūz Gūdarzī, Tehran 1375/1996.
- Mujmal-i faṣīḥī* Faṣīḥ Aḥmad b. Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Khvāfī (d. 845–846/1442), *Mujmal-i faṣīḥī*, 845/1441–42, ed. Maḥmūd Farrukh, 3 vols., Tus/Mashhad 1341/1962.
- Mujmal al-tavārīkh* (Mann) Abū al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad Amīn Gulistāna, *Mujmal al-tavārīkh pas az Nādir*, 1196/1781, partial ed. Oskar Mann, *Das Muḥmil et-tārīkh-i ba'dnadādirīje*, 2 vols., Leiden 1891, 1896.
- Mujmal al-tavārīkh* (Raḏavī) Abū al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad Amīn Gulistāna, *Mujmal al-tavārīkh pas az Nādir*, 1196/1781, ed. Muḥammad Taqī Mudarris Raḏavī, Tehran 1901.

- Mukhtaṣar-i Muḥfīd* Muḥammad Muḥfīd, *Mukhtaṣar-i Muḥfīd*, 1091/1680–81, ed., commentary Seyfeddin Najmabadi, *Moḥtaṣar-i Moḥfīd*, Vol. I, Edition und Einleitung, Wiesbaden 1989.
- Nafaḥāt al-uns* ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Aḥmad Jāmī, *Nafaḥāt al-uns min ḥazarāt al-quḍs*, ca. 1474, ed. Miḥdī Tauḥīdīpūr, Tehran 1336/1957.
- Navā-yi ma‘ārik* ‘Aṭā’ Muḥammad Shikārpūrī, Mīrzā, *Navā-yi ma‘ārik*, 1271/1855, Kabul 1331/1952.
- Naṭanzī Maḥmūd b. Hidāyatullāh Afūshta-yi Naṭanzī, *Nuqāvat al-āthār fī dhikr al-akhyār*, ca. 1007/1598–99, ed. Iḥsān Ishrāqī, Tehran 1350/1971, 1373/1994.
- NT Muḥammad Taqī Khān, Lisān al-Mulk, “Sipihr”, *Nāsikh al-tavārīkh: Tārīkh-i qājāriya*, 1859–60, ed. Jamshīd Kiyānfār, 3 vols., Tehran 1377/1998.
- PM Ya‘qūb ‘Alī Khvāfī, *Pādshāhān-i muta‘akḥkhir-i Afghānistān*, 1907, 2 vols., Kabul 1957.
- Qiṣaṣ al-khāqānī* Valī Qulī b. Dāvūd Qulī Shāmlū, *Qiṣaṣ al-khāqānī*, ca. 1666, ed. Ḥasan Sādāt Nāshirī, 2 vols., Tehran 1371–1374/1992–1995.
- Qismat-i āb* Qāsim b. Yūsuf Abū Naṣrī Haravī, *Risāla-yi tarīq-i qismat-i āb-i qulb*, ed. Māyil Haravī, Tehran 1347/1968.
- Riyāz al-siyāḥat* Zain al-‘Ābidīn Shīrvānī, *Riyāz al-siyāḥa*, 1237/1822, ed. Aṣghar Ḥāmid Rabbānī, Tehran 1339/1960.
- Safarnāma-yi Bukhārā* ‘Abbās Qulī Khān, *Safarnāma-yi Bukhārā*, 1260/1844, ed. Ḥusain Zamānī, Tehran 1373/1994.
- Safarnāma-yi Ḥamza Mīrzā* *Safarnāma-yi Ḥamza Mīrzā (Sharḥ-i lashkarkashī-yi 1276 h.q. [1859–60] az zabān-i yak shāhid-i ‘ainī)*, ed. Muḥsin Raḥmatī, Tehran 1387/2008.
- Safarnāma-yi Rukn al-Daula* Muḥammad ‘Alī Munshī, *Safarnāma-yi Rukn al-Daula ba Sarakhs*, 1299/1881–82, ed. Muḥammad Gulbun, Tehran 1356/1977.
- Saif al-Haravī 1943 Saif b. Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb Saifī Haravī, *Tārīkhnāma-yi Harāt*, written between 1318–1322, ed. Muḥammad Zubair al-Ṣiddīqī, Calcutta 1362/1943.
- Saif al- Haravī 2002 Saif b. Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb Saifī Haravī, *Tārīkhnāma-yi Harāt*, written between 1318–1322, abridged ed. Muḥammad Āṣaf Fikrat, *Pīrāsta-yi tārikhnāma-yi Harāt*, Tehran 1381/2002.

- Sāravī Muḥammad Faṭḥullāh b. Muḥammad Taqī Sāravī, *Tārīkh-i muḥammadī (Aḥsan al-tavārīkh)*, 1212/1797, ed. Ghulām Rizā Ṭabāṭabā'ī Majd, Tehran 1371/1992.
- Sifāratnāma* Rizā Qulī Khān Hidāyat, *Sifāratnāma-yi Khvārazm*, 1292/1875–76, ed., transl. Charles Schefer, *Relation de l'ambassade au Kharezm de Reza Quoly Khan, 1800–1871*, Paris 1876; repr. Amsterdam 1975.
- ST Faiz Muḥammad, *Sirāj al-tavārīkh*, 3 vols., Kabul 1912.
- TA (Humāyūn) Maḥmūd b. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥusainī, *Tārīkh-i aḥmadshāhī*, ca. 1186/1772–73, ed. Sarvar Humāyūn, Peshawar 2001.
- TA (Maulā'ī) Maḥmūd b. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥusainī, *Tārīkh-i aḥmadshāhī*, ca. 1186/1772–73, ed. Muḥammad Sarvar Maulā'ī, Tehran 2007.
- Tārīkh-i 'abbāsī* Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Munajjim Yazdī, *Tārīkh-i 'abbāsī*, 1020/1611, ed. S. Vaḥīdīniyā, Tehran 1366/1987.
- TB Mīrzā Sang Muḥammad Badakhshī, *Tārīkh-i Badakhshān*, ca. 1223/1808–9, ed. Manūchihr Sutūda, Tehran 1367/1988.
- T Hu Imām al-Dīn al-Ḥusainī, *Tārīkh-i ḥusainshāhī* or *Tavārīkh-i aḥmadshāhī*, 1213/1798, National Archives Kabul, 53/23.
- TM Mīrzā Samī'ā, *Tadhkirat al-mulūk*, ca. 1137/1725, transl. V. Minorsky, *A Manual of Safavid Administration*, London. 2nd ed., Cambridge 1980 [1943].
- TMN Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān I'timād al-Saltāna, *Tārīkh-i muntaẓam-i nāširī*, 1300/1883, ed. Muḥammad Ismā'īl Rizvānī, 3 vols., Tehran 1363–1367/1984–1988.
- TRSN Rizā Qulī Khān Hidāyat, *Mulḥaqāt-i tārīkh-i rauzat al-ṣafā-yi nāširī*, 1853–1856, vols. 8–10, Qum 1339/1960.
- T Su Sulṭān Muḥammad b. Mūsā Durrānī, *Tārīkh-i sulṭānī*, beginning of composition in 1281/1865, Bombay 1298/1880.
- Vaqāyi' va savāniḥ* 'Alī Qulī Mīrzā I'tizād al-Saltāna, *Tārīkh-i vaqāyi' va savāniḥ-i Afghānistān*, 1273/1856–57, ed. Mīr Hāshim Muḥaddith, Tehran 1365/1986.
- Vārid, *Mir'āt* Muḥammad Shafī' Ṭīhrānī “Vārid”, *Mir'āt-i vāridāt*, 1142/1730, partial ed. Manṣūr Šifatgul, Tehran 1383/2004.
- Vārid, *Nādirshāhī* Muḥammad Shafī' Ṭīhrānī “Vārid”, *Tārīkh-i nādirshāhī – Nādirnāma*, 1156/1743–44, ed. Rizā Sha'bānī, Tehran 1349/1970.

