

# HISTORY OF IRAN

Dr. Yasin Rizvi

## GEOGRAPHY

IRAN has an area of 1,645,000 square kilometres (628,000 square miles) or about one-fifth of that of the United States. It is bounded on the north by the Soviet Union and the Caspian Sea, on the east by Afghanistan and Pakistan, on the south by the Persian Gulf, and on the west by Iraq and Turkey. Iran lies within the Alpine-Himalayan system of tertiary folding, and consists of three principal zones—the Elburz Mountains in the north, the Zagros Mountains in the west and south, and the central plateau. The Zagros, the country's biggest mountain system, is composed of a great series of parallel folds, up to 300 kilometres across and with a general northwest-southeast trend; the Elburz, a somewhat narrower series of folds just south of the Caspian, runs from west to east. Both the Zagros and the Elburz attain great elevations, culminating in the peak of Demavand, Iran's highest mountain. Demavand, an extinct volcano 5670 metres (18,600 feet) in height, is situated nearly 100 kilometres northeast of Tehran, and its perfect snow-capped cone is clearly visible from the city. The central plateau, averaging about 1400 metres in height, is crossed by lesser ranges of mountains, and contains several large depressions. Outside these main divisions are the salt lands of Khuzistan, at the head of the Persian Gulf, which are

geographically part of the Mesopotamian plain, and the narrow coastal plain of the Caspian in the north, which has a maximum width of about 110 kilometres.

Two great deserts, the Dasht-i-Lut and the Dasht-i-Kavir, occupy a large part of the central plateau, and together account for one sixth of the total area of Iran. Both contain stony plains and ranges of barren hills, sand dunes, salt lakes and stretches of saline soil. The Kavir, or salt desert, is the remains of an inland sea, and consists partly of very saline soil and partly of solid salt or marshy stretches overlaid with a thick salt crust. These latter areas are dangerous or impassable. The rest of the central plateau consists of semi desert or steppe.

There are four main drainage systems—the Persian Gulf, the Caspian, the basins of the central plateau and Lake Rezaiyeh in the northwest. The chief river flowing into the Persian Gulf is the Karun, Iran's only navigable river, which rises in the Zagros and is joined on the Khuzistan plain by the Ab-i Diz and Karkheh. The Karun is navigable by small vessels for over 100 kilometres. The principal rivers flowing into the Caspian are the Aras, Atrek, Sefid Rud, Chahin, Haraz, Lar and Gorgan, all of which are short and unnavigable. Rivers flowing into the areas of inland drainage are few in number, and many are seasonal ; they terminate in salt lakes or marshes, or sink into the sands of the desert. Wherever they occur, villages and towns are to be found. The largest and best known of these inland rivers is the Zayandeh Rud, the river of Isfahan.

The Persian Gulf, which bounds Iran on the south, is a shallow, almost landlocked arm of the Arabian Sea, over a thousand kilometres in length and nearly 500 kilometres across at its widest part, and connected with the ocean by the narrow Straits of Hormuz. The Persian Gulf contains many islands, and numerous shoals and coral reefs. It has been called the hottest body of water in the world.

The Caspian Sea also known in Iran as the Sea of Mazandaran, measures some 900 kilometres in length by up to 450 kilometres in width, and forms the world's largest landlocked body of water. In the north it is shallow, but in the central and southern portions there are two deep basins separated by a submarine ridge running from west to east. The salinity of the water is less than that of average seawater. The level of the Caspian has fluctuated in historical times, mainly owing to climatic variations. Another factor, however, is the changes in the course of the Oxus, which at some periods has flowed into the Caspian and at others—as at present—into the Aral Sea. The level of the Caspian is now some 30 metres below sea level, and is still falling.

Of the lakes of Iran, the largest is Lake Rezaiyeh in Azarbaijan, which is roughly 130 kilometres in length and 30 in width, and has an average depth of only about six metres. Its salinity is extremely high—greater even than that of the Dead Sea.

## Population

According to the last census, the population of Iran in 1956 was 18'9 million. The average annual increase is estimated at 2'5 per cent. which gives a population of 23'4 million for 1965. The average density of population, only 12 per square kilometre in 1956, is nearer 14 today. It reaches 44.7 per square kilometer in the central province containing Tehran and 33'5 in the Caspian province of Gilan ; it is lowest in the arid regions of Baluchistan and Sistan, where in an area of 178,000 square kilometres the total population is under half a million and the average density 2'4 per square kilometre.

The country is divided into thirteen provinces, of which ten are known by number as well as name. These provinces, and their population, are as follows :

Province	Population (millions)	Provincial capital
1. Gilan	1.6	Rasht
Mazandaran and Gorgan	1.7	Sari
3. East Azarbaijan	2.1	Tabriz
4. West Azarbaijan	0.7	Rezaiyeh
5. Kermanshah	1.4	Kermanshah

6. Khuzistan	2.1	Ahwaz
7. Fars	1.3	Shiraz
8. Kerman	0.8	Kerman
9. Khorasan	2.0	Meshed
10. Isfahan and Yazd	1.5	Isfahan
11. Central	2.7	Tehran
12. Baluchistan and Sistan	0.4	Zahedan
13. Kurdistan	0.6	Sanandaj
	—	
	18.9	

The population of Iran is 70 per cent rural and 30 per cent urban, and tribesmen form some 15 per cent of the whole. Of the male working population of 53 million in 1956, 57 percent were engaged in agriculture, 14 percent in industry and 29 percent in other occupations. There are 186 towns of 5000 persons or more, and about 50,000 villages with population of under 5000. Tehran, the capital city, contained 1'5 million people in 1956, since when the figure has risen to around 2 million.

### **Race, Language, Religion**

The Iranian race is descended mainly from the old Indo-European stock, but with large admixture of other racial strains, of which Turkish is the chief. The Turkomans of the northeast and the Qashqai tribe in the south are of largely Mongolian ancestry, while many Iranians in the Persian Gulf area are of Arab origin. Racial, linguistic and religious differences are to some extent related. Persian, the chief language, is spoken by over half of the population. Next in importance comes the group of five main Persian dialects, named after the regions in which they are found, followed by dialects of Turkish, spoken in Azarbaijan, in the northeast and other areas. Language divisions according to 1956 census were as follows

Persian	9,
500,000	

Persian dialects : Gilaki	1,160,000
---------------------------	-----------

Luri	1,080,000
------	-----------

Kurdish	1,060,000
---------	-----------

Mazandarani	920,000
-------------	---------

Baluchi	430,000
---------	---------

4,650,000	
-----------	--

---

Total Persian group	
---------------------	--

14,150,000	
------------	--

Azarbaijani Turkish	3,900,000	
Turkomani	330,000	
<hr/>		
Total Turkish group		4,
230,000		
Arabic	380,000	
Armenian	115,000	
Syriac	70,000	
Pushtoo, Tajiki, Taleshi	15,000	
Total other languages		
580,000		
<hr/>		
Total		
18,960,000		

The official religion of the country, the Shiah sect of Islam, is held by the great majority of the population. The largest minority group are the two million Kurds, Turkomans, Baluchis and Persians of Arab descent who are adherents of the Sunni sect of

Islam. Other religious minorities are the Armenians, Jews, Assyrians, other Christian groups, Zoroastrians and Ismailis.

## ANCIENT HISTORY

“Persia”, in the strict significance of the word, denotes the country inhabited by the people designed as Persians, i.e., the district known in antiquity as Persis, the modern Fars. Custom, however, has extended the name to the whole Iranian plateau; and it is in this sense that the term Persia is here employed, though in 1935 its name was officially established as “Iran”.

In historical times we find the major portion of Iran occupied by peoples of Indo-European origin, calling themselves Aryans and their language Aryan—so in the inscriptions of Darius—the same name used by the consanguineous tribes of India who were their nearest relations. The whole country is designated Ariana—”the land of the Aryans”—the original of the Middle-Persian Eran and the modern Iran; the Greek geographers Eratosthenes and Strabo were in error when they limited the name to the eastern districts of Iran. Thus the name of Iranians is understood to comprehend all these people of Aryan derivation.

Besides the Iranians, numerous tribes of alien origin were found in Iran. In Baluchistan, even now, we find side by side with the eponymous Iranian inhabitants, who only penetrated there a few centuries ago, the ethnologically and philologically distinct race of the Brahui, who are probably connected with the



Dravidians of India. In them we may trace the original population of these districts; and to the same original population may be assigned the tribes there settled in antiquity: the Paricanii and Gedrosii, and the Myci, to whom the name “Aethiopians” is also occasionally applied. In Media the Greek geographers mention a people of Anariacae, i.e., “Non-Aryans.” To these the Tapuri, Amardi, Caspii, and especially the Cadusii or Gelae—situated in Gilan on the Caspian—probably belonged. In the chain of Zagros we find, in Babylonian and Assyrian times, no trace of Iranians; but numerous smaller tribes that we can refer to no known ethnological group, e.g. the Gutaeans and Lulubeans, the Cossaei and in Elymais or Susiana the Elymaeans.

That the Iranians must have come from the east to their later home, is sufficiently proved by their close relationship to the Indians, in conjunction with whom they previously formed a single people, bearing the name Arya. Their residence must have lain chiefly in the great steppe which stretches north of the Black sea and the Caspian, through south Russia, to Turan and the Oxus and Iaxartes. For here we continually discover traces of Iranian nationality. The names and words of the Scythians in south Russia, which Herodotus has preserved, are for the most part perfectly transparent Iranian formations, among them are many proper names in Aria and Aspa. The predatory tribes of Turan seem to have belonged to the same stock. These tribes are distinguished by the Iranian peasants as Dahae “enemies,” “robbers”; by the Persians as Sacae; and by the Greeks as Scythians.

From the region of the steppes the Aryans must have penetrated into the cultivable land of eastern Iran ; thence one part spread over the district of the Indus, then on again to the Ganges ; another moved westward to Zagros and the borders of the Semitic world.

The date of this migration cannot yet be determined with certainty. We know only that the Aryans of India already occupied the Punjab in the Vedic era, c. 1200 B.C. On the other hand, Aryan names appear at first in contemporary documents from the 16th century B.C. down-ward in Mesopotamia and Syria. In the kingdom of Mitanni, the Aryan origin of the dynasty is proved by the names of the kings; in a treaty the Indian gods Mitra and Varuna, Indra and the Nasatyas are invoked by the side of the Mitannian gods, and in the archives of Boghazkeui a book on horse races written by a Mitannian, named Kikkuli, has been found, in which Indian numerals and other Indian words are used. Among the dynasts of Syria and Palestine whose correspondence to their sovereign, the Pharaoh of Egypt, is preserved in the archives of Tel-el-Amarana, many bear Iranian names, e.g. Artamanya, Arzawiya, Shuwardata, and their portraits are represented in Egyptian reliefs. Later still, in the Assyrian inscriptions we occasionally meet with Iranian names borne by North-Syrian princes—e.g., Kundaspi and Kustaspi.

It appears, then, that toward the middle of the second millennium before Christ, in the time of the Hyksos empire, the early Iranian tribes made a great forward movement to the west,

at first probably in the role of mercenaries. In the Egyptian and Hittite texts they form a ruling military class under the Aryan name “Marianni,” i.e. warriors. Some of their leaders founded principalities of their own in Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine. With this we may probably connect the well-known fact that it was about this very period that the horse made its appearance in Babylonia, Egypt and Greece, where for centuries subsequently its use was confined to war and the war chariot. Before this it was as foreign to the Babylonians, even in the time of Hummurabi, as to the Egyptians under the XII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty. On the other hand, it had been familiar to the Aryans from time immemorial; indeed they have always been peculiarly a people of riders.

### **The Achaemenids**

A connected chain of historical evidence begins with the time when under Shalmaneser, the Assyrians in 836 B.c. began for the first time to penetrate farther into the mountains of the east ; and there, in addition to several non-Iranian people, subdued a few Median tribes. These wars were continued under successive kings, till the Assyrian power in these regions attained its zenith under Sargon who led into exile the Median chief Dayuku, a vassal of the Mini, with all his family, and subjugated the princes of Media as far as the mountain of Bikni and the border of the great desert. At that time 28 Median “town-lords” paid tribute to Nineveh; two years later, no fewer than 46. Sargon's successors down to Assurbani-pal maintained and even augmented their suzerainty

over Media. Not till the last years of Assurbani-pal, on which the extant Assyrian annals are silent, can an independent Median empire have arisen.

In 612 B.C. Nineveh and the other capitals of the Assyrian empire were conquered and destroyed by Cyaxares of Media and Nebopolassar of Babylon, and the provinces divided between the victors. The Median empire extended far over Iran; the Kings of Persia also became their vassals. In the west, Armenia and Cappadocia were subdued by Cyaxares; in a war with the Lydian empire the decisive battle was broken off by the celebrated eclipse of the sun on May 28,585 B.C. After this a peace was arranged by Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon and Syennesis of Cilicia, recognizing the Halys as the borderline. The great powers of the near east remained in this state of equilibrium during the first half of the 6<sup>th</sup> century.

The balance, however, was disturbed when Cyrus, king of Anshan in Elam, revolted against his suzerain Astyages, the son of Cyaxares, and three years later defeated him at Pasargadae. Shortly afterwards Astyages was taken prisoner, Ecbatana reduced, and the Median empire replaced by the Persian. The Persian tribes were welded by Cyrus into a single nation, and now became the foremost people in the world. At first Nabonidus of Babylon hailed the fall of the Medes with delight and utilized the opportunity by occupying Harran. But before long he recognized the danger threatened from that quarter. Cyrus and his Persians paid little heed to the treaties which the Median king had

concluded with the other powers; and the result was a great coalition against him, embracing Nabonidus of Babylon, Amasis of Egypt, Croesus of Lydia, and the Spartans. In the spring of 546 B.C., Croesus opened the attack. Cyrus flung himself upon him, beat him at Pteria in Cappadocia and pursued him to Lydia. A second victory followed on the banks of the Pactolus; by the autumn of 546 Sardis had already fallen and the Persian power advanced at a bound to the Mediterranean. In the course of the next few years the Greek littoral towns were reduced, as also the Carians and Lycians. The king of Cilicia voluntarily acknowledged the Persian suzerainty. In 539 Nabonidus was defeated and Babylon occupied, while, with the Chaldean empire, Syria and Palestine also became Persian. The east of Iran was further subdued, and, after Cyrus met his end in a war against the eastern nomads, his son Cambyses conquered Egypt. Cyprus and the Greek islands on the coast of Asia Minor also submitted, Samos being taken by Darius. On the other hand, an expedition by Cambyses against the Ethiopian Kingdom of Napata and Meroe came to grief in Nubia. The usurpation of Smerdis and his death at the hands of Darius was the signal for numerous insurrections in Babylon, Susiana, Persis, Media, Armenia and many of the eastern provinces. But, within two years, they were all crushed by Darius and his generals.

The causes of this astonishing success, which, in the brief space of a single generation, raised a previously obscure and secluded tribe to the mastery of the whole Western Asia, can only be partially discerned from the evidence at our disposal. The

decisive factor was of course their military superiority. The chief weapon of the Persians, as of all Iranians, was the bow, which accordingly the king himself holds in his portraits, e.g., on the Behistun rock and the coins. In addition to the bow, the Persians carried short lances and short daggers. But it was not by these weapons, nor by hand-to-hand fighting, that the Persian victories were won. They overwhelmed their enemy under a hail of arrows, and never allowed him to come to close quarters. While the infantry kneeled to shoot, the cavalry swarmed round the hostile squadrons, threw their lines into confusion, and completed their discomfiture by a vigorous pursuit. In a charge the infantry also might employ lance and dagger; but the essential point was that the archers should be mobile and their use of the bow unhampered.

To all this should be added the superiority of their leaders; Cyrus especially must have been an exceedingly able general. Obviously, also, he must have understood the art of organizing his people. In his time the Persians were a strong manly peasantry, domiciled in a healthy climate and habituated to all hardships—a point repeatedly emphasized, in the tales preserved by Herodotus, as the cause of their successes. Herodotus, however, also records that the Persians were “o all mankind the readiest to adopt foreign customs, good or bad," which goes far to explain, not merely their successes, but also the character of their empires.

The fundamental features of the imperial organization must have been due to Cyrus himself. Darius followed in his steps and

complete, the vast structure. His role, indeed, was peculiarly that of supplementing and perfecting the work of his great predecessor. The organization of the empire was planned throughout on broad free lines ; there was nothing mean or timorous in it. The great god Ahura Mazda, who .l king and people alike acknowledged, had given them dominion “over this earth afar, over many peoples and tongues” and the consciousness was strong in them that they were masters of the world. Thu their sovereign styled himself the “king of kings” and the “king o the lands”—that is to say, of the whole civilized world, for the provinces remaining unsubdued on the extreme frontiers to the west, the north and the east were in their view almost negligible quantities And far removed as the Persians were from disavowing their proud sense of identity, yet equally vivid was the feeling that they ruled the whole civilised world, that their task was to reduce it to unity, an that by the will of Ahura Mazda they were pledged to govern it aright.

This is most clearly seen in the treatment of the subject races. In contrast with the Assyrians and the Romans, the Persians invariably conducted their wars with great humanity. The vanquished kings were honourably dealt with, the enemy's towns were spared, except when grave offenses and insurrections, as at Miletus and Athens, rendered punishment imperative; and their inhabitants were treated with mildness. Like Cyrus, all his successors welcomed members of the conquered races to their service, employed them as administrators or generals and made them grants of land ; and this not only in the case of Medes, but

also of Armenians, Lydians, Jews and Greeks. The whole population of the empire was alike bound to military service. The subject-contingents stood side by side with the Persian troops; and the garrisons—in Egypt, for instance—were composed of the most varied nationalities.

Among the subject races the Medes particularly stood high in favour. Darius in his inscriptions always names them immediately after the Persians. They were the predecessors of the Persians in the empire and the more civilised people. Their institutions, court ceremonial and dress were all adopted by the Achaemenids. Thus the tribal distinctions began to recede, and the ground was prepared for that amalgamation of the Iranians into a single, uniform racial unit, which under the Sassanians was completely perfected—at least for the west of Iran.

The lion's share, indeed, fell to the dominant race itself. The inhabitants of Persia proper paid no taxes. Instead, they brought the best of their possessions as a gift to their king on festival days; peasants meeting him on his excursions did the same. In recompense for this, he distributed on his return rich presents to every Persian man and woman—the women of Pasargadae, who were members of Cyrus's tribe, each receiving a piece of gold. In relation to his Persians, he was always the people's king. At his accession he was consecrated in the temple of a warrior goddess at Pasargadae, and partook of the simple meal of the old peasant days—a mess of figs, terebinths and sour milk. The Persians swore allegiance to him and prayed to Ahura Mazda for his life



and the welfare of the people, while he vowed to Protect them against every attack, and to judge and govern them as did his fathers before him. For helpers he had at his side the “law-bearers”. These—the Persian judges—were nominated by the king for life, and generally bequeathed their office to their sons. The royal decision was based on consultation with the great ones of his people; and such was the case with his officials and governors everywhere.

Every Persian able to bear arms was bound to serve the king—the great landowners on horseback, the commonalty on foot. The noble and well-to-do, who did not need to till their fields in person, were pledged to appear at court as frequently as possible. Their children were brought up in company with the princes “at the gates of the king”, instructed in the handling of arms, in riding and hunting, and introduced to the service of the state and the knowledge of the law, as well as the commandments of religion. Then such as proved their worth were called to high office and rewarded, generally with grants of land.

The highest rank was held by the descendants of the six great families, whose heads stood by Darius at the killing of the Magian. These enjoyed the right of entering the presence unannounced, and possessed princely estates in the provinces. Besides these, however, numbers of other Persians were dispatched to the provinces, settled there, and endowed with lands. There existed, in fact, under the Achaemenids, a strong colonising movement, diffused through the whole empire ; traces of this policy occur

more especially in Armenia, Cappadocia and Lycia, but also in the rest of Asia Minor, and not rarely in Syria and Egypt. These colonists formed the nucleus of the provincial military levy, and were a tower of strength to the Persian dominion. They composed, moreover, the Persian council and vice-regal household of the Satraps, exactly as the Persians of the home country composed that of the king.

Though the world-empire of Persia was thus deeply impressed by a national character, care was nevertheless exercised that the general duties and interests of the subject races should receive due consideration. We find their representatives, side by side with the Persians, occupying every sort of position in the regal and vice-regal courts. They took their part in the councils of the satraps, precisely as they did in military service and they, too, were rewarded by bounties and estates. To wield a peaceful authority over all the subjects of the empire, to reward merit, and to punish transgression—such was the highest task of king and officials.

On his native soil Cyrus had built a town, with a palace and a tomb, in the district of Pasargadae. This Darius replaced by a new capital, deeper in the centre of the country, which bore the name Persis, the Persepolis of the later Greeks. But the district of Persis was too remote to be the administrative centre of a world-empire. The natural centre lay, rather, in the ancient fertile tract on the lower Tigris and Euphrates. The actual capital of the empire was therefore Susa, where Darius I and Artaxerxes II erected their magnificent palaces. The winter months the kings spent chiefly in

Babylon; the hot summer, in the cooler situation of Ecbatana, where Darius and Xerxes built a residence on Mt. Elvend, south of the city. From a palace of Artaxerx II in Ecbatana itself the fragments of a few inscribed columns have been preserved. To Persepolis the kings paid only occasional visits especially at their coronations.

### **Method of Government**

Within the empire, the two great civilised states incorporated by Cyrus and Cambyses, Babylon and Egypt, occupied a position of their own. After his defeat of Nabonidus, Cyrus proclaimed himself “king of Babel” ; and the same title was borne by Cambyses, Smerdis and Darius. So, in Egypt, Cambyses adopted in full the titles of the Pharaohs. In this we may trace a desire to conciliate the native population, with the object of maintaining the fiction that the old state still continued. Darius went still farther. He encouraged the efforts of the Egyptian priesthood in every way, built temples, and enacted new laws in continuance of the old order. In Babylon his procedure was presumably similar, though here we possess no local evidence. But he lived to see that his policy had missed its goal. In 486 B.c. Egypt revolted and was only reduced by Xerxes in 484. It was this, probably, that induced him in 484 to renounce his tide of “King of Babel”, and to remove from its temple the golden statue of Bel-Marduk, whose hands the king was bound to clasp on the first day of each year. This proceeding led to two insurrections in Babylon, which were

speedily repressed. After that the “kingship of Babel” was definitely abolished. In Egypt the Persian kings still retained the style of the Pharaohs ; but we hear no more of concessions to the priesthood or to the old institutions, and, apart from the great oasis of el-Kharga, no more temples were erected.

