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ABSTRACT

In the social and economic history of Iran, as of other Moslem countries, bazaars and guilds of craftsmen and tradesmen working in them have always played an important part. After a discussion of the historical background, this thesis examines the functions of the guilds in the later Ṣafavid period (c. 1597-1722 A.D.), when Iran was a large and generally stable empire administered on bureaucratic rather than feudal lines. Guild practices and traditions from the period endured into the 19th and 20th centuries.

Evidence is adduced to show that the guilds had a dual role as spontaneous associations for defence of their members' interests and as agencies used by the Ṣafavid government for collection of taxes, control of prices, and procurement of goods and labour. Among the subjects which are examined are the functions of responsible officials and headmen, the taxes and the tax collection methods, the apprenticeship system, price supervision, judicial and penal matters, and guild restrictions.

Attention is also given to the Ṣafavid government's intervention in economic life through royal industrial establishments and royal monopolies.

Although merchants were not organized in guilds, they influenced the life of the bazaars, and so too did the East India Companies which established "factories" in Iran during the period. Attention is therefore given to the activities of Muslim Iranian, Armenian, Jewish, and Hindu merchants and financiers, and of the English and Dutch East India Companies.
The stagnation of the Iranian economy in the later part of the period, the lack of technical innovation, and the non-appearance of large-scale forms of industrial and economical organization are considered in the light of the available evidence. The conclusion which is reached is that the Safavid regime's restrictive and monopolistic policy was one of the main causes of this decline.

The guilds played an important part in religious and social as well as commercial and industrial life. Religious and ethical traditions and social and ceremonial functions of the guilds are therefore discussed in this thesis.

Material for the thesis has been gathered from a comprehensive survey of Iranian and foreign sources; but for many topics, adequate evidence to support firm conclusions has not been obtainable. The thesis is therefore offered as a tentative contribution to understanding of a hitherto unstudied phase of Iranian history.
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PREFACE

The importance of the Safavid period in Iran's historical evolution is acknowledged by modern scholars. Although the stability and the unity, more or less within the traditional frontiers, which the Iranian people enjoyed under the Safavid regime came to an abrupt end with its fall, nevertheless many cultural and social institutions of the period endured into the 19th and 20th centuries, and some have survived through the modernizing processes of the Pahlavi period right up to the present day. The beliefs and ideals, and also the customs and folklore, of Twelver Shi'ism have remained an integral part of the national heritage ever since Shi'ism was officially established by the Safavid Shahs and popularly accepted by most Iranians in the course of the 16th and 17th centuries.

Study of Safavid Iran has been focused on international relations and wars and on religion, art, and literature. Economic and social matters have hitherto received less attention. The research which has been done into such matters has generally been based on European records and travel diaries and primarily concerned with the history of European economic expansion overseas. Neither the foreign nor the indigenous sources throw adequate light on the internal economic and social history of Iran in the period. The scarcity of data may well be the main reason for the relative neglect of this field. The importance of the field nevertheless becomes apparent when relevant considerations are taken into account. As already mentioned, social institutions of the Safavid period endured for another two centuries
or more. During the period, the Iranians first entered into regular relations with the Europeans and acquired some awareness of the European economic and military strength which was to overshadow them in the 19th and early 20th centuries. In spite of the advantages of political unity and relatively long lasting stability, the Iranians under Şafavid rule were unable to develop new techniques of production and forms of organization at a time when the Europeans were laying the foundations of their future industrial revolution.

Research into aspects of this important field can be pursued through investigation of all possible sources and assessment of all retrievable data. The present thesis is the outcome of an effort to find and interpret all available information on one of the chief social institutions of Iran in the Şafavid period, namely the guilds of the craftsmen and tradesmen of the bazaars. Since these people were engaged not only in the production and sale of goods but also in religious and cultural activities, the thesis goes beyond the socio-economic field to touch on such matters. As far as the author knows this is the first detailed study of the subject which has been undertaken and put into writing. While well aware of the incompleteness of the data and consequent questionability of the conclusions, the author hopes that the thesis will contribute something of value to future multi-dimensional study of the social and economic history of Şafavid Iran.
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# TRANSLITERATION

## Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ت</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>zh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>س</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ط</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>zh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ق</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ك</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>و</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>و</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ه</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ی</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ا</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ا</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Long vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ی</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ا</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Short vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ا</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ی</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Diphthongs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>او</td>
<td>ow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ای</td>
<td>ay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
written sources which were used in the work are generally cited in footnotes and listed under the author's name in alphabetical order in the Bibliography; but mosque inscriptions and certain manuscripts are only cited in footnotes and are not included in the Bibliography.

In addition to written sources, oral information was used. Since Isfahān was the administrative and commercial centre of Safavid Iran, most of the thesis concerns the bazaar and guilds of Isfahān; and since members of the present bazaar of Isfahān conserve traditions which they trace back to Safavid times, the author has made cautious use of statements given by them in reply to inquiries.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.A.R.</td>
<td>Central Asian Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON.H.R.</td>
<td>Economic History Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.I.(2)</td>
<td>Encyclopaedia of Islam, 2nd ed., Leiden, 1954-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English H.R.</td>
<td>English History Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.E.S.H.O.</td>
<td>Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.R.</td>
<td>W. Foster, Letters received by the East India Company from its servants in the East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Qamārī (lunar), specifying the lunar hijrī calendar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh.</td>
<td>Shamsī (solar) specifying the solar hijrī calendar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHRONOLOGY

In the text of the thesis, years according to both the lunar *hijri* (Islamic) and the solar Gregorian (Christian) calendars are given without specification, the *hijri* date being put first and separated by a stroke from the Gregorian date. In the Bibliography, years according to the solar *hijri* calendar in use in Iran since 1925 are specified with the abbreviation *Sh.* and similarly followed by the Gregorian equivalent.

Dates of reigns of Iranian rulers from the Timurids to the Pahlavis are normally omitted in the text, but are given in the dynastic tables which appear below.
### Dynastic Tables

*(Based on C. E. Bosworth, *The Islamic Dynasties*, Edinburgh 1967)*

#### Timurids (772/1370–912/1506)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>771/1370</td>
<td>Tīmūr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807/1405</td>
<td>Khalīl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807/1405</td>
<td>Shah Rukh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850/1447-853/1449</td>
<td>Ulugh Beg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Timurid rulers in Samarkand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>853/1449</td>
<td>'Abdul-Laṭif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>854/1450</td>
<td>'Abdullāh Mīrzā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855/1451</td>
<td>Abū Sa'īd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873/1469</td>
<td>Ahmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899/1494-906/1500</td>
<td>Mahmud b. Abū Sa'īd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Timurid rulers in Khurasan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>853/1449</td>
<td>Bābur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861/1457</td>
<td>Mahmud b. Bābur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863/1459</td>
<td>Abū Sa'īd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873/1469</td>
<td>Yadgār Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875/1470</td>
<td>Ḥusayn Bayqarā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912/1506-913/1507</td>
<td>Badīʿ uz-Zamān</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Qara Qūyūnlū (782/1380–873/1468) in ʿĀzarbāyjān and Iraq

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>782/1380</td>
<td>Qara Muḥammad Turmush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791/1389</td>
<td>Qara Yūṣuf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802/1400</td>
<td>Tīmūrid invasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>809/1406</td>
<td>Qara Yūṣuf (reinstated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>823/1420</td>
<td>Iskandar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>841/1438</td>
<td>Jahān Shāh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aq Quyunlu (780/1378-914/1508) in
Diyarbakr, Azarbeyjan, and western Iran

780/1378  Qara Yuluk 'Uthman
839/1435  Hamza, in dispute with his brother 'Ali till 842/1438
848/1444  Jahangir
857/1453  Uzun Hasan
882/1478  Khalil
883/1478  Ya'qub
896/1490  Baysunqur
898/1493  Rustam
902/1497  Ahmad
903/1497  Murad (in Qum)
903/1498  Alwand
903/1498  Muhammad Mirza
907/1502-914/1508 Murad (latterly sole ruler)

Safavids (907/1501-1145/1732)

907/1501  Isma'il I
930/1524  Tahmasb I
984/1576  Isma'il II
985/1578  Muhammad Khudabanda
996/1588  'Abbas I
1038/1629  Safi I
1052/1642  'Abbas II
1077/1666  Sulayman I
1105/1694  Husayn I
1135/1722  Tahmasb II
1145/1732  'Abbas III
1163/1749  Sulayman II
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1163/1750</td>
<td>Ismā'īl III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1166/1753</td>
<td>Ḥusayn II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200/1786</td>
<td>Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*nominal rulers*

**Afshārids (1148/1736-1210/1795)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1148/1736</td>
<td>Nādir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1160/1747</td>
<td>'Alī Quli ('Ādil Shāh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1161/1748</td>
<td>Ibrāhīm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1161/1748-1210/1795</td>
<td>Shāh Rukh (in Khorasan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Zands (1163/1750-1209/1794)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1163/1750</td>
<td>Karīm Khān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1193/1779</td>
<td>Abū' l Fath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1193/5-1779-81</td>
<td>Šādiq Khān (in Shīraz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1193-9/1779-85</td>
<td>'Alī Murād (in Iṣfahān)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1199/1585</td>
<td>Ja'far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203/1789-1209/1794</td>
<td>Luṭf 'Alī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qājārs (1133/1779-1243/1925)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1133/1721</td>
<td>Fath 'Alī Khān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1163/1750</td>
<td>Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān (tribal chiefs in Mazandaran)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1184/1770</td>
<td>Ḥusayn Quli Khān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1193/1779</td>
<td>Aqā Muḥammad Khān (crowned in 1211/1796)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1212/1797</td>
<td>Fath 'Alī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250/1834</td>
<td>Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264/1848</td>
<td>Naṣir ud-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1313/1896</td>
<td>Muẓaffar ud-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324/1907</td>
<td>Muḥammad 'Alī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1327/1909-1343 (1304 Sh.)/1925</td>
<td>Ahmad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pahlavis (1304 Sh/1925-1357 Sh/1979)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1304/1925-1220/1941</td>
<td>Rīżā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1320/1941-1357/1979</td>
<td>Muḥammad Rīżā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dedicated to the artisans and craftsmen of Iran.

A peacock from a Qalamkari design.
I. INTRODUCTION

I.1. Survey and Assessment of the Sources of Data on the Guilds in Safavid Iran.

I.2. The Historical Background of the Iranian Guilds.
I.1. Survey and Assessment of the Sources of Data on the Guilds in Safavid Iran.

Study of the Safavid period is in an early phase. Scholars have shown interest in the dynasty's rise and fall, in the establishment and popularization of Shi'ism in Iran, and in international aspects such as the Ottoman-Iranian wars and the start of European diplomatic and commercial relations with Iran. The development of the Iranian fine arts during the period has also received attention. As yet, however, very little research has been done into the internal economic and social history of Iran under the Safavids. One reason for this is the scarcity and inaccessibility of data from contemporary Iranian sources, which to some extent is compensated by the existence of pertinent information from contemporary European sources. Another reason is the influence still exerted on Iranian historical study by the content and periodization of the traditional chronicles, which seldom record social and economic events or changes, and when they do so, treat them as episodes in the career of a king or a dynasty. These factors can give rise to questionable judgements, such as that of the modern historian Abū'l-Qāsim Ṭahiri who has written, in a popular work on the 10th/15th and 11th/16th centuries, that "the security and peace which the bulk of the Iranian population enjoyed in Shāh 'Abbās the Great's reign gradually made them the most tranquil and prosperous of the Eastern countries. The increase in commercial activity, the intercourse with various nationalities, and the Shāh's regard for the artistic professions, all gave solidity to the Iranian
social institution."¹ Research since Mınorsky's edition and translation of the Tazkirat ul-Mulük, a manual of Safavid administration, in 1943 has not yet invalidated his remark in the foreword that "studies of political events, chronology, literature, religion, and art all have their importance, but the picture is likely to remain incomplete and to lack unity until there has been a more thorough examination of the ethnological factors, reflecting as they do the respective positions of the social groups."² The present study is an attempt to gather and analyse data from Iranian and European sources on one of the social groups of Safavid Iran, namely the artisans and tradesmen of the bazaars, and on their guild institutions. The sources and the relevant works of modern scholars are discussed in this chapter.

Among the works of modern scholars, the explanation and comments on the Tazkirat ul-Mulük by V. Minorsky, who also had a close acquaintance with the European sources, are uniquely valuable and have laid the foundation for subsequent research. Also important are L. Lockhart's The fall of the Safavid dynasty (Cambridge 1958), which includes studies of social and economic factors; J. Emerson's unpublished thesis on Some European sources on the economic structure of Persia between 1630 and 1690 A.D. (Cambridge 1971), and S. Schuster-Walser's Das Safavidische Persien im Spiegel Europäischer Reiseberichte 1502-1711 (Baden-Baden 1970), which are pioneering essays in economic historiography and the investigations of M. Roelofsz³ R. W. Ferrier and W. C. Palmer⁴ respectively into the archives of the Dutch and English East
India companies, which in addition to the reports on the businesses of the companies give some information about the economic and social conditions of Iranians. A. K. S. Lambton's *Landlord and peasant in Persia* (London 1955) is the most important work yet written on the social and economic history of the rural and tribal populations, but is not concerned with the urban population. A *History of Iran* written by Russian scholars, who had a close acquaintance with the Armenian, Georgian and Russian sources, in addition to the other sources, is also important; its section on the guilds in Safavid Iran is a useful analysis and explanation of the social and economic role of the working people as the main part of the urban population. Among the works by modern Iranian scholars, the most valuable are N. Falsafi's 5 volume *Zindāgani-yi Shāh ʿAbbās-ī Avval* (*Life of Shah Šabāb I*), which contains a large amount of scattered data from Iranian and European sources on economic and social matters, and M. I. Bastani Parizi's *Siyaṣat va iqtisād-i ʿagr-i Šafavī*, a political and economic history of the period, which is based on solid research even though it is written in a fluent and popular style with many touches of the author's keen sense of humour. A. Tahiri's *Tārīkh-i siyāsī va ijtimaʿī-yi Iran*, which is a relatively short popular general history, pays attention to religious and cultural changes but is weak on economic and social matters. Murtaza Ravandi, in the section on the Safavid period in his *Tārīkh-i ijtimaʿī-yi Iran* (Social history of Iran), has only a rather brief discussion on the urban workers derived mainly from
Minorsky, Chardin, and Tavernier, but gives an interesting and original interpretation of their position, which he considers to have deteriorated as the result of governmental exploitation.

The scarcity of documentary evidence concerning the urban craftsmen and trader and their guilds in the Šafavid period may perhaps explain why this subject has received little attention from modern scholars with the exception of J. Emerson. The reason for this scarcity is that documents such as account books and transaction records of shopkeepers and artisans, tax papers, price lists, endowment deeds (vaqfnāma), records of appointments of guild officials, judgements of guild courts, etc., were destroyed in the internal conflicts which followed the fall of the Šafavids. The late 18th century historian Aṣaf mentions that in the last days of the Šafavid rule, all the account books and documents of the Šafavid and pre-Šafavid kings which had been kept in a palace belonging to the Shāh called the Sarā-yi Chār Hawz were burnt on the order of 'Abdullāh Khān, the governor of Iṣfahān. The 19th century historian Jābirī Ansārī states that on orders of Maḥmūd, the first Ghalzāy Afghān ruler of Iṣfahān, all the account books and important papers of the tradesmen and artisans of the bazaar were cast into the Zāyanda Rūd and that as the result of this barbaric action the records (dāfātir) disappeared.

Nevertheless some relevant Šafavid documents have survived and are accessible, being now in the possession of public libraries, especially the British Library in
of scholarly private collectors. For the most part they are royal decrees, and in some cases they throw light on matters such as guild appointments and the duties of the kalāntar, naqīb, muḥtasib, bāshī etc. In the British Library there is a uniquely informative scroll (B.M., Sloane 4094), undated but probably from Shāh Sulaymān's reign.

The sanctity of the mosque saved a number of Šafavid royal decrees (farmāns) and vaqfānāmas which had been inscribed on the wall of the principal mosque in certain towns, notably Iṣfahān, Kāshān, Ardistān, Yazd, Tabrīz, and Astarābād (now Gurgān). Some of these inscriptions are valuable and unique sources of data on matters such as the crafts and trades of the town, the rates of the taxes and other impositions, and the role of the guilds. Inscribed tombstones from the Šafavid period are another useful source, because some of them give information about the deceased person's craft or trade and pictures of his tools.

The source materials used in the present study may be classified in eight main categories. Particulars of the various printed books and manuscripts are given in the Bibliography. The categories are as follows:

1. Documents

1a. The Taṣkirat ul-Mulūk (T.M.) and Dastūr ul-Mulūk (D.M.). These two manuals of Šafavid administration, written to instruct Ashraf, the second Qalāzīy ruler, and the Afgān conquerors in the arts of court protocol
and imperial government as practiced during the reign of the last Safavid monarch, are not strictly contemporary. *Tazkirat ul-Mulük* of Mīrza Samīʿ and has been edited with a commentary and a translation by the late Vladimir Minorsky. This work is a concise but detailed and purely factual compendium of the machinery of the government at the end of the Safavid period by an unknown official. It contains reliable data on guild organization and related matters, and has been used extensively in the present study. The *Dastūr ul-Mulük* of Mīrza Rafīʿ Ā, very similar in design and wording, appears in general to be better organized and more accurate; a printed edition, with an excellent introduction by Muḥammad Taqī Dānishpazhūh, has appeared in consecutive issues of the journal of the Faculty of Literature and Social Sciences of Tehran University. Both are listed in the bibliography under the name of the respective editors.

2b. **Manuscript documents** (mainly royal decrees).

3c. **Mosque inscriptions.**

2. **Historical works**

2a. **General histories.** These are royal chronicles written in traditional form and ornate language. Accessions, power struggles, wars, revolts, appointments, etc. are recounted in chronological order and generally without explanation, and (as already mentioned) economic and social matters are seldom brought into the picture; but scattered reports of political incidents, tax changes, etc. involving the guilds are to be found in these works. The most important of these works, which were written by official secretaries
(munshīs), are listed below. (1) The Aḥsan ut-Tavarikh, written in 980/1573 except for a portion at the end which was added in 985/1578. The Author, Ḥasan Rūmlū, gives a history of Iranian affairs from 900/1464 to 985/1578. He appears to have been a conscientious inquirer, though he usually fails to explain the real causes of the expeditions and historical events which he describes. (2) The Ṭārīkh-i Ālamārā-yi 'Abbāsī, written in 1025/1616 by Iskandar Munshī, a history of the life and reign of 'Abbās I with an introductory section on his Safavid predecessors. (3) The Zayl (appendix) of the Ālamārā-yi 'Abbāsī, written around 1043/1634 by Iskandar Munshī and Muḥammad Yusuf Vālih-i Muvarrikh. (4) The 'Abbāsnāma, a history of the reign of 'Abbās II by Muḥammad Ṭāhir Vaḥīd, a secretary (munshī) employed by the grand vazīrs Mīrzā Ṭaqī ud-Dīn Muḥammad and Khalīfa Sultān.

Much more valuable as a source of information on social matters is the Rustam ut-Tavarikh of Muḥammad Ḥashim Āṣaf, who held the title Rustam ul-Ḥukamā'. He states in his foreword that his father's cousin and his grandfather Amīr Shams ul-Dīn Muḥammad both served the Šafavids, the latter as master of the royal manufactories (kārkhāna-bāshī) to Shāh Sultān Ḫusayn. His father was in the service of the Vakīl (Karīm Khān Zand) and later, after an imprisonment, of Āqā Muḥammad Khān Qājār. The work consists of a collection of historical and socio-biographical anecdotes culled from his father's and grandfather's reminiscences, extending from the start of the reign of Shāh Sultān Ḫusayn to the end of that of 'Alī Murād Khān Zand in 1199/1785 and continuing to the time of Fath 'Alī Shāh, written in a simple and pithy
style which his father recommended to him. This work contains very valuable information on the social and economic history of 18th century Iran.

All the above mentioned works have now been printed.

2b. Local histories and geographies. The works of this type which were written in the Safavid period contain information about bazaars and guilds. The Ḥyāʾ ul-Mulūk is a history of Sīstān in 'Abbās I's reign written in the early 17th century by Malik Shāh Ḥusayn, who held high official positions and carefully observed what went on. The Tārīkh-i Gīlān, a history of Gīlān, written around 1039/1630 by 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Fūmanī, recounts political and economic events from 923/1517 to 1038/1629, and includes a very clear account of the Gīlānī resistance against the silk monopoly established by 'Abbās I and afterwards revoked by Shāh Ṣafī. The Jāmi'-i Muḥīdī (only part of which has been published) is a history of Yazd written in 1090/1679 by Muḥammad Muḥīd Mustawfī of Yazd, who was appointed collector (mustawfī) of the vaqf (religious endowment) revenue of Yazd in 1077/1666. The Taṣkira-yi Shūstār, a compilation by Sayyid 'Abdullāh ibn-i Ṣūr ud-Dīn Shūstārī, is an account of Shūstār from the earliest time to A.H.1169/1756, with notices of its celebrated men and memoirs of the author's life; the author notes changes in the town's economic fortunes, and enumerates more than seventy professional organizations which existed in it in the 12th/18th century.