- Vāṣifī Zayn al-Dīn Maḥmūd Vāṣifī, *Badāyi' al-vaqāyi'*, 1538–39, ed. Alexander N. Boldyrev, repr., Tehran 1349/1970 [Moscow, 1961].
- Zanbīl* Farhād Mīrzā Mu'tamad al-Daula, *Zanbīl*, 1329/1911; ed. Muḥammad Ramaẓānī, repr., Tehran 1367/1988 [1345/1966].

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Dihkhudā Dihkhudā, 'Alī Akbar, *Lughatnāma*, ed. Muḥammad Mu'īn and Sayyid Ja'far Shahīdī, 2nd ed., 14 vols., Tehran 1374/1995–96.
- DM *Dāyirat al-ma'ārif-i buzurg-i islāmī*, ed. Kāẓim Mūsavī Bujnurdī, Tehran, 1367/1988.
- E.I., 1* *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1st ed.
- E.I., 2* *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed.
- E.Ir.* *Encyclopaedia Iranica*.
- Gaz. Afghanistan II* Adamec, Ludwig, *Historical and Political Gazetteer of Afghanistan*. Vol. 2, *Farah and Southwestern Afghanistan*, Graz 1973.
- Gaz. Afghanistan III* Adamec, Ludwig, *Historical and Political Gazetteer of Afghanistan*. Vol. 3, *Herat and Northwestern Afghanistan*, Graz 1975.
- Gaz. Afghanistan V* Adamec, Ludwig, *Historical and Political Gazetteer of Afghanistan*. Vol. 5, *Kandahar and South-Central Afghanistan*, Graz 1980.
- Gaz. Afghanistan VI* Adamec, Ludwig, *Historical and Political Gazetteer of Afghanistan*. Vol. 6, *Kabul and Southeastern Afghanistan*, Graz 1985.
- Gaz. Iran I* Adamec, Ludwig, *Historical Gazetteer of Iran*, Vol. 1, *Tehran and Northwestern Iran*, Graz 1976.
- Gaz. Iran II* Adamec, Ludwig, *Historical Gazetteer of Iran*, Vol. 2, *Meshed and Northeastern Iran*, Graz 1981.

Note on Transliteration

As this work spans five centuries and the region between Simnān and Multān, any system of transliteration is bound to contain simplifications and inconsistencies. The system adopted here follows that of the *Cambridge History of Iran* and uses an “Arabic” vocalization (*ā, a, ī, i, ū, u*) and the corresponding diphthongs (*ai, au*). The rendering of the consonants privileges the Persian pronunciation: *v* for و, *z* for ض, *z* for ظ. The only exceptions to this rule are the rare fricatives ث, ذ and ژ, which have been rendered as *th*, *dh* and *zh* respectively. The spelling of a number of Turkish and Mongol words reflects a more elaborate vowel system. This is the case for *bēg* and its derivatives, as well as for such Turkmen tribal names as Sarīq, Teke and Yomut. In the rendering of Mongol proper names, the Persianized transliteration takes effect with the transition to Islam, e.g. Ögedei, Möngke, and Hülegü, as opposed to Ūljāitū. Mongol names en vogue in Qājār times are likewise transliterated according to Persian usage: Mangū and Hulākū. The Arabic term *khail* has been rendered as *khēl* throughout the text.

Introduction

In the early 1820s the Iranian traveler Zain al-‘Abidīn Shīrvānī gave an enthusiastic description of the oasis of Herat. He praised the pleasant climate of the region, its tasty water, and the outstanding quality of its grapes and melons. In his opinion, the unique position of Herat and its relationship to the rest of the world was most adequately summed up by the following Persian poem:¹

To he who seeks to find the most pleasant town,
The only truthful answer is Herat;
Consider this world an ocean, Khurāsān a shell within,
And the city of Herat the pearl in its midst.²

This poem can be traced back to the fourteenth century. With slight variations, it is recorded by a number of notable Persian authors, including the Kartid historiographer Saif al-Haravī,³ the Ilkhanid geographer Ḥamdullāh Mustaufī,⁴ the Timurid historian Ḥāfiz-i Abrū,⁵ the seventeenth-century traveler Ibn Valī,⁶ and the Qājār officials Rizā Qulī Khān Hidāyat⁷ and ‘Alī Qulī Mīrzā I‘tizād al-Saṭṭana.⁸

Herat’s favorable conditions notwithstanding, Shīrvānī observes that the city has undergone a number of crises in the course of its history. Citing such authorities as Saif al-Haravī and the Timurid authors Isfizārī (d. 903/1497–98) and Khvānd Amīr (d. 942/1535–36), he singles out the Mongol invasion and the plague epidemic of 838/1434–35 as historical junctures which inflicted heavy losses on the urban population and brought it to the brink of extinction. Later on, Herat weathered periods of invasion and unrest associated with the rise and decline of the Safavid and Afsharid empires.⁹ The size of Herat and its wealth thus rose and fell with the ebb and flow of events described by Shīrvānī. The latter quotes Saif al-Haravī’s account of the Mongol invasion of 619/1222, in the course of which “no head retained its body” and the urban population was reduced from 1.6 million to 16.¹⁰ By the time the Timurids came to power, the population of Herat seemed to have rebounded. Interestingly, Shīrvānī changes perspectives here and switches from historical telescoping to a more visual form of representation: Seemingly assuming a bird’s eye view, he states that at the time of the onset of the plague epidemic of 838/1434, the entire valley of Herat was so densely populated that a space of 30 *farsakh* or 120 miles seemed like one large city. The plague, which is said to have cost 600,000 lives in the city, is seen as a natural outcome of the pollution and moral decay brought about by the

¹ AT 154; HS IV: 553; AM 166. See also Röhrborn 1966: 16, 103–104, 112.