At the head of the court and the imperial administration stood the commandant of the body-guard—the 10,000 “Immortals”, often depicted in the sculptures of Persepolis with lances surmounted by golden apples. This grandee corresponds to the modern vizier. In addition to him, we find seven councilors. Among the other officials, the “eye of the king” is frequently mentioned. To him was entrusted the control of the whole empire and the superintendence of all officials. The orders of the court were issued in a very simple form of the cuneiform script, probably invented by the Medes. This comprised of 36 signs, almost all of which denote single sounds. In the royal inscriptions, a translation into Susan (Elamitic) and Babylonian was always appended to the Persian text. In Egypt one in hieroglyphics was added, as in the inscriptions of the Suez canal; in the Grecian provinces, another in Greek. The cuneiform script could only be written on stone or clay. Thus there has been discovered in Babylon a copy of the Behistun inscription preserved on a block of dolerite. For administrative purposes, however, it would seem that this in-convenient material was not employed, its place being taken by skins, the use of which was adopted from the western peoples of the empire. On these were further written the journals and records kept at the court. With such materials the cuneiform

script could not be used; instead, the Persian language was written in Aramaic characters, a method which later led to the so-called Pahlavi, i.e. Parthian script. This mode of writing was employed in the state-services from Darius I ; and so may be explained the fact that, under the Achaemenids, the Persian language rapidly declined, and, in the inscriptions of Artaxerxes III, only appears in an extremely neglected guise.

Side by side with the Persian, the Aramaic, which had long been widely diffused as the speech of commerce, enjoyed currency in all the western half of the empire as a second dominant language. Thus all deeds, enactments and records designed for these provinces were furnished with an official Aramaic version. To the three cuneiform inscriptions of his tomb at Naqsh-i-Rustam, Darius added an Aramaic version; and of the account of his deeds in the inscription in Behistun he distributed copies in Aramaic over his empire ; of one of these, written in beautiful characters, large fragments have been preserved in the papyri of the Jewish garrison at Elephantine, together with numerous documents in the same tongue. The coins minted by the satraps and generals usually bear an Aramaic inscription. The Demotic in Egypt was employed in private documents. In the Hellenic provinces of the empire Greek replaced Aramaic.

## **Provincial Organization**

Darius I divided the Persian empire into 20 great provinces, satrapies, with a “guardian of the country” at the head of each. Each satrapy was again subdivided into several minor governorships. The satrap levied the taxes, controlled the legal procedure, was responsible for the security of roads and property, and superintended the subordinate districts. The heads of the great military centres of the empire and the commandants of the royal fortresses were outside his jurisdiction; yet the satraps were entitled to a body of troops of their own, a privilege which they used to the full, especially in late periods. The satrap was held in his position as a subject by the controlling machinery of the empire, especially the “eye of the king”; by the council of Persians in his province with whom he was bound to debate all matters of importance; and by the army; while in the hands of the messengers the government despatches travelled “swifter than the crane” along the great imperial highways, which were all provided with regular postal stations. Within the satrapies the subject races and communities occupied a tolerably independent position; for instance, the Jews, under their elders and priests, convened a popular assembly in Jerusalem. Obviously also, they enjoyed, as a rule, the privilege of deciding lawsuits among themselves.

### **Coinage, Commerce and Civilization**

The provinces of the empire differed as materially in economy as in organization. In the extreme west, a money currency in its most highly developed form—that of coinage minted by the state,

or an autonomous community—had developed since the seventh century among the Lydians and Greeks. In Egypt, Syria, Phoenicia and Babylonia, the old mode of commerce was still in vogue, conducted by means of gold and silver bars, weighed at each transaction ; a money currency only began to make headway in these districts in the 4th century B.c. In the eastern provinces, on the other hand, the primitive method of exchange by barter still held the field. Only in the civilized frontier districts of India did a system of coinage find early acceptance. There Persian and Attic money was widely distributed, and imitations of it struck in the 5th and 4th pre-Christian centuries.

Thus the empire was compelled to grapple with all these varied conditions and to reconcile them as best it might. At the court, “natural economy” was still the rule. The officials and troops received payment in kind. They were fed “by the table of the king”, from which 15,000 men daily drew their sustenance and were rewarded by gifts and assignments of land. The Greek mercenaries, on the contrary, had to be paid in currency; nor could the satraps of the west dispense with hard cash. The king, again, needed the precious metals, not merely for bounties and rewards, but for important enterprises in which money payment was imperative. Consequently, the royal revenues and taxes were paid partly in the precious metals, partly in natural produce—horses and cattle, grain, clothing and its materials, furniture and all articles of industry. The satraps, also in addition to money payments, levied contributions “for their table”, at which the officials ate.

The precious metals brought in by the tribute were collected in the great treasure-houses at Susa, Persepolis, Pasargadae and Ecbatana, where gigantic masses of silver and, more especially, of gold were stored in the bullion or partially wrought into vessels exactly as was the case over 2000 years later in the Shah's treasure chamber. When the king required money he minted as much as was necessary. A reform in the coinage was effected by Darius, who struck the daric ; a gold piece of 130 grains, this being equivalent to 20 silver pieces of 86.5 grains. The, coinage of gold was the exclusive prerogative of the king; silver could be coined by the satraps, generals, independent communities and dynasts.

The extent of the Persian empire was, in essentials, defined by the great conquests of Cyrus and Cambyses. Darius' role was to round off the empire and secure its borders: for this purpose in Asia Minor and Armenia he subdued the mountain tribes and advanced the frontier a. far as the Caucasus. He also annexed the Indus valley and the auriferous hill-country of Kafistan and Kashmir, as well as the Dardae in Dardistan on the Indus. From this point he directed several campaigns against the Amyrgian Sacae, on the Pamir Plateau and northwards, whom he enumerates in his list of subject races, and whose mounted archers formed a main division of the armies despatched against the Greeks. It was obviously an attempt to take the nomads of the Turanian steppe in the rear and to reduce them to quiescence, which led to his unfortunate expedition against the Scythians of the Russian steppes.



Side by side with these wars, we can read, even in the scanty tradition at our disposal, a consistent effort to further the great civilizing mission imposed on the empire. In the district of Herat, Darius established a great water-basin, designed to facilitate the cultivation of the steppe. The desire to create a direct communication between the seclusion of Persis and the commerce of the world is evident in his foundation of several harbours on the Persian coast. But this design is still, more patent in his completion of a great canal, already begun by Necho, from the Nile to Suez, along which several monuments of Darius have been preserved. Thus it was possible, as says the remnant of an hieroglyphic inscription there discovered, "for ships to sail direct from the Nile to Persia, over Saba." In course of time it decayed, till it was restored by second Ptolemy. Even the circumnavigation of Africa was attempted under Xerxes.

## **Religion and Art**

It has already been mentioned, that, in his efforts to conciliate the Egyptians, Darius placed his chief reliance on the priesthood, and the Same tendency runs throughout the imperial policy towards the conquered races. Thus Cyrus himself gave the exiled Jews in Babylon permission to return and rebuild Jerusalem. Darius allowed the restoration of the Temple; and Artaxerxes I, by the protection accorded w Ezra and Nehemiah, made the foundation of Judaism possible. Analogously in an edict, of which a later copy is preserved in an inscription, Darius commands

Gadatas, the governor of a domain in magnesia on the Maeander, to observe scrupulously the privileges of the Apollo sanctuary.

The Persian empire of the Achaemenids played a significant role in the development of religion in Western Asia. The definite erection of a single vast, world empire cost them their original connection with the state, and compelled them in future to address themselves, not to the community at large, but to individuals, to promise, not political success nor the independence of the people, but the welfare of the men. Thus they became at once universal and capable of extension by propaganda; and, with this, of entering into keen competition one with the other. These traits are most clearly marked in Judaism; but after the Achaemenid period, they are common to all creeds though our information as to most is scanty in the extreme.

In this competition of religions that of Iran played a most spirited part. The Persian kings—none more so than Darius whose religious convictions are enshrined in his inscriptions—and, with the kings, their people, were ardent professors of the pure doctrine of Zoroaster; and the Persians settled in the provinces diffused this creed throughout the whole empire. Thus a strong Persian propagandism arose especially in Armenia and Cappadocia, where this religion took deep root among the people. In the process, however, important modifications were introduced. In contrast with Judaism, Zoroastrianism did not enter the lists against all gods save its own, but found no difficulty in recognising them as subordinate powers—helpers and servants of

Ahura Mazda. Consequently, the foreign creeds often reacted upon the Persian. In Cappadocia, Aramaic inscriptions have been discovered in which the indigenous god, there termed Bel the king, recognizes the “Mazdayasnian Religion”, i.e., the religion of Ahura Mazda personified as a woman—as his sister and wife.

The gorgeous cult of the gods of other countries with their host of temples, images and festivals, exercised a corresponding influence on the mother country. Thus the old figures of the Aryan cult return to the foreground, there to be amalgamated with the Babylonian divinities. The goddess of springs and streams and of all fertility—Ardisura, Anahita, Anaitis—is endowed with the form of the Babylonian Ishtar and Belit. At her side stands the sun-god Mithra, who is represented as young and victorious here. Both deities occupy the very first rank in the popular creed; while to the theologian they are the most potent of the good powers—Mithra being the herald and propagator of the service of light and the mediator betwixt man and Ahura Mazda, who now fades more into the background. Thus, in the subsequent period, the Persian religion appears purely as the religion of Mithra. The festival of Mithra is the chief festival of the empire, at which the king drinks and is drunken, and dances the national dance. This development culminated under Artaxerxes II, who erected statues to Anaitis in Persepolis, Ecbatana, Bactria, Susa, Babylon, Damascus and Sardis. The truth of this account is proved by the fact that Artaxerxes II and Artaxerxes III are the only Achaemenids who, in their inscriptions, invoke Anaitis and Mithra side by side with Ahura Mazda.

The position of the Persian monarchy as a world empire is characteristically emphasised in the buildings of Darius and Xerxes in Persepolis and Susa. The peculiarly national basis, still recognisable in Cyrus's architecture at Pasargadae, recedes into insignificance. Influences are evident, not only from the old Medean architecture, but also from Egypt, Babylon, to some extent Greece and, in the rock-cut tombs, probably of Asia Minor. Yet the result is Persian, for all these elements are combined into an organic unity, a great style which made possible the greatest architectural complex in the ancient world. Not were the complementary arts any less distinguished, especially sculpture, but also metalwork. But finally, with the collapse of the empire, the imperial art vanished also; when some 500 years later a new native dynasty arose under the Sassanids, a characteristically Persian art grew up again, utilizing traditions of its Achaemenid predecessors, though with many differences, above all in structural methods.

### **Wars Against Greece**

Though, unlike Cyrus and Cambyses, Darius made no new expeditions of conquest, yet a great empire, which is not bounded by another equally great, but touches on many small tribes and independent communities, is inevitably driven to expansion. We have already seen that the attempt of Darius to control the predatory nomads in the north led his expedition against the Scythians; this, again, led to the incorporation of Thrace and

Macedonia, whose king Perdiccas submitted. The Greek cities with their endless feuds and violent internal factions, were incessant in their appeals for intervention. Nevertheless, Darius left European Greece to itself, till the support accorded to the Ionian and Carian insurgents by Athens and Eretria made war inevitable. But not only the expeditions of Mardonius and Datis, but even the care-fully prepared campaigns of Xerxes, in conjunction with Carthage, completely failed.

The wreck of Xerxes' expedition is the turning-point in the history of the Persian empire. The Persians thereafter never found courage to repeat their attack. On the contrary, in 466 B.c. their army and fleet were again defeated by Cimon on the Eurymedon, the sequel being that the Greek provinces on the Asian coast, with all the Thracian possessions, were lost. In itself, indeed, this loss was of no great significance to a vast empire ; and the attempts of Athens to annex Cyprus and conquer the Nile valley, in alliance with the revolted Egyptians, ended in failure. Athens, in fact, had not sufficient strength to undertake a serious invasion of the empire or an extensive scheme of conquest. Her struggles with the other Hellenic states constrained her, by the peace of Callias, definitely to renounce the Persian war ; to abandon Cyprus and Egypt to the king ; and to content herself with his promise—not that he would surrender the littoral towns, but that he would abstain from an armed attack upon them. The really decisive point was, rather, that the disasters of Salamis and Platea definitely shattered the offensive power of the empire ; that the centre of gravity in the world's history had shifted from Susa and Babylon

to the Aegean sea ; for the Achaemenid power was beginning to suffer that inner disintegration which is the ever-recurrent doom of dynasties, if not of states.

Thus the great empire was reduced to immobility and stagnation—a process which was assisted by the deteriorating influences of civilization and world-dominion upon the character of the ruling race. True, the Persians continued to produce brave and honourable men. But the influences of the harem, the eunuchs, and similar court officials made appalling progress, and men of energy began to find the temptations of Powers stronger than their patriotism and devotion to the king. Thus the satraps aspired to independence, not merely owing to unjust treatment, but also to avarice or favourable conditions. As early as 465 B.C., Xerxes was assassinated by his powerful vizier Artabanus, who attempted to seize the reins of empire in fact, if not in name. To these factors must be added the degeneration of the royal line. Kings like Xerxes and more especially Artaxerxes I and Artaxerxes II, so far from being gloomy despots, were good-natured potentates, but weak, capricious and readily accessible to personal influences. The only really brutal tyrants were Darius II, who was completely dominated by his bloodthirsty wife Parysatis, and Artaxerxes III who, though he shed rivers of blood and all but exterminated his whole family, was successful in once more uniting the empire, which under the feeble sway of his father had been threatened with dissolution.

The upshot of these conditions was that the empire never again undertook an important enterprise, but neglected more and more its great civilizing mission. In considering, however, the subsequent disorders and wars, it must be borne in mind that they affected only individual portions of the empire, and only on isolated occasions involved more extensive areas in long and serious strife. To most of the provinces the Achaemenid dominion was synonymous with two centuries of peace and order. Naturally, however, the wild tribes of the mountains and deserts, who could be curbed only by strict imperial control, asserted their independence and harassed the neighboring provinces. When in 400 B.C. Xenophon marched with the mercenaries of Cyprus from the Tigris to the Black sea, the authority of the king was nonexistent north of Armenia, and the tribes of the Pontic mountains, with the Greek cities on the coast, were completely independent. The frontier provinces of India were also lost. Egypt, which had already revolted in the years 486-484, and again with Athenian help in 460-454, finally asserted its independence in 404.

The inner weakness of the empire was soon revealed by the revolts of the satraps. These were facilitated by the custom—quite contrary to the original imperial organization—which entrusted the provincial military commands to the satraps, who began to receive great masses of Greek mercenaries into their service. Revolts of the satraps in Asia Minor and Syria were of everyday occurrence, and the task of suppressing them was complicated by

the foreign wars which the empire had to sustain against Greece and Egypt.

At this very period, however, the foreign policy of the empire gained a brilliant success. The collapse of the Athenian power before Syracuse induced Darius II to order his satraps in Asia Minor, to collect the tribute overdue from the Greek cities. In alliance with Sparta, Persia intervened successfully in the conflict against Athens, war with Sparta followed immediately, over the division of the spoils. Persia joined the Greek League against Sparta, with the result that the Spartan power of offense was crippled; and the upshot of the long-protracted war was that Sparta not only renounced all claims to the Asian possessions, but officially proclaimed the Persian suzerainty over Greece. Ninety years after Salamis and Plataea, the goal for which Xerxes had striven, was actually attained, and the king's will was law in Greece. In the following decades, no Hellenic state ventured to violate the king's peace, and all the feuds that followed centred round the efforts of the combatants Sparta, Thebes, Athens and Argos—to draw the royal powers to their side.

But, for these successes, the empire had to thank the internecine strife of its Greek opponents, rather than its own strength. Its feebleness, when thrown on its own resources, is evident from the fact that, during the next years, it failed both to reconquer Egypt and to suppress completely king Evagoras of Salamis in Cyprus. The satrap revolts, more-over, assumed more and more formidable proportions, and the Greek states began



once more to tamper with them. Thus the reign of Artaxerxes II ended, in 359 B.c., with a complete dissolution of the imperial authority in the west. His successor, Artaxerxes Ochus, succeeded yet again in restoring the empire in its full extent. In 342 he reduced Egypt, and his generals crushed once and for all the resistance in Asia Minor. At his death in 338, immediately before the final catastrophe, the empire to all appearances was more powerful and more firmly established than it had been since the days of Xerxes.

In Greece, a feeling of revolt was gradually developing. Only mutual rivalries of the States prevented its fulfillment. When Philip founded the League of Corinth embracing the whole of Greece, he at once expressed his willingness to take up cudgels on behalf of Greece against Persia. In 336 he dispatched his army to Asia Minor but was assassinated and succeeded by his son Alexander who was far more ambitious than his father. To conquer the whole world for Hellenic civilization was the task that he saw before him.

How Alexander conquered Persia, and how he framed his world empire, cannot be related in detail here. The essential fact, however, is that after the victory of Gaugamela and, still more completely, after the assassination of Darius, Alexander regarded himself as the legitimate head of the Persian empire, and therefore adopted the dress and ceremonial of the Persian kings. He adopted the notion of the king as God's surrogate or even an incarnation of the supernatural power, endowed thereby with

illimitable authority. The expedition of 332 B.C., to the shrine of Ammon, was a preliminary to this procedure which, in 324, was sealed by his official elevation to divine rank in all the republics of Greece.

He drafted 30,000 young Persians, educated them in Greek customs, and trained them to war on the Macedonian model. The Indian campaign showed that his Macedonian troops were in fact inadequate to the conquest of the world, and in the summer of 326 they compelled him to turn back from the banks of the Hyphasis. On his return to Persia he consummated at Susa the union of Persian and Macedonian by the great marriage feast, at which all his superior officers, with some 10'000 more Macedonians, were wedded to Persian wives. The Macedonian veterans were then disbanded, and the Persians taken into his army. Simultaneously, at the Olympian festival of 324, the command was issued to all the cities of Greece to recognise him as god and to receive the exiles home. At that point Alexander died in Babylon, on June 13, 323 B.C.

## **The Diadochi**

Alexander left no heir. Consequently, his death led to an immediate Macedonian reaction. The army took over the government under the direction of its generals. The Persian wives were practically all discarded and the Persian satraps removed—at least from all important provinces. There began the embittered

war, waged for several decades by the generals for the inheritance of Alexander. Peucestas, the governor of Persis, played the role of Alexander and won the Persians completely to his side, for which he was dismissed by Antigonus in 315. A similar position was attained by Seleucus—the only one of the diadochi who had not divorced his Persian wife, Apama—in Babylonia, which he governed from 319 to 316 and regained in the autumn of 312. He conquered the whole of Iran as far as the Indus.

The annexation of Iran by Seleucus Nicator led to a war for the countries on the Indian frontier, his opponent being Chandragupta Maury, the founder of the Indian empire of Maurya. The result was that Seleucus abandoned to the Indian king not merely the Indian provinces, but even the frontier districts west of the Indus, receiving as compensation 500 elephants, with other presents.

The battle of Ipsus, in 301, gave him Syria and the east of Asia Minor; and from then he resided at the Syrian town of Antiochia on the Orontes. Shortly afterwards he handed over the provinces east of the Euphrates to his son Antiochus, who, in the following years, till 282, exercised in the east a very energetic and beneficial activity, which continued the work of his father. In his campaigns Alexander had founded several cities in Bactria, Sogdiana and India, in which he settled his veterans, and before his death he had begun or planned the foundation of Greek cities in Media and other parts of Iran. These plans were now executed by the Seleucids on the largest scale. Most of the new cities were

based on older settlements; but the essential point is, that they were peopled by Greek and Macedonian colonists, and enjoyed civic independence with laws, officials, councils and assemblies of their own—in other words, an autonomous communal constitution, under the suzerainty of the empire. These cities became the main factors in the diffusion of Hellenism, the Greek language and the Greek civilization over all Asiaas far as the Indus. At the same time they were centres of commerce and industrial life; and this, in conjunction with the royal favour, and the privileges accorded them, continually drew new settlers, and many of them developed into great and flourishing towns.

Shortly after his conquest of Babylonia, Seleucus had founded a new capital, Seleucia on the Tigris, his intention being at once to displace the ancient Babylon from its former central position, and to replace it by a Greek city. This was followed by a series of other foundations in Mesopotamia, Babylonia and Susiana.

In 282 a.c. Seleucus took the field against Lysimachus, and annexed his dominions in Asia Minor and Thrace. In 281 he was assassinated while crossing to Europe, and his son Antiochus I was left supreme over the whole empire. From that time onward the Seleucid empire was never at rest. Its gigantic extent, from the Aegean to the Indus, every-where offered points of attack to the enemy. The promotion of Greek civilization and city life had created numerous local centres, with separate interests and centrifugal tendencies, struggling to attain complete independence, and perpetually forcing new concessions from the

empire. Thus the Seleucid kings, courageous as many of them were, were always battling for existence.

These disturbances severely affected the borders of Iran. It was principally the need of protection against the nomadic tribes which led to the foundation of an independent kingdom and Diodotus soon attained considerable power over the provinces, north of the Hindu-Kush. In other provinces, too, insurrection broke out. Arsaces, a chief of the Parni or Aparni—an Iranian nomad tribe, inhabiting the steppe east of the Caspian—made himself master of the district of Parthia in 248 B.C. He and his brother Tiridates were the founders of the Parthian kingdom, which, however, was confined within very modest limits during the following decades. Seleucus II Callinicus successfully encountered Arsaces and even expelled him but new risings recalled Seleucus to Syria, and Arsaces was enabled to return to Parthia.

In spite of concerted efforts made by Antiochus III and Antiochus IV, the Seleucid empire could not withstand the ever-increasing revolts. The latter tried to strengthen Hellenism throughout his empire by settling Greek colonists and mercenaries in the native towns—then, also, in Babylon and Jerusalem and granting them the right of Greek cities. But after his death at Gabae in Persis, the Romans took advantage of the dynastic broils to destroy the Seleucid empire. They reduced its army and fleet, and favoured every rebellion, among others, that of the Jews, shown by the fact that in 77 Inc. the octogenarian

king Sinatruces was seated on the Parthian throne by the Scythian tribe of the Sacaraucians. The names of his predecessors are not known to us. Obviously this period was marked by continual dynastic feuds. Not till Sinatruces' successor Phraates III do we find the kingdom again in a settled state.

A fact of decisive significance was that the Romans now began to advance against Tigranes. In vain Mithradates of Pontus and Tigranes turned to the Parthian king, the latter even proffering restitution of the conquered frontier provinces. Phraates, though rightly distrusting Rome, nevertheless concluded a treaty with Lucullus and with Pompey, and even supported the latter in his campaign against Tigranes in 66. But after the victory it was manifest that the Roman general did not consider himself bound by the Parthian treaty. When Tigranes had submitted, Pompey received him into favour and extended the Roman supremacy over the vassal states of Gordyene and Osroene; though he had allured the Parthian king with the prospect of the recovery of his old possessions as far as the Euphrates. Phraates complained, and simultaneously attacked Tigranes, now a Roman vassal. But when Pompey refused separation Phraates recognised that he was too weak to begin struggle with Rome, and contented himself with forming an alliance with Tigranes, hoping that the future would bring an opportunity for his revenge.

Although Phraates III had not succeeded in regaining the full power of his predecessors, he felt justified in again assuming the title "king of kings"—which Pompey declined to acknowledge—

and even in pro-claiming himself as “god,” but in 57 B.c. the “god” was assassinated by his sons Orodes and Mithradates.