Later histories and geographies written in the 13th/19th century containing information from contemporary sources are useful for the light which they throw on the evolution of the
Iranian guilds. They also give details, which are not recorded elsewhere, about local traditions and about families, many of whom were members of craft and trade guilds. The Farsnama-yi Naşirî of Mîrza Ḥasan Pasâ'î, which was first printed (lithographed) at Tehran in 1312/1895 and has been partially translated into English by H. Busse, contains data on the rise of powerful merchants and the relative decline of small traders and the consequent increased dependence of craftsmen on merchants. The Tārikh-i Kâshân of 'Abd ul-Rahîm Zarrâb and the Rūznâma-yi Kalântar both give much useful information about different aspects of the craft and trade guilds. The Tārikh-i Isfahān va Ray, written around 1359/1941 by Ḥasan Jâbirî Anşârî, contains valuable scattered data on the guilds from Safavid to Qâjâr times. 'Abdul-Wahhâb Shahshâhânî's Bahr ul-Javâhir, written in 1261/1841, gives a complete list of the guilds of Isfahān and the social status of each. The Jughrâfiyâ-yi Isfahān of Mîrza Ḥusayn Khân Tahvîldâr, written in 1308/1891, is unique in the detailed data which it gives about more than one hundred guilds still active at Isfahān in his time.

3. Literary works.

Certain works in the genre of the literary tazkira (collection of biographies and selected writings of poets and scholars) include sections on craftsmen who were also poets. The most important is the Tazkira-yi Naşrâbâdî of Mîrza Tâhir Naşrâbâdî, who as he states in his preface commenced the work in 1083/1672 and dedicated it to Shâh Sulaymân whose patronage he evidently enjoyed. He presents a large number of poets who were craftsmen and guild members. A small number appear
in the *Tuhfa-yi Sāmī*, a literary *tazkira* compiled in 957/1550 by a Safavid prince, Sām Mīrzā, who was one of the sons of Ismā'īl I.

Certain poets of the Safavid period, who knew something about the techniques of the crafts, tools, raw materials, and manufactured products of various guilds, composed verse in a special genre called *shahr-āshūb*, ostensibly about youths whose beauty disturbed the city. These are of interest, because they mention professional traditions, tools, materials, products, etc. The best known *shahr-āshūb* poet is Mīrzā Ṭahīr Vahīd who wrote in 'Abbas II's reign. His *dīvān* (collection of poems) survives in a manuscript in the Central Library of Tehran University. A selection of *shahr-āshūb* poems from various manuscripts with a valuable introduction and notes has been published by the modern scholar Ahmad Gulchīn-Ma'ānī of Mashhad.

4. **European official records.**

During the Safavid period, diplomatic conducts between Iran and the states of Europe, through temporary embassies because permanent embassies were not then customary, became more frequent than ever before, while commercial relations acquired considerable importance and were to a large extent conducted by the European East India companies which obtained permanent establishment rights in Iran. Certain Catholic Christian missionary orders also obtained permanent establishment rights. The East India companies were privately owned but had been constituted through special state privileges and in principle enjoyed the support of their governments; they may therefore be regarded as semi-official
bodies. Among the European visitors to Iran who wrote travel accounts, some came as official envoys or semi-official representatives, others came in pursuit of private business, and others came as tourists. The agents of the East India companies reported on general political and economic conditions as well as on their own commercial activities in their correspondence with their head offices, and some of the travel diarists and missionaries were percipient observers of the general political, economic, and social scene. The various European writings differ in quality: some are commonplace and superficial, some are fanciful, and others are of great importance for the history of Ṣafavid Iran. They can be classified into official reports, travel accounts, and missionary reports, but it will be convenient to include the accounts of both the official and unofficial travellers in the second of these three categories and to limit the first category to the records of the English and Dutch East India companies.

The English East India Company's records and the State Papers (SP) which are of inestimable value, are preserved in Archives of the East India Company at the India Office Library in London. Further material on Iran has been printed and explained in the works of W. Foster, E. B. Sainsbury, and J. Bruce which are listed in the bibliography.

The Dutch East India Company. The records of the Oost Indische Compagnie in the Colonial Archives Department of the Rijksarchief at The Hague are hardly less valuable for the period of the Dutch company's activity in Iran, i.e. 1623–1769. Some of the material on Iran has likewise been printed
and explained in an important work by H. Dunlop. More recently a valuable study of this material by M. Roelofz has been published.

The English Muscovy and Levant companies were also interested in trade with Iran in the 16th and 17th centuries. The reports of the journeys of Sir A. Jenkinson, A. Edwards, M. Salbancke, and other agents of the Muscovy Company are listed in the bibliography.

5. European travel accounts.

A list of the accounts of European travelers, with brief indications of their contents, is included in J. Emerson's work Some European sources on the economic structure of Persia between 1630 and 1690, and in Sibylla Schuster Walser's work. The most useful for the purposes of this study were the accounts (listed in the Bibliography) by the following ten travellers.

I. Pietro della Valle. A wealthy Roman nobleman who travelled for pleasure and recorded his impressions in letters to his friend Mario Schipano. He arrived in Isfahān in 1617 and stayed nearly five years. He vividly describes 'Abbās I's Maydān and bazaar and certain aspects of the city's commercial life (listed under Valle).

II. Fedor Kotov. A Muscovite merchant who was sent to Iran to sell goods from the Russian imperial treasury and arrived at Isfahān around 1624. His enumeration of the guilds and report of the locations of different trades in the bazaar and the Maydān-i Shāh is comparable with Chardin's account.

III. Thomas Herbert. A member of the first English embassy to the Safavid court in 1627, led by Sir Dodmore Cotton and accompanied by Sir Robert Sherley, which after a journey
through Bandar 'Abbās and Iṣfahān was received by 'Abbās I at Ashraf (now Bihshahr) in Nāzandarān. Herbert has not only recorded the fortunes of this mission (on which Cotton and Sherley died), but has also left valuable observations on social and economic conditions.

IV. Jean Baptiste Tavernier. An expert jeweler of Walloon (Belgian) origin, who made six journeys to Turkey, Iran, and India between 1631 and 1665 in pursuit of his craft and met 'Abbās I and 'Abbās II at Iṣfahān. His observations of many aspects of the economic and social scene throw light on the position of Iranian craftsmen and their guilds.

V. Adam Olearius. A learned German who was the secretary of a mission sent by Duke Frederick III of Holstein-Gottorp to investigate the possibility of silk importation through Russia and the Baltic Sea. The mission, under the leadership of Otto Brüggemann, a merchant of Hamburg (who hanged himself) was unsuccessful, but Olearius's account of its experiences in Iran in 1637-38 justifies J. Emerson’s description of him as "the first modern scholarly observer of Iran". He carefully describes the royal bazaar and the caravansarais and also the coffee houses of Iṣfahān.

VI. Jean (Sir John) Chardin (1643-1713). An expert jeweler of French origin and Protestant Christian faith who settled in England in 1681. He first arrived in Iran at the end of 'Abbās II's reign, and altogether spent ten years at Iṣfahān in two stays (1665-1669 and 1671-1677), doing business and practising his craft. In his voluminous account he attempted to describe and assess whatever was important, including the religion, the system of government, and the types of education
as well as the trades, manufactures, arts, crafts, and professional organizations such as guilds. Volumes 2, 5, 6, 8 and 10 of his "Voyages" provide a huge mass of reliable data on social and economic conditions in 17th century Iran.

VII. John Fryer. An English surgeon in the service of the East India Company of London who came to Isfahān in the summer of 1676 and stayed until 1678. His account contains interesting observations of market matters such as price controls, interest rates, and usury, but his comments are superficial. Emerson rightly judges that his "lack of knowledge of the language and somewhat contemptuous attitude towards Muslims did not allow him to penetrate very deeply into Iranian civilization".

VIII. Engelbert Kaempfer. A German doctor of medicine who accompanied a Swedish embassy to Isfahān, where he joined the service of the Dutch East India Company. He was at Isfahān in 1683 and afterwards at Bandar 'Abbās and Hurmuz. In his carefully written discussion of social and economic conditions, he gives a list of the existing guilds and original data on matters such as price control, guild officials, and royal guilds.

IX. Giovanni Francesco Gemelli Carreri. An Italian traveler who sojourned at Isfahān in 1694 during a journey around the world. His account of his stay in Iran contains scattered but reliable information about the craft guilds.

X. Cornelius Le Brun (De Bruin). A Dutch scholar and artist who twice stayed at Isfahān, in 1704-1705 and 1706-1707. His drawings of Isfahān and his descriptions of Iranian society at that time are valuable. He notes the role of the guilds and of
the responsible officials such as the muhtasib and the kalāntar.

6. European missionary reports.

These are valuable in spite of their Christian bias because the authors spent large parts of their lives in Iran and became very well acquainted with the Persian language and with local conditions. The works which have been most used in the present study are those of:

i. Raphaël Du Mans. A French Catholic monk who lived at Isfahān from 1644 until his death in 1696 and during most of that time was head of the mission of the Capuchin order (which had been established with 'Abbās I's permission in 1628). He was also an expert mathematician. He was highly respected at the Safavid royal court, where he acted as French interpreter, and he helped many of the French and other foreign visitors. The report on the state of Persia in 1660, which he wrote for King Louis XIV's finance minister Colbert, deals with economic, social, governmental, and cultural aspects and contains valuable data on the number and the nature of the guilds and the systems and techniques of certain craft industries.

ii. Martin Sanson. A French Catholic priest of the Jesuit order who was sent to learn the language and work as a missionary and spent the years 1683-1692 in Iran. His report deals mainly with the Safavid administrative system and gives information on governmental control of the guilds.

iii. The Carmelite Chronicle. The monks of the different Catholic Christian orders, such as Dominicans, Jesuits, Capuchins, Augustinians, and Carmelites, which maintained missionaries in several Iranian cities from the time of
'Abbas I onward, learned much about various features of Safavid Iran. Interesting reports on political and social as well as religious matters can be found in *A chronicle of the Carmelites in Persia and the Papal mission of the XVIIth and XVIIIth centuries*, edited by H. Chick. This valuable work is a collection of letters from the archives of the order's Casa Generalizia in Rome. (Listed under Carmelites).

iii. Tadeusz Krusinski. A Jesuit Catholic priest of Polish nationality who stayed in Iran from 1707 to 1725 and was put in charge of the Jesuit mission in the country in 1720. He negotiated with the government of Shah Sultan Husayn and the first Ghulzay Afghan ruler Mahmud, and was in Isfahan and Julfa during and after the Afghan siege. His memoirs, which were published in somewhat modified and divergent French and Latin versions by different editors, provided a valuable eye witness's account of the Safavid collapse and its disastrous social consequences.

7. **Armenian sources.**

Petros Di Sarkis Gilanentz. Author of a journal of the years 1722-1723 in Armenian consisting partly of material on the battle of Gulnabad (12 miles east of Isfahan) and the Afghan victory and siege of Isfahan given to him by a fellow-Armenian, Joseph Apisalaimian, who was an eyewitness, and partly of material on events in Georgia and the Caucasian provinces; completed in August/September 1723 for the Russian commander in Gilan, General Levashov. An English translation by Dr. C. O. Minasian of Isfahan was published
in Lisbon in 1959. The journal gives information on matters such as food prices at Iṣfahān and the position and wealth of merchants.
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Study of the social and economic history of Iran, particularly in the earlier centuries, is hampered by scarcity of data. For much of the post-Islamic period, the only substantial sources are court chronicles, which mainly record the wars and victories or defeats of Kings but seldom touch upon matters of social, economic, municipal, tribal, or even military organization. Although study of the history of the guilds has hardly begun, it will probably never be able to find wholly satisfactory answers to the questions when and how the guild organization of urban craftsmen and tradesmen first came into being. The only certain fact is that their structure and behaviour were strongly influenced by Islam.

One of the recent investigators of Iranian guild history is the Russian scholar N. K. Kuznetsova. Her two articles on the guilds in the 18th and 19th centuries are based on Persian, European, and also Georgian and Armenian source materials from those centuries and also from the 17th century, and are concerned with the guilds in Iran and also in the Russian-ruled Caucasian territories formerly belonging to Iran. ¹ The Dutch scholar W.M.Floor attempted in a first article to sketch the whole history of the Iranian guilds from the advent of Islam ² up to 1972, but in fact wrote mainly on the guilds in the 20th century; his summary of the early periods is conjectural and not well supported by documentary evidence. In a
dissertation... entitled The guilds in Qajar Iran, which is a fully documented analysis of all aspects of 19th century guild life, he has made a very valuable contribution. The subject has also been studied by an Iranian researcher, Kāşim Rūhānī, in his doctoral thesis XVI-XVII Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı ve Şafavi Esnaf Teşkilati (Ottoman and Šafavid guild organization in the 16th and 17th centuries) presented to Istanbul University in 1976-77; most of the thesis is devoted to the guilds in Ottoman Turkey, while the passages concerning the guilds in Iran are based only on the Tażkīrat al-Mulūk and the statements of Chardin, Tavernier, and Kaempfer. These first steps leave the field of Iranian guild history wide open for further research.

There is no direct or indirect evidence of the existence of guilds in Iranian cities in pre-Islamic times, and the supposition of their existence in those times by scholars such as Petrushevsky is purely conjectural, even though it may seem inherently probable. The Macedonian conquest probably stimulated trade and urban growth, and the Sāsānīd Shāhs founded several cities which became centres of handicraft industry and commercial exchange. Although archaeological excavations have not revealed the pattern of urban layouts, it is probable that there was a commercial section in every city (as at Bīshāpūr) and possible that the commercial section had something of the shape and character of the later Islamic bazaar. If so, it is possible that the craftsmen and tradesmen of pre-
Islamic times had already begun to form collective organizations prefiguring the later Islamic guilds. This hypothesis would accord with Sjoberg's observation that pre-industrial societies, despite their cultural differences, display essentially similar basic structures.  

Whether or not the guilds of post-Islamic Iran had pre-Islamic antecedents, it is clear from the available evidence that they were basically similar to those of other Islamic countries. Their essential characteristics, like those of many other institutions (e.g. mosques, madrasas, bazaars) and offices (e.g. those of the qāżī and the muḥtasib), were determined by the common Islamic ideology. The terms *sinf* (guild) and *bunīcha* (guild tax), and the titles *naqīb*, *kadkhūda*, *bāshī*, *ustād*, *khalīfa*, and *shāgird* were used in other Muslim countries besides Iran. Bernard Lewis, in a brief article on the *Islamic Guilds*, thinks that they had a "material framework or organization inherited or imitated from the Greco-Roman world and a system of ideas coming essentially from the Syro-Persian civilization, giving as a result a movement at once Islamic, Hellenistic, interconfessional, philosophical and corporatist."  

Under the 'Abbāsid caliphate, the capital Baghdād and a few other cities became important centres of handicraft industries and commerce. Although Baghdād's founder, the caliph Maṇṣūr, did not include a commercial district with specialized bazaars in his plan for the city, not many years passed before factors such as population growth and rises in monetary circulation, purchasing power, and living
standards caused an upsurge of demand for the services of artisans, traders, and labourers. The influx of members of these classes into Baghdad transformed the city's original shape. New fixed and specialized markets and craft workshop quarters grew up around the original military settlement. At the same time the opulence derived from provincial tribute payments to the caliphal government and from private commercial profits brought into being a type of urban society which did not conform with Islamic principles and ideals of justice. It appears that little of the new wealth reached the artisans and labouring classes, and that their discontent with the ruling bodies was one of the main reasons for Baghdad's notorious turbulence. The appointment of a muhtasib did not apparently deter the "market people" (ahl al-suq) from causing trouble for the caliph, who decided in 157/774 to move them to al-Karkh, south west of the original fortified city. Al-Karkh became the main business centre, and was gradually subdivided into many bazaars, each specializing in one kind of trade. Neither this subdivision nor the surveillance by the muhtasib prevented the further growth of opposition from the side of the artisan class. Opponents of the régime could enter the city in the guise of traders and pass on information about activities. The continuing unrest among the artisans and traders, as well as the turbulence of the garrison troops, prompted the Caliph Mu'tasim to move the capital in 221/836 from Baghdad to Samarra, where it remained until 278/892. In later times
the presence of many Shi'ite believers at al-Karkh gave rise to frequent religious disturbances.\(^{19}\) Sufi movements with anti-caliphate and anti-governmental tendencies also won followings among the artisans and tradesmen. It appears, however, that the common interests of all the members of this class generally kept them united in spite of the differences between the various Shi'ite and Sufi sects. A tendency to synthesize the beliefs of these sects can be observed from the 'Abbāsid period right up to the Šafavīd period. At different times, groups of urban workers had links with Ismā'īlī sects, with Sufi sects and orders, with movements combining Sufi beliefs and veneration for the Imam 'Alī such as the 'ayyārān and and later futūvat movement of the 6th/12th-8th/14th centuries,\(^{20}\) and finally with the Shi'ite Ni'matī and Haydarī darvīsh orders in Šafavīd Iran.\(^{21}\)

The question of the origin of the Islamic guilds is linked with the question why independent municipal institutions did not arise in the Muslim countries. Max Weber wrongly attributes the non-existence of such institutions to the tribal tradition of the Arabs.\(^{22}\) S. D. Goitein, in an otherwise valuable study of Islamic institutions, holds that the Islamic guilds were not real guilds because they were not independent; if real guilds had existed, there would have been a specific term for them (whereas the term sinf, plural asnāf, which is used in Arabic and Persian, means only category, i.e. of workers). Basically Goitein's argument rests on a comparison of the Islamic
with the European guilds. He defines guilds as "medieval unions of craftsmen or tradesmen which supervised the general affairs and technical standards of the members and occupations, and which by certain rules controlled the education of apprentices and their admission into the union." This fits the guilds of the Western European countries. Goitein's finding that the Islamic guilds differed from this European model is certainly correct; since they were authentically Islamic, it would be surprising if they had not differed. These two premises, however, do not justify his conclusion that the medieval Islamic realm had no real guilds at all.

C. Cahen in his article "Did professional guilds exist in the classical Muslim world?" has perceived that the problem is not so much one of definition as one of degree. "Nobody," he writes, "can challenge that the fact the Muslim world, since the time which we are considering (i.e. the 'Abbasid period), has had some form of professional organization. The problem is to find out whether and to what extent it was a corporate organization consisting of spontaneous associations... or whether we are discussing organisms which emanated from the administrative system and were under state control." Cahen finally reaches the conclusion that institutions free from state control did not exist in the classical Islamic world. This is true in the sense that medieval Muslim governments, and likewise the Safavid government, were distrustful or jealous of all holders of any independent political
or economic power and therefore attempted either to eliminate or to control them. On the other hand, the ideology of Islam, particularly in its Shi'ite but also in its Sunnite form, strongly emphasizes the independence of the faith and the sacred law (shari'at) from any sort of governmental control. Not only must the state authorities enforce the shari'at; they themselves, like all Muslims, are bound by it. Logically the shari'at is prior to both the community and the state. In theory, a legitimate and properly constituted Islamic government is entitled to intervene in all the community's affairs. In historical fact, however, such a government only existed in the Prophet Muhammad's lifetime and for a short time in the period after his death. Ever since then, devout Muslims have generally been inclined to oppose or at least to disapprove of the ruling government. The governments, for their part, have generally sought justification for their rule and for their interventions in the people's affairs by claiming to act as defenders of Islam and maintainers of law and order. It can be taken for certain that the Islamic states did not create the Islamic guilds, but attempted to control the activities of the guilds, and of the urban populations generally, through the appointment of supervisory officials.

In the opinion of L. Massignon, labour organization and worker incorporation in the Muslim cities date from the 3rd/9th century and were "closely connected with a movement half religious and half socialistic in origin,
that of the Karmatians." This opinion is supported by B. Lewis, who holds that the development of handicraft industries and urban agglomerations in the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries led to a rapid growth of large-scale capitalism with social effects which gave rise to widespread discontent and were not compatible with Islamic principles. The Qarmatī movement attracted many discontented people and disseminated its rather revolutionary principles among all classes, particularly the artisans. The name Qarmatī was given to the whole Ismā'īli or Sevener Shi'ite movement in its earliest phase, but afterward only to certain Ismā'īli groups who did not recognize the claims of 'Ubaydullāh al-Mahdi and his successors of the Fātimid dynasty. The greatest successes of the Qarmatī and Ismā'īli da'vā (propaganda) were in fact the conversion of Arab and Berber tribes. On the other hand, it is known that their propagandists were active in Baghdad, Ray, Nīshāpūr, and Sīstān; and the composition of the Rasā'il Ikhwān al-Ṣafā (Letters of the Brethren of Purity) by Qarmatī intellectuals in the middle of the 4th/10th century shows that the movement had a following among the literate classes in the cities. In general, however, the rulers of Iraq and Iran regarded Qarmatīsm and Ismā'īlism as a dangerous revolutionary heresy or at least as a threat to the 'Abbāsid caliphate which they recognized. Contemporary governments, if they were strong enough, would therefore have prevented the artisans and shopkeepers from forming associations or guilds overtly linked with Qarmatī or Ismā'īli sects. Nevertheless it seems quite likely
that the ideology of these sects had some influence on the ideology of the Islamic guilds. Besides calling for social justice, the Qarmatīs and Ismāʿīlīs, being Shiʿites, greatly venerated the Imām 'Alī, whom the guilds have always taken as their model of justice, honesty, courage, and true faith. Since the Imām 'Alī is venerated not only by Shiʿites but also by Šūfīs, it seems equally likely that the ideology of the Islamic guilds was influenced from the start by the ideology of Šūfī saints and preachers, many of whom stemmed from the artisan class, e.g. the martyred Ḥusayn ibn Maṣūr al-Ḥallāj (244/857-309/922) who was the son of a cotton carder, or Shaykh Abu Saʿīd ibn Abīʾl-Khayr (357/967-440/1049) who was the son of a druggist.