² *Agar kasī pūrsad tu-rā kaz shahrhā khushtar kudām;
gar javāb-i rāst khvāhī guft ū-rā gū “Harī”;
hamchu baḥr ast īn jahān, dar vay Khurāsān chūn ṣadaf;
dar miyān-i ān ṣadaf shahr-i Harī chūn gauharī.*

³ Saif al-Haravī 1943: 6.

⁴ Le Strange 1993: 150.

⁵ Krawulsky 1982: 18.

⁶ Akhmedov 1977: 81.

⁷ *Sifāratnāma*, Persian text, 111.

⁸ *Vaqāyi‘ va savānih* 26.

⁹ *Riyāz al-siyāḥat* 427–30.

¹⁰ *Hīch sarī-rā bar tan va badanī-rā bā sar nagudhāshtand* (Saif al-Haravī 1943: 80–82). According to Shīrvānī, the following order was issued to the Mongol soldiers: *Hīch kas-rā sarī dar badan va bārī dar gardan nabāshad* (*Riyāz al-siyāḥat* 428).

excessive concentration of people.¹¹ By the time Shīrvānī visited Herat in the early nineteenth century, the city population amounted to no more than 6,000 families.¹²

Shīrvānī's overview of the history of Herat provides the framework for the historical narrative recounted in this book and sets the stage for further exploration. The tension between the enduring features of Herat and the ups and downs of its history constitute the subject of the present study. Urban spaces are best understood within and against the "broader canvas" they are situated in.¹³ The poem cited above names Khurāsān as the regional frame of reference. The goal of the book is to make the history of Herat tangible against the background of the horizontal relations linking the city to other nodal points within this expanse. In what follows, I will take a closer look at the elements constitutive of the "map" of Herat and Khurāsān between the fifteenth and the nineteenth century. The urban topography, the geographical setting, the people and goods of the region will figure to the extent that contemporaneous observers consider them noteworthy. Special attention will be paid to the mode in which the terrain is perceived and represented: What local coordinates and points of gravity are identified in a given period, and do they shift over time? Which qualities are attributed to individual sites, and how are the latter fitted into the regional and imperial framework?

Such an enquiry posits that territorial conceptions are part of a larger *Weltanschauung* shaping the horizon of the political and literary actors of the time. To be sure, the physical environment and ecological conditions play a fundamental role in molding perceptions of space. The rich agricultural setting of Herat and its pleasant climate are enduring features which have been taken up by the authors throughout the period. But on a conceptual level, perceptions of space are strongly influenced by overarching patterns of authority, the local exercise of power, and prevailing modes of delegation and administration.

The following history consists of two parallel narratives. First, I will attempt to uncover the historical facts that can be gleaned from the available Persian chronicles. One important concern is to trace the larger shifts of power and their effects on the city and its environs. In this strand of the narrative, Herat figures primarily as an administrative and economic unit. Particular attention will be paid to the ways in which the city relates to the larger polities it is embedded in. Then, there is the local cast, in other words, the administrative units that are grouped around the oasis and reflect the extent ordinarily ascribed to the province by the same name. Another aspect of the political landscape may be termed "demographic". Whenever it is possible, I attempt to assess the composition of the population and to identify the prominent local actors who interacted with the powers in presence.

The second strand of the narrative focuses on the sensual aspects of space and their representation, capturing some of the local sights, sounds, and tastes reflected by the Persian chronicles and, later on, by the European accounts. By allowing the primary sources to "speak for themselves", I hope to highlight some of the ways in which the landscape was represented in the accounts of the time. The available material points to a whole range of possible perceptions. One lasting field of tension is created by the composite views emphasizing both the centrality of Herat and its strategic value as a "gateway".¹⁴ This concept was even applied to the whole of Khurāsān by the author of the tenth-century Persian geography entitled *Hudūd al-'ālam*, who places the region "near the centre of the Inhabited Lands of the world" but also identifies it as the "gate of Turkistān".¹⁵

¹¹ *Riyāz al-siyāhat* 429. Shīrvānī adduces the testimony of Khvānd Amīr for this statement. But I have not been able to locate this information in HS. For the year 838/1434, Khvānd Amīr does mention a plague epidemic in Herat which caused the death of up to 10,000 persons in the city and the suburbs (*balda va bulūkāt*) a day, but the passage does not contain any of the details Shīrvānī ascribes to this source (HS III: 625; Thackston 1994: 344). Isfizārī, by contrast, gives a detailed description of a plague epidemic lasting from 7 Rajab–15 Dhū al-Qa'da 838/6 February–12 June 1435, which killed a total of one million persons, 600,000 in the city and 400,000 in the suburbs (Isfizārī II: 92–94). See also Allen 1983: 19.

¹² *Riyāz al-siyāhat* 430.

¹³ Horden & Purcell 2007: 91.

¹⁴ See, for instance, TA (Humāyūn) 432.

¹⁵ *Hudūd* 102.

The present study takes its departure in the early fifteenth century when Herat, as the capital of Khurāsān, was at its highest in terms of cultural and economic development. Not surprisingly, this illustrious period in the history of the region is reflected by the abundance of data concerning the local sites. They testify to the Timurid attainments in terms of wealth, military strength and religious patronage. The richness of the environment is highlighted by detailed descriptions of the economic assets and unique sensory experiences Herat has to offer. In later Safavid and Qājār accounts, the terrain recedes to the sidelines of the narrative and mostly figures as a backdrop for military action. A case in point is the narration of the Shibanid siege of Herat of 1587–88, in the course of which the city gates are only mentioned to situate the position of the influential Shibanid/Uzbek military leaders who stood in front of them.¹⁶ This sort of description is typical of the battle scenes that dominate much of the chronicles up to the nineteenth century. They represent an altogether different but equally essential “map”, in which the domain is determined by a web of allegiances crucial for the upkeep of power. The physical terrain is only interesting insofar as it fits major strategic considerations, such as river crossings, stages in the desert, and the technicalities involved in the siege or defense of cities.

Another field of enquiry lies in the tension between transmitted territorial concepts and the emergence of new polities in the course of the nineteenth century. In this context, the dimension of time, or rather the historical memory and its role in shaping current perceptions of space becomes an important issue. The poem cited above, which ascribes pearl-like qualities to Herat, continued to be quoted in the second half of the nineteenth century. Thus, it perpetuated the image of Herat’s grandeur even at a time when not much was left of its former splendor. From the Iranian point of view, these persisting pretensions to greatness were coupled with a sense of bereavement, as it increasingly became clear that the Qājār government was unable to live up to its claim to all of the regions constitutive of the ancient Safavid domain. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the political scene changed dramatically. The consolidation of international borders brought about new ways of charting territory and defining state power. The sense of constriction that came with these changes clashed with the persistent memory of former imperial greatness and far-flung territorial possessions.