## **Organization**

The Parthian empire, as founded by the conquests of Mithradates I and restored, once by Mithradates II and again by Phraates III, was, to all exterior appearance, a continuation of the Achaemenid dominion. Thus the Arsacids now began to assume the old title “king of kings”, though previously their coins, as a rule, had borne only the legend “great king”. The official version, preserved by Arrian in his Parthica, derives the line of these chieftains of the Parnian nomads from Artaxerxes II. In reality, however, the Parthian empire was totally different from its predecessor, both externally and internally. It was anything rather than a world-empire. The countries west of the Euphrates never owned its dominion, and even of Iran itself not one-half was subject to the Arsacids. There were indeed vassal states on every hand, but the actual possessions of the kings—the provinces

## **The Parthian Empire**

Meanwhile, in the east, the Arsacids started on a career of expansion. Phraates I subdued difficult M rdJian in Elburz. ucratidesbof tBacther Mith a radates I had to sustain eventually succeeded in wresting from him some districts on thee Indus.

Turanian frontier. Indeed, he penetrated as far as, and farther than, In the west he conquered Media, and thence subdued Babylonia. He further reduced the Elymaeans, sacked their temple in the mountains, The and captured the Greek city of Seleucia n the disorders h and e Seleucids, meanwhile, were harrassed by aggravated acked lions. After the death of Mithradates the brother of Demetrius IIS ontwhich in 130 by Antiochus VII Sidetes, the Parthian king r released Babylonia, but in 129 was defeated in Media and once more recovered ovand fell in a desperate struggle. With this battle the Seleucid dominion over the countries east of the Euphrates was definitely lost.

During these wars great changes had taken place in eastern Iran. In 159 Mongolian tribes, whom the Chinese call Yue-chi and the Greeks Scythians, forced their way into Sogdiana, and, in 139, conquered Bactria with tried Ant ochus VII, they assailed Entering the Parthian into an alliance empire. Phraates II marched to encounter him, but was himself defeated and slain, and his country ravaged far and wide. His successor Artabann I, the uncle of Phraates, also fell in battle against Johannes Antiochen; but his son Mithradates II, surnamed "The Great," defeated the Scythians and restored for a while the power of thwe Arsacids. He also defeated Artavasdes, the king of great America; his son Tigranes, a hostage in the hands of the Parthians, was only redeemed by the cession of 70 valleys. When Tigranes attempted to seize Cappadocia, and the Roman praetor Cornelius Sulla, advanced against him, Mithra-dates in 92 B.C. concluded the first treaty between barn an opportunity The dynastic troubles of the



Seleucids in Syria gave and, with his death, the Arsacid power collapsed for the second time. The Possession of the western provinces and the dominant position in western Asia passed to the Armenian Tigranes, who wrested from the Parthians Mesopotamia and the suzerainty of Atropatene, Gordyene, Adiabene, Osroene. Simultaneously began a new and severe conflict with the Scythians. Parthian coins, probably dating from this period, mention victorious campaigns of Parthian kings and a conquest of the Aria, Margiane and Traxiane. But how confused the situation was is shown by the fact that in 77 B.c. the octogenarian king Sinatruces was seated on the Parthian throne by the Scythian tribe of the Sacaraucians. The names of his predecessors are not known to us. Obviously this period was marked by continual dynastic feuds. Not till Sinatruces' successor Phraates III do we find the kingdom again in a settled state.

A fact of decisive significance was that the Romans now began to advance against Tigranes. In vain Mithradates of Pontus and Tigranes turned to the Parthian king, the latter even proffering restitution of the conquered frontier provinces. Phraates, though rightly distrusting Rome, nevertheless concluded a treaty with Lucullus and with Pompey, and even supported the latter in his campaign against Tigranes in 66. But after the victory it was manifest that the Roman general did not consider himself bound by the Parthian treaty. When Tigranes had submitted, Pompey received him into favour and extended the Roman supremacy over the vassal states of Gordyene and Osroene;

though he had allured the Parthian king with the prospect of the recovery of his old possessions as far as the Euphrates. Phraates complained, and simultaneously attacked Tigranes, now a Roman vassal. But when Pompey refused separation Phraates recognised that he was too weak to begin struggle with Rome, and contented himself with forming an alliance with Tigranes, hoping that the future would bring an opportunity for his revenge.

Although Phraates III had not succeeded in regaining the full power of his predecessors, he felt justified in again assuming the title "king of kings"—which Pompey declined to acknowledge—and even in pro-claiming himself as "god," but in 57 B.c. the "god" was assassinated by his sons Orodes and Mithradates.

### ***Organization***

The Parthian empire, as founded by the conquests of Mithradates I and restored, once by Mithradates II and again by Phraates III, was, to all exterior appearance, a continuation of the Achaemenid dominion. Thus the Arsacids now began to assume the old title "king of kings", though previously their coins, as a rule, had borne only the legend "great king". The official version, preserved by Arrian in his *Parthica*, derives the line of these chieftains of the Parnian nomads from Artaxerxes II. In reality, however, the Parthian empire was totally different from its predecessor, both externally and internally. It was anything rather than a world-empire. The countries west of the Euphrates never owned its dominion, and even of Iran itself not one-half was

subject to the Arsacids. There were indeed vassal states on every hand, but the actual possessions of the kings—the provinces governed by their satraps—consisted of a rather narrow strip of land, 1 stretching from the Euphrates and north Babylonia through southern Media and Parthia as far as Arochosis, and following the course of the great trade-route which from time immemorial had carried the traffic between the west of Asia and India.

It is not without justice that the Arsacid period is described, in the later Persian and Arabian tradition, as the period of “the kings of the part-kingdoms”—among which the Ashkanians had won the first place. The period from the death of Alexander to the Sassanid Ardashir I, is put by the Persian tradition at 266 years; which was afterwards corrected to 523 years. The actual number is 547 years.

### **Character of the Empire**

It may appear surprising that the Arsacids made no attempt to incorporate the minor states in the empire and create great and united dominion, such as existed under the Achaemenids and was afterwards restored by the Sassanids. This fact is the clearest symptom of the inner weakness of their empire and of the small power wielded by them. In contrast alike with its predecessors and its successors, the Arsacid dominion was peculiarly a chance formation—a state which had come into existence through

fortuitous external circumstances, and had no, firm foundation within itself.

Three elements, of widely different kinds, contributed to its origin and defined its character. It was sprung from a predatory nomad tribe which 'had established itself in Khurasan, on the borders of civilization and thence gradually annexed further districts as the political, situation or the weakness of its neighbors allowed. Consequently, these nomads were the main pillar of the empire, and from them were obviously derived the great magnates, with their huge estates and, hosts of serfs, who composed the imperial council, led the armies, governed the provinces and made and unmade the kings.

The military organization, moreover, was wholly nomadic in character. The nucleus of the army was formed of armored horsemen, excellently practiced for long-distance fighting with bow and javelin, but totally unable to venture on a hand-to-hand conflict, their tactics' being rather to swarm round the enemy's squadrons and overwhelm, them under hail of missiles. When attacked they broke up, as it seemed, in hasty and complete flight, and having thus led the hostile army to break its formation, they themselves rapidly reformed and renewed the assault. How difficult it was for infantry to hold their own against these; mounted squadrons was demonstrated by the Roman campaigns, especially in broad plains like those of Mesopotamia. The infantry, in contrast with the earlier status under the Persians, was wholly neglect-ed. On the other hand, every magnate put into

the field as many mounted warriors as possible, chiefly servants and bought slaves, who, like the Janissaries and Mamelukes, were trained exclusively for war.

How vital was the nomadic element in the Parthian empire is obvious from the fact that, in civil wars, the deposed kings consistently took refuge among the Dahae or Scythians and were restored by them. But in Parthia, these nomads were amalgamated with the native peasantry, and, with their religion, had adopted their dress and manners. Even the kings, after the first two or three, wore their hair and beard long, in the Iranian fashion, whereas their predecessors were beardless. Although the Arsacids were strangers to any deep religious interest, they acknowledged the Persian gods and the leading tenets of Zoroastrianism. They erected fire altars and even obeyed the command to abandon all corpses to the dogs and fowls. Beside the council of the nobility, there was a second council of “Magians and wise men”.

Again, they perpetuated the traditions of the Achaemenid empire. The Arsacids assumed the title “king of kings” and derived their line from Artaxerxes II. Further, the royal apotheosis, so common among them and recurring under the Sassanids, a very ancient Asian conception, was a direct development of Iranian views. For at the side of the great god Ahura Mazda there stood a host of subordinate divine beings who executed his will—among these the deified heroes of legend, to whose circle the king was now admitted, since on him Ahura Mazda had bestowed victory and might.

This gradual Iranianization of the Parthian empire is shown by the fact that the subsequent Iranian traditions, and Firdousi in particular, apply the name of the “Parthian” magnates to the glorious heroes of the legendary epoch. Consequently, also the language and writing of the Parthian period, which are retained under the Sassanids, received the name Pahalvi, i.e., “Parthian”. The script was derived from the Aramaic.

But to these elements must be added that of Hellenism, which had penetrated into Parthia and Media. All the external institutions were borrowed from the Seleucid empire; their coinage with its Greek inscriptions and nomenclature; their Attic standard of currency. Mithradates I even followed the precedent of the Seleucids in building a new city Arsacia, which replaced the ancient Rhagae in Media. The first Mithradates assumed, after his great conquests, the title of Philhellene, the Protector of Hellenism”, which was retained by almost all his successors. After the conquest of the Euphrates and Tigris provinces it was imperative that the royal residence should be fixed there. But as no one ventured to transfer the royal household and the army, with its hordes of wild horsemen, to the Greek town of Seleucia, and thus disorder its commerce, the Arsacids set up their abode in the great village of Ctesiphon on the left bank of the Tigris, opposite to Seleucia, which accordingly retained its free Hellenic constitution. So also Orodes spoke good Greek, and Greek tragedies were staged at his court.

In spite of this, however, the rise of the Arsacid empire marks the beginning of a reaction against Hellenism, a reaction which was all the more effective because it depended on the impetus of circumstances working with all the power of a natural force. The essential point is that the east was turning away from the Mediterranean and the Hellenic world, feeling that it could derive no fresh powers from that quarter and that, consequently, the influence of local elements must steadily increase. This process can be most clearly traced on the coins—almost' the sole memorials that the Parthian empire has left. From reign reign the portraits grow poorer and more stereotyped, the inscription more neglected, till it becomes obvious that the engraver himself no longer understood Greek but copied mechanically the signs before his eyes, as is the case with the contemporary Indo-Scythian coinage. Indeed, after Volagases I, the Aramaic script is occasionally employed. The political opposition to the western empires, the Seleucids first, then the Romans, precipitated this development. Naturally enough the Greek cities beheld a liberator in every army that marched from the west. The Parthian magnates, on the other hand, with the army, would have little to do with Greek culture and Greek modes of life, which they contemptuously regarded as effeminate and unmanly. They required of their rulers that they should live in the fashion of their country, practice arms and the chase, and appear as Asian kings not as Grecian rulers.

These tendencies taken together explain the radical weakness of the Parthian empire. It was easy enough to collect a great army

and achieve a great victory; it was absolutely impossible to hold the army together for any longer period, or to conduct a regular campaign. The Parthians proved incapable of creating a firm, united organization, such as the Achaemenids before them, and the Sassanids after them gave to their empire. The kings themselves were toys in the hands of the magnet and the army who, tenaciously as they clung to the anointed dynast of the Arsacids, were utterly indifferent to the person of the individual Arsacid. Every moment they were ready to overthrow the reigning monarch and to set another on his throne. The kings, for their part, sought protection in craft, treachery and cruelty, and only succeeded in aggravating the situation. More especially they saw an enemy in every prince and the worst of enemies in their own sons. Sanguinary crimes were thus of everyday occurrence in the royal household; and frequently it was merely a matter of chance whether the father acted before the son, or the son before the father. The internal history of the Parthian dominion is an unbroken sequence of civil war and dynastic strife.

### **Wars with Rome**

These conditions elucidate the fact that the Parthian empire, though founded on annexation and perpetually menaced by hostile arms in both the east and the west, yet never took a strong offensive after the days of Mithradates II. It was bound to protect itself against Scythian aggression in the east and Roman aggression in the west. To maintain, or regain, the suzerainty over



Mesopotamia and the vassal states of that region, was its most imperative task. Yet it always remained on the defensive and even so was lacking in energy. Whenever it made an effort to enforce its claims, it retreated as soon as it was confronted by a resolute foe.

Thus the wars between Parthia and Rome proceeded, not from the Parthians—deeply injured though they were by the encroachments of Pompey—but from Rome herself. Rome had been obliged, reluctantly enough, to enter upon the inheritance of Alexander the Great; and since the time of Pompey, had definitely subjected to her dominion the Hellenistic countries as far as the Euphrates. Thus the task now faced them of annexing the remainder of the Macedonian empire, the whole east, from the Euphrates, to the Indus, and of thereby saving Greek civilization. With this objective M. Licinius Crassus the triumvir, in 54 B.C., took the aggressive against Parthia, the occasion being favourable owing to the dynastic troubles. Crassus fell on the field of Carrhae. With this, Mesopotamia was regained by the Parthians, and King Artavasdes of Armenia now entered their alliance. But, apart from the ravaging of Syria, the threatened attack on the Roman empire was carried into effect neither then nor during the civil war of Caesar and Pompey. At the time of his assassination Caesar was intent on resuming the expedition of Crassus.

Roman opinion universally expected that Augustus would take up the work of his predecessors, annihilate the Parthian dominion, and subdue the east as far as the Indians, Scythians and

Seres. But Augustus disappointed these expectations. His whole policy and the needs of the newly organized Roman empire demanded peace. His efforts were devoted to reaching a *modus vivendi*, by which the authority of Rome and her most vital claims might be peacefully vindicated. This the weakness of Parthia enabled him to effect without much difficulty. His , endeavours were seconded by the revolt of Tiridates II, before whom Phraates IV was compelled to flee, till restored by the Scythians. Augustus lent no support to Tridates in his second march on Ctesiphon, but Phraates was all the more inclined on that account to stand on good terms with him. Consequently in 20 B.c., he recognized the Roman suzerainty over Osroene and Armenia. In return, the Parthian dominion in Babylonia and the other vassal states were left undisputed.

Thus it was due not to the success and strength of the Parthians but largely to the principles of Roman policy as defined by Augustus that their empire appears as a second great independent power, side by side with Rome. The precedence of the Caesars, indeed, was always admitted by the Arsacids; and Phraates IV soon entered into a state of dependency on Rome by sending four of his sons as hostages to Augustus—a convenient method of obviating the danger threatened in their person, without the necessity of killing them. In B.C., however, Phraates was assassinated by his favourite wife Musa and her son Phraates V. In the subsequent broils a Parthian faction obtained the release of one of the princes interned in Rome as Vonones I. He failed, however, to maintain his position for long. He was a stranger to

the Parthian customs, and the feeling of shame at dependency on the foreigner was too strong. So the rival faction brought out another Arsacid, resident among the Scythian nomads, Artabanus III, who easily expelled Vonones—only to create a host of enemies by his brutal cruelty, and to call forth fresh disorders.

The line of Arsacids which came to the throne in the person of Artabanus III represents a conscious reaction against Hellenism. He stands in open opposition to the old kings with their leanings to Rome and, at least external, tinge of Hellenism. The new regime obviously laid much more stress on the Asian character of its state. The Hellenism of Seleucia was now attacked with greater determination. For seven years, the city maintained itself in open rebellion, until at last it surrendered to Vardanes, who in consequence enlarged Ctesiphon, which was afterwards fortified by Pacorus II. In the neighborhood of the same town Volagases I founded a city, Volagesocerta, to which he attempted to transplant the population of Seleucia. Another of his foundations was Volagesias, situated near Hira on the Euphrates, south of Babylon, which did appreciable damage to the commerce of Seleucia and is often mentioned in inscriptions as the destination of the Palmyrene caravans.

After Volagases I followed a period of great disturbances. The literary tradition, indeed, deserts us almost entirely, but the coins and isolated literary references prove that during the year C.E. 77 to 147, two kings, and sometimes three or more, were often reigning concurrently. Obviously the empire can have seen little

peace during these years, a fact which materially assisted the aggressive campaigns of Trajan who resuscitated the old project of Crassus and Caesar, by which the empire of Alexander as far as India was to be won for Greece. In pursuance of this plan he reduced Armenia, Mesopotamia and Babylonia to the position of imperial provinces. On his death, however, Hadrian immediately reverted to the Augustan policy and restored the conquests. Simultaneously there arose in the east the powerful Indo-Scythian empire of the Kushana, which doubtless limited still further the Parthian possessions in eastern Iran.

An era of quiet seems to have returned with Volagases III, and we hear no more of rival kings. With the Roman empire a profound peace had reigned since Hadrian, which was first disturbed by the attack of Marcus Aurelius and Aelius Verus in 162. This war, which broke out on the question of Armenia and Osroene, proved of decisive significance for the future development of western Asia, for, in its course, Seleucia was destroyed by the Romans under Avidius Cassius. The downfall of the great Greek city sealed the fate of Hellenism in the countries east of the Euphrates. Henceforward Greek culture practically vanishes and gives place to Aramaic. This Aramaic victory was powerfully aided by the ever-increasing progress of Christianity, which soon created an Aramaic literature. After that Greek culture and Greek literature were accessible to the Asians only in an Aramaic dress. Volagases III is probably also the king Valgash, who, according to a native tradition, preserved in the Dinkart, began a collection of the sacred writings of Zoroaster—the origin

of the Avesta which has come down to us. This would show how the national Iranian element in the Parthian empire was continually gathering strength.

## **The Sassanian Empire**

That the Arsacid empire should have endured some 400 years after its foundation was a result, not of internal strength, but of chance working in its external development. It might equally well have so existed for centuries more. But under Artabanus V, the catastrophe came. In his days there arose in Persis—precisely as Cyrus had arisen under Astyages the Mede—a great personality. Ardashir I, son of Papak, the descendant of Sasan, was the sovereign of one of the small states into which Persis had gradually fallen. His father Papak had taken possession of the district of Istakhar which had replaced the old Persepolis, long a mass of ruins. Thence Ardashir I, who reigned from about C.E. 212, subdued the neighboring potentates, disposing of his own brothers among the rest. This proceeding quickly led to war with his suzerain Artabanus V. The conflict was protracted through several years, and the Parthians were worsted in three battles. The last of these witnessed the fall of Artabanus, though a Parthian king, Arta. vades—one of the sons of Artabanus V—who is known to us only from his own coins, appears to have retained a portion of the empire for some time longer. The member of the Arsacid line who fell into the hands of the victor were put to death ; a number of the princes found refuge in Armenia, where

the Arsacid dynasty maintained itself till 429. The remainder of the vassal states were ended by Ardashir ; and the autonomous desert fortress of Hatra in Mesopotamia was destroyed by his son Shapur I, according to the Persian and Arabian traditions. The victorious Ardashir then took possession of the palace of Ctesiphon and assumed the title “King of the kings of the Iranians.”

The new empire founded by Ardashir I—the Sassanian, or Neo-Persian empire—is essentially different from that of his Arsacid predecessors. It is, rather, a continuation of the Achaemenid traditions which were still alive on their native soil. Consequently the national impetus—already clearly revealed in the title of the new sovereign—again becomes strikingly manifest. The Sassanian empire, in fact, is once more a national Persian or Iranian empire. The religious element is, of course, inseparable from the national, and Ardashir, like all the dynasts of Persis, was an ardent devotee of the Zoroastrian doctrine, and closely connected with the priesthood. In his royal style he assumed the designation “Mazdayasnian,” and Zoroastrianism was everywhere vigorously disseminated. Simultaneously the old claims to world dominion made their reappearance. After the defeat of Artabanus, Ardashir, as heir of the Achaemenids, formulated his pretensions to the dominion of western Asia. He attacked Armenia, though without permanent success and despatched his armies against Roman Mesopotamia. They strayed as far as Syria and Cappadocia. The inner decay of the Roman empire, and the widespread tendency of its troops to mutiny and usurpation, favoured his enterprise. Nevertheless, the armies of Alexander

Severus, supported by the king of Armenia, succeeded in repelling the Persians, though the Romans sustained severe losses. Towards the end of his reign Ardashir resumed the attack ; while his son Shapur I reduced Nisibis and Carrhae and penetrated into Syria, but was defeated by Gordian III at Resaena. Soon afterwards, however, the Roman empire seemed to collapse utterly. The Goths defeated Decius and harried the Balkan peninsula and Asia Minor, while insurrections broke out everywhere and the legions created one Caesar after the other. Then Shapur resumed the war, subdued Armenia and plundered Antioch. The emperor Valerian, who marched to encounter him, was overthrown at Edessa and taken prisoner. The Persian armies advanced into Cappadocia ; but here Ballista or Balista beat them back, and Odaenathus, prince of Palmyra, rose in their rear, defeated Shapur, captured his harem, and twice forced his way to Ctesiphon. Shapur was in no position to repair the defeat, or even to hold Armenia; so that the Sassanid power failed to pass the bounds of the Arsacid empire. Nevertheless, Shapur I, in contrast to his father, assumed the title “King of the kings of the Iranians and non-Iranians,” thus emphasizing his claim to world dominion. His successors retained the designation, little as it corresponded to the facts, for the single non-Iranian land governed by the Sassanids was, as under the Parthians, the district of the Tigris and Euphrates as far as the Mesopotamian desert ; western and northern Mesopotamia remained Roman.

## Organization

The Sassanid ruler is the representative of the “kingly Majesty,” derived from Ormuzd, which appears in the Avesta as the angel Kavaem Hvareno, “the royal glory,” and, according to legend, once beamed in the Iranian kings, unattainable to all but those of royal blood. A sculpture, which frequently recurs in the rock-reliefs of Ardashir I and Shapur 1, represents the king and the god Ormuzd both on horseback, the latter in the act of handing to his companion the ring of sovereignty. Thus it is explicable that all the Sassanids, as many of the Arsacids before them, include the designation of “god” in their formal style. From this developed that strict principle of legitimacy which is still vigorous in Firdousi. The person of the individual ruler is a matter of indifference. He can readily be removed and replaced by another ; but no usurper who was not of the legitimate blood can hope to become the genuine king. Therefore tradition carries the Sassanid line back to the Achaemenids and, still further, to the kings of the legendary period.

Officially the king is all-powerful, and his will, which is guided by God and bound up in His law, unfettered. Thus, externally, he is surrounded by all the splendour of sovereignty, on his head he wears a great and resplendent crown, varying with each different ruler ; he is clothed in gold and jewels ; round him is a brilliant court,' composed of his submissive servants. Among his people he is accounted the fairest, strongest and wisest man of the empire; and from him is required the practice of all piety and



virtue, as well as skill in the chase and in arms —especially the bow. Ardashir I, moreover, and his successors endeavored to establish the validity of the royal will by absorbing the vassal states and instituting a firmer organization. Nevertheless they failed to attain the complete independence and power of the Achaemenids, Not strong enough to break up the nobility, with its great estates, they were forced to utilize its services and still further to promote its interests ; while their dependence on its good will and assistance led inevitably to incessant gifts of money, lands and men. This state of affairs had also prevailed under the later Achaemenids, and has materially contributed to the disintegration of the empire and the numerous insurrections of the satraps.