The emergence of 'āyyārān, groups of urban youths who in times of anarchy or oppression acted as an unofficial police in defence of the common people, is an interesting feature of the social history of the early post-Islamic centuries. The most notable 'āyyārān leader was the coppersmith Yaʿqūb Lays, who became the ruler of Sīstān (247/861-265/879) and later of all southern and eastern Iran. S. Nafīsī, a 20th century Iranian scholar, defines the movement of Yaʿqūb Lays as insurrection of Sīstān's coppersmiths' guild and other artisans against the oppression of 'Abbāsīd caliphate. In general the 'āyyārān groups were ephemeral, because the local governments were sooner or later able to establish regular police (called shurṭa before the Saljuq Turkish conquest). The guilds, on the other hand, proved to be durable. For the 'āyyārān, as well as for the guilds,
the Imam 'Alī was the model of courage and good conduct. The moral and religious ideas of both the 'ayyārān groups and the guilds were summed up in the Arabic word futūwa (futūvat) and the Persian word javānmardī, both meaning literally youthfulness and by implication chivalry on the model of the Imam 'Alī.

The Russian historian I. P. Petrushevsky also places the rise of the Islamic guilds in the 3rd/9th century and notes they had become well organized by the 5th/11th century. Their progress was probably connected with the continuance of industrial and urban growth, which went on until the Mongol invasion. Under the relatively stable regime of the Sāmānids (263/875-395/1005), their capital Bukhārā prospered and large numbers of craftsmen and tradesmen settled in its rabaż, i.e. suburbs outside the walled city. There is some evidence of the guilds into which they were grouped. One of these was the guild of scribes and copyists, whose membership was confined to experts in calligraphy (khatjātī) holding a certificate of proficiency in this highly esteemed art from an established master. Other craftsmen such as shoemakers, silversmiths, etc. had their own professional organizations. Under the Būyid or Daylamite regime (320/932-447/1055), Isfahān acquired a well built bazaar consisting of several lanes, each occupied by a particular şinf of artisans and tradesmen, while Shīrāz was endowed by ʿAẓud ud-Dawla (338/949-372/983) with the Sūq ul-Amīr, a once famous but now vanished bazaar in which different sections were occupied.
by different guilds (aşnâr).\textsuperscript{40} A story told by Nizâm ul-Mulk Ťüsî (408/1017-485/1092) in his Siyâsatnâma suggests that the bakers' guild of Ghazni was a well organized and effective body. In protest against the hoarding of wheat and flour by the baker of the royal court, they closed their shops, i.e. went on strike, and the city's inhabitants suffered from a bread shortage. The Sultan İbrahim (451/1059-492/1099), after hearing the people's complaints, summoned the bakers and heard their testimony against the court baker. Finally Sultan İbrahim sentenced the offender to be trampled under the feet of an elephant.\textsuperscript{41} Under the rule of the Turkish Saljuq Sultâns, the political stability and road security in the reigns of Alp Arsalân (455/1063-465/1072) and Malik Shân (465/1072-485/1092) gave a further stimulus to urban industry and trade, particularly at their capital İsfahan.\textsuperscript{42} Nâşir-i Khusraw (394/1004-470/1077), the Ismâ'îlî philosopher and poet, mentions in his Safarnâma (Travel Diary) that the main bazaar at İsfahan was occupied by many different guilds and that there were also fifty caravansarais occupied by specific categories of traders; the number of the money changers in the bazaar was 200.\textsuperscript{43} Ray was also a prosperous city, divided into many quarters such as those of the camel-drivers (sârbânân), hatters (kulâh-dûzan), and broom-makers (jârûb-bandân).\textsuperscript{44}

The Nizârî Ismâ'îlî movement of the so-called "assassins", whose chief Iranian propagandist (dâ'î), Hasan Şabbâh, captured the fortress of Alamût in the Alburz mountains in 483/1090 and set up an independent anti-Saljuq state, made a great effort to win converts among
the bazaar people and other city dwellers. Ahmad ibn 'Abd ul-Malik ibn 'Attash, their propagandist in Isfahān, who seized the nearby mountain fortress of Shāhdiz and held it for six or seven years before he surrendered and was put to death in 500/1107, apparently had many secret followers in the city. 45

The massacres and destruction which accompanied the Mongol invasion did immense damage to Iran's urban and industrial development. Among the formerly great cities, some never again became important, others slowly revived with smaller populations, but only Tabrīz and Shīrāz suffered no damage. Nevertheless the Islamic guild system remained intact and sometimes played an important role in social and political matters. Sayfī Haravī, the author of the Tarikhnama-yi Harāt, a reliable source of information on Harāt in the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries, relates that when Chingīz Khān threatened Harāt in 618/1221, the 1000 strong guild of the weavers (bāfandagān) decided to seek an agreement with the Mongol commanders in the hope that the city might be saved from massacre and destruction or looting. The guild's head (muqaddam), 'Izz ud-Dīn, was chosen to be the delegate of all the citizens. He offered lavish gifts to the Mongol generals, but they rejected any peaceful compromise. The Mongols then plundered Harāt and killed many of the people who had not fled from the city, but in accordance with Chingīz Khān's regulations, they sent the remaining weavers as captives to Mongolia. The weavers and other citizens who had escaped into the
countryside kept up a guerrilla resistance for several years and smuggled food into the city for the starving people whom they had left behind; they were led by guild heads and elders such as Fakhr-ı Haddad (blacksmith), Shams-ı Dabbāj (brocade weaver), Majd-ı 'Assar (oil seed crusher), and 'Alamshāh-ı Biryānī (liver-griller). Their action enabled the city's remaining inhabitants to survive for four years until life returned to normal. Since the economy of Harāt depended on the handweaving industry, the Mongol authorities eventually sent back the weavers whom they had deported to Mongolia.46

In the first four decades of the Ilkhānid dynasty (654/1256-736/1336), the weapons which the Mongol troops in Iran required were supplied by governmental armories. This policy was changed by the first Muslim Īlkhān, Ghāzān Khān (694/1295-703/1304). On his order, the officers in charge throughout the country assembled the swordmakers, bowmakers, arrowsmiths, and quiver-makers (qurbān-sāzān), and organized them into groups each headed by an amīn (i.e. a responsible representative). The various craftsmen were in fact wage-paid workers, because they possessed no personal capital and relied on raw material supplied by their amīn to execute the army's orders. The arrangement did not work satisfactorily and was soon ended.47 In general, the urban working and trading classes suffered from severe exploitation under the Ilkhānid régime, because they were subjected to heavy new taxes payable in cash or in kind;48 the fiscal reform attempted by the
great minister and historian Rashīd ud-Dīn Faẓlullāh, who held office from 697/1298 until 717/1317, only improved their position partially and temporarily. 49

The Moroccan traveller Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, who stopped at Shīrāz and Isfahān in 727/1328 and again in 743/1347, gives an interesting description of the craft guilds. In the latter year the two cities were ruled independently by Shāh Abu Ishāq Injū (d. 758/1357), the patron of Ḥāfiz, and in the former year they had been ruled by Abū Ishāq's father, Sharaf ud-Dīn Mahmūd, who was the Ilkhānid régime's governor general. According to the Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, Abū Ishāq had decided to build a palace at Shīrāz matching the Taq-i Kisrā (palace of Khusraw Anūshirvān) at Ctesiphon and had ordered the people of Shīrāz to dig the foundations. When the work began, artisans of the rival guilds used to come to the site to display their wares, and Shāh Abū Ishāq used to watch from a balcony. 50 At Isfahān, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa found the guilds to be well organized. Each had a chief who was elected at a general meeting and was called the kilū, by which Ibn Baṭṭūṭa probably meant qulī (Turkish for "its slave", i.e. its loyal servant). The different guilds used to invite each other's members to their special banquets, at which each would give proof of its dignity by displaying valuable chattels, such as dishes, which belonged to it. He was told that the different guilds used to rival each other in the lavishness of their ceremonial banquets. 51

Tīmūr, through his repeated raids and many massacres, caused further damage to the cities of Iran; but his
successors, particularly Shāhrukh, Ulugh Bēg, Abū Sa'īd, and Ūsayn Bāyqara, through their maintenance of order for quite long periods and through their patronage of Iranian architecture and arts, stimulated a revival of urban industries and trade. Their capital Harāt attracted large numbers of the best craftsmen and artisans, and its many well organized guilds played an important part. A document from Ūsayn Bāyqara's reign, which is preserved in the Central Library of Tehran University, gives some particulars of important guilds and of the guild regulations which the members were required to observe. The heads (mugaddaman or pishvāyān) of the city's guilds were charged with the supervision of the similar guilds throughout the Sultan's domains (Harāt va mamālik-i maḥrūsa).

This sketch of Iranian guild history before the Šafavid period is very rudimentary, but sufficient to show that the artisans and tradesmen had already acquired a long experience of professional organization and a capacity for the exertion of influence in municipal and political affairs. It is to be hoped that, in spite of the scarcity of source material, future researchers will be able to portray and interpret this important aspect of Iranian history more adequately.
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Chapter 2.

Description and Number of the Guilds

1. Description and Classification of the Guilds.

2. Number of the Guilds.
2.1. Description and Classification of the Guilds.

There is no precise Persian equivalent of the word "guild" as it is used in European languages, although European writers generally agree in so translating the word گیمر[^1]. This practice has been followed in the present study. It should, however, be noted that in Persian literature the word گیمر (plural گیمر) has a very wide and often ambiguous application, being used to designate any category or association of people in society who are distinguished or brought together by common activity or interests[^2]. For example, the historian Iskandar Munshi, writing in Shah 'Abbas I's reign remarks that the expression گیمر-i ra'āya (groups of the subjects) usually means the different occupations including یلدا, poets, army, urban working people, government officials, agricultural workers, etc[^3]. According to a decree of Karīm Khan Zand, the founder of the Zand dynasty, the گیمر-i khalq or گیمر-i nās (groups of the people) are classified as four گیمس, namely officials, agricultural workers, traders, and artisans. Karīm Khan's classification was intended to comprise the entire working population of Iran, including the higher ranks of the administration and excluding only the non-employed[^4].

Besides the term گیمر, literature relating to the guilds in the pre-Ṣafavid and Ṣafavid periods contains various synonyms which are frequently used by writers. In the Timūrid period, one of these terms was یاگم; a
member of a guild was ahl-i jamā'at, and the chiefs were called pishvayan or muqaddaman-i jamā'at. The word ahl appears in the organizational terminology of the futūvat and Ṣūfī orders and in Ṣūfī tradition and literature; while retaining its Ṣūfī significance, it was also applied to artisans and traders holding membership in the futūvat. (The religious aspects and functions of the guilds are discussed in chapter 7 of this work). In the Ṣafavid period, the designations ahl-i kaśb, (traders), ahl-i muṭtarafa (craftsmen) and ahl-i şanā'at (artisan) were widely used; but in the course of the 17th and 18th centuries, they were relegated to literary or formal usage, and gradually lost their specific meanings, while the word ginf became the normally used term for "guild" and retained this meaning until later times.

The meaning of ginf in the 17th and 18th centuries may be defined as a group of city-dwellers engaged in the same occupation, working in the same bazaar, headed by their own chiefs, and paying a regular guild tax to the local authorities. This strict and limited definition must be used if the activities of organized industrial and commercial groups in the cities of Ṣafavid Iran are to be discussed with any precision. On the other hand, this definition may perhaps in itself be a source of confusion, since contemporary sources apply the word "ginf" to groups of people who were not guild members in the above sense. For example, there is no evidence that the guild system was fully developed in small towns and
villages, and there is some evidence that not all workers in cities were included in it. Nevertheless, in general descriptions of society, these looser groupings were referred to as asnaʾf. There were also certain guilds which did not possess an independent chief (bāshī), having been placed together with other guilds under a single joint supervisor. According to a decree of Shāh Tahmāsb I, Mullā Ḥasan Muzahhib was appointed the chief (bāshī) of a number of book-related but technically distinct guilds in Tabrīz, namely illuminators, copyists, binders (mujallidān), painters, gilders, and paper sellers. Similarly, the goldsmiths, workers in gold leaf, and gold wire-drawers were under supervision of a single chief called the zargarbāshī (chief of goldsmiths). Some guilds had no independent chief of their own because they came under the control of a single government official. Thus at Isfahān, the different groups of public entertainers were headed by the māshʿaldār-bāshī, who was the šāhib-jamʿ (chief book-keeper) of the torch-bearers. Some occupations were not liable for the regular guild taxes (bunīcha), e.g. the barbers, public entertainers, bath attendants, and ambulatory craftsmen at Isfahān, who did not have shops in the main bazaars but operated in the Maydān-i Shāh (Royal Square). Finally, in considering the scope of the term sinf, it must be remembered that there were also the many craftsmen and tradesmen of the outlying villages who had no connection with the urban guilds but held a considerable share in the
production of manufactured goods and articles. Olearius, who accompanied a Holsteinian ambassador to Iran in 1636-38, states that the inhabitants of the villages near Iṣfahān were employed in the making of textiles and tapestries of wool, cotton, and silk. The inhabitants of the villages surrounding Kāshān and small towns along the caravan route between Yazd and Mashhad were similarly engaged in the making of textiles and carpets and also of pottery.

It is difficult to determine the relative social ranking of the different guilds in Ṣafavid Iran, since in the Islamic doctrine there is no nobility except the nobility of devotion to God (Qur'ān, 49,13: "the noblest among you in God's sight are the most pious"). Moreover, the available sources do not clearly state what criteria of social worth were acknowledged at that time. In Ṣafavid Iran, where almost all the people were believing Muslims, the Islamic doctrine was of course accepted. Class distinctions were not recognised in law, and were not considered right in practice. Thus the social structure of Ṣafavid Iran differed from the social structures of the European countries and cannot be analysed by comparison with them. A definition of the word class which appears to be applicable to the social groups of Ṣafavid society has been suggested by G. Sjoberg. According to him, a social class is "a large body of persons who occupy a position in a social hierarchy by reason of their manifesting similarly valued objective criteria including
kinship affiliation, power and authority, possessions and material evidences of wealth, moral attributes including religious and ethical beliefs and actions, and personal attributes involving speech and personal mannerism."^{19}

The very scattered available evidence concerning the social and economic life of 17th and 18th century Iran shows that the population of the large cities consisted of: (a) an elite or upper class which manifested the characteristics of Sjoberg's definition and which comprised feudal magnates (khāns), high-ranking officials, military commanders, religious leaders, and wealthy merchants, in short the ruling class. (b) The ruled class, which differed markedly in composition from the upper class and comprised small-scale traders (kasaba), artisans, unskilled manual labourers, simple soldiers, and other humble groups.^{20} According to the text of the already mentioned decree of Karīm Khān Zand which is reported in the Rustam ut-Tavārīkh, the four categories into which this ruler divided the people at the beginning of his reign were (a) ahl-i mulāzamat (governors and civil servants), (b) ahl-i hirfa va kasb (artisans and tradesmen), (c) ahl-i bay' va shara (merchants), (d) ahl-i zirā'at (farmers).^{21} Tavernier, writing in Shāh 'Abbās I's reign, mentions that the craftsmen and tradesmen were considered to occupy the third place in the social classification of Šafavid Iran.^{22} Although neither Āṣaf nor Tavernier specifically states that the artisans and tradesmen had an inferior social status, their accounts indicate that the
military commanders, senior bureaucrats, and leading 'ulama constituted the élite, and that the artisans and tradesmen, who were the largest elements of the urban population, served this élite and did not belong to it. However, this lower social status paradoxically did not deprive the craftsmen (pīshavaran) of dignity and esteem, or deprive individuals from amongst them of social mobility and opportunities to raise their status.

Islamic doctrine and law (shari'at) hold craftsmen in high respect. The theologian Muhammad Ghazzalī (d. 505/1111) declared that God loves craftsmen (kāsib ḥabīb-i Khudā'īst) because they not only earn their livelihood in a good way but also supply the needs of their community. It is interesting to note that knowledge of a craft was regarded as a merit and excellence for members of the élite, even for Shāhs. Simon, a Carmelite priest who was in Iran in 1608, states that "Shāh 'Abbās I was proud of his knowledge of several crafts; he enjoyed making scimitars, arquebuses, and bridles and saddles for horses, weaving cloth, and distilling salts, oranges, flower water, and medicaments; and in short, with all mechanical crafts, if not perfect, he is at least somewhat conversant". "It is not a matter for surprise to learn of Shāh 'Abbās I's pleasure in mechanical arts, because in the Levant and especially Persia a man is considered ignoble and is not esteemed, even when of high rank, if he does not know some arts or crafts; and often the fathers have been asked what crafts they practised". Karīm Khān Zand boasted of his proficiency in bricklaying
(banna’ī), carpet-making, and stocking-weaving, while Āqā Muhammad Bīdābādī, an eminent contemporary religious scholar, gained his livelihood from button-making (dugma-chīnī).  

Birth and upbringing did not prevent intelligent artisans or their sons from receiving high governmental appointments, and thereby rising into the ruling class. For instance, Mīrzā Shāh Husayn, a high-ranking bureaucrat in Shāh Ismā’īl I’s army who became the Shāh’s vakīl (deputy and designated regent), had originally been a stone-mason, and Mīrzā Najm, another important official in Shāh Ismā’īl’s reign, had at first probably been a goldsmith at Rasht (in Gilān province) and had been promoted solely on account of his capacity.  

Tavernier notes that Mīrzā Muḥammad ‘Alī Bey, the prime minister (ṣadr-i ʿazam) of Shāh ‘Abbās II, was the son of a tailor and had been appointed successively chief (bāshī) of the goldsmith’s guild and head of the royal mint (mu‘ayyir-bāshī) before he reached the highest official position in the Ṣafavid state.  

Many craftsmen and traders gained reputations for their scholarly activities, mainly in the field of religious sciences, Arabic language, Persian poetry and prose, and calligraphy. For instance, in Shāh Ismā’īl I’s reign, Mawlānā Ḥasan Shāh Baqqāl (a grocer) of Shīrāz left his occupation to become a teacher and established an excellent college (madrasa) in that city.  

Luṭf ‘Alī Āzar (d.1195/1781) states that in his time Sirāj-yi Ḥakkāk (an engraver) was by far the best calligrapher, and that Khwāja Ghīyās ud-Dīn Naqshband, the bāshī of the weavers of Yazd, was an
eminent artist, while Naşrabādī states that Zamānī-ya
Naqqāš, a painter, had been a well known poet in Shāh
Abbās II's reign.

Sources from the Șafavid period mention poor artisans
who left their ill-rewarded occupations and successfully
went in for large-scale commerce. For instance, Āqa Nūr-i
Jūlā, a weaver, who abandoned weaving for the lucrative
Indian trade, became after a few years a rich merchant
and built a mosque in the Isfahān bazaar known as the
Masjid-i Āqa Nūr-i Jūlā (which still exists). Khāvāja
Bāqir-i 'Ăşgār, one of the wealthiest merchants in
Shāh 'Abbās II's reign, had at first been an oil crusher
('ăşgār). In general, such wealthy businessmen
(saudāgarān), while enjoying an honourable place in
society, lived very simply. They usually did not display
their wealth, because by so doing they would lose their
good name with their fellow businessmen.

The available evidence indicates that a guild's
social status in the 17th and 18th centuries depended
to a great extent on the religious and moral qualities
which Islamic laws (sharī'at) and tradition ascribed to
its trade or occupation. This religion-rooted distinc-
tion between high and low occupations had persisted in
all the Islamic nations throughout their history.
Occupations which are sanctioned by sharī'at rules were
regarded as superior to occupations which are reprehended
by the sharī'at. The latter were not only considered
inferior, but also, in general, were ill-rewarded. The
individuals who pursued the inferior occupations generally came from poor families, and these families consequently remained poor.36

Another criterion of the social status of artisans and tradesmen depended on the degree of skill and length of experience which the various occupations or professions required. In general, the professions requiring hard skills and yielding high returns occupied the position at the top of the social scale, while those yielding low returns and employing unskilled workers lay at the bottom of the scale. In the first place, the artisans working in the royal workshops (kārkhana-hā-yi saltanatī) had higher skills and qualifications than the self-employed artisans and therefore enjoyed a better social as well as economic status.37 For this reason, artisans were glad to enter the royal workshops when opportunities arose. Amongst the ordinary guilds, a few stood particularly high in esteem, for example physicians and druggists, to whom patients entrusted their life and health, and money-changers with whom people deposited their money. Certain crafts such as glass-making, gilding, and calligraphy were esteemed for the skill and art which they required. Wealth and honesty were the main sources of the prestige of guilds such as the goldsmiths and jewellers.

Information about the earnings of different occupations and guilds is scarce. The European travellers indicated that goldsmiths, gold wire drawers (zarkashān),
goldbeaters (TALE-kuban), jewellers, and money-changers (garrafan) enjoyed the highest earnings and social status. Brocade weavers (zar-bafan) earned better incomes than most other workers. The craftsmen and traders who had their shops in a royal bazaar and particularly in a qaygariya enjoyed better business opportunities than those who had shops in other quarters (mahallat) or in the suburbs. The artisans in the royal bazaar were fully qualified members of the respective guilds, whereas the craftsmen who carried on their business elsewhere were by tradition only loosely attached to the organized guilds. The wealthier artisans and traders tried to exhibit their economic standing through adornment of their shops. Kotov, the Russian traveller who sojourned in Iran in 1624, states that in the royal bazaar of Isfahan there were shops well roofed over with stone domes and with fronts and interiors painted in gold and many colours. MIRZA Husayn Tahvildar, writing in the middle years of Qajar period, remarks that while the size and equipment of most of the cotton cloth dyers' shops at Isfahan were roughly the same, the heads and chiefs of the dyers' guild spent 1500 tumans more than the others did on equipping their shops.
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2.2. Number of the Guilds

On the number of officially recognised guilds with which the government had dealings, precise information is lacking. Generally in Safavid Iran, as in other pre-industrial societies, work specialization was based on the product and not, as in modern industrial society, on the process; but the developments in the 17th century, particularly the growth of commerce resulting from the presence of the European East India Companies, probably led to greater diversification and division of labour, though on the other hand it weakened indigenous industries such as silk and wool manufacturing. The Safavid administrative and fiscal systems also promoted specialization, which enabled the bureaucracy to control the guilds more closely, to buy goods more cheaply, to sell their own imported goods more conveniently through royal agents and Armenian brokers, and to collect the guild tax (bunīcha) more easily. In general, however, a craftsman in Safavid Iran made and assembled all the parts of an object himself, and often also offered his product directly to the buyers.