The gap between Qājār claims to authority and the actual scope of government was noted in the 1820s by the British traveler James Fraser. He felt that the difficulties in delineating the domain of Fath ‘Alī Shāh (r. 1212–1250/1797–1834) were most pronounced in the eastern territories, where “the district of Herat and the provinces of Seistan and Beloochistan blend with the mountains of Afghanistan”.¹⁷ Fraser noted that the vagueness of the boundaries of Khurāsān coincided with an inherent tension between historical claims to an immense stretch of land on the one hand and the actual confines of the Qājār province on the other:

The limits assigned to this country were at one time magnificent; for they comprehended on the north every thing to the Oxus, including the steppe of Khaurezm [Khvārazm], Balkh, and all the intervening country to the east: on the south east not only the city and dependencies of Herāt, but those of Subzawur [Isfizār], Furrah [Farāh], Geereesh [Girishk], and even Candahar [Qandahār] itself: on the south, it was always bounded by Kermān [Kirmān] and Seieestān [Sīstān]: on the west it included the district of Yezd [Yazd], but its salt desert was bounded in that direction by the districts of Ispahān [Iṣfahān], Cashān [Kāshān], and Rhē [Ray], somewhere near Semnaun [Simnān]; beyond the Elburz mountains, the district of Astrabad [Astarābād] and of Goorgaun [Gurgān] were also considered as dependencies of this vast territory. If Khorasān were to be considered merely as a province of Persia, and were the appellation limited to that portion of country east of Irāk, which obeys the Persian monarch, its extent would now be small indeed.¹⁸

At the same time, Fraser pointed out that Khurāsān as a territorial and political unit had repeatedly been subject to redefinition in the course of history. The ongoing re-creation of this conceptual space had taken place in a setting which, in Fraser’s opinion, was characterized by contest rather than by actual control over the land. The competition between the imperial neighbors was matched locally by the military prowess and high mobility of the inhabitants of Khurāsān:

¹⁶ McChesney 1993: 84–91.

¹⁷ Fraser 1834: 19.

¹⁸ Fraser 1825: 242.

Khorasān having from the earliest ages been a sort of debateable land, upon the confines of several great monarchies, and a constant object of desire to their sovereigns, was always the theatre of fierce and bloody wars; in which the wandering tribes in its vicinity were generally enlisted on one part or other.¹⁹

This “debateable” land, and the transformations it underwent over time, lie at the core of this book. The material is organized according to the chronological sequence while the focus of the narrative shifts according to the nature of the information yielded by the primary sources. Given the relative abundance of data dealing with Herat in the fifteenth century, Chapter 1 serves two purposes. Besides describing the position of Herat in Timurid times, it is also intended to acquaint the reader with the lay of the land. In this manner, I hope to create a regional frame of reference and to facilitate orientation in the subsequent chapters. In addition to impressions from the city of Herat, this chapter contains a complete listing of all the administrative divisions that make up its hinterland. The second chapter deals with Herat under the auspices of Safavid authority. As the primary sources yield little information on local circumstances, this chapter rather assumes a bird’s eye view to locate Herat within a larger regional framework. The narrative switches to the ecological setting and highlights some of the strategic considerations that determined the movements of the court within Khurāsān. Herat is situated in relationship to the other important urban coordinates in the region, that is, Mashhad, Qandahār, and Multān. This axis was “opened” up by Nādir Shāh’s sweeping conquests in the eighteenth century, which effectively put an end to the old balance of power in force between the Mughals of India, the Chingizids of Central Asia, and the Safavids in Iran. In the following chapters I adopt a polycentric approach to capture the breaking up of territorial allegiances after 1747. The third chapter describes the Afghan empire that emerged on the shattered remains left in the wake of Nādir Shāh’s conquests. Given the Durrānī rulers’ continued orientation towards India, the point of gravity shifted to Qandahār, and Herat became the western outpost of their realm. Chapters 4 and 5 elucidate the delineation of Iranian and Afghan spheres of influence from both sides of the emergent border. In the long run, the creation of fixed boundaries had a similar effect on the conceptualization and exercise of power in Iran and Afghanistan. The resulting linkage between government authority and a territorially defined space strengthened the government’s “hold” over the land and its inhabitants. Yet for most of the nineteenth century, the circumstances in the environs of Herat and in the eastern reaches of Iranian Khurāsān were characterized by a great degree of movement, as tribal groups either sought to evade government control or faced forceful deportation and resettlement. In the sixth and final chapter I attempt to position the changing status of Herat in a wider context. The description of the political developments in northeastern Khurāsān and in Sīstān serves to juxtapose expansive early modern notions of territorial entitlement with the actual configurations of power “on the ground”. The account of the events leading up to the delineation of the Irano-Russian borders in the northeast of Khurāsān and the delimitation of the Irano-Afghan boundary in Sīstān highlights the new territorial realities that took shape in the late nineteenth century.

THE SECONDARY SOURCES

My attempt to capture the historical coordinates, patterns of authority and ecological conditions determining the framework of political activity in Khurāsān draws on the established scholarship in this field. Bert Fragner’s macro-historical surveys have spurred my interest in the genesis and development of regional concepts and the effects of tribalism on military organization. I owe my understanding of the constraints and opportunities delimiting the horizon of pre-modern and early modern political actors to the works by Jean Aubin. The dynamic aspects of the exercise of power are also highlighted by Charles Melville’s research on the itineraries of the Ilkhanid and Safavid court.

V. V. Barto’ld’s *Historical Geography of Iran* is a valuable source concerning the lay of the land. The topography of Timurid Herat has been treated in detail by Terry Allen, Lisa Golombek, Dorothea Krawulsky and Maria Szuppe. Nataliya Tumanovich combines a description of the topography of the city from Kartid times to the nineteenth century with a general historical account. Furthermore, her edition and translation of

¹⁹ Fraser 1825: 257.

a text on the *khvājas* of Barnābād gives rare insights into the local circumstances in the vicinity of Herat and highlights one particular instance of the relationship between spiritual authority and royal patronage. Caroline Stack has provided a general overview of the events surrounding Herat from Timurid times to the end of the nineteenth century. Gisela Reindke's dissertation on the form and function of Afghan towns contains one chapter concerning the historical development of Herat, its economic conditions and population in the nineteenth century. Rafi Samizay and Abdul Wasay Najimi have produced useful architectural surveys of the Islamic monuments around Herat and the old city quarters.

As this study spans five centuries, I have relied on a number of secondary sources to gain an understanding of the main forces at work in each given period. The early Timurid era is covered by Beatrice Forbes Manz's finely grained probe into the relationship between government and society. Eva Maria Subtelny's research on Timurid agricultural policies and patterns of patronage has proven a particularly useful source for the situation of Herat in the late fifteenth century. There are a number of valuable works on the Safavid period. My understanding of the administrative system derives from the works of Klaus Röhrborn and Roger Savory. I have greatly benefited from Giorgio Rota's expertise on the role of Caucasian *ghulāms* in the Safavid administration and military. The military organization of the Safavids is treated in depth by Masashi Haneda. Maria Szuppe has devoted a detailed study to the situation in Herat at the time of the Uzbek and Safavid intervention in the early sixteenth century. My description of the "Uzbek" factor in the politics of Khurāsān and the nature of Central Asian dynastic concepts draws widely on Robert McChesney's work. Charles Melville's account of Shāh 'Abbās I's patronage of Mashhad sheds light on the waning position of Herat in the seventeenth century.