But the older Achaemenids held an entirely different position ; and hardly a single Sassanid enjoyed even that degree of power which was still retained by the later Achaemenids. It was of fundamental importance that the Sassanian empire could not make good its claim to world dominion; and, in spite of the title of its kings, it always remained essentially the kingdom of Iran—or rather West Iran, together with the districts on the Tigris and Euphrates. This fact, again, is most closely connected with its military and administrative organisation. The external and internal conditions of the empire are in mutual reaction upon one another. The empire, which in extent did not exceed that of the Arsacids with its vassal states, was protected on the east and west by the great deserts of central Iran and Mesopotamia. For the defence of these provinces the mounted archers, who formed the basis of the army, possessed adequate strength ; and though the Scythian

nomads from the east, or the Romans from the west, might occasionally penetrate deep into the country, they never succeeded in maintaining their position. But the power of the neo-Persian empire was not great enough for further conquests, though its army was capable and animated by a far stronger national feeling than that of the Parthians. It still consisted, however, of levies from the retinue of the magnates led by their territorial lords; and, although these troops would stream in at the beginning of a war, they could not be kept permanently together. For, on the one hand, they were actuated by the most varied personal interests and antipathies, not all of which the king could satisfy; on the other hand he could not, owing to the natural character and organization of his dominions, maintain and pay a large army for any length of time. Thus the great hosts soon melted away, and a war, begun successfully, ended ingloriously and often disastrously. Under such circumstances an elaborate tactical organization employing different species of arms, or the execution of a comprehensive plan of campaign, was out of question. The successes of the Sassanids in the east were gained in the later period of their dominion; and the Roman armies, in spite of decay in discipline and military spirit, still remained their tactical and strategical superiors. A great victory might be won—even an emperor might be captured, like Valerian—but immediately afterwards successes, such as those gained against Shapur I by Ballista and Odaenathus of Palmyra, or the later victories of Carus, Julian and others demonstrated how far the Persians were from being on an equality with the Romans. That

Babylonia permanently remained a Sassanian province was due chiefly to the geographical conditions and to the political situation of the Roman empire, not to the strength of the Persians.

Among the magnates six great houses —seven, if we include the royal house—were still regarded as the foremost, precisely as under the Achaemenids, and from these were drawn the generals, crown officials and governors. In the last of these positions we frequently find princes of the blood, who then bear the royal title. Some of these houses—whose origin the legends derive from King Gushtasp, the protector of Zoroaster—already existed under the Arsacids, and Karen who had obviously embraced the cause of the victorious dynasty at the correct moment and so retained their position. The name Pahalvan, moreover, which denoted the Parthian magnates, passed over into the new empire. Below there was an inferior nobility, the dihkans and the “knights”; who, as among the Parthians, took the field in heavy scale-armor. To an even greater extent than under the Arsacids, the empire was subdivided into a host of small provinces, at the head of each being a Marzban. These were again comprised in four great districts. With each of these local potentates the king could deal with as scant consideration as he pleased, always provided that he had the power or understood the art of making himself feared. But to break through the system or replace it by another was impossible. In fact he was compelled to proceed with great caution whenever he wished to elevate a favourite of humbler origin to an office which custom reserved for the nobility. Thus it is all the more worthy of recognition that the

Sassanian empire was a fairly orderly empire, with an excellent legal administration, and that the later sovereigns did their utmost to repress the encroachments of the nobility, to protect the commonalty and to carry out a just system of taxation.

## **Religious Development**

Side by side with the nobles ranked the spiritual chiefs, now a far 'fore powerful body than under the Arsacids. Every larger district had its upper Magian. At their head was the supreme Mobed, resident in Rhagae, who was regarded as the successor of Zoroaster. In the new empire, of which the king and people were alike zealous professors of the true faith, their influence was extraordinarily strong comparable to the influence of the priesthood in later Egypt, and especially in Byzantium and mediaeval Christendom. As has already been indicated, it was in their religious attitudes that the essential difference lay between the Sassanid empire and the older Iranian states. But, in details, the fluctuations were so manifold that it is necessary at this point to enter more fully into the history of Persian religion.

The Persian religion spread more and more widely after the Achaemenian period. In the Indo-Scythian empire the Persian gods were zealously worshipped; in Armenia the old national religion was almost entirely banished by the Persian cults; in Cappadocia, North Syria and the west of Asia Minor, the Persian gods were everywhere adored side by side with the native deities.

It was in the 3rd century that the cult of Mithras, with its mysteries and a theology evolved from Zoroastrianism, attained the widest diffusion in all Latin-speaking provinces of the Roman dominion; and it even seemed for a while as though the Sol invictus Mithras, highly favoured by the Caesars, would' become the official deity-in-chief of the empire. But in all these cults, the Persian gods are perfectly tolerant of other native or foreign divinities; vigorous as was their propagandism, it was yet equally far removed from an attack on other creeds. Thus this Parseeism alway bears a syncretic character ; and the supreme god of Zoroastrian theory, Ahura Mazda, in practice yields place to his attendant deities, who work in the world and are able to lead the believer, who has been initiated and keeps the commandments of purity, to salvation.

But meanwhile, in its Iranian home and especially in Persis, the religion of Zoroaster lived a quiet life, undisturbed by the proceedings of the outside world. Here the poems of the prophet and fragments of ancient religious literature survived, understood by the Magians and rendered accessible to the faithful laity by versions in the modern dialect. Here the opposition between the good spirit of light and the demons of evil—between Ormuzd and Ahriman—still remained the principal dogma of the creed; while all other gods and angels, however estimable their aid, were but subordinate servants of Ormuzd, whose highest manifestation on earth was not the sun god Mithras, but the holy fire guarded by his priests. Here all the prescriptions of purity — partly connected with national customs, and impossible of execution abroad—were

diligently observed; and even the injunction not to pollute earth with corpses, but to cast out the dead to vulture and dog, was obeyed in its full force. At the same time Ahura Mazda preserved his character as a national god, who bestowed on his worshippers victory and world dominion. In the sculptures of the Sassanids, as also in Armenian traditions, he appears on horseback as a war god. Here, again, the theology was further developed, and an attempt made to annul the old dualism by envisaging both Ormuzd and Ahriman as emanations of an original principle of Zervan, infinite time, a doctrine which long enjoyed official validity under the Sassanids till, in the reign of Chosroes I, the sect of Zervanities was pronounced heretical. But, above all, the ritual and the doctrine of purity were elaborated and expanded, and there was evolved a complete and detailed system of casuistry, dealing with all things allowed and forbidden, the forms of pollution and the expiation of each, etc., which, in its arid and spiritless monotony, vividly recalls the similar prescriptions in the Pentateuch. The consequences of this development were that literal obedience to all priestly injunctions now assumed an importance far greater than previously; hence-forward, the great commandment of Zoroastrianism, as of Judaism, is to combat the heresies of the heathen, a movement which had already had an energetic representative in the prophet himself. Heathenish cults and forbidden manners and customs are a pollution to the land and a deep insult to the true God. There-fore the duty of the believer is to combat and destroy the unbeliever and the heretic.

Such were the views in which Ardashir I grew up, and in their energetic prosecution he found a potent instrument for the building up of his empire. It has previously been mentioned that Volagases III had already begun a collection of the holy writings; and the task was resumed under Ardashir. At his order the orthodox doctrines and texts were compiled by the high priest Tansar; all divergent theories were prohibited and their adherents proscribed. Thus arose the Avesta, the sacred book of the Parsees. Above all, the sacred book of laws, the Vendidad, breathes throughout the spirit of the Sassanian period. Subscription to the restored orthodox doctrine was to the Iranian a matter of course. The schismatics Ardashir imprisoned for a year; if, at its expiration, they still refused to listen to reason, and remained stiff-necked, they were executed. It is even related that, in his zeal for uniformity of creed, Ardashir wished to extinguish the holy fires in the great cities of the empire and the Parthian vassal states, with the exception of that which burned in the residence of the dynasty. This plan he was unable to execute. In Armenia, also, Ardashir and Shapur, during the period of their occupation, sought to introduce the Orthodox religion, destroyed the heathen images—even those of the Iranian gods which were here considered heathen—and turned the shrine into fire altars. Shapur I, who appears to have had a broader outlook, added to the religious writings a collection of scientific treatises on medicine, astronomy, mathematics, philosophy, zoology, etc., partly from Indian and Greek sources.

A short time afterwards, the Roman empire followed the example of the Sassanids and attempted to enforce unity of creed on all sub. jects: with Devious began the systematic persecution of the Christians. For, meanwhile, the Christian religion had spread far in east and west with an equally zealous propagandism and an equal exclusiveness and intolerance. In the countries of the Tigris and Euphrates, now alto. gether Aramaic, Christianity had everywhere gained a firm footing. But its missionary enterprise stretched over the whole of Iran, and even farther. The time was come when, in the western and eastern worlds alike, the religious question was for large masses of people the most important question in life, and the diffusion of their own creed and the suppression of all others the highest and holiest of tasks. The man who thinks thus knows no compromise, and so Zoroastrianism and Christianity confronted each other as mortal enemies. Still the old idea that every religion contained a portion of the truth, and that it was possible to borrow something from one and amalgamate it with another, had not yet lost all its power. From such a conception arose the teaching of Mani or Manes. Our knowledge of Manichaeism has been greatly in-creased by the discovery of many fragments of its literature in Eastern Turkistan; but they all are surpassed in importance by a large Chinese manuscript in the British Museum containing translations of Manichaeism hymns and ritual. We can now clearly see that Manichaeism originated from a Gnostic sect. Mani, a Persian from Babylonia, pro-claimed himself as the last and greatest apostle of Jesus and as the Paraclete announced in the Gospel of



John. But with the Gnostic interpretation of the Gospel he tried to combine doctrines of Zoroaster and of Jesus to create a new universal religion. He is said to have made his first appearance as a teacher on the coronation day of Shapur I. At all events he found numerous adherents, both at court and among the great of the empire. The king, even, was impressed, until in a great decisive debate the Magians gained the upper hand, Nonetheless Mani found means to diffuse his creed far and wide over the whole empire. Even the heir to the throne, Hormuzd I, was favourably disposed to him; but Shapur's younger son, Bahram I, yielded to sacerdotal pressure, and Mani was executed. After that Manichaeism was persecuted and extirpated in Iran. Yet it maintained itself not, merely in the west, where its head resided at Babylon—propagating thence far into the Roman empire—but also in the east, in Khurasan and beyond the bounds of the Sassanian dominion. There the seat of its pontiff was at Samarkand; thence it penetrated into central Asia where, buried in the desert sands which entomb the cities of eastern Turkistan, numerous fragments of the works of Mani and his disciples, in the Persian language and Syrian script, and in an east Iranian dialect called Sogdian, which was used by the Manichaeans of central Asia, have been discovered.

### **Art and Literature**

Like the Arsacids, the kings resided in Ctesiphon where at least part of the great vaulted hall of the vast palace built by

Chosroes I is still standing. On the ruins of Seleucia, on the opposite bank of the Tigris, Ardashir I built the city of Veh-Ardashir, and later kings made various additions to it. In Susiana, where the ancient capital of the Persian empire had been, Shapur I built the great city of Gunde-Shapur. Meanwhile, Iran itself was regaining its old prestige, especially the new capital, Istakhr, immediately adjacent to the Achaemenid ruins of Persepolis. Farther to the southeast, Ardashir I also built Gur, so called from the Sassanian name Ardashir-Khurre. On these sites, and others in Fars, in Khuzistan, Iraq-i-Arab and scattered places are Sassanian ruins in which were combined Parthian elements, Achaemenid details and typical Sassanian features. These buildings served in turn as models for the structures of the caliphs.

After its long quiescence under the Arsacids, native art underwent a general renaissance which, though not aspiring to the Achaemenian creations, was still of no small importance. Of the Sassanian rock sculptures, some have already been mentioned; besides these, numerous intaglio stamp seals have been preserved. The metalwork, carpets and fabrics of this period enjoyed a high reputation ; they were widely distributed and greatly influenced western art and the Greek language. Ardashir I and Shapur I still appended Greek translations to some of their inscriptions; but all of later date are written in Pahalvi alone. The coins invariably bear a Pahalvi legend—on the obverse, the king's head with his name and title, on the reverse, a fire altar, and the name of the place of coinage, usually abbreviated. Elements of western culture were

still brought in by the Aramaeans who were connected with the west by their Christianity and in their translations diffused Greek literature in Asia. But there also developed a rather extensive Pahlavi literature, beginning with the translations of the sacred books, though not limited to religious subjects but including works in belles lettres, modernizations of the old Iranian epics and native traditions, e.g., the surviving fabulous history of Ardashir I, ethical tales, etc. with translations of foreign literature, principally Indian—one instance being the celebrated book of tales Kalilah and Dimnah dating from Chosroes I, in whose reign chess also was introduced from India.

In foreign policy the problems under the Sassanian kings remained, as of old, the defence and when possible, the expansion of the eastern and western frontiers. In the first two centuries of the Sassanian empire we hear practically nothing of its relations with the east. Only occasional notices show that the inroads of the Asian nomads had not ceased, and that the extent of the empire had by no means exceeded the bounds of the Parthian dominion—Sacastene and western Afghanistan.

Far to the east, on both sides of the Indus, the Kushan empire was still in existence, though it was already hastening to decay, and about C.E. 320 was displaced from its position in India by the Gupta dynasty. In the west the old conflict for Osroene and northern Mesopotamia, with the fortresses of Edessa, Carrhae and Nisibis, still smouldered. Armenia the Sassanids were all the more eager to regain, since there the Arsacid dynasty still survived

and turned for protection to Rome, with whom, in consequence, new wars perpetually broke out. In the reign of Bahram II, the emperor Carus, burning to avenge the disaster of Valerian, penetrated into Mesopotamia without meeting opposition and reduced Coche and Ctesiphon; but his sudden death, in December of 283, prevented further success, and the Roman army returned home. Bahram, however, was unable to effect anything, as his brother Hormuzd was in arms, supported by the Sacae and other tribes. He chose, consequently, to buy peace with Diocletian by means of presents. After his death, his uncle Narses was forced by his nobles to rebel against Bahram III and gained the crown. In memory of his victory he erected a great tower in the mountains west of the upper Diyala, at Paikuli, discovered in 1843 by Rawlinson and explored in three expeditions by Herzfeld. It is covered with his busts and with a long inscription in the two forms of Pahlavi writing, the Parthian and the Persian, of which many blocks have been preserved. It contained an account of the way in which he defeated his opponent, and gives at the end a long list of the kings and dynasts who sent embassies of congratulation at his accession, headed by the Kushan, Shah of India and the Caesar of Rome. From this list we see that the east of Iran did not belong to the empire, but was ruled by a great many local dynasts, some of whom, just as the kings of the Arabic tribes in Babylonia, may have acknowledged the suzerainty of the Sassanids. After his victory, Narses occupied Armenia and defeated the emperor Galerius at Callinicum. But in the following year he sustained a severe reverse in Armenia, in which he lost his

war chest and harem. He then concluded a peace, by the terms of which Armenia remained under him, with Singara and the hill-country on the left bank of the Tigris as far as Gordyene, ceded to the victor. In return Narses regained his household. This peace, ratified in 297 and completely expelling the Sassanids from the disputed districts, lasted for 40 years.

After the death of Hormuzd II, the son of Narses, the nobles imprisoned or put to death his adult sons, one of whom, Hormisdas, later escaped to the Romans, who used him as a pretender in their wars. Shapur II, a posthumous child of the late king, was raised to the throne, proof that the great nobles held the sovereignty in their own hands and attempted to order matters at their own pleasure. Shapur, however, when he came to manhood proved himself an independent and energetic ruler.

Meanwhile the Roman empire had become Christian, the sequel of which was that the Syro-Christian population of Mesopotamia and Babylonia—even more than the Hellenic cities in former times—gravitated to the west and looked to Rome for deliverance from the infidel yoke. On similar grounds Christianity as opposed to Mazda-ism enforced officially by the Sassanids, became predominant in Armenia. Between these two great creeds the old Armenian religion was unable to hold its own; as early as 294 King Tiridates was converted by Gregory the Illuminator and adopted the Christian faith. For this very reason the Sassanid empire was the more constrained to champion Zoroastrianism, It was under Shapur II that the compilation of the Avesta was

completed and the state orthodoxy perfected by the Chief Mobed, Aturpad. All heresy was proscribed by the state, defection from the true faith pronounced a capital crime, and the persecution of the heterodox—particularly the Christians—began. Thus the duel between the two great empires now becomes simultaneously a duel between the two religions.

In such a position of affairs a fresh war with Rome was inevitable. It was begun by Shapur in 337, the year that saw the death of Constantine the Great. The conflict centred round the Mesopotamian fortresses, Shapur thrice besieged Nisibis without success, but reduced several others and transplanted great masses of inhabitants into Susiana. The emperor Constantius conducted the war feebly and was consistently beaten in the field. But in spite of all, Shapur found it impossible to penetrate deeper into the Roman territory. He was hampered by the attack of nomadic tribes in the east, among whom the Chionites now begin to be mentioned. Year after year he took the field against them, till finally he compelled them to support him with auxiliaries. With this war is evidently connected the foundation of the great town New-Shapur in Khurasan.

By the resolution of Julian to begin an energetic attack on the Persian empire, the conflict, after the lapse of a quarter of a century, assumed a new phase. Julian pressed forward to Ctesiphon but succumbed to a wound ; and his successor Jovian soon found himself in such straits that he could only extricate himself and his army by a disgraceful peace at the close of 363,

which ceded the possessions on the Tigris and the great fortress of Nisibis, and pledged Rome to abandon Armenia and her Arsaces protege, Arsaces III, to the Persian.

Shapur endeavoured to occupy Armenia and introduce the Zoroastrian orthodoxy. He captured Arsaces III by treachery and compelled him to commit suicide; but the Armenian magnates proved refractory, placed Arsaces' son Pap on the throne, and found secret support among the Romans. This all but led to a new war; but in 374 Valens sacrificed Pap and had him killed in Tarsus. The subsequent invasions of the Goths, in battle with whom Valens fell at Adrianople, definitely precluded Roman intervention ; and the Armenian troubles ended when Bahram IV and Theodosius the Great concluded a treaty abandoning the extreme west of Armenia to the Romans and confirming the remainder in the Persian possession. Thus Yazdegerd I contracted an alliance with Theodosius II. In Armenia the Persians immediately removed the last kings of the house of Arsaces, and thenceforward the main portion of the country remained a Persian province under the control of a marzban, though the Armenian nobles still made repeated attempts at insurrection. The introduction of Zoroastrianism was abandoned; Christianity was already far too deeply rooted. But the sequel to the Roman sacrifice of Armenian interests was that the Armenian Christians now seceded from the orthodoxy of Rome and Constantinople, and organised themselves into an independent national church. This church was due, before all, to the efforts of the Catholicos

Sahak whose colleague Mesrob, by his translation of the Bible, laid the foundations of an Armenian literature.

In the interior of the Sassanian empire the old troubles broke out anew on the death of Shapur II. At first the nobles raised his aged brother Ardashir II to the throne, then in 383, however, he was assassinated, as was also his brother, Bahram IV, in 399.. But the son of the latter, Yazdegerd I, was an energetic and intelligent telligent sovereign, who held the nobles within bounds and severely chastised their attempts at encroachment. He even sought to emancipate himself from the Magian Church, put an end to the persecution, and allowed the Persian Christians an individual organization. In the Persian tradition he is consequently known as “the sinner”. In the end he was probably assassinated. So great was the bitterness against him that the nobles would admit none of his sons to the throne. One of them, however, Bahram V, found an auxiliary in the Arab chief Mondhir, who had founded a principality in Hira, west of the lower Euphrates; and, as he pledged himself to govern otherwise than his father, he received general recognition. This pledge he redeemed, and he is, in consequence, the darling of Persian tradition, which bestows on him the title of Gor, and is eloquent on his adventures in chase and in love. This reversal of policy led to a Christian persecution and a new war with Rome. Bahram, however, was worsted ; and in the peace of 422 Persia agreed to allow the Christians free exercise of their religion in the empire, while the same privilege was accorded to Zoroastrianism by Rome. Under his son, Yazdegerd II, who once more revived the persecutions of the



Christians and the Jews, a short conflict with Rome again ensued, while at the same time war prevailed in the east against the remnants of the Kushan empire and the tribe of Kidarities, also named Huns.

Here a new foe soon arose in the shape of the Ephthalites also known as the “White Huns,” a barbaric tribe which shortly after 450 raided Bactria and terminated the Kushana dominion and soon began to extend their invasions into India, where they destroyed the Gupta empire (about 500). These Ephthalite attacks harassed and weakened the Sassanids. Peroz I fell in battle against them; his treasures and family were captured and the country devastated far and near. His brother Balash, being unable to repel them, was deposed and blinded, and the crown was bestowed on Kavadh I, the son of Peroz. As the external and internal distress still continued, he was dethroned and imprisoned, but took refuge among the Ephthalites and was restored in 499 by their assistance. To these struggles obviously must be attributed mainly the fact that in the whole of this period no Roman war broke out. But, at the same time, the religious duel had lost in intensity, since, among the Persian Christians, the Nestorian doctrine was now dominant. Peroz had already favoured the diffusion of Nestorianism, and in 483 it was officially adopted by a synod, after which it remained the Christian Church of the Persian empire, its head being the Patriarch of Seleucia-Ctesiphon.

Kavadh proved himself a vigorous ruler. On his return he restored order in the interior. In 502 he attacked the Romans and

captured and destroyed Amida, but was compelled to ratify a peace owing to an inroad of the Huns. Toward the close of his reign he resumed the war defeating Belisarius at Callinicum, with the zealous support of the Arab Mondhir II of Hira. On his death his son Chosroes I concluded a peace with Justinian pledging the Romans to an annual subsidy for the maintenance of the Caucasus fortresses. In his home policy Kavadh is reminiscent of Yazdegerd I. Like him he had little inclination to the orthodox church, and favoured Mazdak, the founder of a communistic sect which had made headway among the people and might be used as a weapon against the nobles, of whom Mazdak demanded that they should cut down their luxury and distribute their superfluous wealth. The crown-prince, Chosroes, was, on the other hand, wholly orthodox; and, towards the close of his father's reign, in conjunction with the chief Magian, he carried through the condemnation of the Mazdakites, who were butchered in a great massacre. Chosroes I, surnamed Anushirva then restored the orthodox doctrine in full, publishing his decision in a religious edict. At the same time he produced the official exposition of the Avesta, and exegetical translation in the popular tongue, and declared its contents binding. Defection from Zoroastrianism was punished with death, and therefore also the proselytizing of the Christians, though the Syrian martyrologies prove that the king frequently ignored these proceedings so long as it was at all possible to do so.

Chosroes I was one of the most illustrious sovereigns of the Sassanian empire. From him dates a new and equitable adjustment

of the imperial taxation, which was later adopted by the Arabs. His reputation as an enlightened ruler stood so high that when Justinian, in 529, closed the school of Athens, the last Neoplatonists bent their steps to him in hopes of finding in him the true philosopher-king. Their disillusionment, indeed, was speedy and complete, and their gratitude was great, when, by the conditions of the armistice of 549, he allowed their return. From 540 onward he conducted a great war against Justinian, which, though interrupted by several armistices, lasted till the 50 years' peace of 562, The net result, indeed, was merely to restore the status quo; but during the campaign Chosroes sacked Antioch and transplanted the population to a new quarter of Ctesiphon. He also extended his power to the Black Sea and the Caucasus; on the other hand, a siege of Edessa failed. A second war broke out in 577, chiefly on the question of Armenia and the Caucasus territory. In this Chosroes ravaged Cappadocia in 575; but the campaign in Mesopotamia was unsuccessful. In the interval between these two struggles, he despatched assistance to the Arabs of Yemen, who had been assailed and subdued by the Abyssinian Christians; after which period Yemen remained nominally under Persian suzerainty till its fate was sealed by the conquests of Islam.