Three reliable contemporary sources give the number of guilds at Isfahān in the 17th and 18th centuries as thirty-three. The Tazkīrat al-Mulūk states that there were thirty-three royal workshops (kārkhana-hā-yi buyūšt-i salṭanat), and that the technical affairs of each were managed by a chief called the bāshī. Each chief of a royal workshop had a dual function, being responsible not only for the royal
workshop but also for the corresponding guild in the town. Both Jean Chardin, who resided in Iran from 1664 to 1670 and from 1671 to 1675, and Khākī-yi Khurāsānī, a poet in Shah 'Abbās II's reign, state that the number of the main guilds in Isfahān came to thirty three.

Each guild, however, comprised subdivisions which could be classified as distinct professional organizations. For instance the armourers' guild was composed of the arrow-makers (tīrgarān), bow-makers (kamāngarān), makers of rifle stocks (qundāq – sāzān) or (qundāq – tarāshān), (percussion) needle makers (sūzan-sāzān), 6 rifle makers (tufang-sāzān) 7 and gunpowder makers (bārūt-sāzān). 8 Scattered information on the number of the guilds appears in other European and Iranian sources. Pére Rafael Du Mans, the French priest and scholar, who died in 1696 after spending fifty one of his eighty-three years in Iran, counted forty guilds at Isfahān (including some which were more properly subdivisions), while Engelbert Kaempfer, the German physician, who was at Isfahān from March to November 1685, noted about fifty, including entertainers and others who did not have shops in the main bazaar; their figures and details closely correspond. Mīrzā Ṭāhir Vaḥīd, living in the reign of Shah 'Abbās II, noted the names of a hundred and two guilds, but does not state from which city or cities he obtained this number. 11 'Abdullāh Jazā'īrī (d.1173/1762) gives the names of seventy six occupations, all at Shūshtar (the capital of Khūzistān in the Safavid period). These lists include certain occupations whose identities can hardly be distinguished from
others of a similar nature. For instance there were three guilds at Shüshtar all engaged in tailoring, the bazaar-tailors (khayıät-i bázârî), who made clothes to measure in the bazaar and sewed them there, the bazaar-sewers (bázârî-duzân), who sewed clothes for the ready-made tailors (dûkhta-furûshân), and the sewers of landara cloth (landara-duzân), who sewed broadcloth (mahût) and barak (camel-hair cloth). The principal reports on the number of the guilds relate to Isfahân, which was of course not the only city in Iran where guilds existed. Scattered references in local histories and geographies prove that guilds existed elsewhere but do not give enough information to permit estimates of the number of guilds flourishing in a particular city or town at any time.

During the Şafavid period, there was a tendency towards concentration of certain crafts in particular provincial cities and districts, due partly to the increase of regular trade with foreign countries and partly to the expansion of internal demand for the products. The towns of Gîlân specialized in silk production; Kâshân in spinning and weaving, especially of expensive fabrics such as brocade and velvet; Kirmân became the centre of production of lambskin coats and men’s long robes (qabâ) and pottery, Qum of swords and blades, Yazd of silkweaving (sha’r-bâfî), and Shîrâz of glass-making. In these cities and the adjoining districts, large proportions of the inhabitants were engaged in producing the local
speciality. Thus the relative growth of external and internal demand appears to have promoted both functional and regional specialization and division of labour.

As mentioned above, the main guilds of Isfahān, according to reliable sources, numbered thirty three. Each of these guilds pursued its occupation in a particular lane (rāsta) in the bazaar leading to the cross-roads (char-suq) of a certain quarter. Each had its own chief (bāshī) and each paid the guild tax. The members of these guilds were respected by the government as well as by the people. Since they served the state by paying the bunīcha and supplying the needs of the court and the royal establishments (buyūtāt-i salṭanatī), the officials in charge of their affairs were ready to help them by providing facilities such as the building of bazaars and the maintenance of security.24

It has been possible to compile from the various sources three lists of the guilds or professional groupings at Isfahān in the 17th and 18th centuries. The first list, showing the thirty three main guilds and the professionally distinct subdivisions which many of them contained, is as follows:

1. Book-binders (ṣahhāfān), comprising booksellers, gilders, copyists, binders (mujalladān), block printers (bāsmachīyān), inlayers, paper makers, lapis lazuli washers (lājvār-d-shūyān),25 ink sellers (murakkab-furūšān), and inkstand sellers.26

2. Goldsmiths, comprising silver wire drawers (sīm-kashān),27 gold wire drawers (zar-kashān), jewellers, gold beaters...
(tala-kuban), goldsmiths (zargaran), silver and gold medal makers, silver engravers (qalam-zanan), and engravers (hakkakan). 28

3. Money-changers (sarrafan). 29

4. Physicians, including druggists and perfume-sellers ('attaran). 30

5. Glass makers (shisha-garan), including mirror makers (a'ina-sazan). 31

6. Gold brocade weavers (zaribafan), including gold lace makers (gulabatun-duzan) and silver brocade makers (naqda-duzan). 32

7. Brocade weavers (sha'r-bafan), 33 including (chadur-shab-bafan) 34 weavers of black dark silkcloths for women's veils (mishki-bafan) 35 and men's cloak makers ('aba-bafan).

8. Drapers (bazzazan) including sellers of shawls, canvas for tents, woollens, and certain sort of brocades.

9. Textile printers (chit-sazan), comprising calico and silk cloth printers. 36

10. Armourers, comprising arrow makers, bow makers, makers of rifle stocks, needle makers, rifle makers, and gunpowder makers. 37

11. Tailors, including tailors (darziyan), hat makers, suqurlat makers, 38 sewers of landara, trouser makers (chaqshur-duzan), stocking makers (jurb-duzan), furriers (pustin-duzan), and ironers (utu-kashan). 39

12. Haberdashers (kharrazi-furushan). 40 (This occupation became extremely flourishing at Isfahān after the influx
of European goods such as glass beads, spectacles, coral, buttons, handkerchief, handbags, etc.\textsuperscript{41}

13. Weavers (nassājān), including cotton beaters (naddāfān), loincloth weavers (lung-bāfān), and weavers of 'abā (material for men's cloaks).\textsuperscript{42}

14. Carpenters (najjārān), including turners (kharrātān), wooden comb makers (shāna-sāzān), wood carvers (qālib-sāzān), makers of shoe-heels (pāshna-sāzān), makers of saddle pommels (gārh-tarāshān), chest makers (sandūq-sāzān), jewellery box makers (mijrī-sāzān), and tin box makers (quṭi-sāzān).\textsuperscript{43}

15. Confectioners (qannādān), including sugar refiners (shikar-bīzān) and sellers of sweetmeats (ḥalvā-furūshān).\textsuperscript{44}

16. Swordmakers (shamshīr-sāzān), knife makers (kārd va chāqū-sāzān), and steel workers (fulād-garan) who made steel helmets, Qur'ān cases, shields, and steel parts such as the upper parts of qalyānā (water-pipes), saucers for coffee cups etc., scissor makers, and chainmail makers (zira-sāzān).\textsuperscript{45}

17. Dyers (sabbāghān), including dyers of cotton cloths, dyers of silk (sabbāghān-i abrīsham), and dyers of yarn (sabbāghān-i rīsmān) who dyed cotton for the weavers and tailors.\textsuperscript{46}

18. Saddlers (zīn-sāzān), including leather bucket makers (dalv-dūzān) and makers of leather instruments (garīk-yaraqān).\textsuperscript{47}

19. Blacksmiths (āhangarān), including locksmiths (qufl-sāzān), makers of horse-shoes (na'l-bandān), farriers
(na'licher-a-garān), and foundrymen (rikhta-garān). 48
20. Coppersmiths (misgarān), including braziers (ruy-
garān) and brass vessel makers (davāt-garān). 49
21. Shoemakers (kaftsh-dūzān), including makers of a sort
of shoe called gūrji-dūzān, shagreen makers (sāgharī-
dūzān) who made shoes from the hides of pack and riding
animals, and gīva makers (rašqāfān) who made light cotton
summer shoes. 50
22. Builders (bannāyān), including architects (mi'mārān),
stone cutters, plasterers, panellers in stone and marble,
and house painters. 51
23. Oil-pressers (aṣṣarān), including oil millers
(aṣṣarān-i rūghān) and pressers of sesame (aṣṣarān-i
arda). 52
24. Grocers (baqqālān), including greengrocers (sabzī-
furūshān), sellers of roasted chick peas (hammāgān), sellers
of dried fruits (khushka-barfurūshān), sellers of rice
(birinj-furūshān or raqqāzān). 53
25. Potters (fakhkharān), comprising brick makers (kūra-
pazān), makers of pottery (kūzgarān), and makers of glazed
tiles (kāshī-pazān). 54
27. Tanners (dabaqghān). 56
28. Secondhand dealers (simsārān) and scrap sellers (khurda-
furūshān). 57
29. Corn chandlers ('allāfān), including seed merchants. 58
30. Cooks (tablūkān). 59
31. Tent material makers (lavvāfān), saddlebag makers
(khūrjīn-sāzān), tent makers (khayyāmīyān) and pack-saddle makers (akkāfān). 60

32. Braid sellers ('allāqa-bandān). 61

33. Makers of prayer mats (ja-namāz or iḥrāmī), and straw mat makers (būrīyā-bāfān). 62

The second list is of occupations which were regarded as low in status. Workers in these occupations required little skill and consequently little or no professional training. They did not have shops in the bazaar, and their groups were not headed by a bāshi. In short, these occupations comprised the jobs of the poorer people and the jobs which were considered dirty, immoral, inferior, or religiously reprehensible. The list, which is based on data from the 17th and 18th centuries, is as follows:

1. Washermen (gāzurān or sīākārān).
2. Camel-drivers (sārbanān).
3. Candle makers (sham'-sāzān).
4. Water carriers (saqqāyān).
5. Wood cutters (hīzum-shikanān).
7. 'Atā'īyān (junk-dealers, buyers of old household cloths (jul), old sacking (palās), old clothes, broken china).
8. Rope-makers and hair-coilers (mū-tābān).
11. Pudding makers (āb-bandān or pālūda-sāzān).
12. Sheep's head friers (kalla-pažān).
15. Mud brick makers (ḥisht-mālān).
17. Fortune tellers (ʾarrāfān).
18. Washers of the dead (ghassālān).
20. Millers (āsīyāb-bānān).
21. Hunters (sayyādān), e.g. bird-netters and fishermen.
22. Meat-porters (lāsh-kashān), who carried carcases from the slaughterers to the butchers.
23. Runners (šaṭīrān).
26. Brokers (dallālān), i.e. non-commercial brokers, including marriage-brokeresses who were often Jewish.
27. Coffeehouse proprietors (gahvachīyān).

The third list, which includes several of the occupations shown on the second, is of professional organizations or groups which were not subject to the normal tax (bunīcha), and which had no head (bāshī) of their own, but were supervised by a senior government official. Each of these groups had to pay customary fees (rusūm) to the official in charge. The arrangement served two purposes, firstly to ensure direct state control of the persons engaged in these professions, most of which were considerable harmful to the morals and discipline of the community, and secondly to provide for the immediate expenses of the supervising official and his staff. Although some of these occupations
might have sufficient earning power to offer a considerable source of tax revenue, the fact that most of them were not respectable by the canons of Iranian tradition or were not strictly legal in Islamic law made it unbecoming for the state to receive revenue from them. Their taxes were therefore used to meet the immediate cost of supervision instead of being credited to the royal treasury. The senior official charged with the supervision of such groups was normally the naqīb (see chapter 3).

The list of the mainly low-status guilds under the immediate supervision of the naqīb of Iṣfahān is as follows:

1. Showmen (ma'raka-ḡīrān). (The word probably then, as now, meant reciters of the battles and martyrdoms of the Imāms 'Alī and Ḥusayn, who illustrate their recitations with colourful unrolled portable pictures of these battles).

2. Qalandaranān. (In earlier times, qalāndar had meant "wandering darvīsh"). According to Kotov, the Russian traveller who was in Iran in 1624, the qalandaranān or abdāl lived in mosques and looked after them. They frequented the Maydān-i Shāh and bazaar of Iṣfahān, and told stories about the lives of Islamic saints, i.e. the Imāms. They went barefoot and naked, wearing only a sheepskin with the fur outwards flung over their shoulders. On their heads they put hideous caps, in their hands they carried sticks and spears and axes, and in their ears they stuck big crystal stones. Their appearance was terrible, as though mad and evil. By day they would walk around the Maydān-i Shāh and bazaar, and would eat and drink little, at night
they would drink wine and fornicate. 64
5. Washers of the dead (ghassālān).
8. Storytellers (qissa-gūyān).
9. Shāhnāma-khwānān (reciters of Firdawsi's Shāhnāma or parts thereof).
10. Fortunetellers (fāl-gīrān).
11. Beggars (g'adāyān).
12. Mu'azzīnān (utterers of the call to prayer).
14. Puppet show operators (khayma-shab-bāzān). 65

At Isfahān certain groups having the nature of guilds were under direct supervision of the chief book-keeper (sahib-jam') of the royal torch-bearer's department (mash'al-dār-khāna), who was also in charge of the royal band (naqqāra-khāna). 66 The mash'al-dār-bāshī collected various customary fees from the guilds under his authority. Since these funds were not considered quite pure enough for the use of the Shāh and the government, they were usually left at the disposal of the mash'al-dār-bāshī for the purchase of his requirements such as sheep's tail fat (dunba), tallow, lamp oil, melted fat (jizghāla), large and small kettledrums (kūs and naqqāra), and accessories for the band. 67 The guilds under the control of the mash'al-dār-bāshī were the following:
1. Dancers and singers (ahl-i ṭarb).
2. Drummers (ṭabbālān).
5. Pigeon trainers (kabūtar-bāzān).
6. Bang-khāna keepers (places where bang, i.e. hashīsh or cannabis, was consumed).
7. Buza-khāna keepers (places where buza, a sort of beer made from millet or rice, was consumed).
8. Kuknār-khāna keepers (places where a sherbet made from poppies was consumed).
9. Keepers of brothels (bayt ul-luṭf). Chardin in 1666 noted that there were 14,000 whores in Iṣfahān. They were registered in an office responsible for the supervision of this trade and received licences from it. Their abodes were in the "lane of naked" (kūy-i birahnagan) and in several caravanserais adjoining the Maydān-i Shāh. According to John Struys, who was in Iran in 1671, at Ardabīl "the whores, who have their own residence (i.e. quarter) and ply all over the town and in the caravanserais, are reckoned as a corporation or guild".

Another category consisted of professional organizations under the supervision of the Shāh's private barber (khāṣṣā tarāsh), as follows:

1. Masseurs (dallākan).
2. Razor blade makers (tīgh-sāzān).
3. Bloodletters (faṣṣādān).
5. Dyers of white beards, e.g. with henna (rang-bandān).
7. Wardrobe keepers (jāma-dārān).
8. Circumcisers (khatna-kārān).71

Data on the membership numbers of the guilds in Isfahān or elsewhere is even scarcer than on the number of the guilds. No direct information appears in the sources, and the available indirect information is scattered and incomplete. Uruj Beg Bayāt, the Secretary of Shāh 'Abbās I's embassy to Spain, who stayed in that country and embraced Catholicism, wrote that in 1601 there were ten thousand craftsmen's shops in Isfahān, in addition to six hundred caravansarais occupied by tradesmen and artisans.72 According to Kotov, in the main bazaar of Isfahān alone there were two hundred money-changers, ninety saddle makers, four hundred copper-smiths and cloth printers, two hundred haberdashers, and over two hundred swordsmiths and slipper makers,73 while a very large caravansarai in the Gulbār quarter was occupied by straw mat makers,74 and thousands of weavers were employed in cloth manufactories.75 According to Taḥvīldār, writing in the Qājār period, the guild of architects and builders in Isfahān had numbered twelve thousand in Safavid times.76 As regards other cities very little is known. Tabrīz in Shāh Şafī's reign had fifteen thousand shops, three hundred caravansarais,77 seventy khāns (commercial buildings) for merchants, and a hundred and ten khāns for craftsmen.78 Although these figures are interesting in themselves, they do not provide an adequate basis for any estimates of the numbers enrolled in the guilds at Isfahān or other Iranian cities during the Safavid period.
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3.1. The Governmental Administration of the Guilds.

a) The Guilds as Administrative Intermediaries.

The Šafavid Shāhs reunited most of the Iranian lands, and from the time of Shāh 'Abbās I maintained internal security, which is an essential prerequisite for the prosperity of cities; but they sought to centralize authority in their own hands and therefore did not permit any effective development of the spontaneous local institutions which are necessary for the lasting vitality of large urban agglomerations. Indeed, under the absolutist system of government which existed in Iran in the 16th and 17th centuries and again in the early 19th century, the idea that any political or economic organization might be independent of the palace was virtually unthinkable. The nature of urban life was determined by the dominance of the palace and the governing classes. The hierarchical structure of 16th and 17th century Iranian society may be conceived as a pyramid having the Shāh at the top followed by large number of governors, military commanders, vazīrs and other high-ranking officials, 'ulama, and chiefs of the tribes (khāns), who dominated social and economic life at every level. The government, however, in attempting to keep the urban populations under control, generally used their traditional organizations as intermediaries, while the various social groups in the large cities managed to keep some measure of autonomy and to continue handling their internal affairs in accordance with their own traditional
rules and codes. Nevertheless the social structure of Ṣafavid Iran was characterized by the dominance of the state over many aspects of the life of the producing classes, such as farmers, craftsmen, shopkeepers, and even merchants. For this purpose an elaborate bureaucracy was created, and direct and indirect economic and political or ideological pressures were applied. Government-appointed officials as well as elected elders supervised the activities of the trade guilds, and it seems that the guild members often came to believe that the bureaucratic apparatus was an essential part of their own organization.

The methods of state control were of several kinds. Firstly, the Shāhs and provincial governors built complete central markets in the important cities, or at least built qayšarīyas (monumental bazaar entrances with public buildings, warehouses, and superior shops). As owner and lessor of these premises, the government could determine and supervise the commercial and industrial activities of a city. Concentration of particular trades in particular streets or quarters was, of course, a characteristic of all Islamic cities, but as Chardin remarked, the location of each guild in the new royal bazaar of Isfahān had been ordained by Shāh 'Abbās I. This particular bazaar was not only a centre of artisans and tradesmen, but also the focus of the city's social life. It was a symbol of the authority of the state, and at the same time a very lucrative source of income for the state because many shops and carvansarais in it were owned by the Shāhs.
Royal officials closely watched all that went on in this bazaar. Shāh 'Abbās I used to visit it and personally inspect everything. While such supervision helped to maintain order and security and thus to promote the prosperity of the city dwellers, the government's main concern was fiscal. The incorporation of the tradesmen and artisans into guilds made it easier to collect taxes from them and to control prices of goods supplied by them. Secondly, the Ṣafavid government exercised its supervision through the guilds. During the reign of Shāh 'Abbās I, the various officers (kalāntar, naqīb, muḥtasib, dārūgha, bāshī, kadkhudā) had more or less become tools in the hands of the government. Many instances of government interference in the affairs of guilds are related by Chardin, Tavernier, and Du Mans, and it is clear that in comparison with the Tīmūrid period, the degree of state control had been greatly increased. The main specific aims of the Ṣafavid régime may be summarized as follows:

a) Through the guilds as well as through its own officials, the government controlled the quality of staple products required by the general public, kept down their prices, and ensured the use of correct weights and measures.

b) Through use of the guilds to assess and collect the taxes payable by artisans and tradesmen, the government relieved itself of a complex administrative burden.

c) Through the channel of the guilds, the government obtained its own requirements of goods (e.g. for the royal workshops) at low prices, and sold surplus agricultural
products from the royal estates. 13

d) Through the channel of the guilds, the government obtained workers for its establishments and corvées in peacetime and wartime. Their bāshīs supplied whatever labour and services the government might demand. 14 In wartime, artisans and traders were conscripted to provide a mobile bazaar (urdū-bāzār) which supplied the needs of the army. The Venetian envoy, Barbaro, found tailors, blacksmiths, saddlers, arrowsmiths, and druggists accompanying the army of Uzun Ḥasan Āq-Quyūnlū (872/1467-882/1478) on his campaigns. 15 Muhammad Muḥsin, writing after the Afghān rebellion, states that in the time of Shāh Tahmāsb II, the garrison commander of Iṣfahan, Tahmāsb-Qulī Khan Jalā'ir, before setting out with reinforcements for the army which was to fight the Turks in 'Īrāq, ordered the artisans and traders to set up a mobile bazaar for the benefit of his troops (chār-bāzār [= chār-sūq] va dakākīn sakhtand). 16

e) Through the work of guild officers in regulating the bazaars, and in arbitrating commercial disputes, the government was relieved of a wide range of duties, and fewer cases were brought before the state courts 17 (i.e. the courts under the dīvān-bēġī in which matters of customary law were decided).

f) Finally, through the heads of the guilds, the government compelled artisans and traders to participate in state ceremonies. The author of Iḥyā' ul-Mulūk, writing in the reign of Shāh 'Abbās I, states that for the reception
of Muhammad Khān, the ruler of Turkistān, on his arrival at Isfahān in 1022/1613, each guild under the supervision of its elders illuminated the Maydān-i Shāh and the bazaar of Isfahān. 18