My description of the Afsharid period is primarily based on Lockhart's landmark study of 1938 and Peter Avery's account of Nādir Shāh's military career.²⁰ John Perry's work on Karīm Khān Zand contributes to our knowledge on the circumstances in western Khurāsān subsequent to Nādir Shāh's death in 1747. The developments in "Afghan" Turkistān are treated in detail by Robert McChesney and Jonathan Lee. Apart from these studies, very little literature deals with the era of the Sadūzai kings. Despite a number of inaccuracies, Ganda Singh's work still represents the most important source for the reign of Aḥmad Shāh. The material compiled by 'Azīz al-Dīn Vakīlī Fūfalzā'ī concerning the reigns of Tīmūr Shāh and Shāh Zamān documents the position of the nobility and administrative divisions in the Sadūzai Empire. However, on the whole, this domain remains largely uncharted, and a great part of my work has been devoted to the elementary task of reconstructing the essential facts of the historical narrative.

Similar difficulties are met by the study of Khurāsān in the nineteenth century. The only source dealing with Herat during this period is David Champagne's account of its position between the Qājār and Muḥammadzai fields of gravity until its incorporation into the Afghan domain in 1863. Largely based on British documents, this work illustrates the strategies adopted by the Iranian, Afghan, and British forces involved. Yet it yields little information on the circumstances prevailing in Herat or on the local configurations of power. The picture somewhat brightens when it comes to the developments in Iranian Khurāsān and the adjacent regions. There is a much greater density of sources concerning the history of this region and the geographic and political position of individual tribal groups. Sayyid 'Alī Mīr Niyā has tackled both issues. A number of authors have investigated the local circumstances in the eastern Iranian realm. The names of Ramāzān 'Alī Shākīrī and Kalīmullāh Tavaḥḥudī are associated with the history of the Khurasanian Kurds. Pirouz Mojtahed-Zadeh has documented the history of the Khuzaima Arabs of Qāyīn. Ata Dshikijew, Hafez Farmayan, William Irons, Wolfgang König, Urāz Muḥammad Sārī and William Wood have contributed works concerning the Turkmens. Manūchihr Sutūda and Asadullāh Ma'ṭūfī have compiled material on the history of Astarābād. The circumstances in Sīstān have been explored by 'Iraj Afshār "Sīstānī" and Muḥammad A'zam Sīstānī.

The administrative structure of the Qājār government and the patterns of redistribution between center and periphery are dealt with by a number of works. Colin Meredith has written about the early Qājār administration. A classic in this field is Ann K. S. Lambton's work on Qājār Iran. Aside from analyzing the

²⁰ For more recent works on the Afsharid era, see Axworthy 2006 and Tucker 2006.

workings of Qājār bureaucracy, A. Reza Sheikholeslami and Heinz Georg Migeod also shed light on the relationship between the central government and the entrenched tribal leadership of Khurāsān. Abbas Amanat is to be commended for his book on Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh and his numerous entries in the *Encyclopaedia Iranica* which highlight the role of individual Qājār officials. Another valuable resource is Miḥdī Bāmdād's six-volume "Who's Who" covering the period from the eighteenth to the twentieth century. Firoozeh Kashani-Sabet provides an overview of the processes leading up to the delineation of borders between Afghanistan and Iran.

SETTING THE STAGE: KHURĀSĀN IN THE COURSE OF HISTORY

This book is concerned with the historical entity of Khurāsān and the changes it underwent over time. It begins with a description of the region in the fifteenth century and ends with its division into three modern polities: the Russian province of Transcaspia, Afghanistan, and a truncated version of the former Iranian province. In order to place these developments in context, it might be useful to trace the contours Khurāsān was endowed with over time. Beginning with the formation of Khurāsān in Sasanid times, the following overview will describe the limits of the region, its constituent parts and the cities serving as regional capitals. Certain shifts in gravity notwithstanding, one may detect some degree of stability in the perception and structuration of this space. Territorial units were typically defined on the basis of the rivers delimiting them. The entity of Iran was thought to be bounded by the Oxus (*Jaiḥūn*, *Āmu Daryā*) in the east and the Euphrates in the west.²¹ Viewed as the divide between Iran and Transoxiana (*Tūrān*, *Turkistān*, *Mā varā' al-nahr*), the Oxus also played an evocative role as the northeastern border of Khurāsān. Political unification did not necessarily imply the merging of territorial concepts. Even in periods when Khurāsān and Transoxiana were under one supreme ruler, the notion of the river as separating two distinct geographical realms remained tangible. As will be seen below, large-scale military campaigns aimed at the agglomeration of known territorial entities rather than at the definition of new ones. The position and identity of Khurāsān in contradistinction to Transoxiana was thus hardly affected by shifting patterns of military control.

In his account of the genesis of Khurāsān, Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū hints at the enduring bonds connecting the lands adjoining the Āmū Daryā. While adducing popular etymologies for the name of "Khurāsān", he assumes a genealogical connection between the two neighboring regions:

Everybody has something [different] to say about the naming of Khurāsān. The genealogist Ibn Daḡfal says that Khurāsān and Haiṭal were the sons of 'Ālim b. Sām b. Nūḥ and left Zābul. Khurāsān settled here and his name became associated with this region. Haiṭal crossed the river [Āmu Daryā] and settled over there and that region was named Haiṭala after him. Some have called [this region] *khūrsān*, 'sunlike' and some have called it *khūr āsān*, 'easily eaten'.²²

The entities of Khurāsān and Iran owe their existence to Sasanian policies. In a deliberate attempt to legitimize their rule, the early members of the Sasanian dynasty (224–651 AD) fused the existing concept of *arya* with Zoroastrian traditions. Portraying themselves as heirs of the legendary Kayanid dynasty of Sīstān and elevating Mazdaism to a state religion, the Sasanians identified their realm as "Ērān-Shahr", thus setting it apart from their enemies in the eastern territory of "Tūrān" across the Oxus.²³ During this period, Khurāsān – "there where the sun rises" – was defined as the easternmost region of the dominion. It comprised the regions of Hyrcania (Jurjān/Gurgān), Margiana (Marv), Areia (Herat) and later Bactria (Balkh). Within the province, Marv served as the administrative center and seat of governor general. Other

²¹ The idea of Iran as being bounded by the Oxus in the east can be traced to Abū Maṣṣūr Ma'marī's introduction to the *Shāhnāma-yi Abū Maṣṣūrī* (346/957), which in turn represents the translation of a vanished Pahlavi original, the *Xvadāy-nāmag* (Khaleghi-Motlagh, "Abū Maṣṣūr Ma'marī," *E.Ir.* 1: 337). In this text, Ērān-Shahr is described as stretching "from the Amūya river to the river of Egypt (Miṣr)" (Minorsky 1956: 172).