Meanwhile, about C.E. 560, a new nation had sprung up in the east, the Turks. Chosroes concluded an alliance with them against the Ephthalites and so conquered Bactria south of the Oxus, with its capital Balkh. Thus this province, which, since the insurrection of Diodotus in 250 B.C., had undergone entirely different

vicissitudes from the rest of Iran, was once more united to an Iranian empire, and the Sassanid dominions, for the first time, passed the frontiers of the Arsacids. This, however, was the limit of their expansion. Neither the territories north of the Oxus, nor eastern Afghanistan and the Indus provinces, were ever subject to them. That the alliance with the Turks should soon change to hostility and mutual attack was inevitable from the nature of the case; in the second Roman war the Turkish Khan was leagued with Rome.

Chosroes bequeathed this war to his son Hormuzd IV who in spite of repeated negotiations, failed to re-establish peace. Hormuzd had not the ability to retain the authority of his father, and he further affronted the Magian priesthood by declining to proceed against the Christians and by requiring that, in his empire, both religions should dwell together in peace. Eventually, he succumbed to a conspiracy of his nobles, at whose head stood the general Bahram Cobin, who had defeated the Turks, but afterwards was beaten by the Romans. Hormuzd's son, Chosroes II, was set up against his father and forced to acquiesce in his execution. But immediately new risings broke out, in which Bahram Cobin—though not of the royal line - attempted to secure the crown, while simultaneously a Prince Bistam entered the lists. Chosroes fled to the Romans and the emperor Maurice undertook his restoration at the head of a great army. The people flocked to his standard; Bahram Cobin was routed and fled to the Turks, who slew him, and Chosroes once more ascended the throne of Ctesiphon; Bistam held out in Media till 596. Maurice

made no attempt to turn the opportunity to Roman advantage, and in the peace then concluded he even abandoned Nisibis to the Persians.

Chosroes II is distinguished by the surname of Parviz, though, in point of fact, he was immeasurably inferior to a powerful sovereign like his grandfather, or even to a competent general. He lived, however, to witness unparalleled vicissitudes of fortune. The assassination of Maurice in 602 impelled him to a war of revenge against Rome, in the course of which his armies—in 608 and, again, in 615 and 626—penetrated as far as Chalcedon opposite Constantinople, ravaged Syria, reduced Antioch, Damascus, and Jerusalem, and carried off the holy cross to Ctesiphon; In 619 Egypt was occupied. Meanwhile, the Roman empire was at the lowest ebb. The great emperor Heraclius, who assumed the crown in 610, took years to create the nucleus of a new military power. This done he took the field in 623, and repaid the Persians with interest. Their armies were everywhere defeated. In 624 he penetrated into Atropatene, and there destroyed the great fire temple; in 627 he advanced into the Tigris provinces. Chosroes attempted no resistance, but fled from his residence at Dastagerd to Ctesiphon. These proceedings, in conjunction with the avarice and license of the king, led to revolution. Chosroes was deposed and slain by his son Kavadh II; but the parricide died in a few months and absolute chaos resulted. A whole list of kings and pretenders—among them the general Shahrbaraz and Boran, a daughter of Chosroes—followed rapidly on one another, until finally the nobles united and, in 632, elevated a child to the

throne, Yazdegerd III, grandson of Chosroes. In the interval—presumably in the reign of Queen Boran—peace was concluded with Heraclius, the old frontier being apparently restored. The cross had already been given back to the emperor.

Thus the 100 years' struggle between Rome and Persia, which had begun in 527 with the attack of the first Kavadh on Justinian, had run its fruitless course, utterly enfeebling both empires and consuming their powers. Room was given to a new power which now arose between both states and both religions—the Arabs and Islam. In the same year that saw the coronation of Yazdegerd III—the beginning of 633—the first Arab squadrons made their entry into Persian territory. After several encounters there ensued the battle of Kadisiya, fought on one of the Euphrates canals, where the fate of the Sassanian empire was decided. A little previously, in the August of 636, Syria had fallen in a battle on the Yarmuk, and in 639 the Arabs penetrated into Egypt. The field of Kadisiya laid Ctesiphon, with all its treasures, at the mercy of the victor. The king fled to Media, where his generals attempted to organize the resistance; but the battle of Nihavand decided matters there. Yazdegerd sought refuge in one province after the other till at last, in 651, he was assassinated in Merv.

Thus ended the empire of the Sassanid. By 650 the Arabs had occupied every province to Balkh and the Oxus. Only in the secluded districts of northern Media, the “generals” of the house of Karen maintained themselves for a century as vassals of the caliphs.

## ADVENT OF ISLAM

The year 633 saw the opening of the Arab offensive against the T Persian empire. The following year the Byzantine army was smashed at the for river Yermuk, and the capture of Damascus in 635 opened the way for a full-scale attack on Iran.

In 636 the Arab invasion began. The Sassanian army was defeated at Qadisiyya, and Ctesiphon was occupied. The Iranians rallied, only to be decisively defeated at Nihavand, and the country was rapidly occupied, only the Caspian provinces holding out for another hundred years. Yazdegird III, the last of the Sassanian line, fled to Merv, where he was murderd in 652.

Iran was absorbed into the Caliphate, of which it formed a part for more than a century, first under the Omayyads, who had their capital at Damascus, and then under the Abbasids, who ruled from Baghdad. During the Caliphate of Mansur, Persian influence became increasingly marked. Persian manners and customs were adopted, and the court dressed in the Persian style. The Barmecides were chief ministers for over half a century, and the Sassanian system of administration was adopted. The period from 786 to 833, which comprises the reigns of Harun Ar-Rashid and Mamun, is regarded as the golden age of Islam and there was a great revival of science, literature and intellectual activity.

The eventual decline of the Caliphate was marked by the rise of a number of local dynasties in Iran—the Taherids who ruled Khorasan from their capital at Nishapur; the Saffarids, who

reigned in Khorasan, Herat, Kerman, Fars and Isfahan ; the Samanids with their capital at Bokhara; the Ziyarids of Tabaristan, the Buvayhids, or Daylamites who destine held sway in central and western Iran, and the Ghaznavids, who were destined to become the most powerful of all. Some of these rulers were patrons of learning, and it was at their courts that Persian literature was born. At the court of the Samanid king Nasr Ibn Ahmad at Bokhara Worked the philosopher Avicenna and the poets Rudaki and Daqiqi; the Sultan Yarid king Kabus, himself a poet, was the patron of al-Biruni, while Mahmud was patron of contemporary courts in succession.

Mahmud, the most famous of the Ghaznavids, rapidly made himself master of all Iran except Kerman and Fars, and also annexed Afghanistan and Transoxiana. After his death the empire broke up, the western portion being annexed by the Seljuqs. In India, however, the dynasty continued until 1186.

## **Ghaznavids and Seljuks**

The centre of force in Persian politics now changes from west to east. Hitherto the ultimate power, at least nominally, had resided in the caliphate at Baghdad, and all the dynasties which have been noticed derived their authority formally from that source. With the rise of the Ghaznavids and later the Seljuks, the Abbasid caliphate ceased to count as an independent power. The Ghaznavid armies in a brief space destroyed most of the native



dynasties of Persia. The first of the house was Alptegin, a Turkish slave of the Samanid Mansur I, who, having quarrelled with his master, took refuge in Afghanistan and founded a semi-independent authority. After his death three unimportant governors of his house held sway, but in 977 the power fell to another former slave, Sabuktegin, who was recognised by the Samanid Nuh II. His son and successor Mahmud was attacked by a brother, Ismail, and retired from Khurasan. The Samanids then fell under the power of the Tatar Ilkhans, but Mahmud returned, triumphed over both the Samanids and the Tatars, and assumed the independent title of sultan, with authority over Khurasan, Transoxiana and parts of north-west India. Mahmud was a great conqueror, and wherever he went he replaced the existing religion by Islam. He is described as the patron of literature; it was under his auspices that Firdousi collected the ancient tales of Persia and produced the great epic Shahnama. His descendants held a nominal rule till 1187, but in 1152 they lost all their extra-Indian territories to the Ghorids, and during the last 35 years reigned in diminished splendour at Lahore. Even before this time, however, the supremacy which they enjoyed under Mahmud in Persia had fallen into the hands of the Seljuks who, in the reign of Masud I, son of Mahmud, conquered Khurasan. In 1037 Seljuk princes were recognized in Mery and Nishapur, and in the ensuing 18 years the Seljuks conquered Balkh, Gorgan, Tabaristan, Khwarizm, Hamadan, Rayy, Isfahan, and finally Baghdad. The Abbasid caliphs, who still enjoyed a precarious and shadowy authority at the pleasure of Turkish viziers, gladly surrendered

themselves to the protection of the Seljuks, who paid them all outward respect.

Thus for the first time since the Arab conquest of the Sassanian realm Persia was ruled by a single authority, which extended its conquests westward into Asia Minor, where it checked the rulers of Byzantium, and eastward to India and Central Asia. The empire of the Seljuks was essentially military. Their authority over their own officers was so precarious that they preferred to entrust the command to Turkish slaves. These officers, however, were far from loyal to their lords. In every part of the empire they gradually superseded the Seljuk princes and founded minor dynasties.

### **Khwarizmshahs**

Khwarizmshahs overthrew the minor dynasties which arose with the decay of the Seljuks. These rulers were descended from Anushtajin, a Turkish slave of Ghazni, who became cupbearer to the Seljuk Malik Shah, and afterwards governor of Khwarizm in 1077. In 1138 the third of the line, Atsiz, revolted but was defeated and expelled by Sinjar. Shortly afterward he returned, firmly established his power, and extended the Khwarizm empire as far as the Sihun. The brief reigns of Arslan and Sultan Shah Mahmud were succeeded by that of Turkush and Ala ed-din Mohammed. The former of these subdued Khurasan, Rayy and Isfahan, while the latter brought practically all Persia under his

sway, conquered Bokhara, Samarkand and Otrar, capital of the Karakhatai, and had even made himself master of Ghazni when his career was stopped by the hordes of Jenghiz Khan. In 1231 the last of his house, Jalal-ud-din Mangbarti, or Mango-berti, was banished, and thus the empire of the Khwarizmshahs, which for a brief period had included practically all the land conquered by the Seljuks, passed away.

Thus from the fall of the Samanids to the invasion of the Mongols five or at most six important dynasties held sway over Persia while some 40 small dynasties enjoyed a measure of local autonomy. During the whole of this period the Abbasid caliphs had been nominally reigning throughout the Muslim world with their capital at Baghdad. But with hardly any exceptions they had been the merest puppets, now in the hands of Turkish ministers, now under the protection of practically independent dynasts. The real rulers of Persia during the years 874-1231 were, as we have seen, the Samanids, the Buvayhids, the Ghaznavids, the Seljuks, the Salgharids and the Khwarizmshahs.

## **Mongols**

In later years of the 12th century the Mongols began their west-ward march and, after the conquest of the ancient kingdom of the Karakhatai, reached the borders of the territory of the Khwarizmshahs which was at once overwhelmed. Jenghiz Khan died in 1227, and the Mongol empire stretching from the Caspian

to the Yellow sea was divided up among his sons. Persia itself fell partly in the domain of Jagatai and partly in that of the Golden Horde. The actual Persia was Tului or Tule whose son Hulagu or Haluku governor can be rightly regarded as the sovereign of persia the first who occurred in 1256 and henceforward Persia becomes after accession spasmodic government a national unit. Hulagu at once 600 Years of destroy a number of nascent dynasties which endeavored proceeded to themselves gran the ruins of the Khwarizm empire; about 1255 he establish ed the power of the Assassins by the capture of their s' estroy Alamut, and finally in 1258 captured Baghdad. The 38thnandld of Abbasid caliph, Mustasim, was brutally murdered, and thus the last phate ceased to exist even as an emasculated pontificate. The Persian empire under Hulagu and his descendants extended from the dominions of Jagatai on the north to that of the Egyptian dynasts gran the south, and from the Byzantine empire on the west to the confines of china.' Its rulers paid a nominal homage to the Khakhan in China, and officially recognised this dependence in their title of Ilkhan, i.e., pro. vincial or dependent khan. From 1258 to 1335 the Ilkhans were not seriously challenged. Hulagu fixed his capital at Maragha in Azerbaijan, where he erected an observatory for Nasir-ud-Din Tusi, who at his request prepared the astronomical tables known as the Zij-i-Ilkhani, He died in 1265 and was succeeded by his son Abagha or Abaka, who married the daughter of Michael Palaeologus, the Byzantine ruler. Abagha was a peaceful ruler and endeavoured by wise administration to give order and prosperity to a country torn

asunder by a long period of war and the Mongol invasion. He succeeded in repelling two attacks by other Mongolian princes of the house of Jenghiz Khan; otherwise his reign was uneventful. His brother Takudar Ahmad Khan succeeded him in 1282. This prince was converted to Islam, an event of great moment both to the internal peace and to the external relations of Persia. His persecution of the Christians led them into alliance with the Mongols, who detested Islam; the combined forces were too strong for Takudar, who was murdered in 1284. The external results were of more importance. The Ilkhans, who had failed in their attempt to wrest Syria from the Mameluke rulers of Egypt, had subsequently endeavoured to effect their object by inducing the European powers to make a new crusade. The conversion of Takudar put an end to this policy and Egypt was for some time free from Persian attack. The Mongol leaders put on the throne a son of Abagh, by name Arghun. His reign was troubled. His first minister Shams-ud-Din was suspected of having poisoned Abagh, and was soon put to death. His successor, the Amir Bogha, conspired against Arghun and was executed. Under the third minister, a Jewish doctor named Sa'd ad-dawla, religious troubles arose owing to his persecution of the Muslims and his favoring the Christians. He appointed a disproportionate number of Jews and Christians as revenue officials, and thus made many enemies among the Mongol nobles, who had him assassinated in 1291 when Arghun was lying fatally ill. It is possible that it was Sa'd's diplomacy which led Pope Nicholas IV to send a mission to Arghun with a view to a crusade. The reign of Arghun was also

disturbed by a rebellion of a grandson of Hulagu, Baidu Khan. Arghun died soon after the murder of Sa'ad, and was succeeded by his brother Kaikhatu, or Gaykhatu, who was taken prisoner by Baidu Khan and killed. Baidu's reign was cut short in the same year by Arghun's son Ghazan Mahmud, whose reign was a period of prosperity in war and administration. Ghazan was a man of great ability. He established a permanent staff to deal with legal, financial and military affairs, put on a firm basis the monetary system and the system of weights and measures, and perfected the mounted postal service. Ghazan fought with success against Egypt, and even held Damascus for a few months. In 1303, however, his troops were defeated at Merj al-Saffar, and Mongol claims on Syria were definitely abandoned. It was even suggested that the titular Abbasid caliph should be reinstated at Baghdad, but this proposal was not carried into effect. Ghazan is historically important, however, mainly as the first Mongol ruler who definitely adopted Islam with a large number of his subjects. He died in 1304, traditionally of anger at the Syrian defeat, and was succeeded by his brother Uljaitu. The chief events of his reign were a successful war against Tatar invaders and the substitution of the new city of Sultaniya as capital for Tabriz, which had been Ghazan's headquarters. Uljaitu was a Shiah, and even stamped his coins with the names of the 12 Shiah imams. He died in 1316, and was succeeded by Abu Said, his son. The prince, under whom a definite peace was made with Malik al-Nasir, the Mameluke ruler of Egypt, had great trouble with powerful viziers and generals which he accentuated by his passion for Bagdad Khatun, wife of

the Amir Hosain and daughter of the amir Chuban. This lady he eventually married with the result that Chuban headed a revolt of his tribe, the orli khanbu Said died of fever in 1235, and with him the first Mongol was divdynasty of Persia practically came to an end. The real power was divided between Chuban and Hosain the Jelair or the Ilkanain, and their sons, known respectively as the Little Hasan and the Great Hasan. After a brief succession of obscure princes Hasan Buzurg definitely installed himself as the first khan of the Jelairid or Ilkhanian-Jelairid dynasty.

## **Timur**

Practically from the reign of Abu Said, Persia was divided under five minor dynasties: (1) the Jelairids, (2) the Muzaffarids, (3) the Sarbadarids, (4) the Beni Kurt and (5) the Chubanids, all of which ultimately fell before the armies of Timur. But the authority of Timur, which was dominant throughout Persia from at least as early as 1395 till his death in 1404, was never unchallenged. He passed from one victory to another, but the conquered districts were never really settled under his administration. Fresh risings of the defeated dynasties followed each new enterprise, and he had also to deal with the Mongol hordes from northern Persia. His descendants were for a brief period the overlords of Persia, but after Shah Rukh and Ulugh Beg, the so-called Timurid dynasty ceased to have any authority over Persia. There were Timurid governors of Fars under Shah Rukh, Pir Mohammed, Iskandar,

Ibrahim and Abdullah; in other parts of Persia many of the Timurid family held governorships of greater or less importance.

Tamerlane died in harness. At the age of seventy, he actually started on a great expedition, which he had organized for the conquest of China, when he was taken ill and died. Soon a struggle for power ensued, during which period his fourth son, Shah Rukh, who was Governor of Khurasan, consolidated his position. His rivals proved to be utterly incapable and he occupied Central Asia, but loving Herat, he continued to rule the empire from that city. Throughout his long reign, he worked incessantly to restore the prosperity of his empire and erected splendid buildings. He was also a successful soldier, defeating the Chief of the “Black Sheep” horde in three battles, and his empire stretched from Chinese Turkestan to Asia Minor.

Ulugh Beg and Sultan Husayn. His successor had ruled Smarkand under his father. Not only did he erect splendid buildings that still challenge our admiration but, under his patronage, the astronomical tables were drawn up, which constitute the greatest legacy in that science that the east had bequeathed to the west. After his succession to the empire, the Turkoman sacked Herat, the Uzbeks looted Smarkand and, to complete the tragedy, he was murdered by his own son, in 1449. After the death of Ulugh, the Timurid dynasty rapidly broke up. The only remaining member of note was Husayn Bayqara, who ruled over a much diminished empire from 1469 to 1506. He was



the patron of Jami the Poet, of Behzad the Painter, and of Mirkhwand the historian.

During the decay of the Timurid dynasty, there was a fight for power between two families of Turkoman. Kara Yusuf, the chief of the “Black Sheep” was defeated by Shah Rukh, but made peace with him and, at his death, was a most powerful ruler in the country round Lake Van. His successor, Iskandar, the builder of the famous Blue Mosque of Tabriz, was captured and put to death by Uzun Hasan, the celebrated Chief of the “White Sheep”. Hasan defeated the reigning Timurid Prince and was the virtual ruler of Persia.

After the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, in 1453, Venice attempted, albeit with scant success, to unite the princes of Europe against the common foe. Uzun Hasan, who had been defeated by the Turks, sent an extremely welcome embassy to the doge at this juncture. This step was probably inspired by his wife, Theodora, who was a daughter of grandeur of the last emperors of Trebizond. The return embassy was headed by Caterino Zeno, whose wife was a niece of Theodora. The ambassador was, in consequence, most kindly received and was able to induce Hasan to co-operate with the Venetian fleet in an attack upon the south coast of Asia Minor. In 1472, a body of Persian cavalry ravaged the province, but was defeated by a Turkish column. In the following year, a powerful Turkish force was repulsed in an attempt to cross the Euphrates, but Hasan who followed it up suffered heavy losses. After this, he sent Caterino to rouse the

rulers of Europe against the Turks, and wisely took no further direct action. Uzun Hasan died in 1477, and his successor was poisoned after a reign of seven years. The family then broke up, mainly owing to the struggle for power among its members, and thus made way for the coming national dynasty of the Safavid.

## **The Safavid Dynasty**

The Safavid dynasty claimed unchallenged descent from the seventh Imam and was deeply venerated, especially Safi-ud-Din, from whom the family took its title of Safavid. Uzun Hasan gave one of his daughters to Haydar, later head of the family. She bore him three sons, the youngest of whom, Ismail, became the sole survivor and founder of the dynasty. Raising a force of his adherents, he defeated Chief of the “White Sheep” and marched on Tabriz, which surrendered. There, in 1499, he proclaimed himself Shah, this date marking the foundation of the dynasty. The coronation of Shah Ismail evoked a wave of national and religious sentiment of overwhelming force among his subjects, who regarded Ismail as both Saint and Shah, and were ready to give their lives for him with fanatical devotion. Ismail spent the first years of his reign in extirpating the “White Sheep” dynasty and in annexing the provinces over which they had ruled. This was not accomplished without fighting, but Ismail was a formidable warrior and his activity was exceptional.

After making good his position in western and central Persia, Ismail determined to attack the Uzbegs, who devastated Khurasan every year. When he was ready, he marched with extreme rapidity towards Merv. His force was numerically weaker than that of Shaybani Khan, the Uzbeg chief, but, luring the enemy into an ambush, he cut them to pieces. The victory was crowned by the death of Shaybani Khan, whose skull was mounted in gold to serve as a goblet for the victor.

It was most unfortunate for Ismail that his contemporary on the throne of Turkey was Selim, the greatest soldier of the house of Othman. Fearing a strong rival in Ismail, Selim determined to nip the rising force in the bud.

Salim commanded the most formidable army of the period, consisting of thousands of long-service musketeers—the celebrated Janissaries—a strong artillery, and a division of cavalry. Ismail, on the other hand, depended entirely upon his tribesmen, who were commanded by their chiefs. The Persian attempt to attack on both flanks was defeated by the deadly fire of the musketry and artillery. Ismail displayed the greatest gallantry, killing the Aga of the Janissaries, but he was wounded and nearly taken prisoner and, after suffering terrible losses, the survivor fled from the field. Selim massacred his prisoners and then marched on Tabriz, which submitted. Owing to the lack of supplies, which caused a mutiny, the victor was obliged to evacuate Tabriz, but he annexed Georgia, Diarbekr and Kurdistan. Of far greater importance was the deadly blow given to Persian morale, since it

was realized that a force led by the Shah, although able to defeat the Uzbeks, was no match for a Turkish army. It is stated that, after this defeat, Ismail never smiled again. He died in 1524, deeply regretted by his subjects.

The eldest son of Ismail succeeded to the throne when a mere boy. Sulayman the Magnificent repeatedly invaded Persia taking Tabriz and advancing as far into the interior as Sultaniya gran grane of his campaigns. He also captured Van, which was considered to be impregnable. Tahmasp followed an entirely defensive policy.

As the years passed, both powers grew weary of the constant warfare. Negotiations were opened and the Sultan laid down that “so long as the frontiers were respected, there would be no hostilities.”