The rest of this chapter consists of short descriptions of the functions of the officers who dealt with guild affairs, namely the kalāntar, naqīb, muḥtasīb, dārūgha, malik ut-tujjār, kadkhudā, and also the functions of craft masters and apprentices. Although the insurrections and wars after the fall of the Šafavids upset the governmental and bureaucratic structure from time to time, there is substantial evidence that the administrative and municipal organization at the lower levels remained more or less intact. In particular, the guild administration system of Šafavid Iran was largely maintained under the Zands and Qājārs. 19 In the course of the second half of the 19th century, however, the offices now to be discussed gradually declined in importance. After the constitutional revolution and the subsequent introduction of new administrative methods, most of these old offices disappeared, though in the traditional bazaars some of them still exist.

b) Kalāntar

A.K.S. Lambton, in an essay on The office of kalāntar under the Šafavids and Afshārs, has examined its various functions in detail. Noting that the kalāntar was an urban official belonging to the "civil" hierarchy who appeared in the post-Ilkhanid period, she makes the following
comment: "The fact that there is no mention in the Tażkīrat ul-Mulūk of the kalāntar's salary supports the view that, notwithstanding his association with the government, he was not its servant in the same way as was, for example, the vazīr. This view is contradicted by other evidence, which indicates that the office of kalāntar was then included in the governmental hierarchy. The kalāntars of Iṣfahān and other cities held titles, granted by the Šafavīd Shāhs, such as 'Ālī-jah21 or 'Ālī-hażrat22 (His Eminence). In 1135/1722, during the siege of Iṣfahān by Maḥmūd the Afghān, Shāh Sultān Ḥusayn dismissed Mīrzā Rafiʿā, the kalāntar of Iṣfahān, in the same way that he had earlier in 1133/1720 dismissed the grand vazīr Fath 'Ālī Khān Dāghistānī, and ordered the confiscation of this kalāntar's property.23

More specific evidence, but from a later period, is reported by Muḥammad Ḥāshim Āṣaf: Karīm Khān Zand, after his accession at Iṣfahān in 1163/1750, appointed a governor (hākim) for every city, and every governor had seven officers, (nummāl-i sab'), namely the vazīr, muḥtasib, mustawfi, vakīl ur-raʿāyā, muḥāṣṣīs, kalāntar, and naqīb, to each of whom a fixed salary was paid.24 The kalāntar in Šafavīd times had considerable authority over the affairs of the artisans and traders. He appointed the kadkhudās, took part in the apportionment of the taxes among guild members, and protected them against oppression by government officials.25 John Fryer, writing in the reign of Shāh Sulaymān, states that the kalāntar was the clerk of the bazaar, who fixed prices and punished cheaters.26 Although
the kalāntar intervened in decisions on price-fixing, he was not directly responsible for this function. At Isfahān there was some overlap between the duties of the kalāntar and the muhtasib. Sanson, also writing in Shāh Sulaymān's time, states that the Shāh appointed a kalāntar in every city who was made responsible for ensuring the correct conduct of the traders and who furthermore arbitrated their disputes and contentions. According to Mīrzā Rafīʿā's Dāstūr ul-Mulūk, the members of each guild nominated their kadkhudā, and the kalāntar issued a certificate (taʿlîqa) and gave a robe of honour (khilʿat) to the kadkhudā. The kalāntar presided over the bunīcha committee and apportioned the bunīcha among the various guilds. His signature on a demand for bunīcha was in some measure a confirmation of the guild's consent to the assessment. The kalāntar settled disputes over guild affairs and between guild members. The appointment or dismissal of masters (ustādān) required his approval. According to Du Mans, the kalāntar was close to the Shāh, and collected the Shāh's shop rents, which he delivered to the royal treasury. From every guild with which he dealt, the kalāntar received a customary annual fee.

c) Naqīb

The naqīb was another high-ranking officer who was directly involved in guild affairs during the Safavid period. The word, which means "verifier", was in Iranian usage given to the head of the sayyids (descendants of the Imām 'Alī) in a town and at first meant "verifier of the
genealogies of *sayyid-ship*. G. Baer thinks that the office of *naqib* derived from the *futūvat* tradition, in which the Imam 'Alī is revered as the model of integrity in work and conduct (*ikhlas*-'*eunal*). It has not been possible to find a clear description of the function of the *naqīb* before the Timurid period. In documents from that period the office of *nakīb* is mentioned as an honourable rank. A diploma for the appointment of 'Abdullāh Murvārīd as the *nakīb* of Harāt, the capital (*Dar us-Saltana*) of the Timurid Sultan Husayn Bāyqara, which has survived from the last decade of the 9th century (1484-1494 A.D.), shows that his function as *nakīb* of Harāt was to scrutinize the authenticity of the genealogies of the *sayyids*. Khwandāmīr, in his history * Hibūs-Siyar* which goes up to 930/1524, indicates that the *sayyids* had an organization in every city under the supervision of a *nakīb*. There was probably a close link between the functions of the *nakīb* pertaining to religion and those pertaining to the guilds. Husayn Vā'īz Kāshifī (d.910/1504) states that the *nakīb* supervised the relationship between masters of crafts (*ustādān*) and apprentices (*shāgirdān*), and girded every craftsman with a ceremonial belt (*miyān bastān*) on his promotion to the rank of mastership. In the Safavid period, such religious functions were still performed by the *nakīb*, but his principal role was the supervision of certain categories of guild affairs. The *nakīb* was appointed by the Shāh and ranked as a high official. Evliya Efendi, the Turkish
visitor who was in Iran in the mid-17th century, states that the naqīb of Tabrīz was a government official and was the head of the sayyids. The naqīb of Iṣfahān held the title 'Ālī-ḥaẓrat, which was granted only to officials of the highest rank. It may be assumed that the office of naqīb was hereditary and that a naqīb handed over his post to his son, who was confirmed in it by a royal decree. Minorsky states that the naqīb was the deputy or assistant of the kalāntar. According to the Taḏkīrat al-Mulūk, the main duty of the naqīb was to fix the bunīcha of the various guilds. Furthermore, when a guild approved a craftsman as master, it was the naqīb who certified the candidate's qualifications. N. Kuznetsova attaches importance to the role of the naqīb in ritual ceremonies, and summarizes his functions in relation to the guilds as follows: supervision of custom and ritual, surveillance of the moral behaviour of members, enforcement of the rules governing the induction of novices and their apprenticeship to masters, guardianship of traditions concerning a craft's original patron saints, assessment of the bunīcha, apportionment of orders for goods between guild members, restraint of price fluctuation in the bazaar, and determination of prices for goods. The Taḏkīrat al-Mulūk mentions that the naqīb had great authority in certain guilds. He appointed the elders of the darvīšes, religious reciters (rawża-khwānān) and religious entertainers (ahl-i maʿārik), etc. Although the naqīb was a government official, his relationship with the guilds
was close, and he generally enjoyed the respect of their members, not only for his ancestry but more importantly for his own dignity and honour.

d) **Muḥtasib**

The rise of the office of *muḥtasib* in the early Islamic period was a measure of the growth in the number of cities throughout the Islamic Empire. The ḥisba, i.e. the *muḥtasib*’s function as overseer of the economic and social life of the Islamic city, is discussed in a valuable book by Ibn al-Ukhūwa (d.729/1329). The development of the ḥisba in the 'Abbasid period (132/749-656/1238) resulted from the effort of the Caliphs to islamize all the institutions of government and to make them as far as possible uniform. Although the actual role of the *muḥtasib* differed in the various cities, his basic duties were the regulation of every day economic affairs such as payment of debts, fulfilment of contracts, supply of essential commodities, accuracy of weights and measures, quality of craft manufactures, purchase prices of raw materials, and sale prices of finished goods. The *muḥtasib* carried out his tasks in accordance with Islamic law (shari'at) and the Qur'ānic command (sūra III, 104, 110, 113) to enjoin what is good and prohibit what is evil, and at the same time he represented the government's authority in the bazaar. Khwāja Niẓām ul-Mulk Tūsī (d.485/1092), the *vazīr* of the Saljuqid Sulṭans, states in his *Sīyāsatinna* that a *muḥtasib* must be appointed in every
city to supervise the bazaar, to check weights and measures for accuracy, to inspect the prices at which raw materials and finished goods are bought and sold, and to prevent any kind of cheating, fraud, or deception. In the reign of Sultan Mahmud Ghazan (694/1295-703/1304), the first Muslim ruler of the Mongol Ilkhanid dynasty, who attempted to carry out important reforms, the muhtasib checked the weights in use among the tradesmen and was appointed by the government. From the Timurid period, royal diplomas for the appointment of individuals to the office have been preserved in the Sharafnama of 'Abdullah Murvarid. In Karim Khan Zand's time, the muhtasib was one of the seven principal government officials in each city.

Under the Safavid régime, the office of chief muhtasib of the empire (Muhtasib ul-Mamalik) carried great prestige and the title 'Ali-jah ("His Eminence"). He supervised the prices of goods in Isfahān, affixed his seal on the official lists of prices, and punished any of the artisans (ahl-i ḥirfa) or tradesmen who violated his regulations; he also appointed a deputy (nā'īb) in every provincial city. Le Brun reports that the muhtasib was the inspector general of the bazaar and used to prepare detailed lists of the various goods and their prices. First the muhtasib and guild's representatives fixed the prices, then he displayed the prices every month on the gate of the palace (i.e. the 'Ali-Qāpū in Isfahān); he also punished or fined cheaters who were found using false weights and measures. The muhtasib had absolute authority and used it to prevent
any rise in the cost of the staple necessities. No one could overrule the muhtasib's decisions. According to a diploma dated 1072/1662, the muhtasib was responsible for maintaining public morality, and in addition to this task, he was to supervise certain groups and guilds, such as the mullas (minor clergy), mu'azzins, darvishes and ghassals. The Muhtasib ul-Mamalik received 50 tumans as his salary and 253 tumans and 300 dinars in local fees (rusūm-i maḥallī). Although the office of muhtasib endured after the fall of the Safavids until the early Qājār period, like many other traditional offices it afterwards gradually lost importance and finally disappeared.

e) Darūgha

The word darūgha is derived from the Mongol dārū "to press, to seal" and was used in the Mongol feudal hierarchy. In Iran, the office of darūgha rose to importance when, under the Timurids, the name darūgha was given to the state-appointed governors of the major towns; but under the Safavids the function of the darūgha was different. His basic task was to protect the town from disorder and from any threats to its security. In the Safavid period, the darūgha administered the market police, usually under the jurisdiction of the dīvān-begī (ministry of justice). Krusinski, the Polish priest who was in Iṣfahān during the Afghan siege, states that one of the chief duties of the darūgha was to protect the town against robbers and criminals; he was directly responsible for the security of the bazaar at all hours of day and night. He stopped at the qaysariya of
Išfahān for an hour every night and then patrolled the bazaar. His men, who did the patrolling, were called _abdās_ (a word originally meaning "young men"); if they discovered any stolen property, the _dārūgha_ would take from one tenth to one fifth of it as a reward. The tradesmen and artisans paid a regular fee to the _dārūgha_ to protect their shops from burglary. Fryer mentions that the artisans and craftsmen of each bazaar collectively provided the amount of the fee.

The _dārūgha_ had power to fine and physically punish individual artisans and traders who violated the regulations of the bazaar. According to Du Mans, he might also fine the members of a guild collectively. If butchers and bakers overcharged or gave short weight, he had them flogged, or had their ears and noses cut off, or their tendons ripped. In the capital Išfahān, he was responsible for keeping special registers of crafts which were liable to labour service for the royal court. The post of _dārūgha_ was a lucrative one. As salary alone, the _dārūgha_ of Išfahān received 400 _tūmāns_, and he gained large amounts more from both customary fees (rusūm) and unlawful takings. The _Tazkīrat al-Mulūk_ does not indicate who paid the rusūm to the _dārūgha_ of Išfahān, but probably means the fees contributed by the different guilds.

**f) Malik ut-Tujjār**

The merchants (_tujjār_) did not form a homogeneous class, but in every city were divided into several groups based on line of business, religious affiliation, place of
origin, nationality, and other criteria. At Isfahān and at commercially important cities such as Kāshān, Tabrīz, and Yazd, a distinction was made between merchants from different parts of the country. Also mentioned is a division of merchants by special location in the cities where they did business. In the main bazaar of Isfahān, there were more than thirty well-established caravansarais, each belonging to a particular group of merchants engaged in a certain line of business or having a certain place of origin or nationality, e.g. the caravansarais of the Gīlānīs, Khurāsānīs, Turks, Farangīs (European), and Indians.

As a result of these divisions, the Iranian merchants in the Ṣafavid period never had any permanent professional organization similar to the contemporary craftsmen and tradesmen's guilds. The merchants were exempted from the bunīcha (guild tax), the only tax which they normally had to pay being the tamghā. On special occasions, however, such as the arrival of a royal guest or the occurrence of a royal wedding, the merchants were made to contribute to the cost of officially sponsored public jubilations. Lippomano, a Spanish ambassador who was in Iran in 1585-1586, remarks that Shāh Muḥammad Khudābanda's financial straits compelled him to obtain the garments and cloths for dressing his court on credit, which the merchants granted most unwillingly.

A merchant's son normally took over his father's business. After completing a few years' apprenticeship, the son would become his father's trusted assistant, and
would often marry the daughter of a fellow merchant. Through such marriages, a merchant gained more respect and facilities for his business, and improved his social status. 81

The concentration of the wealthiest merchants in Iṣfahān and certain provincial capitals was due mainly to the narrowness of the markets in other cities, but partly also to governmental action. The economic policy of the Šafavids in general and Shāh 'Abbās I in particular was not helpful to indigenous merchants. The Shāhs were more concerned to develop their own commercial enterprises, and they did this through the instrumentality of royal agents and merchants from favoured ethnic groups, namely the Tabārizā (Tabrīzī merchants) of Iṣfahān, 82 and the Armenians whom Shāh 'Abbās I had forcibly removed from Julfā in ʿAzarbāijān in 1604 to enable them to start business as merchants in his capital. 83 Nevertheless, in several cities such as Iṣfahān, 84 Kāšān, 85 Tabrīz, 86 Yazd, and Shīrāz, 87 there were communities of indigenous merchants, who had a loose mutual relationship and organization and were supervised by a government-appointed functionary having the title malik ut-tujjār (chief merchant).

The malik ut-tujjār of Iṣfahān was appointed by the Shāh from amongst the city's leading merchants. 88 According to Le Brun, he had to possess not only a reputation for probity and good behaviour, but also a qualification to arbitrate commercial disputes which might be brought before him. 89 He had a hybrid role, being charged on the one hand with the supervision of his fellow merchants and the
settlement of disputes between merchants and between them and their clients, and on the other hand with the protection of the government's interests and communication of its demands to his fellow merchants. In the former capacity, he was the responsible spokesman of a professional group which enjoyed a certain autonomy in its internal affairs, and served as intermediary between it and the government. The French priest Sanson, who was at Isfahān in 1683, states that the malik ut-tujjar represented the interests of the merchants and craftsmen and stood up for them against every kind of injustice or vexation. Nevertheless it seems that the main function of the malik ut-tujjar was to act on behalf of the Shāh and government. According to Chardin, he was the Shāh's commercial advisor, and according to Kaempfer, he was responsible for the purchase of garments for the royal family and the army. Le Brun states that the "melikuziaer" or chief of the merchants bore that title by virtue of his final jurisdiction in commercial proceedings which were brought before him, but was at the same time in charge of the tailors working for the royal court. Although he acted under the orders of the nazir-i buyūtāt (superintendent of the royal establishments), "the provision of clothing and all similar articles for His Majesty's personal use was entrusted to his care. He was also the supervisor or inspector general of all persons authorized to dispose of silk and other manufactures belonging to His Majesty in foreign parts". As a royal adviser, the malik ut-tujjar,
together with other experts, assessed the values of presents which were offered to the Shāh. The fact that the malik ut-tujjār was appointed by the Shāh and sat in the same rank as senior officials at ceremonies did not mean that he was considered to be a member of the official hierarchy. The Tazkirat ul-Mulūk in its enumeration of the offices (manṣābs) of the Šafavid régime does not mention the malik ut-tujjār among them. The seat of the malik ut-tujjār at Išfahān was the Shāh Caravansarai in the royal bazaar, where several wealthy merchants carried on their business.

It is known from the scarce available evidence that a similar functionary existed in certain other cities, and it may be surmised that there was one in every important commercial centre. Sanson states that a provincial malik ut-tujjār was called Le Kalenter ou Prévost des marchands. According to Chardin, a provincial chief merchant had the title raʾīs ut-tujjār (which he translates as roi des marchands). The functions of provincial chief merchants resembled those of the malik ut-tujjār of the capital. They upheld the general interests of the merchant community, settled disputes, defended businessmen and craftsmen against every kind of vexation, and ascertained the causes of bankruptcies.

In some of the sources, another functionary, apparently different from the malik ut-tujjār is mentioned, namely the tājir-bāshī (head merchant). Kaempfer's account indicates that the two offices were not separate in Shāh Sulaymān's reign, but it seems that there were two different functionaries with these titles in Shāh Sūltān Ḥusayn's reign.
The precise role of the tājir-bāshī at that time is not clear. According to the later historian Āṣaf, the tājir-bāshī was responsible for the commercial businesses of the royal establishments (buyūtāt-i saṭṭanatī).¹⁰³ In that case, the tājir-bāshī must have been a government official, whereas the malik ut-tujjār was in principle a representative of a class.

During the Qājār period, the merchants of every city elected from among themselves a trustworthy and experienced fellow merchant as the head of their guild (ṣinf) and called him ra'īs ut-tujjār. He had no legal authority, but his judgement in mercantile disputes was traditionally acceptable to the merchants concerned.¹⁰⁴
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3.2. The Internal Organization of the Guilds

a) Bashī

In general it appears that the internal affairs of the guilds in the Șafavid period were administered by officers or elders of their own choice known variously as rīsh-safīd "white beard", kadkhudā "headman", or bāšī "chief". The representatives of the guilds were initially chosen by the members, but the choice of a bāšī generally had to be confirmed by a diploma (farmān) of the Shah, or in a provincial city of the governor. This provided further opportunities for governmental control and exploitation of the guilds through the instrumentality of the bāšī.

In the Mongol period, the terms pīshvā and mughaddam appear to have been used with the same meaning as bāšī in the Șafavid period. Sayfī Haravī, whose history of Harāt goes up to 721/1321, mentions that Amir 'Izz ud-Dīn was the chief (ra'īs) and mughaddam of the weavers of Harāt and presided over their guild.1 Ibn Baţṭuţa states in Iṣfahān the members of each craft appointed one of their own members as their headman, whom they called kilu (i.e. gušī).2 A very interesting and reliable description of the function of the bāšī of certain guilds in Timurid Harāt has been preserved in a unique document from the early 15th century consisting of diplomas (farmāns) of appointment of the chiefs of the guilds (jama'āt) of the oculists and surgeons (kaḥhalān va jarraḥān), furriers (pūstīn-dūzān), carpet-weavers, shoe-makers, and barbers. These farmāns show that the chiefs (pīshvāyān va kalantārān) were appointed by the ruler and were charged with the supervision of their respective
guilds throughout the territory (mamālik-i maḥrūsa). Each chief was elected from among the guild members, and to be eligible, he was required to possess a working knowledge of his craft and a reputation for piety and good morals and behaviour. The professional certificate of anyone who wished to be considered for the position of chief had to be authenticated by the master-craftsmen (ustādān) of his guild. The Timurid documents quoted in the Sharafnama of 'Abdullāh Murvārīd show that certain occupations were grouped together (asnāf-i mushtarāk) and placed under the supervision of single chief; for example Ustad Shams ud-Dīn Muḥammad was appointed chief of the drummers (naqqārachīyān), washers of the dead (ghassalān), street vendors (ṭavvāfān), bloodletters (faṣṣādān), sieve-makers (gharbal-sāzān), bathkeepers (hammāmiyān), bath-attendants who shaved heads (sar-tarāshān), masseurs (dallākān), millers (āsiya-bānān), and dancers (lutiyan). The pīshvāyān, who were similar to the later bāshis, controlled the artisans in every professional aspect. They were required to prevent any kind of fraud or cheating by members, and they also punished any violations of the guild's regulations. For instance, Ustad Danīshmand Samarqandī, the chief of the furriers of Harāt, was required to supervise the cutting, sewing, and purchase and sale of fur by all members of his guild.

There is clear evidence that in the Safavid period the bāshis of the guilds were appointed by the Shāh in Isfahān and by the governors in the provincial cities. The bāshis were the link between the guilds and the government, but with the increased centralization during and after the reign
of Shah 'Abbas I, they tended to become more closely connected with the government. Kaempfer states that in the reign of Shah Sulaymān, the prime minister frequently consulted the bāshīs of the guilds. It may be surmised that at this stage the bāshīs began to encounter opposition from the guild members. At Isfahan the bāshīs of the workshops of buyūtāt-i sāltanātī were often charged with the supervision of the bazaar guilds of the same trades. Normally the bāshī of a guild was chosen from among its members on the basis of superior accomplishment in its craft, but was appointed by royal diploma on the recommendation of nāzir-i buyūtāt (superintendent of the royal establishments). Amin Aḥmād Ṛazī, writing in the time of Shah 'Abbas I, mentions that Khwājah Ghīyas ud-Dīn Naqshbandī, who was perfect and unrivalled in his profession, was chosen to be the chief of the weavers of Yazd. A surviving farman of Shah Tahmāsb I dated 983/1575 assigns to Mullā Ḥasan Muzahhib (manuscript illuminator) a number of responsibilities which are specified in detail: he was to supervise the guilds of the manuscript illuminators, scribes, binders, illustrators, and paper sellers, licence persons who were qualified to practise the said crafts, constantly inspect the raw materials which the said artisans used in their work, and take action against any artisan guilty of professional misconduct.