²² Krawulsky 1982: 12. The purport of the last etymology is not quite clear. The expression "easily eaten" may possibly be understood as an allusion to the region as an embattled zone frequently "swallowed up" in the course of military campaigns. In this case, it may be considered an equivalent of Fraser's "debateable land".

²³ Gnoli 1989: 137, 140, 156–7, 175; Morony, "Sāsānids," *E.I.* 2, IX: 71–2, 74. See also Fragner 1999: 14.

important cities were Nev-Shapur (modern Nīshāpūr) and Pūshang (later Fūshanj) on the Harī Rūd, both of which were founded by the second Sasanian ruler Shāpūr I (r. 240–270 AD).²⁴ Although Iran as a political denomination vanished with the demise of the Sasanian Empire only to resurface under the Ilkhanid dynasty (1256–1335) in the aftermath of the Mongol invasion,²⁵ the concept of Khurāsān as a territorial and political entity was to remain through time.

Its stability as a regional entity notwithstanding, the outlines of Khurāsān did not necessarily correspond to patterns of authority. The evocative idea of the Oxus as a divide between Iran and Central Asia often did not match the political realities. For the pre-Muslim and early Muslim periods, Hamilton Gibb has noted that the Murghāb river and the Sīr Daryā (Jaxartes) constituted more effective barriers against invading armies:

The Oxus is a boundary of tradition rather than of history... [I]t has never proved a barrier to imperial armies from either side. It was not on the Oxus but on the Jaxartes that Alexander's strategic insight fixed the position of Alexander Eschate, and when the outposts of Persian dominion were thrust back by the constant pressure of the Central Asian hordes, their retreat was stayed not on the Oxus but on the Murghāb. Thus when the tide of conquest turned and the Arabs won back her ancient heritage for Persia, they, like Alexander, were compelled to carry their arms even further to the East and all unknowing re-establish the frontiers of the Achaemenid Empire.²⁶

As pointed out by Gibb, the reach of government ended at the Murghāb river for most of the Sasanian period. The two administrative centers located on the river, Marv-i Shāhijān and Marv al-Rūd (present-day Bālā Murghāb) served as outposts against the Hephtalites (White Huns), who occupied Sogdia, the Oxus basin and the lands north and south of the Hindu Kush during the early sixth century. With the defeat of the Hephtalites in 563–568, the Oxus became the border between the Iranians and the Western Turks for a short period in history.²⁷ At the time of the Muslim conquest in the seventh and early eighth centuries, the river initially served as a boundary but eventually came to embody the core of the easternmost Arab possessions. The Arab forces crossed the Oxus for the first time in 33/653–4, and in 86–93/705–712 the great general Qutaiba b. Muslim (d. 715) conquered Bukhārā and Samarqand, thereby establishing control over the ancient Achaemenid province of Sogdia.²⁸ With its incorporation into the Muslim sphere, Sogdia lost its meaning as a regional designation for the expanse of land between the Oxus and the Jaxartes and was more narrowly applied to the Zarafshān valley feeding the oases of Samarqand and Bukhārā.²⁹

During the Abbasid period, the concept of Khurāsān widened to include all the lands controlled by the Arab governors of Marv, which retained its erstwhile position as military and administrative center of the east.³⁰ Even so, there are indications that the lands beyond the Oxus continued to be perceived as a realm distinct from the former Sasanian sphere of influence. Arab geographers of the time coined terms like *Khurāsān va mā varā' al-nahr* ("Transoxiana"), *Khurāsān va al-mashriq* (the "East"), or simply *al-Mashriq* for the entire eastern territory.³¹ In 232/846, Ibn Khurradādhbih listed Transoxiana as one of the four administrative units making up Khurāsān and described the other three parts of Khurāsān as consisting of Marv-i Shāhijān and adjacent districts, Balkh and the region of Ṭukhāristān, as well as Herat, including Fūshanj and Bādghīs.³²

²⁴ Marquart 1901: 47, 49. See also Bosworth, "Khurāsān", *E.I.*, 2 V: 56; Bosworth, "Marw al-Shāhidjān," *E.I.*, 2 VI: 620; Frye 1983: 154; Fragner 1999: 14; Fragner 2001b: 344–5; Le Strange 1905: 383; *Riyāz al-siyāḥat* 383.

²⁵ Fragner 1997: 121–31.

²⁶ Gibb 1970: 1.

²⁷ Gibb 1970: 1, 3; Marquart 1901: 53, 70; Shaban 1971: 479–82.

²⁸ Gibb 1970: 15, 31, 56.

²⁹ Barthold [Bosworth], "Al-Sughd", *E.I.*, 2 IX: 772–3.

³⁰ Marquart 1901: 76. See also Bosworth, "Khurāsān", *E.I.*, 2 V: 56–7; Bosworth, "Marw al-Shāhidjān," *E.I.*, 2 VI: 620. The shift of the provincial capital from Marv to Balkh during the governorship of Asad b. 'Abdullāh in 118/736 apparently constituted an exception and was not followed by later Umayyad or Abbasid governors (Gibb 1970: 80, 88).

³¹ Shaban 1971: 479–81.

³² Marquart 1901: 70.

With the rise of the Persian dynasty of the Samanids (819–999) and the shift of the capital to Bukhārā in 279/892, the Oxus again found itself in the heartlands of the empire.³³ Based on Ibn Khurradādhbih and Iṣṭakhrī, the tenth-century Persian geography entitled *Hudūd al-‘ālam* nevertheless distinguished between Transoxiana and Khurāsān. Seemingly a resident of Gūzganān (present-day Jūzjān in northwestern Afghanistan), the author assigned vast proportions to Khurāsān, which he reported to be bounded by India (*Hindistān*) in the east, Gurgān in the west, and the Oxus (*Jaiḥūn*) in the north. He also pointed out that the political unity of Khurāsān and Transoxiana should be attributed to recent developments:

The king of Khorāsān... in the days of old was distinct from the king of Transoxiana but now they are one. The *mīr* of Khorāsān resides at Bukhārā...; he is from the Sāmān family... These (princes) are called Maliks of the East and have lieutenants (*‘ummāl*) in all Khorāsān, while on the frontiers (*ḥadd-hā*) of Khorāsān there are kings (*pādshāhān*) called ‘margraves’ (*mulūk-i aṭrāf*).³⁴

The lasting notion of the Oxus as a borderline and the resulting competition between the regional centers of Herat and Bukhārā during the Samanid period is reflected by an anecdote describing the literary powers of the Persian poet Rūdakī (d. 940–41). The latter is said to have prompted the Samanid ruler Amīr Naṣr b. Aḥmad (r. 301–331/913–943) to return to Bukhārā after a prolonged stay in Herat, by means of a catchy poem. Recounted by the twelfth-century author Niẓāmī ‘Arūzī, the anecdote makes it clear that, to Amīr Naṣr at least, the summer camp in Herat was so attractive that he was tempted to make it his permanent residence, had it not been for Rūdakī’s intervention:

Naṣr ibn Aḥmad, who was the most brilliant jewel of the Sāmānid galaxy..., was most plenteously equipped with every means of enjoyment and material of splendor – well-filled treasuries, a far-flung army and loyal servants. In winter he used to reside at his capital, Bukhārā, while in summer he used to go to Samarqand or some other of the cities of Khurāsān. Now one year it was the turn of Herāt...