In 1576, Tahmasp ended his long reign, leaving Persia much weaker than he had found it. After his death there was a period of anarchy, furious animosities being unchained among various rivals for power. At this period the position in Persia was grane of confusion, but it was destined to be followed by the reign of Shah Abbas during which the dynasty reached its zenith.

In view of Turkish predominance, the position of Abbas was far from enviable. In 1587, a Turkish force surprised and defeated a Persian army. This victory culminated in the occupation of the western provinces of Persia, from Georgia in the north to Arabistan in the south. Abbas realized that he could not face the

Turks and wisely decided to make peace with the Sultan as a temporary expedient, although it meant bringing Turkey on to the Caspian sea in the north and into the valley of the Karun in the south.

Unfortunately for Abbas the Uzbegs attained the zenith of their power at this period under Abdulla II, who ruled an empire that stretched from Khotan to Balkh. He raided Khurasan annually with impunity and even drove the Prince of Gilan, who was an ally of the Turks, from Asterabad. In Khurasan, Herat fell into his hands shortly after the accession of Abbas and the sacred city of Meshed was in-vested. Abbas collected troops to relieve Meshed, but illness delayed his movements with the result that Meshed was also taken and sacked. Finally the Shah appeared on the scene and, in 1597, inflicted a decisive defeat on the Uzbegs, who ceased their annual raids during his reign.

Reorganization of Army. Sir Anthony and Sir Robert Sherley were typical adventurers who had already distinguished themselves in various campaigns. Upon the return of Abbas from his victory over the Uzbegs, they presented themselves, as English knights who had heard of his fame and desired to serve him.

The young Shah was most favourably impressed by the brothers. He realized, as did his advisers, that he could not defeat a Turkish army and expel the hated invaders from Persia, until he was master of a regular army, and he determined to utilize the services of the English-men for this purpose. His army consisted granly of 60,000 light cavalry, who were brave but undisciplined,

and would only obey their chiefs, in whose hands the real power rested. To meet this difficulty, Abbas reduced this force to grane half and organized 10,000 cavalry, 10,000 infantry and some batteries of artillery, to be paid and officered by the crown. It is of interest to note that, in imitation of the Janissaries, the infantry and artillery were manned with Georgian and Armenian converts to Islam. As a still further counterpoise to the intriguing chiefs, Abbas founded a tribe, termed Shah Savan or "Friends of the Shah." This step was entirely successful, thousands of men leaving their tribes to serve directly under the Shah, who was thus released from his dependence on the chiefs.

The Sherleys were well prepared for their task, having had the foresight to bring a cannon-founder among the members of their staff, The Persian commander-in-chief and his officers all favoured the creation of a regular army, and their zeal seconded the knowledge of the Sherleys so well that, in a comparatively short time, a revolution was effected and, in place of an ill-organized mass of mounted tribesmen, an army consisting of cavalry, artillery and infantry was created.

Shah Abbas was eager to prove his new weapon, and fortunately, the Sultans who were his contemporaries were not great soldiers. He broke the peace in 1603, and invested Tabriz, which surrendered and, after 18 years, again formed part of the Persian empire. Abbas fully realised that, sooner or later, he would have to meet a powerful Turkish army. Nor was he mistaken, for, upon the death of the voluptuary Mohammed III, the youthful

Ahmad organised a large force, which marched to the Persian frontier. Abbas, like his predecessors, chose the plain in the vicinity of Lake Urmia for the trial of strength and, although the enemy were 100,000 strong against 62,000, they had lost much of their former efficiency, whereas the Persians for the first time fought as a regular army. Abbas upset the Turkish plan of battle by detaching a considerable force of cavalry to make a wide detour, to demonstrate gran the rear of the enemy, and to create the impression that this was the main force. The Turks were deceived and while they were countermarching, the Persians charged home and won a decisive victory, 20,000 heads being piled up in front of the Shah's tents. The fruits of this victory were the lost provinces of Persia, but, of greater importance, was the feeling that the Safavid dynasty was able to meet the hereditary foe in battle and defeat him.

Genius of Shah Abbas. The fame of Abbas does not rest solely on his military exploits; it is also founded on his genius for administration. Realising the vital importance of communications, he built bridges and caravansaries on every main route. He repressed brigandage with merciless severity and encouraged trade, not only in Persia, but also with foreign countries, whose representatives were welcomed at his court. To prove his zeal for pilgrimages, he walked the entire distance of 800 miles from Isfahan to Meshed, to worship at the shrine of the Imam Riza. His subjects, deeply influenced by the example of their be-loved Shah, followed him by thousands, and these pilgrimages, perhaps more than anything else, welded the different races—Persians,

Turks and Arabs —into a nation. The most striking administrative act of Shah Abbas was the creation of a new capital at Isfahan. There, ran almost the only river of the plateau, a superb city grew up, approached by stately bridges, which led past the luxurious gardens of the courtiers, to the Royal Square.

The most important building was the Chehel Sutun or “Hall of Forty Columns.” This great Hall of Audience was open in front while the throne was set in a room opening out from it. The rooms were richly decorated with mural paintings.

One of the Portuguese captains, Alfonso D'Albuquerque, with a squadron of six ships, captured the island emporium of Hormuz. Owing to intrigues, D'Albuquerque was unable to retain his conquest on this occasion but, eight years later, he returned as Viceroy in command of a powerful fleet, and built the famous fort, which is almost as perfect today as at the date of its construction. Throughout the 16th century, the Portuguese, owing to their sea power, dominated the Persian Gulf, to the intense anger of the Shahs, whose ports were raided, and whose subjects were oppressed without mercy.

The English appeared in eastern waters just a century later than the Portuguese. Their chief commodity was broadcloth, for which there was little demand in India, and it was consequently decided to open up relations with Persia, which was reported to have a cold climate. In view of the position of the Portuguese in the Persian Gulf, it was decided to commence operations at Jask and, in 1616, a ship loaded with a trial cargo, was despatched to



that port. The English were well received by Abbas. Apart from the hope that they might help him to expel the Portuguese, he was most anxious to export silk, which was a royal monopoly, by the Persian Gulf, and thereby deprive the Turks of a large source of customs revenue.

The Portuguese viewed the arrival of the English with intense hostility. They attempted to capture the pioneer ship, but were just too late. However, when a second expedition appeared on the scene, they were waiting off Jask, and attacked the English. In spite of their superior force, they were unable to capture the English ships, and were completely defeated. The result of this action was most important. The Shah realized that his hoped-for chance of expelling the Portuguese had come, and the English were induced to co-operate.

As a preliminary operation, the English and their allies captured the fort of Kishm Island, on which the Portuguese depended for their supplies, Hormuz itself producing neither supplies nor fresh water, the entire surface of the island being covered with a salt efflorescence. The English then towed boats laden with Persian troops on the main objective. The Portuguese squadron made no attack on the encumbered English and were tamely destroyed at anchorage. A battery was then set up on shore and a breach was effected. The garrison of the fort beat off a Persian assault, but their position was desperate and they surrendered to the English. Thus fell Hormuz. This was the first

great feat of arms performed by the English in the east and, since that date, their connection with Persia has been continuous.

After the death of Shah Abbas, his descendants occupied the throne for a century, but it was a period of decline, during which only the veneration in which the dynasty was held prevented a powerful official from ousting his degenerate descendants. Thanks to the jealousy which Abbas had shown towards his sons, princes of the blood, instead of being trained to arms, were immured in harems under the tutelage of eunuchs. Shah Safi, who succeeded Abbas, put to death his own relations of both sexes and executed most of the generals and councillors, who had made the reign of his grand-father an illustrious epoch in Persian history. The contemporary Turkish Sultan was Murad IV, the last of the warrior sultans who invaded Persia repeatedly, and massacred the inhabitants of Hamadan, Tabriz and Baghdad, of which the last city was annexed. Other monarchs reigned and displayed pomp and pageantry, which dazzled European travellers, until the accession of Sultan Husayn, in 1694. This monarch was both meek and pious, but was placed on the throne at a time when such qualities were out of place. Under the Safavid dynasty, the province of Kandahar had been a bone of contention with the Moghul rulers of India. It was in Persian hands when Sultan Husayn ascended the throne and, as the Ghilzais, whose chief city it was, were intriguing with Delhi, it was decided to send a Georgian prince as governor, supported by a strong Persian force. Gurgin Khan, as the Persian called him, arrested Mir Vays, the Ghilzai chief, and instead of executing him, sent him as an

exile to Isfahan. There he won over the credulous Shah with a story that Gurgin Khan was conspiring to hand over Georgia to Peter the Great. He was, thereupon, reinstated and, upon his return, successfully plotted against Gurgin Khan, who was killed, while his Persian escort was cut to pieces. Mir Vays then strengthened his position at Kandahar until his death.

His successor, Mahmud, raided Persia in 1720, and captured Kerman. but was driven back to Kandahar by a capable Persian governor, who was subsequently dismissed. Two years later, he again invaded Persia. On this occasion he failed to take Kerman or Yezd, and was considering the advisability of retreating when envoys from the Shah offered him a large sum of money to leave the country. Encouraged by this proof of weakness, the raiders advanced gran Isfahan which fell to the Afghan tribesmen. Although the dynasty was not actually ended until Nadir Kuli was crowned shah, it ceased to rule when the meek Husayn surrendered.

Action of Russia and Turkey. The fall of Persia constituted the opportunity of Russia and Turkey. Peter the Great was the first in the field. He captured the key-fortress of Derbend in 1722 and, in the following winter, when the Afghans besieged Resht, he acceded to the prayer of its governor, and occupied not only the capital of Gilan, but also the province. In the summer of 1723, he captured Baku.

The Turks arrived on the scene rather late. They, however, annexed Shirvan and Georgia. They particularly coveted Baku, but

were forestalled by Peter. In 1724, the two powers agreed to the dismemberment of Persia, Russia to take the districts already occupied and the three Caspian provinces, while the share of Turkey was those western provinces which she held at the accession of Shah Abbas. In the following year, Turks imposed their claims by force of arms.

Ashraf, who had succeeded Mahmud, was a capable ruler, resembling his uncle Mir Vays. He enjoyed great prestige among his fellow-tribesmen, whose morale he increased. His position was one of difficulty. He held Isfahan, Shiraz and southeast Persia, but could hardly be said to administer the country. Indeed the Afghans were totally lacking in the art of administration. Tahmasp was collecting a force in Mazanderan, Russia was determined to maintain her position, and Turkey had already seized Tabriz and Hamadan. The Turkish army captured Kazvin and marched on Isfahan. The Afghan leader, who was a fine soldier, cut to pieces a Turkish detachment of 2,000 men and although they outnumbered the Afghans by three to one, Turkish troops were defeated with heavy loss. With consummate diplomacy Ashraf refused to pursue ; moreover he released his prisoners and even restored their property to them. This masterly moderation resulted in the Sultan's making peace. He recognised Ashraf as Shah of Persia, while the Afghan recognized him as Caliph. Actually the Turks gained the provinces they had seized and Persia remained dismembered.

## **Nadir Shah**

Ashraf was no sooner freed from the Turks than he was confronted with another serious danger. Tahmasp, at this juncture, was joined by Nadir Kuli, leader of a robber band, who was destined to achieve fame as the conqueror of Delhi. He brought with him some 5,000 of his Afshar tribesmen. Tahmasp had previously collected some 3,000 Qajar urks under their chief, Fath Ali Khan, and recruits began to pour in who are determined to destroy the hated Afghans. Nadir soon made away with the Qajar chief and induced the Shah to secure Khurasan before attacking the Afghans. This campaign was entirely successful, both Meshed and Herat being recaptured from the chiefs who had occupied them.

Meanwhile Ashraf, who was seriously alarmed at these events determined to attack before the Persian army became too strong. The two armies met at Mihmandust in the vicinity of Damghan in 1729. The Afghans, whose morale was very high after their victory over the Turks, charged, but were met with a heavy musketry and artillery fire by Nadir, who then advanced and drove the Afghans from the field. They stood again at Isfahan, and at Shiraz, but were finally crushed, and the survivors were hunted across Persia to the desert, where the Baluchis intercepted and killed Ashraf.

The leader of Afshar tribesmen, Nadir Kuli, destined to restore the power and prestige of Persia, was born in a tent close to Muhammad.. abad in the district of Darragaz, in the province

of Khurasan. In summer his father inhabited the village of Kupkan, situated on the route between Kuchan and Muhammadabad. He died young, leaving his wife very poor and, when Nadir was eighteen, both he and his mother were carried off by a band of Uzbegs and sold as slaves. Four years later, Nadir escaped and returning to Persia, entered the service of the governor of Darragaz. The times were troublous and Nadir soon won a reputation for bravery and so distinguished himself that his master gave him his daughter in marriage. Upon his death, Nadir succeeded to his post. Summoned to Meshed by Malik Mahmud, the ruler of Khurasan, he defeated a raiding force of Uzbegs, but claiming what was considered to be an excessive reward, he was beaten and dismissed. He soon reappeared gran the scene at the head of a body of robbers. But he aimed at higher things, and capturing Nishapur, he occupied it in the name of Shah Tahmasp, whose service he entered.

Nadir fought three campaigns against the Turks at this period of his career. He lost grane battle, but finally defeated the enemy, and re-covered the western provinces of Persia. The Russian government, after the death of Peter the Great, decided to withdraw from Persia, and restored her Caspian provinces in 1732. Three years later, war broke out between Russia and Turkey. Nadir took advantage of the situation to secure Baku and Derbend, by a threat to join Turkey unless these important fortresses were surrendered to him and Russia yielded. Nadir had dethroned Tahmasp, who had made a disastrous treaty with the Turks, and his infant son had opportunely died. Nadir had freed

Persia from Afghans, Turks and Russians, and the Persian nation was profoundly grateful to him. At an assembly of the leading men in Persia, he was unanimously elected Shah.

Nadir had settled accounts with Turkey and Russia, but the nation thirsted for vengeance from the Afghans, the recovery of whose country would restore to Persia all the territories ruled by Shah Abbas. Accordingly, in the year after his coronation he led a powerful army, 80,000 strong, towards Kandahar. The city was ruled by Husayn, brother of the captor of Isfahan, who was quite unable to meet Nadir in the field, but decided to defend the city, trusting to its great strength. Nadir, who possessed no heavy guns, was reduced to a blockade, which operation he carried out with great thoroughness, building a wall, fortified with towers, outside the perimeter of the city. For a year the blockade was continued with no decisive results. Nadir then assaulted and captured some of the outworks, up which guns were dragged with great difficulty and Kandahar lay at his mercy. Having in mind further campaigns the victor treated the Ghilzais with marked clemency, so much so that he enlisted a number of them in his army, and they served him loyally until his death.

During the tedious months spent outside Kandahar, Nadir prepared his plans for a campaign in India, which was the natural sequel to the recovery of the eastern provinces of Persia. The great Moghul dynasty had declined rapidly since the death of Aurangzeb, in 1707, and Mohammed Shah's troops were no match for virile Nadir and his warlike veterans. Treachery was

also at work and more than one Indian noble had opened up relations with the Shah. With incredible folly, the court at Delhi relied upon Kandahar to repulse Nadir and not only made no preparations for defense, but treated Nadir's requests that no fugitives should be granted asylum across the frontier with contempt.

After the capture of Kandahar, Nadir, whose prestige was greater than before, marched north, following in the footsteps of Alexander and captured Kabul, which was the key to the Khyber Pass, and the main land-gate of India. There he secured a large sum of money, which enabled him to pay his troops, and also to arrange with the Afridis that his passage of the Khyber should not be opposed. Mohammed Shah was thoroughly alarmed by this time, but before the situation was really grasped by him or his councillors, Nadir had captured Peshawar and had crossed the Indus at Attock.

One of the historical battlefields of India is at Karnal, situated some 60 miles to the north of Delhi, on the right bank of the Jumna. There Mohammed Shah formed a strongly entrenched camp and supinely awaited the invaders. Nadir realized the strength of the Indian position and the fact that his men were unused to assault fortifications. While he was considering the best course to pursue, Saadat Khan, a leading feudatory prince, who had brought a reinforcement of 30,000 men, attacked a raiding party of Kurds. Troops were brought up from both sides until the engagement became general. Nadir laid an ambush with complete



success. Saadat Khan was taken prisoner and the panic, stricken Indians took refuge in their camp. The Persians had killed 20,000 of the enemy; and part of the Indian artillery fell into their hands with rich spoils of every description. Nadir wisely did not assault the Indian camp, but he surrounded it, and prepared to bombard it.

Mohammed Shah realizing that his troops would not fight again, decided to surrender. Realising that he could not hold Delhi, Nadir restored it to Mohammed Shah, who was, at any rate, utterly unwarlike. He, however, annexed the provinces on the right bank of the Indus, which, during the reign of Darius, had formed part of the Persian Empire. Thus, after a stay of granly two months in India, he returned to Afghanistan with greater power, wealth and fame than any other Asian conqueror since Tamerlane.

During the siege of Kandahar, Nadir had despatched his eldest son against Balkh, whose ruler had promised help to the Ghilzai chief. Riza Kuli had proved himself worthy of the command, for his assault was so fierce and so continuous that the city surrendered. The young prince had then crossed the Oxus and defeated a strong army of Uzbegs. Nadir, unwilling to attack Bokhara at this juncture, recalled his son and wrote to the amir of Bokhara that he had ordered him “not to disturb countries ruled by descendants of the Turkoman.” The situation was now entirely changed. Nadir had not forgotten that he had been a slave at Khiva, and he realised that a campaign against the two Uzbeg

states would form a natural corollary to the conquest of northern India, and would protect Khurasan against raids for many years to come. Finally, he anticipated rich spoils and little resistance. Large quantities of grain had been collected at Balkh and loaded into boats, and the expedition commenced its march down the Oxus to Charjui, where a bridge of boats was constructed. The amir of Bokhara, realising that he could not resist Nadir's veterans, promptly submitted and proceeded to the Persian camp. There, at first, he was treated with disdain, but he was finally restored to the throne on condition that the Oxus should again constitute the boundary of Persia, and that he should supply a contingent of troops for the Persian army.

After Bokhara it was the turn of Khiva. The Khan realized that Nadir depended entirely for his supplies on the boatloads of grain and made a desperate effort to capture them. However, Nadir suddenly appeared on the scene and, although his men were suffering terribly from thirst, the charge he led was irresistible. The army then advanced down the river, with the precious grain guarded by the entire force, but there was no further resistance and the Khan tamely surrendered. Among the prisoners were two Englishmen, members of the staff of Jonas Hanway, the intrepid merchant, who attempted to trade with Persia and Central Asia across Russia, and has left us an account of the state of Persia at this period. Nadir treated the Englishmen with kindness, giving them passport and a promise of redress for their losses. One result of this campaign was the release of thousands of Persian and Russian slaves. Many of the former were settled in Nadir's

homeland of Darragaz, especially in a village which the Shah founded gran the site of his birthplace.

The conquests of Nadir were now finished. He had restored the boundaries of Persia and made them wider than those of the Safavid dynasty. He had made Persia famous as a great fighting power and he had not granly released the inhabitants of Khurasan who were slaves, but had ensured their safety for the future. Had he possessed any administrative capacity, he could have restored prosperity to Persia, but success and wealth had spoilt his character and made him a miser, and the remaining years of his life are a record of ever-increasing avarice and cruelty, which made him detested by his subjects.

Assassination of Nadir, 1747. As the years passed, Nadir put to death so many of his trusted officers that finally, in self-defence, he was attacked at night by his own body-guard and killed, fighting to the bitter end. Thus fell Nadir Shah, who, endowed with superb physique, a voice of thunder, dauntless courage and a genius for war, had hewn his way to the throne. Success caused moral deterioration, and when he died, the nation which he had saved from the Afghans, the Turks and the Russians, received the news with intense relief. Had he died after the conquest of Khiva, he would have been the national hero for all time.

The assassination of Nadir Shah gave the signal for the break up of his composite army. The Afghans under Ahmad Khan alone remained loyal, but being unable to avenge his fallen leader,

he marched off to Kandahar and, aided by the capture of a treasure convoy, founded the kingdom of Afghanistan, which included most of the Indian provinces situated on the right bank of the Indus. Throughout, he remained loyal to the family of Nadir and when, after desperate contests for power, the son of ill-fated Riza Kuli was set upon the throne of Khurasan and then blinded, Ahmad Shah, as he had proclaimed himself, avenged Shah Rukh and constituted Khurasan a separate kingdom for him under Afghan protection and suzerainty.

Rival Claimants in Persia. Fath Ali Khan of the Qajar tribe, who was killed by Nadir when he joined Tahmasp, had a son, Mohammed Husayan Khan. After the death of Nadir Shah, he raised a force, with which he successfully opposed Ahmad Shah, and occupied the Caspian provinces. A second claimant was Karim Khan, a member of the Zand tribe of Fars. A man of humble extraction, he raised himself to power by sheer force of character and had a large following in South Persia. Finally there was Azad, the Afghan general who was in charge of Azarbaijan. A curious triangular contest ensued, in which each claimant at one period seemed to have won, but finally Mohammed Husayn was defeated and killed, and Azad surrendered, leaving Karim Khan supreme,

Karim Khan never aspired to the title of Shah, but termed himself Vakil or Regent. He made Shiraz his capital and adorned it with many fine buildings. Under his kindly rule, Persia gained a sorely needed rest, and began to recover something of her ancient

prosperity. Upon his death, however, there was the usual fight for power among the members of his family. Meanwhile Aga Mohammed Khan, the eunuch chief of the Qajar tribe, collected a force and, winning over to his side Haji Ibrahim, the redoubtable Vizier of the Zand monarch, finally defeated Lutf Ali the heroic representative of the Zand dynasty, who was barbarously done to death by the Qajar.

### **The Qajar Dynsaty**

Aga Mohammad was a good soldier and, after the final defeat of his rival, decided to attack Heraclius who, upon the death of Nadir Shah, had declared independence of Georgia, and had annexed provinces up to the River Aras. He had also made a treaty with Russia, by the terms of which he was entitled to receive immediate help from Russia, yet he foolishly met the overwhelming Persian army in the field and was defeated. Tiflis was taken, the priests and infirm were massacred and the able-bodied of both sexes were enslaved. After Georgia, the Shah turned his attention to Khurasan. The wretched Shah Rukh was unable to offer any resistance, but Aga Mohammed required more than submission. He coveted with passion priceless jewels from Delhi, which he knew were in the possession of the blind monarch, and set his torturers to work. Day by day some valuable gem was produced. Last of all the famous ruby of Aurangzeb was extracted and Shah Rukh, worn out by the tortures, died cursing the Qajar enunch. Shortly afterward, the tale of his cruelties was brought to

an end at the hands of two of his body-guards whom he had doomed to death, but yet permitted to attend upon him. Thus, in 1797, after grandly three years' rule over the whole of Persia died the founder of the Qajar dynasty, who was rightly detested by all classes.

Under his nephew, Fath Ali, Persia came within the orbit of European politics. The first step was taken by the British rulers in India. In 1798, Lord Wellesley received a letter from the Amir of Kabul in which he stated his intention of making an expedition into India. This would have upset British policy and Wellesley sent a Persian, who was acting resident at Bushire, to induce the Persian court to put pressure on the Amir. The task of the envoy was made easy by an Afghan demand for the cession of Khurasan, to which the young Shah replied that he intended to restore the eastern boundaries of Persia, as they were in Safavid days. He followed up this threat by despatching a force to help two Afghan pretenders, with the result that the Amir retired from Lahore to meet the threat in the west. The mission of the British agent was thus entirely successful and paved the way for an accredited British envoy, who was about to land grand Persian soil.