The internal administrative organization of every guild was controlled by its bāshī. The bāshīs of Isfahan were made responsible for the respective guilds throughout the country. A qualified artisan or tradesman who wished to set up an independent business had to apply to the bāshī of the guild,
who registered the name of the applicant in his office and gave him the necessary licence to set up a shop. Of all the guild officers, the bāshīs were the closest to government. One of their functions was to provide labour for the royal corvées, and they were able to extract considerable sums from artisans anxious to escape from them. Tavernier remarks that "tous les chefs de ces métiers-là sont officiers payés du Roi, qui ne travaillent point s'ils ne veulent, et qui ont droit de commander à tous ceux qui sont sous eux". Certain bāshīs had specially close ties with the court, for instance, the zargar-bāshī (chief of the goldsmiths' guild). Through the zargar-bāshī, the government endeavoured to keep a particularly careful watch on the goldsmiths' guild, which was exceptionally wealthy and made a larger contribution to the state's revenue than any other. It was in order that the goldsmiths might be strictly controlled that they were always housed in the qaysarīya. Not surprisingly, the zargar-bāshī of Iṣfahān enjoyed valuable privileges. For example he was entitled to two per cent of the value of all jewelry etc. that the goldsmiths and silversmiths supplied to the royal court, and to one per cent of the value of what they sold in the city.

The office of bāshī might only be held by a Muslim. Tavernier relates that Jacob John, an Armenian artisan, brought a printing press from Europe to Iṣfahān and that Shāh 'Abbās I. afterwards appointed him the bāshī of the carpenter's guild and demanded that he should profess Islām; in spite of Jacob John's refusal, the Shāh temporarily retained him as bāshī of the carpenter's guild.
In the provincial cities, every guild had its own bāshī, who similarly presided over its affairs. The appointments were made by the governors; for instance, in Shāh 'Abbās I's reign, Ustād Jamāl Mī'mār was appointed the bāshī of the architects and masons of Shūshtar which was then the provincial capital of Khūzistan, and Nawrūz 'Alī Bēg Shāmlū was confirmed as the bāshī of the goldsmiths' guild in Harāt by the governor 'Abbās-Qūlī Khān.20

The Tāzkirat ul-Mulūk does not state whether the salaries of the bāshīs were paid by the Šafavid government or by the guild members. It appears from the Tīmūrid documents that the chiefs of the guilds of Harāt received remuneration from the guild members; for instance Ustād Dānishmand Samarqandi, the chief of the furriers, received "kind services" (i.e. emoluments) from the members regularly every year (murattab sāl bi-sāl ū-rā khidmat-hā-yi nīkū kardand).21 The salary of a bāshī in the Šafavid period depended on the importance of the craft. Du Mans states that the chiefs of the artisans who worked for the court were paid by the government; they were "serviteurs du roy" and "ainsi des autres qui ont gage du Roy".22 According to the Dastūr ul-Mulūk, the ḥakīm-bāshī (chief physician at the royal court) was paid 341 tumāns, and the tūshmāl-bāshī (chief of the cooks and kitchens of the royal court) received ninety tumāns.23 Kaempfer states that the salaries of other bāshīs varied between 20 and 40 tumāns per annum,24 but does not mention who paid them. Whatever may have been the source of a bāshī's remuneration in Šafavid times, he held office by virtue of a royal diploma and was in fact a representative
of the state rather than of his guild. Through this institution, the government obtained the services of reliable and influential guild members for the protection or pursuit of its own interests.

A list of the bāshīs who assembled for a ceremony at Shāh Sulṭān Husayn's court has been left by Muḥammad Ḥāshim Āṣaf. He describes them all as having pleasant features and elegant appearances with intricately patterned "Khalīl Khānī" silk turbans, fine leather shoes, Kurdish trousers, and gold brocade sashes. Each had his own karnaʾī, a sort of water pipe. (The karnaʾī bowl for water pipes is the best quality). They came mounted on costly steeds, and many of their trappings and accoutrements were of gold or silver. Each was a master in his own craft with a delight in it and no inclination to any other trade, and for this reason was perfectly accomplished.

From the references in the sources, it has been possible to compile the following list of bāshīs in the later Šafavid period.

1. Chief of the goldsmiths zargar-bāshī.
2. " " " Jewellers jawāhir-bāshī.
3. " " " tailors khayyāt-bāshī.
4. " " " water-carriers saqqā-bāshī.
5. " " " architects miʿmar-bāshī.
6. " " " stone-masons ḥājjār-bāshī.
7. " " " cloth ironers uthū-kash-bāshī.
8. " " " watchmakers sāʿat-sāz-bāshī.
9. " " " house painters nagqash-bāshī.
10. " " " carpenters najjār-bāshī.
11. " " " merchants tājir-bāshī.
13. " " " bakers chūrchi-bāshī.
14. Chief of the grocers  
15. " " " druggists  
16. " " " rice-sellers  
17. " " " butchers  
18. " " " forage sellers  
19. " " " millers  
20. " " " fruit sellers  
21. " " " cooks  
22. " " " oil seed crushers  
23. " " " moneychangers  
24. " " " chainmail makers  
25. " " " swordsmiths  
26. " " " bow-makers  
27. " " " arrow-makers  
28. " " " locksmiths  
29. " " " makers of braid, trimmings etc.  
30. " " " candlemakers  
31. " " " coppersmiths  
32. " " " braziers  
33. " " " saddlers  
34. " " " enam'ellers  
35. " " " bootmakers  
36. " " " confectioners  
37. " " " bookbinders  
38. " " " cameldrivers  
39. " " " cotton carders  
40. " " " drapers  
41. " " " brocade weavers  
42. " " " tent equipment makers  
43. " " " packsaddle makers  
44. " " " shoemakers  
45. " " " hatmakers  
46. " " " turners  
47. " " " mirror makers  
48. " " " tentmakers  
49. " " " court barbers  

baqqal-başhī.  
'atţar-başhī.  
razzāz-başhī.  
qasğab-başhī.  
'allāf-başhī.  
ünčī-başhī.  
yamış-başhī.  
tabbaḵ-başhī.  
'aşşar-başhī.  
şarraf-başhī.  
zira-saż-başhī.  
sayyāf-başhī.  
kamāngar-başhī.  
tiğar-başhī.  
chilāngar-başhī.  
'allāqaband-başhī.  
shamma'ī-başhī.  
misgar-başhī.  
rüyyar-başhī.  
sarraj-başhī.  
mīnā-saż-başhī.  
chakma-saż-başhī.  
gannād-başhī.  
şahhāf-başhī.  
sarban-başhī.  
şallāj-başhī.  
bazzāz-başhī.  
sha'r-başf-başhī.  
lavvāf-başhī.  
akkāf-başhī.  
kaffāsh-başhī.  
kulāh-düz-başhī.  
kharrarāt-başhī.  
ā'īna-saż-başhī.  
khayyām-başhī.  
khāṣa-tarāš-başhī.
50. Chief of the weavers of gold lace and brocade

51. " " " smiths ḥaddād-bāshi.

52. " " " brick carvers ājur-tarāsh-bāshi.

53. " " " runners šāṭir-bāshi.

54. " " " wrestlers pahlavan-bāshi.

55. " " " bath keepers ḥammāmī-bāshi.

56. " " " inlayers munabbat-kār-bāshi.

57. " " " engravers ṭakkāk-bāshi.

58. " " " washers of the dead ghassāl-bāshi.

59. " " " blacksmiths naʿl-band-bāshi.

60. " " " weldiggers and tunnelers muqannī-bāshi.

61. " " " singers muḥannī-bāshi.

62. " " " minstrels muḥrib-bāshi.

63. " " " buffoons luṭī-bāshi.

To sum up, the bāshiš were chosen by their guilds, but their appointments had to be confirmed by the government. They held undisputed authority over the guild members, and while they appear to have been anxious to retain the good will of the members, they generally had to exercise their authority in compliance with the government's wishes.

b) Kadkhudā

The word kadkhudā had the general meaning of chief or notable and was used as the title of headmen of villages and small towns (qaṣabas). Its use with reference to guilds dates from pre-Safavid times. While this title denoted a definite rank in the Iranian guild system, there were no specific rules to determine how a guild member might attain it. All that is certain is that skill, merit, and high standing were required for the office of kadkhudā. The masters of each guild nominated from among themselves a
person whom they regarded as outstandingly proficient, and agreed on a salary for him and recommended him to the kalāntar. On the strength of this recommendation, the kalāntar introduced the prospective kadkhudā to the naqīb, and after obtaining the naqīb's endorsement, issued the certificate of his appointment as kadkhudā and at the same time bestowed a robe of honour on him. Thereafter the kadkhudā administered his guild's affairs and endeavoured to advance its interests in all matters of concern to it. In fact the approval of the kalāntar was a mere formality, and the choice of the candidate lay in the hands of the guild members.

The kadkhudās were evidently the real leaders of the guilds and spokesmen of the interests of the guild members, who paid their salaries. Their functions comprised: a) determination of the amount of the bunīcha payable by the guild under the supervision of the naqīb, assessment of the quotas payable by the individual guild members, and collection of the bunīcha from them in accordance with these assessments. b) Arbitration of disputed claims and professional differences within the guild. c) Supervision of the training of apprentices by masters, and admission of qualified members to mastership.

The seat of the kadkhudā was at the central crossroads (chār-suq) of his guild's bazaar or at a special guild house. Bihishtīyān, a contemporary writer on architectural monuments, has ascertained that in the Safavid period the kadkhudā of the dyers' guild in Isfahān officiated at the chār-suq of the dyers' bazaar (bāzār-i...
rang-razān) and there resolved the guild’s disputes. Naṣrābādī in his Taẓkira states that the qannād-khāna (house of the confectioners) in the Isfahān bazaar was the seat of the confectioners’ kadkhūdā.33

It is significant that the kadkhūdā’s jurisdiction was not derived from any governmental decree, but from his personal standing and relationship with the guild members.34 The kadkhūdā discussed the qualifications of candidates for mastership with the naqīb and had an important role in their promotion and initiation.35 At Isfahān, the kadkhūdās of the various guilds were summoned by the naqīb to regular meetings at which prices were discussed and fixed.36 The kadkhūdās kept themselves informed about the deliberations which the members of the guild held among themselves on their various affairs, and they maintained close consultation with the kalāntar on these matters.37 Kuznetsova has found that in the early 19th century the elders of the craftsmen (i.e. the kadkhūdās) acted more or less as intermediaries between the craftsmen and the merchants.38

The kadkhūdā’s function, however, was hybrid. On the one hand he was appointed by his fellow guild members to promote their interests before the government; on the other hand he served as a link between the high-ranking supervisory officials and his guild. The authorities expected him to enforce regulations and maintain order among his members. In fulfilling this function the kadkhūdā had to deal mainly with the bāshi, who generally supported the interests of the government.
No documentary evidence has been found from the Șafavid period on the question whether the kadkhudās of different guilds met regularly to discuss matters other than price fixing and to coordinate their actions; but the reported existence of a chief kadkhudā (kadkhudā-bāshī) of the guilds of Șīfahān in the reign of 'Alī Murād Khān Zand suggests that there were some such links between the guilds. The kadkhudā-bāshī, named 'Alī Āqā Dalv-dūz (leather bucket maker), was ordered by 'Alī Murād Zand to gather 200 tumāns in cash from the guilds of Șīfahān and deliver it to the royal treasury. He refrained from imposing such a heavy burden in view of the poverty of the city’s artisans and shopkeepers, and managed to get the required sum from the vazīr of Șīfahān and the local governor of Khurāsgān (an eastern suburb of Șīfahān), thereby sparing the craftsmen of the Șīfahān bazaar from this unjust imposition.39

The office of kadkhudā was sometimes hereditary. Nasrābādī states that Mulla Mushfiqī, the kadkhudā of the bazzāz-khana (guild house of the drapers), and Ustād Ḥājjī Sharīf, the kadkhudā of the qannād-khana, both took over the office of kadkhudā from their father.40 Mīrzā Ḥasan Fasā’ī states that the office of kadkhudā-bāshī at Shirāz remained in the Ḥākīm Salmān family from the time of Shāh 'Abbās I up to the reign of Muḥammad Shāh Qājār.41

c) Apprenticeship and Craft Masters

The system of apprenticeship in Șafavid times is one of the least documented of the subjects under study. The lack of specific documents suggests that it was a rigid system deeply rooted in traditional custom.
In view of the continuity of the Iranian socio-economic structure throughout the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries and into the early part of the 20th century, it seems probable that a high proportion of the apprentices in every guild were sons of masters in the same guild. To a large extent the exercise of crafts and trades remained hereditary within families. A master's son began to learn the family's craft in childhood, then became an apprentice either to his father or one of his relatives, and eventually often succeeded to his father's business. Tavernier states that throughout Iran, sons learnt crafts from their fathers at an early age. 42 Kinship and family affiliation were important factors in guild membership. 43 Among the practitioners of crafts and to a less extent professions, it was customary to keep technical secrets exclusively within the family. 44 Naturally this custom maintained traditional attachments of particular vocations to particular families. For instance, medicine was a hereditary occupation among the descendants of Mīrzā Muhammad 'Alī Tabīb in Kāshān 45 and Mīrzā Ḥakīmā in Iṣfahān, and calligraphy among the descendants of Qudsī Khūsh-nīvīs from the Šafavīd period onward. 46

Although the hereditary practice of professions and trades in certain families was usual, it was not automatic. There are mentions of individuals who moved into other occupations. For instance, Mawlānā Ḥasan-shāh Baqqāl, who had been a grocer, afterwards became a teacher at a school in Shīrāz; 47 Mīrzā Taqī 'Itimād ud-dawla, the grand vazīr of Shāh Ṣafī and Shāh 'Abbās II, was the son of a baker; 48 and Ḥājjī Sharaf Bēg, a weaver's son who had relinquished
his father's craft, became a rich merchant through the Indian trade.\footnote{49}

Without work in an organized trade or craft or profession, it was difficult or impossible to secure a livelihood. Cartwright, who was in Iran in Shāh 'Abbās I's reign, reported that idle persons were not permitted to live among the people. According to the regulations, persons who were out of work must refer to the magistrate and register themselves, declaring their circumstances and the previous jobs which they had done. The magistrate then found work for them. When anyone was proved to have lied, he was either bastinoed or forced to work in the "public slavery".\footnote{50}

When a craftsman's son preferred not to pursue his father's profession, the father would entrust him as an apprentice (shāgīrd) to a master (ustād) of another craft at an early age. According to the available evidence, the age of entry into a craft or trade was not the same in all cases. Thomas Banister, the agent of the Muscovy Company who was in Iran in 1568-69, gives it as five years.\footnote{51} John Cartwright gives it as six, and Chardin states that apprentices were accepted at anything between twelve and fifteen years of age.\footnote{52} In the light of Tavernier's statement that some of the masters commenced their apprenticeship at their father's shop when they had completed their school education and were between twelve and fifteen years old, all these reports may be accepted as correct. Only sons of masters were sent to a primary school (maktab); other boys were engaged as apprentices at the age of around six.
When a father entrusted his son to a master, no written contract with fixed provisions was signed. Usually the master came to an oral agreement with the apprentice's father or guardian, and sometimes they held discussions on the matter before the guild's kadkhuda. No doubt the illiteracy of the great majority of the artisans and traders necessitated the oral form. An unnamed European traveller who was in Iran in the reign of Shāh 'Abbās II states that the master only registered the apprentice's name and made no further inquiries. Nevertheless the family background of an applicant and the moral conduct of an apprentice were matters of great concern for a master. When an apprentice was admitted, he was instructed in his duties, both as to the craft and as to moral conduct. In some skilled trades, the social background and good behaviour of a candidate were particularly important. This was because the chosen candidate would have to be carefully trained and supervised by his master and would be quite likely to become a member of his master's family through marriage.

The lengths of apprenticeships were not specified, and in principle apprenticeship agreements might be ended by either the master or the apprentice at any time. According to Chardin, every agreement included an understanding on the rate of wage. A new apprentice began work at his master's shop on very simple tasks, but received pay almost from the start. The rate of the wage varied according to age and experience. In the first year an apprentice received something between two liards and one sou, and as he became more skilled, his wage was raised. Contrary to Chardin,
the writer of *Disposition and temper of the Persians* reported that there was no agreement between the master and apprentice on a definite wage in the early years; but he also observed that it was normal for the master to allow the apprentice a wage from the first day.\(^\text{58}\)

The actual lengths of apprenticeships depended on the craft. Kuznetsova reckons that the period of training might be anything from three to ten years.\(^\text{59}\) During this time the apprentice showed his ability and talent in the craft and attempted to acquire its techniques under the direction of his master until eventually he acquired full skill. Chardin alleges that masters were reluctant to teach apprentices all the techniques of the craft in a short time, being anxious about new competition when fully qualified apprentices could set up their own shops; while an apprentice's training remained incomplete, a master could take advantage of his labour without fear of his competition.\(^\text{60}\) In practice the traditional morality did not allow an apprentice to leave his master. Furthermore the former master might have claims against the apprentice and thus be able to restrain him. Other masters were therefore generally unwilling to employ a "rebellious" apprentice.

The final stage through which a *shāgīrd* passed before becoming an *ustād* was that of a *khalīfa* (literally a "deputy"). A *khalīfa* was a fully trained man who had acquired all the arts and techniques of his craft or profession. There is no direct evidence concerning the status and functions of a *khalīfa* in the Ṣafavid period; but the rank of *khalīfa* still exists today among various craftsmen such as
confectioners, goldsmiths, and silversmiths. The khalīfa is qualified to act as his master's deputy when the latter is absent. 61

In the European guild system, there was a numerous class of journeymen (literally "day labourers") who had completed their apprenticeship but had not attained the rank of master, and were employed by masters on a short-term, often weekly, basis. 62 The Western scholars who have investigated oriental guilds in connection with the study of Islamic cities have come to the conclusion that the rank of journeyman did not exist in the Islamic countries. 63 Kuznetsova thinks that if the rank of journeyman had existed in Safavid Iran, Chardin would have mentioned it, whereas he only mentions masters and apprentices. She concludes that in the Iranian guilds there was no need for journeymen, because anyone who had learned his craft could rise freely to mastership. 64 It can certainly be accepted that there was no rank in the Iranian guilds directly comparable to that of the journeyman in the medieval European guilds. In 17th and 18th century Iran, however, there was a large category of workmen who had no permanent shops, but were occupants of temporarily rented shops or booths, or were itinerant day labourers going from town to town to village or house to house. Workers in this category were called muzdvar (hired man) or kārgar (daily paid labourer). Some were artisans and traders who had valuable skills but did not possess fixed establishments. The existence of this group must not be overlooked in studies of the evolution of Iranian society. Even after the wave of industrial development in the period 1963-1978, daily hired workers and
Itinerant artisans are still numerous in Iran, e.g. silversmiths, carpenters, and tailors. The socio-economic system of the Safavid period promoted a multiplication of street artisans (muzdvarān), whose services were used mainly by the lower income groups in the cities and suburbs and by peasant families, because they could supply basic needs much more cheaply than their shop-owning counterparts in the bazaars. Chardin states that the artisans and vendors of this type who carried on their trades in the Royal Square (Maydān-i Shāh) of Isfahān rented spaces in the Maydān, or if more fortunate, rented small shops surrounding the Maydān at three tumans per shop per week. Most of them spread their tools and wares on the ground in the square and were charged a rent of one tumān per space per week, which they paid day by day or week by week to the Shah's agents. Shah 'Abbās I had designated a space for each trade. Among them were blacksmiths, armourers, saddlers, hat makers, coppersmiths, patchers, money changers, thread makers, locksmiths, second hand dealers, carpenters, fruit sellers, sellers of nuts and dried fruits, street vendors, butchers, greengrocers, cooks, wood sellers, dealers in pack animals, felt makers, fur sellers, confectioners, and cotton-carders. In the evening the members of these groups placed their tools and wares in chests which were left in the corners of the Royal Square, where they were guarded by watchmen throughout the night.

There were also groups of artisans, known as khāna-kārān, who had no fixed shop and worked for hire at customer's houses. According to Chardin, there were large numbers of these artisans in Isfahān, such as goldsmiths, coppersmiths, carpenters,
etc. Some of them were respected and prosperous craftsmen who worked at the houses and establishments of wealthy employers. To employ several such craftsmen was considered a noble act and a token of aristocracy. No doubt other khâna-kâran artisans performed various tasks for employers with modest means, though no evidence is available. Du Mans remarks that in Isfahân there existed a group of artisans ("ouvriers") who lacked sufficient capital and other means to offer their products directly to consumers and therefore sold them to established traders who had shops in the bazaar.

To become a master craftsman in the bazaar required a long period of apprenticeship which had to be completed satisfactorily, and the acquisition of a certificate of mastership which was subject to the approval of the guild's present masters and the endorsement of the naqîb and the kalântar. According to the Tažkirat ul-Mulûk, before a guild could appoint anyone a master, its masters were required to attest the candidate's qualification and eligibility for mastership (ustādî) to the naqîb. There is no evidence to show whether a candidate for mastership had to present a fine piece of his own work for examination and judgement by the masters of the guild and the naqîb; but it is known that a craftsman who wished to be employed in the royal workshops had to produce a piece of work for presentation to the bāshî. The good will of the masters was absolutely essential for an apprentice's promotion. The candidate's eligibility for mastership was then notified to the kalântar, from whom a certificate (ta'ilîqa) was
obtained. Mirza Rafi'a remarks that the kalantar only issued his certificate if at least two thirds of the masters agreed on the candidate's eligibility.

Another uncertain question is whether a former apprentice automatically became a full member of the guild upon his induction as a master, or whether full membership required further inquiries by the guild's elders and officials and also consent by the new master himself. There is no evidence from the Safavid period on this question; but Polak, the German doctor of medicine who was in Iran in the early part of Nasir ud-Din Shah Qajar's reign, states that membership of a guild was optional.