There the army rested. The climate was charming, the breeze cool, food plentiful, fruit abundant, the air filled with fragrant scents, so that the soldiers enjoyed their life to the full during spring and summer. When Mihrḡān [autumnal equinox, CNK] arrived, and the juice of the grape came into season..., they did full justice to the delights of youth... Mihrḡān was protracted, for the cold did not wax severe, and the grapes ripened with exceptional sweetness...

So the Amīr Naṣr ibn Aḥmad saw Mihrḡān and its fruits, and was mightily pleased therewith. Then the narcissus began to bloom, and the raisins were plucked and stoned... (T)hey wintered [in the vicinity of Herat, CNK], while the Mandarin oranges began to arrive from Sīstān and the sweet oranges from Māzandarān; and so they passed the winter in the most agreeable manner...

When [the second] spring came the Amīr sent the horses to Bādghīs... And when summer came and the fruits again ripened, Amīr Naṣr ibn Aḥmad said, ‘Where shall we go for the summer? For there is no pleasanter place of residence than this. Let us wait till Mihrḡān.’ And when Mihrḡān came, he said, ‘Let us enjoy Mihrḡān at Herāt and then go’, and so from season to season he continued to procrastinate, until four years had passed in this way... the Amīr’s attendants grew weary, and desire for home arose within them, while they beheld the king quiescent, the air of Herāt in his head and the love of Herāt in his heart...

[The courtiers solicit the help of Rūdakī and offer him a reward of five thousand *dīnārs* if he can induce the Amīr to depart for Bukhārā, CNK]

(Rūdakī) composed a *qaṣīda*; and, when the Amīr had taken his morning cup... took up the harp, and... began this elegy:

The Jū-yi-Mūliyān we call to mind,
We long for those dear friends long left behind;

...

The sands of Oxus toilsome though they be,
Beneath my feet were soft as silk to me.

...

Long live Bukhārā! Be thou in good cheer!
Joyous towards thee hasteth our Amīr!

The Moon’s the Prince, Bukhārā is the sky;

³³ Bosworth, “Sāmānids”, *E.I.*, 2 VIII: 1026; Fragner 2001b: 345–6.

³⁴ *Hudūd* 102. See also pp. xiv, 325. Minorsky comments that the author’s allusion to former kings intends the Tahirid (820–872) and Saffarid (867–903) dynasties. Writing in 988, that is, six years after the *Hudūd al-‘ālam*, the Arab geographer Ibn Ḥauqal likewise distinguished Khurāsān and Transoxiana as two clearly delimited geographical entities (Kramers & Wiet 1964: 413–99).

O Sky, the Moon shall light thee by and by!

Bukhárá is the mead, the Cypress he;
Receive at last, O Mead, thy Cypress tree!

When Rúdagí reached this verse, the Amír was so much affected that he descended from his throne, all unbooted bestrode the horse which was on sentry-duty, and set off for Bukhárá so precipitately that they carried his leggings and riding-boots after him for two parasangs... nor did he draw rein anywhere till he reached Bukhárá...³⁵

Under the Turkish dynasty of the Ghaznavids (977–1186), the center of gravity shifted to Ghazna (present-day Ghaznī), Panjāb and parts of Sind. During the reign of Sulṭān Maḥmūd (999–1030), the most powerful member of the dynasty, Ghaznavid authority extended not far beyond the right bank of the Oxus in the north, so as to include the ancient kingdom of Khvārazm, which had only nominally formed part of the Samanid Empire.³⁶ In May 1040, Maḥmūd's successor Mas'ūd I suffered a decisive defeat at the hands of the Saljūqs, who had begun to move across the Oxus a decade earlier and occupied Marv in 1036.³⁷ Tughril Bēg (r. 429–455/1038–1063), the founder of the Saljūq dynasty (1040–1195), gained control over the former Ghaznavid dominions in the east and the Buyid lands in western and southern Persia. Over the following century, Marv served as the center of the Saljūq administration in the eastern part of the realm. While Tughril Bēg moved his capital westward from Nīshāpūr to Ray and Iṣfahān, his relatives holding the province of Khurāsān as an appanage came on an equal footing, or nearly so, with the central rulers, at times even assuming authority in the western parts of the realm. In the Saljūq era, Marv served as the seat of government for the two most famous governors of Khurāsān, Tughril Bēg's brother Chaghri Bēg (r. 428–452/1036–1060) and Aḥmad Sanjar b. Malik Shāh (r. 511–552/1118–1157), who assumed an almighty position in Khurāsān and northern Persia and relegated his nephews in western Persia and Iraq to an inferior position.³⁸

The next profound reshuffling of regional concepts occurred in the aftermath of the Mongol invasion of 1220, the brunt of which was borne by the urban centers of Transoxiana and Khurāsān. In the course of their far-ranging and constant movements, the Mongols created territorial divisions that reflected new and expanded notions of space. The nomad populations (*ulūs*) allotted to the four sons of Chingiz Khān (d. 624/1227) and his chief wife gradually came to be associated with fixed territories,³⁹ and the Oxus re-emerged as a dividing line. Transoxiana and its Inner Asian neighbor Mughūlistān fell to the patrimony of Chingiz Khān's second son Chaghatai (d. 1242), and Khvārazm and the lower Sīr Daryā became part of the Golden Horde under Chingiz Khān's grandson Batu b. Jochi (d. 1255) and his descendants for the next 140 years.⁴⁰ Subsequent to the conquest of Iran, Mesopotamia, Anatolia and the Caucasus by Chingiz Khān's grandson Hülegü b. Toluy (d. 1265) in 1255–59, the representation of Iran as a territorial unit regained currency. Indeed the Ilkhanid state (1256–1335) assumed proportions reminiscent of the Sasanian Empire. The center of gravity shifted to western Persia, with Tabrīz serving as capital from 1265–1305 and turning into a hub of political, economic and cultural life. Meanwhile, the regions adjoining the Oxus became an embattled zone between Iran and the Ulūs Chaghatai, and suffered further economic damage in the process.⁴¹

Implying territorial division on the basis of Chingizid lineages, Mongol "Ulūsism"⁴² proved to be a lasting legacy. Henceforth, sovereignty was associated with Chingizid descent, and this linkage was to shape

³⁵ Browne 1921: 33–36. See also *Chahār maqāla* 145–9; Browne 1951 I: 16–17; Landau 2011: 16–17.