The genius of Napoleon dominated his adversaries to such an extent that even his fantastic schemes caused them great alarm. Among these must be reckoned his plan of using the Shah as an instrument for the invasion of India in co-operation with French and Russian troops. The movement was, however, stopped at the Volga upon the death of the Tsar. The British, determined to

fore-stall the French, instructed their agent, Captain John Malcolm, to induce the Shah to bring pressure on the Amir of Kabul to counteract the designs of the French, and to negotiate a political and commercial treaty. Malcolm's success was complete and he speedily gained all his objects. Moreover he established a high regard for British honour in Persia.

The British foolishly withdrew Malcolm and left no permanent representative at Tehran. Napoleon took advantage of the favourable position and in 1802 made definite overtures to Persia. These were followed up, in 1805, by the appearance at Tehran of a French envoy who, in view of the fact that the emperor had declared war on Russia, offered to restore Georgia to Persia and to subsidize the Shah, who in return, was to join France in an invasion of India. Fath Ali, after much hesitation, agreed to the French proposals. Fortune, however, favoured the British since, by the time that the Persians had agreed to the French proposals, Napoleon had made peace with the Tsar, and Persia lost all hope of recovering Georgia through his aid.

Treaty with Great Britain, 1814. Outwardly a French Mission held the field and Malcolm, when he again landed in Persia, was affronted. In spite of this the situation was changing, the French Mission was dismissed and Sir Harford Jones representing the crown, as apart from the governor-general of Bengal, was given a magnificent reception and a new treaty was negotiated. In 1814, a definite treaty was signed, by the terms of which treaties or military co-operation with nations hostile to Great Britain was

barred, Persia further pledging herself to use her influence with the states of central Asia to adopt a similar policy. In return, Persia was granted a subsidy of £150,000 per annum, which was to be stopped if she engaged in an aggressive war. This treaty dealt with the French peril after it had passed. On the other hand, it was not realised by British statesmen that, so far as Persia was concerned, the annexation of Georgia and Karabagh by Russia had created an entirely new situation, that the treaty had not recognised the fact and was therefore likely to lead to trouble.

Persia was bound to fight for Georgia and the campaigns that followed may be considered to fall into two distinct periods. The first ended with the defeat of Persia in 1812, peace being made in the following year by the treaty of Gulistan. Thirteen years later, Persia again attempted to reconquer Georgia, and her final defeat is recorded in the treaty of Turkomanchai, which was signed in 1828. By this treaty the Aras became the boundary of Persia. An indemnity was demanded and extra-territorial rights were included as a commercial treaty, by the terms of which there was a 5% tax on imports and exports. This treaty inaugurated a new era and became the basis of which other European nations conducted their intercourse with Persia. Great Britain recognised the changed position and, in view of the fact that Persia was the aggressor, declined to pay the subsidy. Persia was, however, in dire straits from lack of money to pay the Russians, and it was arranged that a single payment of £150,000 should be held to cancel all further claims on the subsidy.



Persia realised that her defeat by Russia was final. To salvage her wounded pride, she decided to make strenuous efforts to recover Herat and other provinces that now formed the state of Afghanistan. This trend of policy was viewed with apprehension by the British Government; since Persia was under Russian influence and if Herat, Kabul and Kandahar were reconquered, Russian agents would be established close to the Punjab. Actually Persia's objective during this period was Herat, and Great Britain made strenuous and successful efforts to keep that province outside the influence of both Persia and Russia.

Abbas Mirza was more successful in Eastern Persia than against Russia. He gradually reconquered Khurasan until Sarakhs alone held out, encouraged by the presence of the Khan of Khiva. However, the Khan, alarmed by the surrender of Kuchan, retired, and Sarakhs was stormed, a feat which restored Persian prestige in Central Asia. Shortly afterwards, Abbas Mirza and then Fath Ali Shah died.

Mohammed Shah was the son of Abbas Mirza and, when he had defeated various pretenders and established himself on the throne, it was clear that he was determined to capture Herat. He had already, during his father's lifetime, commanded a force which was besieging that city, but had hastened to Tehran to secure his nomination as heir-apparent, upon hearing the news of his father's death. At this period a second British military mission reached Tehran, but it was received with marked coldness by the young Shah and was unable to serve any useful purpose.

In 1837, the Shah opened his campaign, and the first prisoner that was captured, was bayoneted in his presence. Yar Mohammed, the able vizier of the prince of Herat, had made every preparation for a siege. The fortifications had been repaired and strengthened; supplies in large quantities had been stored, and all villages, within 12 miles of the city, had been burned. By a singular stroke of good fortune, an English artillery officer, Eldred Pottinger, arrived on the scene, and soon became the life and soul of the defence. In the spring of 1838, the British envoy reached the Persian camp and nearly persuaded the Shah to break off the siege. However, at this juncture, the Russian envoy offered the services of a Russian officer. Sir John McNeill was consequently flouted and quitted the Persian camp. Shortly after his departure, the Shah made his final effort. For six days the defences were battered, but the general assault failed. The Shah was utterly dejected and when he received a communication from the British minister that his government would view the occupation of Herat as a hostile act and that the island of Kharak had been seized by British troops, he agreed to their demands and broke up the siege. He died in 1848, leaving Persia gran the verge of revolution and bankruptcy.

Nasir-ud-Din began his reign well. He brought with him from Tabriz his adviser, Mirza Taki Khan, and appointed him his vizier. He was the most remarkable Persian of his generation, being not only capable and hard-working, but also incorruptible. He set to work to abolish the sale of appointments and of justice; and the embezzlement of the soldiers' pay, the grant of pensions to

favourites and many other abuses were all taken in hand. His reforms raised up a host of enemies, among them the mother of the Shah who persuaded her son that the vizier was too powerful, with the result that he was executed—a terrible blow to Persia. After this the Shah, generally speaking, ruled in the bad old way, although he was a more enlightened ruler than his predecessor, partly owing to his visits to Europe.

# MOVEMENT FOR MODERNISM AND PROGRESS

Constitutional Movement: The desire for a constitution in Persia is quite recent. Persia was affected by the construction of telegraph lines and so forth, but her national pride in her own perfection was also strong. The Shah as a young man was in favour of progress, but the failure of the attempt at constitutional government in Turkey in 1876 frightened him, and his later policy tended toward keeping Persia free from dangerous new ideas. Nasir-ud-Din was assassinated in 1896. His successor, Muzaffar-ud-Din, was a poor creature who led Persia down the broad road to bankruptcy by borrowing large sums of money from Russia, which he wasted on his journey to Europe and gave his favourites. During his reign all fear of the Shah passed away, and the tribes robbed with impunity on the caravan routes, inflicting serious losses upon all classes.

The movement in favour of a new order was led by Sayyid Jamal-ud-Din, who gained considerable influence in Turkey and Persia during the last years of Nasir-ud-Din. He was rather a Pan-Islamist than a constitutionalist, who vehemently denounced the corruption of the Persian vizier, Ayn-ud-Dola. Another moving spirit was Prince Malkom, a clever Armenian with French education. He was Persian minister in London and, while holding this post, quarrelled with the vizier over a lottery, which the Shah

had sold to him, but which the latter wished to cancel. In a paper which he published, Prince Malkom advocated a parliament for Persia, while he never ceased to denounce his enemy, the vizier.

The weakening of the power of the Shah encouraged the reformers and, in 1905, a definite movement began in favour of a constitution. It commenced with protest against the vizier, who was held to be responsible for the costly journeys of the Shah, for the corrupt government and for the disorder in the country. A number of merchants followed a time-honoured custom and took bast or sanctuary at a mosque in the capital, where they were joined by some mullas. Driven from the mosque by order of the vizier, they proceeded to the shrine of Abdul Azim outside Tehran, where their numbers rapidly increased. In vain the Shah intervened by sending his favourite to induce them to disperse. Finally the Shah was obliged to dismiss the obnoxious vizier and to promise to convene an Adalatkhana or 'House of Justice"—it is to be noted that there was no demand for a constitution at this juncture. Upon receiving the royal promise, the bastis returned to their homes and the Shah took no steps to convene a house of justice. In 1906, the Shah had a paralytic stroke and the vizier decided to take strong measures against the reformers. This led to the second Bast, which ended in the departure of the Mujtahids or "Doctors of the Divine Law" to Qum and the threat that they would lay the land under an interdict. Simultaneously thousands of citizens took bast at the British legation and declined to leave it until a national assembly had been granted by the dying Shah.

This was, at length, conceded by Muzaffar-ud-Din, who opened the assembly in October 1906, and died shortly afterwards.

The Revolution. Mohammed Ali, who succeeded his father, was a ruler of the worst type. He attempted to blind the reformers by twice pledging himself to adhere to the new constitution. However, he had no intention of keeping his solemn promises, for he resented any infringement of his absolute power to dispose of the revenues of Persia for his own purposes. The able vizier of Nasir-ud-Din was recalled to office with secret instructions to overthrow the constitution. He set to work to gain the consent of the majority of the Majlis for the raising of a loan, as the Shah had found the treasury empty, and could not buy partisans without money. It seemed as if the vizier was achieving his purpose when he was assassinated. This black deed was glorified and the fortieth day after the suicide of the assassin was observed as a national holiday. Public opinion forced the Shah to appoint Nasir-ul-Mulk, who had been educated at Oxford, to restore the finances of Persia but, before he could carry through any of his reforms, the Shah, who had collected gangs of ruffians, called out his forces with the intention of closing the obnoxious Majlis and of arresting its leaders. But he suddenly hesitated and stayed his hand. The Majlis thereupon collected armed volunteers and sent telegrams to the provinces asking for support, which evoked a wave of enthusiasm.

The Shah yielded to the popular feeling and sent a Quran to the assembly sealed with an oath that he would observe the

constitution. This is the most solemn form of oath in Persia. Six months later, the Shah bombarded the building in which the Majlis sat, arresting some of the leaders and regaining control of the government for the time being. The answer to this outrage was a rising at Tabriz. In vain the Shah despatched troops to crush the rebellion. They merely blockaded the city and, in the spring of 1909, the Russians broke up the blockade in the interest of their subjects. The defence of Tabriz gave time for national forces to be organised at Resht and Isfahan. These forces combined and entered Tehran, whereupon the Shah who was in camp a few miles from the capital, threw up the sponge and took refuge in the Russian legation. He was deposed by the victors and left Persia.

Thus with little loss of life, the Persian revolution was successfully accomplished.

During the First World War, Iran was the scene of conflicting Anglo-Russian and German-Turkish influences. By the time hostilities ceased the country was in a state of near anarchy—a condition in which it remained for more than two years. Then, in February 1921, Reza Khan, marching from Qazvin with a force of troops, overthrew the weak government of Tehran and established one in which his own influence was paramount. In 1923 he became Prime Minister himself, and Ahmad Shah left Iran forever. The last Qajar monarch was formally deposed in 1925, and a few weeks after this event the Constituent Assembly

chose Reza Khan as Shah. He was crowned the following year, taking the ancient name of Pahlavi for the new dynasty.

## **Reza Shah the Great**

Reza Shah Pahlavi was born at Savad Kuh in Mazandaran in 1878. In youth he had been a member of the Persian Cossack Brigade, in which he advanced to high rank by his force of character and natural ability to command. Intensely patriotic, he was keenly aware of Iran's glorious past and its present impotence, and was determined to bring about a national revival. His aim was : full independence for his country, the modernization of its institutions, and progress through industrialization.

Reza Shah's first task was to put an end to internal disorder. This he did by creating a single unified army, defeating the rebel chiefs who had gained power in some districts, disarming the tribes, and establishing the authority of the central government throughout the length and breadth of Iran. In the field of foreign affairs, he brought to an end the system of capitulations, concluded a series of pacts with Soviet Russia covering mutual neutrality, trade, tariffs and fishing rights, and effected barter agreements with Russia and Germany. Within Iran, he established a national bank, which was given the monopoly of issuing bank notes; government departments were reorganized, weights and measures standardised and the first systematic budget instituted.



The power of the old nobility was weakened and the use of titles abolished. The excessive influence of the clergy was reduced, hundreds of new state schools being set up in place of the old religious establishments. At the same time civil and criminal codes, based mainly on French models, were introduced and took precedence over religious law, thus depriving the clergy of many of their legal functions. Tehran University was founded, and women were made eligible to study there, the wearing of the veil having been prohibited. Numerous factories were built to provide a variety of products ranging from foodstuffs and consumer goods to building materials and munitions; some of these were state owned, some private and some of mixed ownership. Government monopolies were established to handle foreign trade, and the profits accruing helped to finance a great series of construction projects including the Trans-Iranian Railways, modern port installations in the Persian Gulf and the Caspian Sea, and thousands of miles of new roads.

When the Second World War broke out, Iran declared herself neutral; but when Germany began the offensive against Russia in 1941 the importance of Iran as a strategic country in the Soviet rear and the source of the British navy's fuel supplies, together with the need for a safe supply route for the Russian armies and thwarting the activity of German agents in Iran who might have sabotaged the tenuous rail link from the Persian Gulf to the north, led to a simultaneous invasion by Russian and British forces. In his country's interests Reza Shah abdicated in favour of

his son, Mohammad Reza Shah, the present reigning monarch. Reza Shah died in South Africa in 1944.

Reza Shah, now justly named The Great, was one of the outstanding figures in Iran's long history. In the face of apathy, inertia and intense conservatism, he united and modernised his country, almost single handed, by sheer force of character and will, in the brief space of twenty years. He is rightly regarded as the founder of modern Iran. In the words of His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah, "It was my father who led us Persians into the new age."

### **Shahanshah Arya Mehr**

On September 17, 1967, His Imperial Majesty Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi Shahanshah Arya Mehr, will have ruled Iran for 26 years. Perhaps at no period in the 2,500 years of Iranian Monarchy have the Iranian people held their monarch in greater esteem and admiration. They have rallied behind him both in crisis and reform, in war and in peace as an inspired leader with extraordinary ability to handle the burdens of kingship. With a degree of political stability unprecedented in most parts of the world, during his reign the Shahanshah has led his nation towards more effective democracy, greater prosperity and industrial progress.

His August Majesty was born in Tehran on October 26, 1919, and officially proclaimed 'Crown Prince on April 24, 1925, at the

coronation of his father, the late Reza Shah the Great, founder of the Pahlavi Dynasty. As Crown Prince, he attended primary school in Tehran between the ages of 6 and 12, and, after passing his final examinations continued his studies for the next five years in Switzerland. Returning to Tehran as an accomplished linguist and well versed in history, social movements and modern economics, he concentrated the next two years on military training at the Staff college, graduating in 1938. Shortly afterwards he was appointed Inspector of the Iranian Armed Force.

At the outset of World War II, Iran proclaimed her neutrality, but on August 25, 1941 the country was simultaneously invaded by the Soviet troops from the north and the British forces from the south. Reza Shah the Great abdicated on September 16, and, on the next day, the Crown prince was sworn in as Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi the Shahanshah of Iran. Thus, at the age of twenty-two, the Shahanshah ascended the throne at a critical period in Iran's history. He soon demonstrated his determination to preserve the independence, territorial integrity and the national unity of Iran.

On January 29, 1943, Iran joined the Allies as signatory to a treaty with Great Britain and the Soviet Union. On September 9, 1943, war was officially declared against the Axis powers. In November of the same year, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Winston Churchill and Josef Stalin attended the historic Tehran Conference. In the "Tehran Declaration" issued by the

Conference, the young Shahanshah had obtained guarantees of post-war aid in the reconstruction of Iran.

After the termination of the war the country needed firm leadership to solve food shortages, inflationary prices and economic chaos. A separatist movement in the Iranian province of Azerbaijan seized power in 1945 and declared its autonomy, counting on the support of foreign troops to intimidate popular opposition. Iran presented her case before the UN Security Council. The Shahanshah, as Supreme Commander of the Iranian Armed Forces, ordered the army to restore peace and security in Azerbaijan, personally supervising the military operations. The resolute stand of the Shahanshah, providing the nation with firm leadership, soon led to the collapse of the autonomous regime. The Iranian army entered Tabriz on December 12, 1946, and with popular support, restored peace and order in Azerbaijan.

On February, 4, 1946 during ceremonies commemorating the founding of the Tehran University, an attempt was made on the Shahanshah's life. The would-be assassin fired five pistol shots at point blank range, and, although wounded, the Shahanshah miraculously survived.

In a move towards more representative government and as a step toward social and economic reform, Shahanshah inaugurated, in February 1950, the first session of the Senate in Iran, and in the following month signed a Parliamentary bill to nationalize the oil industry.

Carrying the reform movement further, the Shahanshah decreed in 1951 the sale and distribution to farmers of over 2,000 villages belonging to the Crown Estates. This was indeed the first step of its kind setting a precedent which was to be followed elsewhere.

By the middle of 1953, however, the internal situation in Iran had deteriorated, the Government had flaunted Constitutional Laws and the National Assembly had been dissolved. Anarchy was the order of the day, political and social instability was rampant, the country's economic situation was nothing less than chaotic, and above all the nation was being subjected to constant foreign propaganda and intervention.

In order to express dissatisfaction with the prevalent situation, and, by virtue of his desire to have the people of Iran react freely against foreign elements and to avoid bloodshed, His Imperial Majesty left the country on August 16, 1953. However, His Majesty's departure brought about a worsening of the situation to such an intolerable degree that within three days the whole nation rose against the then Government and once again proved its deep attachment to Iran's age-old Monarchy. On August 19, 1953, the Iranian Sovereign returned to Tehran where he was accorded a tumultuous welcome.

In the contemporary history of Iran,<sup>1</sup> the national uprising of 28<sup>th</sup>. Mordad (19<sup>th</sup> August) marks the beginning of an era of deep

---

<sup>1</sup> This account (pp.71-88) is based on the article in the Jam-i-Jam, for which the Academy is grateful to the Imperial Iranian Embassy, Islamabad.

and constructive achievements of the nation which ensured its progress and advancement. This uprising came at a critical moment and not only it saved the very existence of the nation and its worthy traditions but it also established law and order and internal stability which enabled the people to introduce various reforms under the wise leadership of their great leader, His Imperial Majesty Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi, in all their social, economic, agricultural, industrial, health and education-al fields. This uprising provided an opportunity for the establishment of social justice, and allowed true democracy to manifest itself. Under these favourable conditions the Iranian nation has been able to pursue persistently its goals for a better life.

In order to achieve these lofty aims and to change the economic structure and order of the country, a basic revolution was needed and this Revolution came on Bahman 6, 1341 corresponding to January 26, 1963, a white or bloodless revolution which brought with it a better and wider understanding of true independence and constitution for the nation. On this occasion, the Shah, addressing the first Congress of Farm Co-operatives, announced its fundamental principles and called upon the nation to approve them. In a touching speech he said:

Here mindful of my duties as a King and of my obligation under the Oath I have taken for the protection and advancement of my nation, I declare that I cannot remain an indifferent observer in the campaign of the forces of God against the armies

of the Devil, for I am the standard-bearer of this battle. To prevent any future power from re-establishing the serfdom of the peasants in this country and letting a small minority plunder the national wealth, I, in my capacity as Head of State and by virtue of Article 27 of the Constitution and Article 26 of the Amendment to the Constitution which proclaims 'That the Power of the State is derived from the people,' hereby directly approach the nation and require a national referendum for the approval of these reforms before the election of the two Houses of the Nation by the nation which governs the two Houses, which is the source of all national power so that in future no vested interests and no group of persons may eradicate the effects of these reforms which liberate the peasant from the chains of slavery of the feudal landlord, which provide a better and more just future for the workers and the honest civil servants, which will bring more prosperity to the guilds and traders and which will protect our national wealth.

It is my wish that these laws be directly approved by the nation as they have been drafted to ensure the success of the historical reforms and evolution of the country. The basic reforms which I, as Monarch and Head of State, submit to the national referendum, and to the direct and positive vote of the Iranian people are as follows:

1. The Land Reform;

2. The nationalization of the forests;
3. The sale of shares in government-owned factories to underwrite Land Reform;
4. The participation of workers in the profits of factories ;
5. Emancipation of Women;
6. The creation of the Literacy Corps.

It was the first time that the Iranian nation which loves freedom and democracy, was being invited by the ruler of the country to determine its own destiny. The referendum was held on January 26, 1963, in which the nation overwhelmingly voted in favour of the six principles, and its decisive vote reflected a national determination to continue the course adopted a decade earlier.

On January 29, 1963, the Royal Decree concerning the six principles was communicated to the Government for execution. The promulgation of this programme now known as the Sixth of Bahman Reforms or the White Revolution, and its enthusiastic endorsement by the nation, created a new situation in Iran. Land Reform in particular has changed the very basis of Iranian society, bringing to an end the centuries-old “land-owner and serf” system and creating in its place a population of small, independent farmers tilling their own land.



## Land Reform

Until recently most of the villages in Iran were owned by one or more landowners, while the biggest proprietors each possessed many villages. About one fifth of the country's 50,000 villages belonged to proprietors owning more than one village. The old Iranian land tenure system varied from place to place, but was generally based on the division of the productive elements of the crop into five parts—land, water, seed, draught animals and equipment, and labour. The first two of these were usually provided by the landowner, who received two-fifths of the crop and the remaining three were contributed by the peasants working on the land, who received three-fifths. In some areas the labourers received a one-third share, in others as much as four-fifths, but whatever the method of division, the effects were similar. The landowners, who more often were absent from the villages they owned, drained the profits away from the villages and spent them where they resided—in the towns, particularly in Tehran. The income of the farming population remained low, and the development of the rural areas was sacrificed to that of the towns. The villages became increasingly impoverished, and as the gap between their standards of living and those of the towns widened, more and more villagers migrated to the cities, which grew as fast as the countryside became depopulated. Agricultural production stagnated, and could no longer keep pace with the rise in the country's population. To these social and economic evils were added the political power wielded by the big landowners,

who influenced the course of elections in their areas and united to oppose reform.

Land Reform had been initiated by the Shahanshah over a decade earlier in 1951, when he announced that he would divide the royal estates and sell them to landless peasants at low prices with the installments paid over a long period. In 1955 a law was passed extending this measure to public lands as well. However, this example was not followed by the big landowners, and it became evident that stronger measures would have to be adopted. The next move came in 1961, when a law was passed under which a landowner possessing two or more villages was permitted to keep one only. The others he was obliged to sell to the State, which purchased them in fifteen installments in order to resell them to the peasants. This law later became known as the first stage of Land Reform.

The Land Reform bill approved on the sixth of Bahman, which introduced the Second Stage, represented a far more radical and difficult step, affecting as it did the 100,000 smaller landowners who then held about 63 per cent of the country's farmland. These owners, who possessed one village or less, were obliged to come to an agreement with the peasants on their land in one of three ways. They could grant the peasants a thirty-year lease, or sell them the land on terms agreed to by both sides or divide the land between themselves and the peasants in the same proportion as that in which the crops had previously been shared. In any case, ownership was restricted to 200 hectares—though

this figure was subsequently raised, for a certain period, to 500 hectares in cases where mechanised farming had been introduced.