The transition from apprenticeship to mastership was marked by a ceremony. Although none of the sources for the Safavid period explicitly mention this ceremony, certain sources imply its existence. According to Husayn Vai'iz Kashifi (d.910/1504), the craftsmen and tradesmen who were adherents of the futuwar orders were girded with a sash in a special ceremony. The Taqizrat ul-Muluk states that the masters of the guilds expressed their approval (rizahmandi) of an apprentice's application for mastership at a meeting (probably a ceremony) in the presence of the naqib. It must be borne in mind that the naqib had a spiritual standing among the artisans and tradesmen. Kuznetsova states that on the day of the initiation, a formal ceremony took place in which the new entrant was girded with a belt. A similar ceremony is still customary in the zurkhana (gymnasium) when a craftsman or trader joins a traditional
athletic fraternity. R. Ārāsta, a contemporary scholar, describes the girding ceremony in the zurkhāna as having all the force of a religious rite. In it the successful candidate for the rank of athlete (pahlavānī) is crowned with a cap (tāj) or girded with a sash (kamar-band). According to Ārāsta, this ceremony goes back to Ṣafavid times. G. H. Muṣaḥib, another contemporary writer, states that a banquet was part of the ceremony of conferment of mastership. From the reports of European travellers in the Ṣafavid period, it is possible to piece together an account of the ceremony of initiation of a shāṭir, i.e. a runner or footman, who escorted or ran before the Shāh or a royal caravan (qāfila). Only after a long period of apprenticeship and after passing a very vigorous examination was a shāṭir admitted to the rank of mastership. Usually a shāṭir apprenticed his son to a master when the son was six or seven years old. The apprentice's long training under the supervision of his master took place in three stages. During the first year, the shāṭir was trained in walking and running, and had to run a league's distance without stopping. The distance was increased year by year until the apprentice reached the age of eighteen. At this point, he entered the second stage in which the training was stricter and tougher. He had to run long distances carrying a heavy parcel with a jar of water, a griddle (baking plate), and other objects on his back. In the third stage, he was obliged to prove his speed over a total distance of thirty six leagues by running twelve times from the 'Alī- qa'pū in İsfahān to the Kūh-i Şufa (the
mountain on the south of the city). The passage of this
test completed the apprenticeship and was celebrated with
a ceremony called jashn-i shāṭirān (the footmen's feast).
When the candidate for the rank of shāṭir was in the
service of the Shāh or of a high officer or official, the
ceremony was more elaborate. In such cases, the shops in
the Maydān-i Shāh and along the runner's route were illumi­
nated, and entertainers were brought to the Maydān-i Shāh
to amuse the people. The test took place under the super­
vision of ten or twenty masters of the shāṭirs' guild. The
candidate wore thin trousers and was belted with a sash onto
which three hawk-bells were sewn. After the test, the candi­
date, if successful, was presented with prizes and robes.81

Gemelli, whose caravan bound for Bandar Kung lost its way
until a shāṭir appeared and guided them, noticed that the
shāṭir had bells around his waist to warn horses and pack
animals of his approach.82

Before a qualified master could set up a shop, he had
to obtain permission from the bāshi of his guild. According
to Chardin, the bāshi took a sum of money from the applicant,
and after registering him, gave him the permission.83

In every guild the masters were the supporting arm and
the guiding hand. They nominated the kadkhudā and recom­
mended him to the naqīb. One of the criteria for the
determination of a guild's bunīcha was the number of its
masters. They set its tone and raised or lowered its
social standing.84
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Methods of Government Control.

4.1. The Guilds and Taxation
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4.3. Restrictions and Monopolies

4.4. Judicial and Penal Institutions of the Guilds
4.1. **The Guilds and Taxation**

One of the most distinctive features of the Iranian guilds was the fact that they were used as instruments for the collection of taxes and imposts from tradesmen and craftsmen. The government levied the taxes through the guilds and dealt with the members of each guild collectively. W. M. Floor, in his dissertation on the **Guilds in Qajar Iran**, states the payment of taxes was the most obvious and noticeable function of the Iranian professional organizations in the 19th century, and that this in itself demonstrates that they were treated as guilds. Furthermore, the criteria on which taxes were calculated preclude any doubt as to which groups belonged to guilds and which did not.¹ The state imposed a tax on a guild as a corporate entity, and the authorities of the guild apportioned the tax among its members. There is no precise information, however, about principles on which the tax liabilities were assessed and fixed, either for guilds by the state authorities or for individual tradesmen and craftsmen by the guild authorities.

It seems probable, in the light of the scanty available evidence, that the nature and the amount of rate of the taxes payable by a guild were determined by several factors, such as custom and tradition, estimation of the guild's normal income, and also a certain amount of bargaining. Consequently there was always a danger that the assessment or apportionment might be unjust in failing to reflect the relative level of prosperity of a particular guild or its
individual members. Thévenot, who was in Iran in 1654, reports that the assessment of a guild's dues was based on the incomes of its members.²

In Isfahān, the imposition of the guild taxes, which had the generic name bunīcha, was legalized through the approval of a tax committee consisting of the kadkhudās of the various guilds, the naqīb, and the kalāntar. This committee's authority did not extend over all guilds, since some of them were taxed by state officials directly. The tax committee, under the chairmanship of the naqīb, determined the quota of tax payable by each guild, and the kadkhudās fixed the liabilities of the members of their guild by apportionment of these quotas. The Shāh's decree (farman), being absolute, could override decisions of the tax committee. The Shāh might impose new taxes or remit established taxes. A farman concerning imposition or remission of a tax was broadcast by public criers (jārchīs) or displayed on inscribed tablets inside or outside mosques. One such tablet granting certain exemptions can still be seen in the Masjid-i Jāmi' of Ardistantā in the province of Isfahān.

The Dastūr ul-Mulūk states that the responsibility for the collection of the taxes from the Iranian provinces (sarḥaddāt va vilāyat) and cities rested ultimately with the grand vazīr (I'timād ud-Dawla), who performed his task in accordance with statute law (qānūn), reason, and the rights of the realm (ḥuqūq-i mamlakat), which means customary rights.³ The Tažkirat ul-Mulūk states that the šāhib-jam' (chief receiver) of the royal treasury received
on the Shah's behalf the sums due from the guilds in Isfahān and other cities. He delegated to subordinates called muḥāṣṣils (collectors) the tasks of collecting the said sums and of dispatching them to the royal treasury.⁴ Lippomano, the Venetian ambassador to Spain, who was in Isfahān in 1585, noted that one of the Shah's permanent sources of revenue was taxation of guilds, and that all the guilds, such as silk workers, cotton weavers, armourers, sugar refiners, etc. paid prescribed sums.⁵

The taxes on the guilds were both regular and temporary. The heaviest regular tax was the already mentioned bunīcha or more precisely haqq-i bunīcha, which may be translated "guild tax". It was a due (haqq) levied by the tax committee on a guild's members for the special privilege (bunīcha) of keeping a shop in the bazaar or elsewhere. When the individual artisan or trader had paid his due, and as long as he observed the guild's regulations, the guild would support and protect him.⁶ According to the Tażkirat ul-Mulūk, the amount of the bunīcha to be levied on each guild was assessed during the first three months of the year.⁷ Du Mans states that the fixing of the guild tax had to be completed within a month in the spring.⁸ At Isfahān the fixing of the bunīcha was accomplished by three processes. First the naqīb of Isfahān suggested the amount of each guild's bunīcha, then the elders of the guilds had to consent to these amounts, and lastly the kalāntar had to confirm each amount with his seal. The naqīb, after appointing someone to gather the elders (kadkhudās and rīsh-safīdān) of
each guild and bring them to him, fixed the bunīcha of each guild with consent of its elders and according to the law of the realm. The liability of each guild was then formally notified. At Isfahān the collection of the bunīcha was the responsibility of the local vazīr and dārūgha. The kadkhudās, however, probably did the actual collection of the bunīcha from the artisans and traders.

There are no precise documents to tell us on what principles and by what procedures the amount of a guild's bunīcha and the proportionate liability of each member were determined. It was the task of kadkhudā to apportion the quota of tax among the guild members. In all probability this role called for real leadership and good personal relations, because it seems clear beyond doubt that the kadkhudā had no power of coercion. Fāsā'ī states that apportionment of the bunīcha quota among the members of the guilds of Fārs was determined by the kalāntar and the official, called by Fāsā'ī the bunīcha-dār, who collected the bunīcha of the individual members. Fāsā'ī adds that the system of apportionment and collection of the bunīcha derived from the Šafavid period. Undoubtedly the relative income of different guilds was a major consideration in the determination of this tax. For instance, the goldsmiths and jewellers were taxed heavily because they made higher profits than the other artisans and tradesmen. According to Chardin, the liability of each member of a guild was equal. He states that guild members had to pay a fixed sum of guild tax equally and regularly, and that for a tradesman's shop (boutique de revendeur) the
sum was 20 sous and for an artisan's shop (boutique d'artisan) 10 sous. Possibly Chardin may have confused the ḩaqq-i bunīcha with the dīvān tax (taklīf-i dīvān or māl-i muḥtarafa) which is discussed later. Similarly, the compiler of "the Government and Constitution of Persia" in Pinkerton's collection states that every shop of the handicraft trades had to pay 10 pence and that the rest (i.e. shops selling unprocessed commodities) payed 20 pence. Contrary to Chardin's statement that the bunīcha was paid equally, Du Mans mentions that the inequality and diversity of the assessments of the bunīcha were a cause of dissatisfaction and grievance.

The ḩaqq-i bunīcha was collected in monthly instalments. Payment of this tax gave the shopkeeper or artisan the legal right to occupy a shop together with certain privileges which were endorsed by the customary law and the internal guild regulations. The bunīcha tax was levied until 1926, when by the law of 20th Azar 1305 taxes on guilds were abolished. The phrase ḩaqq-i bunīcha meant not only liability to the tax but also the resultant privileges. A payer of the tax could cede his rights to a qualified member of the same guild. Taḥvīldār, the author of a Jughrafiyā-yi Iṣfahān written at the end of the 19th century, states that in the Qājār period, if any member of a particular guild closed down his shop or workshop in the bazaar, the fellow members were obliged to make good any deficit in the total bunīcha payable to the government. When a large number of members of the guild of oil millers (jamā'at-i 'aṣṣārān-i ẓāghan) closed down their shops because business was stagnant,
those who continued in business had to pay the **bunīcha** on behalf of their colleagues.\(^{19}\)

The increasing size of the salaried regular army (gullar or ghulāmān) and of the palace staff strained the finances of the Safavid state. The central government and the provincial governors, in order to meet rising costs and casual expenses (*havādis*), sought additional revenue in the form of extraordinary imposts (*āvāriż*), which for the most part fell onto the shoulders of the artisans and shopkeepers. One such burden was the contribution which the artisans and tradesmen had to make towards the upkeep of foreign ambassadors and guests of the Shah. This charge was known as *havādis*\(^{20}\) or *khārij-i pādshāhī* (royal expenses) or *madād-i maʿāsh* (royal extras).\(^{21}\) It was calculated that the contribution of the Isfahān guilds to the cost of government hospitality (*madād-i khārij-i mīhmānān*) came to an annual total of 3000 *tūmans*, which was collected by officials of the royal treasury.\(^{22}\) The shoemakers, leather makers, and hatters were exempted from corvées but had to pay lump sums toward the royal hospitality expenses.\(^{22}\)

These contributions and the **bunīcha** were not the only taxes which artisans and tradesmen had to pay. According to Iskandar Munshī, they were also liable for **takālīf-i dīvān** and **māl-i muhtarafa**.\(^{24}\) The nature of the **takālīf-i dīvān**, which means dues for government expenses, is not clear; perhaps Iskandar Munshī meant the above-mentioned imposts for royal hospitality. As regards the **māl-i muhtarafa**, which may be translated artisan tax, he states that artisans and tradesmen were compelled to pay it, and
mentions that Shah Muhammad Khudabanda remitted it as a reward to the guilds of Tabriz. It appears to have been the same tax which Chardin noted under "havarez" = ('avariz). According to N. Falsafi, the avari were sums paid by the artisans and tradesmen for city maintenance. The māl-i muhtarafa was probably also the same as a tax mentioned by the anonymous Venetian merchant who was in Iran in 931/1514 and reported that the tradesmen and artisans who owned shops in the bazaar were compelled to pay a heavy tax, fixed for tradesmen at as much as two or six aspers or even a ducat per day and for craftsmen with regard to the circumstances of their business.

According to a farman of Shah 'Abbas I dated Zul-Ḥijja 1038/1628, which is preserved in the Masjid-i Shāh of Iṣfahān, the 'avariz of the barber's guild, payable by hairdressers (salmāniyān), masseurs (dallākān), cloakroom keepers (jāma-dārān) and other bath attendants, and makers of razor blades and grinding wheels, were remitted by the Shāh; but it is not stated for how long. Members of the entertainer's guild had to pay an occupation tax to the mash'al-dār-bāshī. (This name, meaning torchbearer, was given to a šāhib-jam', i.e. head receiver, who was also in charge of the lighting and heating of the royal palaces and of the dawlat-khana, and at the same time supervised the royal band (naqqāra-chīyān) and headed the torch bearers at night when he carried a large torch in front of the Shāh.) In addition to this, the mash'al-dār-bāshī supervised all the different groups who worked as entertainers. The author of the Rustam ut-Tavārikh states that in the
early years of the reign of Karīm Khān Zand, the experts in fiscal affairs assessed a divān tax (māliyat-i divān) on the guilds on the model of account books (dafātir) which had been compiled in the reign of Shāh Tahmāsb II. 31 According to Fasa‘ī, the governor of Fārs in 1159/1746 imposed a heavy tax called tawjīh on the traders of Shirāz, and the tax collectors then seized one thousand tumāns from the Shirāzi artisans and shopkeepers. 32

In addition to the bunīcha and divān taxes, some of the guilds were liable for the corvée (bīgāri) (i.e. for the supply of labour or goods without payment). Unpaid labour by guilds was exacted by the Shah and officials of the central government and also by provincial rulers (khāns). 33 In provincial towns where certain traditional crafts flourished, the guilds concerned had to execute orders from the royal court without payment. For instance, the skilled tailors of Kāshān and Iṣfahān had to provide, free of charge, the robes of high officials such as vazīrs, kalāntars, mīn-bāshīyan (regimental commanders, i.e. of 1000 men), yūz-bāshīyan (company commanders, i.e. of 100 men), and others below the rank of amīr (general). 34 Some of the guilds had to fulfil their corvée through unpaid labour. In such cases, the chief of the guild provided a certain number of labourers, thereby saving the treasury a great deal of money. 35 The corvée was used to obtain labour for the repair or construction of royal or other governmental buildings, and for work in the royal workshops. 36 Tavernier states that guilds which were exempted from the divān tax had to fulfil a corvée equal to it in value. The
chiefs of the artisans and labourers, after consultation with the guild's kadkhudās, decided which individuals should perform the required corvée, with the result that there were many opportunities for favouritism and fraud. The Shāh had an overriding authority to decide which guilds should be liable for corvée. The carpenters and masons of Iṣfahān were permanently liable for it. At the beginning of every autumn, the vazīr-i buyūtāt, who was the deputy of the nazir-i buyūtāt (controller of the royal establishments) summoned the chief of the masons (mi'mār-bāshi), who was responsible for the repair of buildings belonging to the Shāh, and ordered him to supply the necessary labour. The mason's guild had also to make a large unpaid contribution to the construction of palaces and bridges. According to Kaempfer, a palace of Shāh Sulaymān called Tākht-i Sulaymān, which was situated high up on the Kūh-i Šūfa of Iṣfahān, had been erected by the unpaid labourers of the corvée, and according to Le Brun, Shāh Sulṭān Ḥūsayn similarly constructed several palaces at no cost to himself. A farman of Shāh Ṣafī dated 1041/1631 made his grand vazīr, Mīrzā Taqī I'timād ud-Dawla, responsible for the repair of the mausoleum of the Imām 'Alī at Najaf in Iraq which the Ottoman Turks had conquered in 1638. The repair took two years and was probably carried out by Iranian workers sent to Iraq under the corvée. Kaempfer noted that the unpaid workers, whose services were commandeered either for the royal building operations or for the royal workshops, suffered from very harsh and distressing conditions.
Chiefs of guilds were authorized in certain circumstances to take commissions on the sales of their guild. The bashi of the goldsmiths and jewellers demanded two percent of all sales in the town. The payment of such a sum by the members of an important guild could be construed as a reward or bribe to ensure that their privileges were preserved. Similarly certain guilds paid an extra charge described as brokerage (kharj-i dallālī). The brokerage of a particular bazaar was granted by the Shāh to certain individuals. For instance, Shāh 'Abbās II granted the kharj-i dallālī of the wood and charcoal bazaar first to Imām-Qulī Khān Varasta and then to the poet Mas'ūdā.

It seems that fines must have become another heavy burden. They were the commonest penalty inflicted on artisans and tradesmen who had been found guilty of breaking laws and regulations. Shāh Muḥammad Khudābanda abolished the payment of cash fines by the artisans and traders of Tabrīz, because he was anxious to improve their economic circumstances.

Customary dues (rusūm) were levied on certain guilds, though not all guilds were liable. The Shāh usually granted the rusūm due from a particular guild to a high-ranking official of his choice. The amīr shikār (master of the hunt) received rusūm from the guilds of fishermen, butchers, sheep's brain friers, pigeon keepers, poulterers, and falconry glove makers in Astarābād and Yazd (inscriptions dated 1047-1637 in the Masjid-i Jāmi' of Ardistān and dated Jamādī ul-Avval 1047/1637 in the Masjid-i Jāmi' of Yazd).
According to another inscription, dated 1038/1628 in the Masjid-i Shāh of Iṣfahān, the barber's guild (jama'at-i șalmaniyān) had to pay rusūm to the private barber of the Shāh (khaṣṣa-tarāsh). The rusūm received by the dārugha of Iṣfahān, amounting to 95 tumāns per annum, came from a levy on the painters and tailors. The weavers' guild of Yazd paid rusūm to the mīn-bāshī and yūz-bāshī. The head of the royal library at Iṣfahān (șahib-jam'-i kitāb-khana-yi saltanatī) received rusūm from the basmachiyan (block-engravers), zar-kūbān (gold leaf makers), kāghaz-garān (paper-makers), miqrāz-garān (scissor makers), and muzahhibān (illuminators).

Finally, the Şafavid bureaucracy gained a considerable revenue by taxing prostitutes. Although the placing of the prostitutes' organization in the same category as those of the craftsmen and tradesmen may seem astonishing, especially under a régime which professed to defend religion, nevertheless the prostitutes were classified as a guild because they had their own peculiar rules and paid a professional tax. B. Lewis regards the existence of immoral guilds in the Muslim lands as a strange phenomenon. It is possible, however, that the official recognition of the immoral professions in the Muslim cities was intended to give the government some means of controlling them and protecting the public. Chardin noted that in 1666 there were 14,000 whores in Iṣfahān who were registered in a special office. All of them had to have a licence. Fryer states that "courtezans, therefore, are displayed by the king, giving him so much for their licences when they first set up".
According to the Venetian merchant who sojourned in Iran in 930/1514, the rate of the tax taken from the prostitutes was fixed with regard to their beauty. The total amount of the whores' professional tax in Iṣfahān was estimated by Chardin at around 200,000 écus in 1666, and by Muḥammad Yūsuf Vālij at 4000 tumāns per annum. This huge amount, being unclean money, was not paid into the royal treasury but was spent by the mash'al-dār-bāshi on the heating and lighting of royal palaces and on fireworks for various festivals.

Guilds with low social status were sometimes the beneficiaries of tax exemptions. Surviving inscriptions in mosques at Iṣfahān, Yazd, Astara, Kāshān, and Ardistan record decrees (farmāns) of the Ṣafavid Shāhs for the grant of such exemptions. According to decrees of Shāh 'Abbās I and Shāh 'Abbās II, the exempted guilds comprised bath attendants, wardrobe keepers in public baths, masseurs, razor blade makers, knife-grinders, old cloth dealers, dyers of white beards (rang-bandān), i.e. with henna in public baths, midwives, hired mourners (nūṣagaran), ladies' hairdressers, bath stokers, millers, hunters and fishermen (gayyādān), blood-letters (fassādān), and meat porters. In 1022/1613, Shāh 'Abbās I remitted the dīvān tax on candle makers throughout Iran in the month of Ramažān.