³⁶ Bosworth, „Khvārazm,” *E.I.*, 2 IV: 1063.

³⁷ Spuler, „Ghaznavids,” *E.I.*, 2 II: 1050; Bosworth, „Saldjūkids,” *E.I.*, 2 VIII: 938; Cahen, „Čaghri-Beg,” *E.I.*, 2 II: 4.

³⁸ Bosworth 1968: 49, 150–5; Bosworth, „Khurāsān,” *E.I.*, 2 V: 58; Bosworth, „Marw al-Shāhidjān,” *E.I.*, 2 VI: 620; Bosworth, „Saldjūkids,” *E.I.*, 2 VIII: 939–43.

³⁹ The term *ulūs* designates a coalition of tribal groups in the service of a Mongol ruler (Doerfer 1963 I: 175). According to Jackson, the awards allotted to Chingiz Khān's relatives in the early thirteenth century were by no means static. He describes the *ulūs* as an “extremely complex pattern of rights over tribal elements, colonies of enslaved subject peoples, and grazing grounds, with perhaps the addition of nearby cities and their agricultural hinterlands”. In the course of the later thirteenth century, these domains consolidated into more clearly delineated possessions of fewer Chingizid princes (Jackson 1999: 27–28, 31, 35).

⁴⁰ Bosworth, „Khvārazm,” *E.I.*, 2 IV: 1064.

⁴¹ Bosworth, „Khurāsān,” *E.I.*, 2 V: 58; Fragner 2001: 348–9; Gronke 2003: 56–7; Spuler, „Īl-Khāns,” *E.I.*, 2 II: 1120–3.

⁴² Fragner 2001b: 347–8.

the strategy and the mental map of the subsequent political actors well into the eighteenth century. A case in point is the famous Central Asian conqueror Tīmūr Lang, who gained legitimacy by styling himself *güregen*, “royal son-in-law” of a Chingizid family.⁴³ Between 1370 and 1405, Tīmūr Lang forged Transoxiana, Khvārazm and Iran into one political entity, in effect uniting the *ulūs* of Chaghatai and Hülegü.⁴⁴ At the height of its power, the Timurid empire covered the entire expanse from Transoxiana in the east to the Euphrates and the Caucasus in the west.⁴⁵ While Khvārazm remained the bone of contention between the Timurids and the Golden Horde Khāns for most of the fifteenth century, Khurāsān and Transoxiana became the heartlands of the empire and experienced a substantial economic revival. Tīmūr’s son Shāh Rukh (r. 1409–1447) shifted the capital from Samarqand to Herat, leaving the administration of Transoxiana to his son Ulugh Bēg (d. 1449). This period witnessed an unparalleled flowering of architecture, literature and science.⁴⁶

Subsequent rulers fashioned their ideas of sovereignty and entitlement according to a Chingizid and/or Timurid mold. While the Chingizid “constitution”⁴⁷ shaped ideas of legitimacy, it was the model of Tīmūr-i Lang that was invoked by the Abu al-Khairids, Safavids, and Nādir Shāh alike. This eagerness to claim Tīmūr’s heritage highlights the selective nature of historical memory, which is often informed by current interests and amalgamates some historical instances into notions of continuity while ignoring others.

Timurid rule coincided with the division of Iran into an eastern and a western force field, with Herat and Tabrīz as focal points. In the west, the Turkmen Qarā Quyūnlū and Āq Quyūnlū tribal confederations used their footholds in Eastern Anatolia to expand into western Iran. Formally a vassal of Shāh Rukh, the Qarā Quyūnlū ruler Jahān Shāh (r. 843–872/1439–1467) made Tabrīz his capital. In 1467, Ūzūn Ḥasan Āq Quyūnlū (r. 861–882/1457–1478) entered the stage. Having defeated Jahān Shāh Qarā Quyūnlū and the Timurid ruler Abū Sa‘īd (r. 855–873/1451–1469), he seized Tabrīz and reduced the Timurid realm to Khurāsān and Transoxiana.⁴⁸ The importance Herat and Tabrīz enjoyed in the late fifteenth century is highlighted by the Khurasanian poet Ḥusain Abīvardī Faizī, who described them as two of the four “thrones” in the Islamic world, the other two being the Ottoman capital of Istanbul and the Arab lands under the Mamlūk capital of Cairo.⁴⁹ His statement confirms the evolution of Iran into a double-headed realm during this period.

The rise of the Safavid dynasty in the early sixteenth century coincided with the creation of two powerful political entities of Chingizid origin. Based in Agra, the Mughal rulers (1526–1858) laid claim to the eastern parts of present-day Afghanistan and opposed their Iranian neighbors over the possession of Qandahār. Of more immediate concern to the Safavids were the Abu al-Khairid (Shibanid) rulers of Transoxiana (1501–1599) and their repeated attempts to impose their authority over Khurāsān. Abu al-Khairid activity in Khurāsān peaked for the first time in the early sixteenth century. In 1510 the confrontation between Shāh Ismā‘īl I (r. 907–930/1501–1524) and Muḥammad Khān Shībānī over the possession of Marv resulted in the death of the Chingizid leader and was followed by the designation of the Oxus as borderline between the Safavid and Abu al-Khairid dominions.⁵⁰ Herat nevertheless changed hands several times until the death of the famous Abu al-Khairid general and later *khān* ‘Ubaidullāh, in 1540.⁵¹ Between 1588 and 1598 the Uzbek troops led by ‘Abdullāh Khān (r. 991–1006/1583–1598) and his son ‘Abd al-Mu‘min again made their presence felt in Khurāsān.⁵²

⁴³ Manz, “Tīmūr Lang,” *E. I.*, 2 X: 511.

⁴⁴ Fragner 2001: 349.

⁴⁵ Gronke 2003: 60.

⁴⁶ Bosworth, “Khvārazm,” *E. I.*, 2 IV: 1064; Bosworth, “Khurāsān,” *E. I.*, 2 V: 59; Hajianpur 1991: 165–7.

⁴⁷ McChesney 1993: 74–5.

⁴⁸ Minorsky-[Bosworth], “Tabrīz,” *E. I.*, 2 X: 43–5; Roemer 1976.

⁴⁹ Ḥusain Abīvardī Faizī, “Chār takht,” ed. Īraj Afshār, *Farhang-i Īranzamīn* 15 (1347/1968). See also Woods 1999: 134 fn. 36.

⁵⁰ Szuppe 1992: 81.

⁵¹ Hambly 1991f: 178–9; Roemer 1986d: 217, 236–9; Szuppe 1992: 84–7, 94, 99, 108–9.

⁵² Müller 1964: 46–7, 62–5, 78.