A second bill in the Six Point Programme authorized the transfer of shares in government-owned factories to former land-owners in compensation for lands which they had passed to the government—which in turn had transferred them to the peasants. These shares carry a government-guaranteed interest of 6 per cent for a number of years. The scheme had the additional advantage of turning the factories into limited companies and extending private ownership.

The objects of the Land Reform measures were to spread social justice by bringing the antiquated landowner-peasant system to an end, to raise the income of the farmers, and to release the capital of the big landowners for investment in other productive fields. Together with the agricultural schemes and investments under Third Plan, including increased irrigation and mechanization, Land Reform will help to raise the living standard of the villages. The farmers, who now cultivate land of their own, have a bigger incentive to work hard and produce more, and the profits they make will go to improve village life. At the same time the increased purchasing power of the rural areas will help the development of home industry, which has hitherto been limited by the small size of the domestic market for industrial products. Agricultural output will be further stimulated by the spread of literacy and improved standards of health resulting from the activities of the Literacy, Health and Development Corps. Finally,

the ending of the land-owners' influence and the removal of impediments to the free exercise of the right to vote will result in the strengthening of democracy throughout the country.

The departure of the landowners would have caused grave dislocation to the country's agriculture if provision had not been made for it in advance. Since the farmers frequently lacked the knowledge as well as the capital to work their land by themselves, co-operative societies were formed to discharge the duties of the former landowners, to run village affairs and grant agricultural loans. The Agricultural Credits and Rural Development Bank, a state credit distribution agency, makes loans available to the co-operative societies, which in turn lend money [for approved purposes to the farmers. By March 20th, 1965 the Bank had distributed nearly 120 million dollars to over one million farmers for current agricultural expenses, irrigation, tree planting, livestock and agricultural machinery. The \$55 million lent in the year to March 20th, 1965 alone is estimated to have led to increases in production valued at \$84 million.

## **Statistical Evaluation**

### *First Phase*

Number of villages purchased from landowners, public domain and I crown land—10,418.

Number of farming families who have become landowners—350,064 Assuming that each family has five members, the number of individuals whose families have received land—1,750,248.

Cost of purchased villages—£31,108,431.

Payments made to landlords in cash as first installment—£5,327,485. Number of rural co-operative associations established in villages to which reforms have been applied—4,818.

Capital held by rural co-operatives—£2,571,428.

### Second phase

Number of villages transferred from landowners on 30-year leases, or purchased by mutual consent, or divided up between farmers and land owners on the basis of traditional crop-sharing ratios—25,846.

Number of farming families who have benefited so far from the second phase of the Reform—796,710.

Assuming that each family has five members, the number of individuals benefiting from the second phase—3,983,550.

In all, nearly six million individuals have obtained land under the two phases of the Reform.

The third phase of the Land Reform which is under way, aims at :

(i) enhancing the production of foodstuffs, and of raw materials for industrial consumption ;

(ii) raising the per capita income and improving the living standard i of farmers;

(iii) increasing production so that the consumer will not have to pay more.

### **Nationalization of Forests**

In the days when feudal lords, landlords and influential men ex-tended their transgression to the natural wealth of the country, forests too gradually came under the control of these transgressors, and they managed to secure deeds of ownership for forests, though forests like mines, rivers, lakes and other natural resources belong to the nation. Without paying attention to technical principles, they exploited this plundered wealth as much as possible and continued to cut down trees unsparingly, gradually destroying forests. The Law of the Nationalization of Forests put an end to this pillage and returned this national wealth to its real owner, that is, the nation. The Forestry Organization, attached to the Ministry of Agriculture, was charged by this law to take possession of forests, and exploit them in a scientific and technical manner.

### **Sale of Shares of Government Factories**

This law which was drawn up as a covering for Land Reform, and ratified by the cabinet, comprises 14 Articles and a list of government factories whose shares are to be sold. It has two aims:

1. The government had never been able to manage its factories like other industrial units and private companies run by individuals which would bring in profits and have economic independence. It often happened that in order to stop a factory from being closed down, every year a part of the public funds was spent to make up for the losses incurred by this factory. With the sale of the shares of government factories, they became commercial units, and nameless shares were given to individuals, thus saving the government from losses incurred in this way.

2. Making use of these shares as covering for Land Reform and offering them to big landowners instead of cash for the purchased land, prevented the capital from remaining idle or going out of the country. It gave these former owners of land the assurance that the capital thus obtained from the sale of their property would be used in industry and produce an annual profit.

As a result of the enforcement of this law, these units became joint-stock companies, the factories were run with a greater power, and their worth increased. Parallel with economic stabilization of the factories and increase in the value of their shares, the installment bonds of Land Reform, given by the Ministry of Agriculture to former land-lords, were now considered as negotiable bills in the exchange, which these

landlords could turn into cash whenever necessary in the banks or free markets.

The factories whose shares were presented for sale were sugar factories, weaving factories, building material factories, cotton, silk-work seeds and chemical industries.

### **Workers Sharing the Profits of Workshops**

The fourth principle of the White Revolution which enabled all workers to share in the profits of all productive units was ratified in the cabinet meeting on 7th January 1963, and it is one of the most progressive laws of the modern world.

It comprises 20 Articles and 10 Notes. The first two articles are as follows:

Article One--The employers of industrial and productive workshops to whom the Law of Labour applies, must enforce the provision of this law in connection with their employees. The question of application and the date of the endorsement of the said provisions in each work-shop shall be determined by a commission headed by the Minister of Work and Social Service or his deputy, and consisting of the representatives of the Ministries of Finance, Industries and Mines, and Justice and an expert on economic and social matters.

Article Two—The employers of the workshops to whom this law applies according to the verdict of the commission mentioned



in Article One, must draw up collective agreements by the end of May, 1963 at the latest with the deputies of the employees of the workshop or the syndicate which consists of the majority of the workers of the work-shop, granting compensations in proportion to the acquisition or savings in the expenditure, or acceptance of wastage, or allowing the employees to share the net revenues, or similar methods, or methods combining two or more of the said methods which would increase the in-come of the workers. A copy of the said collective agreement must be sent to the Ministry of Works and Social Services. Such agreements must not be contrary to the existing laws and regulations of the country.

A worker in a workshop, like a peasant who farms land, should be interested in the life and permanence of his workshop only when he shares in the profits of the workshop and feels that his interest lies in the continuity and expansion of the workshop and increase of production. His sharing in the net profits gives him a psychological security in his relation with the employer which forms a barrier against the influence of misleading ideas and extremist views which for various reasons spread more quickly among the working classes. In this way a healthier atmosphere is created for work, and the worker considers himself as a part owner of the workshop, and feels some responsibility with regard to the materials and appurtenances of the workshop and their preservation. The obsessions which used to appear in the old system of managing the workshops towards the employer, will now find no opportunity to grow. As in the old tyrannical regime of masters and serfs, the peasant never understood the

true meaning of country, but became patriotic as soon as he was given the chance to own land and find financial and economic independence and individual freedom, the worker, too, by sharing in the profits of the factory, found it in his heart to be truly patriotic. This psychological result must be considered one of the most important consequences of the White Revolution of the Shah and the People. But from an economic point of view, too, the enforcement of this law had brilliant results, for it raised the level of production in industrial units. The conditions of work had been made desirable by the enforcement of the Law of Labour and Social Insurance of Workers, in the same manner as it had been affected in the most progressive countries of the world. Now, this law which enables the worker to share the profits, made the workers realize that their effort in the improvement and increase of production would bring them other rewards in addition to their wages.

## **Emancipation of Women**

The past several decades in Iran have been one of overthrowing the old bonds and social chains and of bringing not only new liberties and freedom but also of health and education to the masses. The new social order has ensured the fundamental liberties for every section of the community and for both sexes on the basis of full equality. The task was more than a mere repeal of formal slavery; it was the greater task of ensuring full equality, in the real sense of the word, to all men and women. It was to

ensure freedom of expression, of thought and freedom to determine one's social, communal and political destiny. In the ancient Aryan society of Iran, women had the most respected and honoured position. They enjoyed full civil liberties, side by side with their men. They had every opportunity to show their talents.

The advent of Islam, whose teachings are compatible with the requirements of all ages, further consolidated the rights of women, though these rights were gradually ignored or forgotten. Years passed with women going further under eclipse. January 7, 1936 brought a new chapter in the life of the Iranian women when His late Majesty Reza Shah the Great took the first step towards their emancipation. This process was completed on February 27, 1963, when His Imperial Majesty Mohammad Reza Shah announced full equality and franchise for Iranian women. The royal proclamation on that day removed the last stain from the Iranian Society and broke every chain and bond which had tied down Iranian women who were then able to play their part fully in the great social upheaval of the Shah-People Revolution.

Since then, Iranian women have proved their full worth and have made invaluable contributions to the advance of society.

On February 27, 1963, which came to be called the 'Day of Women's Rights', the Shah, addressing a large gathering of women who had come to the Royal Court to offer their thanks, said:

Today another step was taken and the last so-called social disgrace of our society, namely the exclusion of half of our

population, was done away with. We broke the last chain, and henceforth all individuals in this country shall participate in their own social affairs, and side by side they shall try their utmost for the exaltation, honour, progress, welfare and happiness of this nation and country. I am sure that you ladies will consider this matter so significant, and you are so well aware of this great duty which is placed on your shoulders today, that you will understand and perform this social duty better than anyone else.

For the first time in Iranian history, women voted during the national referendum of January 26, 1963. Within a month they received their full freedom and equality and were able to vote, and also be elected, in the next parliamentary elections. Eleven women were elected as members of the Majlis as well of the Senate.

## **Literacy Corps**

The Bill regarding the creation of the Literacy Corps was designed to facilitate the execution of the law concerning universal compulsory education. Under it the Ministry of Education and the armed forces are co-operating closely in the struggle against rural illiteracy.

The first goal of the Literacy Corps is to teach reading, writing and arithmetic to boys and girls between the age of seven and thirteen. The Corps' approach to this task is practical and realistic. Where facilities exist they are made use of; where they do not, their absence is not permitted to hold up the programme. Where

there is no suitable accommodation for use as a classroom, disused buildings may be repaired and adapted for the purpose. Where even this possibility does not exist, classes are held in the open air. It is one of the teachers' tasks to help spread enthusiasm for education and to encourage parents to send their children to school, as well as to persuade adults to join the evening classes provided for them.

The second goal of the Literacy Corps is to raise the level of knowledge of the villagers. The Corps' teachers distribute suitable books, give talks and show films about a variety of basic subjects such as improved methods of agriculture, the care of livestock and poultry, the use of insecticides and personal, home and village hygiene. Traveling libraries are being arranged to prevent the newly literate from lapsing into illiteracy, and to assist in the spread of knowledge. The Corps also helps to acquaint the villagers with the advantages of joining co-operatives, which they can help to form by contributing small sums of capital. The Literacy Corps' third goal is purely social. It is to help create a spirit of co-operation in the villages and to encourage participation in local affairs. Under the old order, there was little room for co-operative effort; the system induced rather a spirit of humility and dependence on the land-owner, which generally resulted in apathy and inertia. The Literacy Corps strives to combat this spirit. It teaches the farmers that they are no longer a lowly class, and acquaints them with democratic principles. It encourages them to set up and run village assemblies, by means of which they can handle their own affairs, and to participate in

educational programmes through local educational councils. Finally, the Literacy Corps' members encourage co-operative work, such as roadmaking, digging water channels or qanats, and constructing schools, bath houses, mosques and other buildings for the use of the whole community. They are expected to play a personal part in such activities, and to set an example in manual labour.

The legal decree for the formation of the Literacy Corps was ratified by the Cabinet on 26<sup>th</sup> October 1962. Its supplementary Bill was drawn up by the Ministries of War and Education and it was ratified by the Cabinet on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 1962. On the occasion of the enforcement of this decree, the Shah referring to the campaign of this Literacy Corps as 'a national crusade', said:

The holy battle which began in the whole country on the 21<sup>st</sup> of December 1962 for the suppression of the demon of ignorance, and for the propagation of literacy in all the towns and villages with the aid of the fine youth of this land, is to my mind a national crusade, and I expect all the devoted children of this land on whose manliness depends the victory in this crusade, to remember their grave and glorious responsibility and never forget that they are henceforth the soldiers who are fighting in the first line of the battle.

Today, the whole world is watching our victory in a battle which is being fought for the first time by the Iranian and with Iranian initiative. It is evident that in this battle, I, who have

ordered the creation of the Literacy Corps, will lead the way everywhere as the standard-bearer of this national crusade.

The first group of the Literacy Corps, consisting of 2,460 youths, were sent to towns and villages after being given four months' training. They began their crusade against ignorance and illiteracy in the villages with eagerness and determination.

According to the report of the Minister of Education read on 7th October 1964 in the presence of the Shah on the occasion of the Mehragan celebration, out of the first group of the Literacy Corps 2,332 youths had accepted service as teachers in villages, and 566 of the second group and 3,492 of the third group were dispatched to villages for a campaign on illiteracy.

The Minister of Education asked the Shahanshah's leave to send 3,450 of the fourth group to other towns and villages. Thus by October 1964, a total of 9,968 school graduates who were called up for military service, were actively fighting against illiteracy, and their efforts in this work and the work of guiding villagers in health and sanitation problems and co-operative activities won the Shah's satisfaction. According to the report of the Minister of Education these are the fruitful results of the operations of the Literacy Corps.

So far the Literacy Corps has constructed or repaired 6,714 elementary school, has built 2,376 mosques, 2,224 public baths, and 557 places for washing the dead before internment. In road construction they have also had much success. They have

constructed 18,293 kilo-metres of good roads, as well as 7,609 bridges over streams and rivers in the areas where they are stationed.

Thus on the sixth of Bahman 1341, a new era began in Iran. The Shahanshah's revolutionary reform measures, backed by the approval and enthusiastic support of the great mass of ordinary Iranian citizens, brought about the bloodless overthrow of a system that had endured for hundreds of years without change. Social justice has been extended to all, and Iranian society placed on a fresh and firmer basis. With rapidly rising standards of living, the growth of literacy, the fuller exploitation of natural resources and increasing industrialization, Iran now enters upon one of the most promising periods of her long history.

Subsequently three more points were added to the Six-point Programme :

Health Corps and Development Corps Following the highly successful experiment with the Literacy Corps, the Shahanshah proclaimed, on January 21, 1964, the formation of a Health and also a Development Corps. The aim of the Health Corps is to raise the standard of health and sanitation in rural areas through prevention and treatment, mass vaccination and inoculation. Already, three terms of Health Corpsmen have been sent to rural areas. They number 368 doctors, dentists, pharmacologists, and medical assistants operating in teams of three. Operating now are 170 medical teams, 27 laboratory teams, 30 dentistry teams and 21 public health instructors teams.



## **Houses of Justice**

A difficulty that the public had been facing for many years when trying to settle disputes or following litigation was the deficiency of the judiciary and lack of judicial offices in smaller districts. Litigants had to travel long distances for the most minor cases. Thus, one of the major decisions, in the past years has been to expand the judiciary in proportion to the requirements of the public.

In order to facilitate the execution of laws on village level and to settle local differences and disputes through locally respected men, Houses of Justice have been established in villages under local justices of peace. These Houses of Justice function, in fact, as a local court fully acquainted with local custom and traditions. They have proved highly successful.

## **Authorship**

In addition to a biography of Reza Shah the Great, the Shahan-shah is the author of two more books. One is entitled Mission for My Country, which covers the history of Iran, its political and social evolution over the centuries, as well as its present and future plans. It also gives a frank and intimate account of the Monarch's private life. This book has been translated and published in nine foreign languages. The entire

proceeds from this book have been donated by His Imperial Majesty for educational and cultural purposes through the Pahlavi Foundation and the Royal Society for Publications and Translations.

The other which was released last year under the title of White Revolution has already aroused world-wide acclamation.

### **IRAN AND THE R.C.D.**

Shahanshah of Iran is a firm believer in International peace and Afro-Asian solidarity. He is a true lover of Islam and welcomes every step taken for the betterment and welfare of Islamic world. This spirit of His Imperial Majesty brought about the signing of the R.C.D. pact between Pakistan, Iran and Turkey in July 1964.

The heads of States of Iran, Pakistan and Turkey met in a Summit Conference on July 20-21, 1964 at Dolmabache Palace in Istanbul to consider the recommendations of their foreign ministers and discuss the creation of a strong regional economic institution. The meeting was held under the Chairmanship of his Imperial Majesty the Shahan-shah Arya Mehr of Iran.

The three Heads of State, while reaffirming their belief that regional cooperation is an essential factor in accelerating peace and stability, decided that the existing collaboration between the three brotherly states should be further strengthened and

developed for the common benefit of the peoples of the entire region.

Having reviewed the practical steps taken by the foreign ministers towards the promotion of cooperation among the three countries, the Heads of State endorsed the recommendations contained in the report of the Ministerial Pre-Summit meeting which had concluded just two days earlier in Ankara. They decided that the activities planned within the new scheme of collaboration shall be carried out under the name of “Regional Cooperation for Development” (R.C.D.).

A Ministerial Pre-Summit meeting was convened at Ankara (Turkey) on July 18-19, 1964 to prepare grounds for giving the cooperation among the three like-minded nations an institutional shape. The three foreign ministers of Iran, Pakistan and Turkey who attended the Ankara meeting noted that there existed greater possibilities of cooperation in the economic, technical and cultural fields which could be developed outside the existing framework of their bilateral and multilateral collaborations.

The ministers examined the specific problems of common interest to their countries and affirmed their belief that the existing cooperation in the economic, technical and cultural fields among the three countries should be further increased.

The spirit of perfect harmony and regional solidarity which characterised the various stages of the deliberations leading to the formation of R.C.D. was symbolized in the statements of the

three Heads of State issued immediately after the conclusion of the Summit Conference.

Warmly greeting the peoples of Pakistan and Turkey, His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah Arya Mehr of Iran said:

We have just concluded a most friendly conference with the Presidents of Turkey and Pakistan and have noted with much pleasure the sincere spirit of cooperation and amity that exists among our three countries.

It is my earnest hope and desire that our countries and peoples would enjoy, in future, the benefits of yet stronger friendship and greater cooperation.

In another statement issued later from Tehran, the Shahanshah said:

The recent agreement with our Turkish and Pakistani brethren and neighbours is indeed a source of great pleasure and satisfaction. This cordial and impartial cooperation opens new horizons for activity and holds promises of a great future for all of us.

In the same way that we recognize Turkey and Pakistan, our neighbouring brothers as our sincere and staunch allies, we, too, from the depth of our hearts, stand at their side...

Pakistan President Field Marshal Mohammad Ayub Khan in a message to the people of Iran said:

I should tell the Iranian people that their monarch is an eminent leader, who has taken great steps in drawing the three countries of Iran, Turkey and Pakistan closer and these steps will undoubtedly prove effective in improving the life of the three countries with results to be seen in future. I hope that this friendship will bear peace and happiness for the three countries.

The President of the Republic of Turkey also issued a statement at the conclusion of the historic Summit Conference in which he said:

The aim of this conference is to secure the welfare and happiness of the peoples of Iran, Pakistan and Turkey. It is only natural in the present day world that leaders of the various countries should devote all their energy to improving the lot of their people, and the aim of our talks here cannot be anything else.

The Regional Cooperation for Development during its existence of about three years has amply justified the hopes which the people of Iran, Pakistan and Turkey associate with the tripartite arrangement. The R.C.D. has been singularly fortunate in that the impulse to integration in the region has proved stronger than the pulls of the national differentiation. This is as good a beginning as any multinational agency any-where in the world can hope for. Over a period of three years, the RCD has not only defined the scope of its work and taken organizational shape but has shown imagination and vigour in translating into deeds aspirations articulated by the historic Istanbul Summit

Meeting of July, 1964. The R.C.D. has now established a reputation for constructive work and fruitful accomplishments in the fields of commerce, industry, transportation, communication, insurance and banking.

Equally effective work has been done by this young organization in the field of cultural cooperation which forms a vital part of the aims and objects laid down by the Heads of States.

## **SUPPLEMENT**

Names of the dynasties that reigned over Iran during the last 2500 years. Only Iranian pronunciation of names has been given.

1. Mad-ha : 655-550 B.C. (105 years)
2. Hakhamanshi : 558-330 B.C. (228 years)
3. Ashkanian : 250 B.C.-226 C.E. (476 years)
4. Sasanian : 226-646 (420 years)
5. Umviyan : 41-132/661-750 (99 years)
6. Abbasiyan : 132-656/750-1258 (508 years)
7. Tahiriyan : 205-259/820-872 (52 years)
8. Saffariyan : 254-290/867-905 (36 years)

9. Samanyan : 261-389/874-999 (125 years)
10. Ale-Zyar : 316-434/928-1042 (114 years)
11. Ale-Buyeh : 320-447/932-1055 (123 years)
12. Dayalameh-Kakooyeh : 398-443/1007-1051 (45 years)
13. Ghaznawiyān : 351-582/962-1186 (224 years)
14. Ale-Afrasyab : 369-409/979-1018 (40 years)
15. Ale-Mamoon : 385-407/995-1016 (22 years)
16. Saljooghyān : 429-700/1037-1300 (263 years)
17. Saljooghyān-e-Kirman : 433-583/1041-1187 (146 years)
18. Khawarazmshahiyān : 470-628/1231-1077 (154 years)
19. Ghaurian : 543-612/1148-1215 (67 years)
20. Eal Khanian : 654-750/1254-1349 (93 years)
21. Chaupanian : 621-907/1224-1502 (278 years)
22. Eal Kanian : 736-813/1340-1415 (77 years)
23. Ale-Eanju : 729-758/1333-1361 (29 years)
24. Mozaffaryān : 713-795/11313-1393 (80 years)
25. Malook-e-kart : 643-791/1245-1389 (144 years)
26. Surbadaran : 737-783/1337-1381 (44 years)

27. Gharakhatoiyān-e-Kirman : 619-703/1222-1303 (81 years)
28. Atabakan-e-Yazd : 590-718/1188-1314 (128 years)
29. Atabakan-e-Loristan : 543-740/1148-1399 (251 years)
30. Atabakan-e-Fars : 543-686/1148-1287 (139 years)
31. Atabakan-e-Shamva Dyār-e-Bakr : 495-712/1101-1312 (211 years)
32. Atabakan-e-Azarbaijān va Iraq : 531-622/1136-1225 (89 years)
33. Temooriyan : 771-906/1369-1500 (131 years)
34. Ghara Ghuyunlu : 780-873/1378-1502 (124 years)
35. Safawiyeh : 907-1148/1502-1736 (234 years)
36. Afsharyeh : 1148-1210/1736-1796 (60 years)
37. Zandyeh : 1163-1209/1750-1794 (44 years)
38. Ghajarieh : 1193-1264/1779-1848 (69 years)
39. Pahlavi : 1343 A.H. (Qamri)  
1925 C.E.  
1304 A.H. (Shamsi)
1. H.1.M. Raza Shah Pahlavi



2. H.I.M. Mohammad Riza Shah Pahlavi, Shahanshah-i-Arya  
Mehr