A. K. S. Lambton, without quoting any source, states that in the Ṣafavid period there were seventeen guilds exempt from tax, including doctors of medicine, washers of the dead, grave diggers, singers, midwives, rawżā-khwāns (reciters of religious elegies), bath keepers, blood-letters,
ma'raka-gīrān (tellers of religious legends or showmen), and poets. 62

The big businessmen of Safavid Iran, who were the tujjār (merchants), sawdāgarān (entrepreneurs), and bunakdārān (wholesale dealers), were not members of guilds and did not pay the guild tax (bunīcha), but were subject to a tax called the tamghā. This Mongol word (which originally meant signature or seal) was first used to designate a tax under the Ilkhanid dynasty (654/1256-736/1336). The tamghā tax (māl-i tamghā) was a cash levy imposed at varying rates on imported goods in the custom houses or in certain caravan-sarais. The tamghā assessors (tamghāchīyān) in the Ilkhanid period fixed the amount of the tamghā according to the weight and quality of the goods. 63 In the Safavid period, the collection of this tax in the capital and in every provincial city was farmed out to a senior official, who arbitrarily decided the amount due on the taxable goods. After the payment of the tax, the goods were stamped with a seal (muhr-i tamghā), the stamp for imported cloth being called tamghā-yī qimāsh. 64

Under the Ilkhanids, the revenue from the tamghā was allocated to the expenses of emissaries and ambassadors. 65 In Shāh Tahmāsb I's reign, the imposition of higher tamghā taxes without regard to the solvency of the businessmen provoked revolts of merchants and wholesalers at Harāt and Tabrīz, which were then the main commercial centres, and Shāh Tahmāsb I was consequently obliged to abolish the tamghā tax throughout the country. 66 By another farman, dated 971/1563 in the Masjid-i Jāmi' of Iṣfahān, Shāh Tahmāsb I
exempted the money changers (ṣarrāfān) from a special tamghā payable to the royal mint (dār uṣ-zarb). The money changers had previously had to pay a sum of tamghā when they brought gold and silver specie to be recoined at the state mints.67 These concessions did not last long, because according to Iskandar Munshi, the merchants and wholesalers of Tabriz again revolted and refused to pay the tamghā tax in the reign of Shāh Muḥammad Khudābanda, who was similarly forced to remit the tamghā.68 Shāh 'Abbas I, however, must have ignored his father's decree and arbitrarily reimposed the tamghā, because it is reported to have been levied in his reign and also in those of his successors.69 Du Mans mentions that in 1660 the businessmen of Isfahān had to pay a taxe sur les marchés on their imported goods.70

The sources do not indicate the rates of tamghā in Isfahān or in the provincial cities; but the English traveller Lockyer, who stopped at Bandar 'Abbās for a short time in 1705, states that a 14 per cent tax was levied on imported goods at the harbour custom house. The Dutch and English East India Companies, however, had been exempted from custom duties by Shāh 'Abbās I when he authorized their establishment at Bandar 'Abbās. Lockyer adds that the English Company's factors were in secret collusion with the Iranian merchants engaged in the Indian trade, who had their goods shipped by the Company and labelled as its goods so that they might avoid declaring them at the custom house. They then pretended to buy their own goods from the Company, and paid the factors a two per cent reward for the service rendered.71 The tamghā tax on imported goods continued to be legally imposed until the early 19th century.72
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4.2. Price Control

The dual nature of the craftsmen’s and tradesmen’s guilds in Safavid Iran has already been mentioned in Chapter 3. While the basic purpose of a guild was to serve the individual and collective needs of its members, these needs were not the only factors which kept it in existence or determined its structure and functions.

In the name of the public interest, various authorities intervened in the affairs of the bazaar. Police authorities such as the muhtasib and darūgha attempted to protect the public against fraud, adulteration, and other malpractices. At the same time officially sponsored committees attempted to regulate weights, measures, coins, and market conditions. From the point of view of the government, the safest and surest way to control the craftsmen and tradesmen was through the intermediary of the guilds in which they were already or might in the future be grouped. With the help of the kadkhudās and the muhtasib, the authorities could fix and enforce maximum prices for essential goods with a view to preventing social unrest in the big cities.

Apart from governmental control, competition in the markets tended to stabilize prices. The customary concentration of all sellers of a particular commodity in a special section of a city’s bazaar made it easy for a buyer to compare prices and difficult for a seller to overcharge. On the other hand, in the predominantly agricultural and pastoral society of 17th and 18th century Iran, fluctuations in the yields of crops and animal
products caused a tendency toward price instability. Natural disasters such as droughts and floods and earthquakes, or human disruptions such as tribal raids and revolts, could suddenly cut off supplies to the cities and change abundance into scarcity. Abdullah Shūshtarī, writing in the early years of the reign of Nādir Shāh Afshār, mentions that at Shūshtar commerce had flourished for a time as a result of good rains, adequate harvests, and security on the caravan routes, and that consequently the local merchants had not hoarded commodities but had increased their transactions with other cities. The prices of essential foodstuffs and other goods such as sugar, pepper, coffee, silk, textiles, sheep and cattle, and beasts of burden had fallen and the artisans and traders (āhl-i makāṣib) had profited from the situation. This abundance and prosperity did not last, however, because after three years a sudden drought came, and goods fell into short supply and prices rose sharply.

In the Šafavid period, prices in the large cities were in principle controlled by the muḥtasib, but were in fact mainly determined by the guilds. Price committees met regularly, and the guilds were represented on them by their kadkhudās. The kadkhudās were summoned for consultation not only about price levels, but also about supply fluctuations and general market prospects. According to the Taḵkīrat-ul-Mulūk, the chief muḥtasib (ʿAlī-ḥaẓrat-i Muḥtasib-ul-Mamalik) obtained a list of suggested prices and guarantees of the observance of these prices from the kadkhudās, and then affixed his seal to the lists and sent
them to the nazir-i buyütat. The nazir-i buyütat studied
the lists and, if he approved, affixed his seal and sent
them to the heads of the different royal establishments.
The prices, having thus been determined, were advertised
on notice-boards which were put up near the royal palace
of the ’Alī Qāpū. The traders and artisans were then
obliged to offer their goods for sale at the listed
prices. The goods subject to price control appear to
have been for the most part foodstuffs, and the prices
were fixed by weight, not by size or volume. Evliya states
that in Tabrīz every shopkeeper hung up a yellow brass
scale at the front of his shop and never took it down.

Aṣaf records that in Karīm Khān Zand's reign, the
chief muhtasib kept registers (dafātir) of price changes
and that prices were fixed at the levels recorded in these
registers. According to Aṣaf, this price fixing system
was copied from a price register which had been compiled
in the reign of Shāh Tahmasb II. The muhtasib usually
advertised the fixed prices every week or every month,
depending on the nature of the commodity. Prices of bread,
meat, poultry, and fruits were fixed weekly, and varied
according to the season and the scarcity or abundance of
the supply. Du Mans states that the prices of food-
stuffs were settled by consultation between the kadkhudās
and four assistants of the muhtasib. Chardin likewise
reports that every Saturday either the muhtasib or his
assistants, after brief discussions with the kadkhudās of
the respective guilds, advertised the crucial prices of
provisions for the following week. T.M. also gives the
interesting information that throughout the week, the deputies of the muḥtasib together with the kadkhudās examined the fluctuations of the bazaar in order to determine which commodities should be increased or decreased in price.9

Although the main categories of goods for which maximum prices were fixed consisted of basic foods and other necessities, and the main purpose of the system was to prevent social unrest, at the same time government bodies such as the royal establishments, in so far as they bought from the bazaar, used the system to obtain their requirements more cheaply. No tradesman or craftsman dared to exceed the set prices, because the sale of the essential commodities was closely supervised through more than one channel. Tavernier observed that the muḥtasib and his deputies controlled the prices of the prime necessities as closely as they could. If a tradesman deceived a customer by overcharging or falsifying scales and weights or in any other way, the aggrieved buyer could take back his purchase and have his money repaid.10 During the reign of Shāh Ṣafī, the representative of the bakers' guild of Tabrīz complained to the government that the local muḥtasib had fixed the price of bread so low that the bakers could not make any profit from its sale. The result of the complaint, however, was that the Tabrīzī bakers, instead of getting a price increase, were ordered to sell their bread even more cheaply.11 Fryer states that in the fixing of grain prices, the kalāntar had some authority together with the muḥtasib and his deputies and the kadkhudās.12 At any time the Shāh might intervene personally to keep down the prices of goods.
Kotov, the Russian traveller who was in Iran in the reign of Shah 'Abbās I, states that the Shah used to make casual visits to the bazaar and ask about the price and quality of items offered for sale. Shāh Sulaymān similarly investigated the prices and the quality and durability of essential goods.

The price control was tightened in times of famine and war or after a riot or other emergency. For instance in 1072/1661, when a severe famine occurred and food prices in Isfahān consequently rose and the poor people of the city suffered from a dearth of essential provisions, Shāh 'Abbās II ordered the nāzir-i buyūtāt, Ṣafī-Qulī Beg, to find a remedy. Ṣafī-Qulī summoned the tradesmen who had hoarded the available supplies and compelled them to offer these supplies at the prices which had been current before the famine. At the time of Shāh Sulaymān's coronation in 1079/1668, which took place after a bad harvest, so many people gathered in Isfahān for the event that a dearth of bread arose. Shāh Sulaymān made the army commander, 'Alī-Qulī Khān, responsible for the procurement of supplies. When 'Alī-Qulī Khān brought grain to the city and distributed it among the bakers, the bakers were required to sell the bread at special prices. To sum up, in abnormal circumstances particular guilds were subjected to still stricter control.

Prices of goods for sale to royal and governmental bodies were in some cases fixed monthly. The suggested prices were notified by the respective kadkhudās to the sāhib-jam' (collector, i.e. chief accountant) of the royal
establishments. The latter passed the prices on to the muhtasib ul-mamalik, who prepared a list of the prices and gave it to the nazir-i buyūtāt. The nazir-i buyūtāt had discretion to reduce the prices. 17

In the provincial cities, the price fixing procedures were similar to those at Iṣfahān. The Dastūr ul-Mulūk states that the deputy (naʿīb) of the muhtasib ul-mamalik in every provincial city maintained a continuous control over the local prices, and that the craftsmen sold their goods in accordance with price lists which were advertised monthly after their confirmation by his deputy. 18

There is some evidence that the sale of foreign goods also was regulated by the muhtasib and the price commissions. Fryer states that along the routes, the European merchants sold their goods at free prices mutually agreed after bargaining, but in the towns they had to observe the official published prices. 19

In the absence of sufficient documentary evidence, and in view of the fluctuations of Iranian and foreign currency values, it is impossible to form an accurate and comprehensive picture of price trends in Iran in the Șafavid period; but on the basis of the scattered and fragmentary information from reports of European visitors which is set out below, it appears that the general trend was upwards and that the rise in prices became sharper as the Șafavid régime approached its end. The equivalent values of certain Iranian and English coins in 1627-28, according to Thomas Herbert, were as follows:

One 'abbāsī (a silver coin not above a quarter of an ounce in weight, which was the most important and widely used
currency at that time) = 16 pence; one شهی = 4 pence; one بیستی = 2 pence; two قزبیگی = one penny, one قزبیگی = ½ penny. 20

Prices of essential provisions at different times between 1581 and 1722.

At Isfahan in 1581:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rice</td>
<td>1 man (6 kilograms)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 بیستی</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bread</td>
<td>1 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wood</td>
<td>1 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 &quot; 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At Isfahan in 'Abbas I's reign:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wheat</td>
<td>100 pecks (1 bushel)</td>
<td>7 shillings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley</td>
<td>100 &quot;</td>
<td>½ ducat 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At Sulmaniya in 'Abbás I's reign:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hen</td>
<td>per head</td>
<td>5 pence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eggs</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2 pence 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At Isfahan in Clearios's time (1636-38):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sheep</td>
<td>per head</td>
<td>10 تاباسی</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wood</td>
<td>1 man</td>
<td>1 pence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>1 &quot;</td>
<td>1 or 2 pence 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At Isfahan in 'Abbás II's reign:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bread</td>
<td>1 pound</td>
<td>2 liards (1 liard = 3 دینار) 18 دینارس 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meat</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At Isfahan at the time of Shāh Sulaymān's accession (1668)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bread</td>
<td>1 man</td>
<td>one تاباسی 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At Isfahan in Shāh Sulaymān's reign:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hen</td>
<td>per head</td>
<td>6 pence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rice</td>
<td>1 pound</td>
<td>2 pence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
wood 12 pounds 4-5 pence
charcoal 12 " 4-5 pence

At Isfahan in 1716:
wood 7 pounds 3 pence

At Isfahan between March and August 1722 during the siege by the Ghalzay rebels:
bread 1 man 600 dinars (1 penny = 12½ dinars)
rice 1 " 1200 dinars
chicken per head 700 "
sugar 1 man 6000 "
ghee (cooking oil) 1 man 4000 "

While the above price figures are too obscure to permit definite conclusions, the traveller's reports clearly indicate a gradual rise of prices until Shāh Sulaymān's reign, and a rapid rise thereafter. Teixeira, who was in Iran in Shāh 'Abbās's reign, found the price of excellent provisions and necessaries very moderate. Struys in 1672 found the prices very dear. Sanson (1683) and Bell (1715-1718) both noted increasing dearness. The price rise in the last decades of the Safavid period passed out of the control of the muhtasibs and the guild authorities.

The unexpected collapse of the Safavid régime is certainly attributable in a large part to its autocratic nature and to the incapacity of Shāh Sulṭān Husayn, but might nevertheless not have occurred if the Iranian economy had not been suffering from inflation and general deterioration under the exploitative economic policy which the régime had long pursued.
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4.3. Restrictions and Monopolies

A certain degree of restriction and monopoly is inherent in the nature of guilds in any community. Although the Islamic beliefs and the ideals of futūvat cherished by the Iranian guilds included concepts of the good quality and honest description of the product or service and of the just price and the fair reward or wage, naturally the elders of the guilds viewed such matters in the light of their member's interests. In general they were anxious to prevent competition by outsiders, which might have been beneficial to consumers but would have been harmful to established craftsmen and tradesmen.

It is difficult to ascertain the exact nature of the guild restrictions and monopolies which existed in Šafavid Iran. Information on the subject from the 17th and 18th centuries is sparse, but from the 19th century is more definite. Nevertheless it can be taken for certain that various kinds of restrictions and monopolies existed during the Šafavid period. The structure of the bazaar in all Islamic countries stemmed from restrictions which were maintained by the guilds. In Iranian cities, as elsewhere, separate sections of the bazaar were reserved for particular trades. Each section was occupied by the members of a certain guild, and under no circumstances were craftsmen and artisans from other guilds allowed to practise their business in it. When Shah 'Abbās I built the royal bazaar of Isfahān, each guild established its business in a lane of the bazaar which was specially designated and allocated to it by royal decree. This strict demarcation was not
only thought to be advantageous for the government, but was also supported by the guild elders. Moreover, in each alley of the bazaar, the number of shops was limited, and there was consequently a restriction of the number of craftsmen and tradesmen in any guild who could found their own businesses.

Professor A. K. S. Lambton states that there is no surviving document which records any debarment of non-members of guilds from trading in bazaars; but it is known that the total number of shops in the royal bazaar of Isfahan was limited and that each guild had a prescribed number of shops in a certain alley (rāsta). A newcomer had to buy the right of occupation (sar-gufīt) of a shop and therewith the right to do business. This right was called haqq-i bunīcha, which also meant the guild tax. The Taṣkīrat ul-Mulūk states that every master craftsman had to pay the haqq-i bunīcha. From this statement it can be inferred that, as in later times, payment of the haqq-i bunīcha was necessary for the privilege of occupying a shop in the main bazaar. Scattered references also show that the occupant of a shop in the royal bazaar had to be a full member of the appropriate guild. The bashī of each guild was responsible for the administration of the shops in his rāsta, and he registered the name and location of every shopkeeper in it. Permission for the opening of a new shop or for a change of the occupancy of an existing shop had to be sought from the bashī, who in turn had to report the name of the applicant and the condition of the shop to the governmental authorities.

According to the tradition of
the Iranian guilds, the eldest son of a deceased master inherited the rights and privileges of his father, including the ḫaqq-i bunīcha. When a deceased master craftsman left no immediate heir or qualified successor, the ḫaqq-i bunīcha was bought by another craftsman of the same guild.

The concentration or dispersal of a craft or trade within a city depended on two factors: firstly its nature, and secondly its relationship with the government. If the nature of a craft or trade was messy or untidy, its pursuit was only allowed in a prescribed location. For instance, in Tavernier's time, the wholesale fruiterers and purveyors of foodstuffs were confined to the old bazaar of Iṣfahān. Chardin noted that the old bazaar was occupied by unimportant guilds such as lemon and pomegranate juice makers, vinegar distillers, and charcoal and firewood sellers. Le Brun, who stayed in Iran from 1702 to 1704, states that at that time the old bazaar of Iṣfahān was used mainly as a stable and only as a place of business by some poor and insignificant guilds. He also mentions that a particular area, which had formerly been inhabited by unskilled and wretched workers, was reserved for the fullers and dyers ("shkaran", i.e. siyāhkāran). Another poor quarter of Iṣfahān had once been inhabited by the stone cutters who had pursued their crafts there. At both Iṣfahān and Tabrīz, certain alleys specially were allocated to camel drivers and cart drivers.

Such localization of craftsmen and tradesmen had an influence on the residential pattern. The close relationship between home and workshop necessitated the assignment of residential
quarters adjoining the bazaar or other place of work to particular occupational group. The merchants (tujjar) of Georgian and black slaves, who came from Qarabagh district (today in Soviet Armenia), and who had a monopoly of the slave trade at Isfahan, resided in the Qarabagh caravansarai in the bazaar and were not allowed to pursue their business anywhere else.

The most profitable and prestigious arts and crafts of Isfahan were concentrated in the royal bazaar. The money changers (şarrafan), goldsmiths, jewellers, and other sellers of valuable and luxurious goods all had shops at the entrance to the royal bazaar in the qayşarîya. This was also the case in other Iranian cities in the Šafavid period (and still is today). The shops in the qayşarîyas were owned by the Shah. The rents from them were a valuable source of revenue, and the royal ownership of them facilitated state control of occupations which were important in the economic life of the cities. Gemelli Carreri, who was in Iran in 1693-1694, mentions that gold and silver wares and luxurious goods were on sale in qayşarîyas of Ardabil and Tabriz and that the qayşarîya of Isfahan, being at the heart of the country's economic life, was well stocked with valuable goods from both Iran and abroad, such as gold and silver brocades, and all sorts of velvets, jewels, and pearls.

It has already been mentioned in Chapter 2 that according to both Chardin and the Tazkhirát ul-Muluk, no master craftsmen or artisans were allowed to practise a craft or trade unless they had received a credential or
certificate\textsuperscript{21} from the bashī of their guild. On the other hand, Chardin states that there was no restriction of the range of a guild's production, and he mentions as an example that a coppersmith was allowed to make a silver tray even though such trays were usually made by the silversmiths.\textsuperscript{22} Similarly an unknown European traveller, who was in Iran at a later time, probably near the end of the 17th century, states that although certain artisans were subject to restrictions and were not allowed to engage in other crafts, there was no general system of monopolistic control of the types of manufacture which the different guilds might undertake.\textsuperscript{23} The statements of Chardin and of this unknown European traveller are open to question. While it can be accepted that a coppersmith might make a silver tray in an exceptional circumstance or in response to a special request, it seems most unlikely, for both financial and technical reasons, that coppersmiths would have undertaken silver tray making as a permanent occupation. Restriction of the number of persons exercising a particular trade was an essential guild function, and there is evidence of its practice in the 19th century and even later. For instance, in Nāgīr ud-Dīn Shāh Qājār's reign, according to the file (daftar) and rule (dastūr) which were lodged in the kalāntar's office at Iṣfahān, a group of cooks (āsh-pazān) who specialized in a certain sector of the culinary profession (pukht-u-paz) were not allowed to sell their meat warm, but were required to keep it on ice on trays and to sell it chilled, whereas another group had to sell their meat warm. These two groups, namely the cold meat sellers (sard-furūshān) and hot meat sellers (biryānīyān), were officially
regarded as mutually exclusive. Such a practice is unlikely to have been first introduced in the 19th century, and may be assumed to have already existed in the 17th and 18th centuries.

Kuznetsova has remarked on the restrictive character of another customary practice. Every master had his own mark (nishān or tamghā) which was stamped or engraved on his handiwork. This mark was confirmed by the guild's elders or in a general meeting of the members. When a craft master died without a successor, his nishān could be transferred to another qualified member of the same guild if the elders or a full meeting of the members approved.

Monopolies of crafts and professions were evidently very rigid in small and distant towns. Tavernier noted the existence of a strict monopoly at Lār. The guild of the camel drivers of Lār monopolized the transportation from the town to Bandar 'Abbās and the ports of the province of Fārs on the Persian Gulf. Thus the camel drivers of Shirāz had to unload their camels at the caravansarai of Lār, whence the camel drivers of Lār carried the bales to the destinations.

In addition to the guild restrictions, there were governmental restrictions or monopolies which affected certain trades. A number of decrees of the Šafavid Shāhs record their attempts to make soap manufacture a state monopoly. A decree of Tahmāsb I had required the slaughterers and butchers of Iṣfahān to sell all their tallow (pih) to certain officials and to deliver it to the government's soap factory (šabūn-khāna). Since the common
soap makers had thereby been deprived of their livelihood, Shah Tahmasb I, in a farman dated Muḥarram 981/1573, ordered dissolution of the government's soap making establishments and prohibited any resumption of them. The soap makers then started to make soap on their own account. At some later date, however, Shah Tahmasb's prohibition was disregarded, and soap making was again monopolized by the government, until Shah Șafí issued a farman reiterating his ancestor's prohibition of state monopolization of this manufacture.

Another type of governmental restriction was imposed on street vendors. As was mentioned in Chapter 2, Chardin has left a description of the street vendors who occupied stands in the Maydān-i Shāh of Īṣfahān. They offered for sale many kinds of goods and wares, which they displayed on mats. At sunset they put their goods into chests, which they left in the corners of the Maydān-i Shāh. Each group of the vendors and artisans in the Maydān was restricted to a certain pitch. An individual might only set up his stand in the proximity of stands where similar wares were sold.

From time to time various occupations were prohibited in the public interest or to protect the people's morals. A farman of Tahmāsb I dated Rabī' 1 941/1534 ordered the closure of all taverns, gambling houses, shops selling bang (cannabis) and buza (a sort of rice beer), and music halls (qavvāl-khanas), and the imposition of severe penalties on persons thereafter engaging in these businesses. For the benefit of public morality, 'Abbās II decreed the prohibition of prostitution, and thereby caused all the brothels (bayt ul-luṭf) to be closed down, at least for a time.
Another type of restriction was imposed on the non-Muslim craftsmen and artisans. The Turkish traveller Evliya Efendi (d.1093/1682) states that in Iran, non-Muslim traders were not allowed to sell foodstuffs to Muslims. According to a farman of 'Abbās I, the Jewish merchants of Iṣfahān were only allowed to do their business in the Jarchī caravansarai in the royal bazaar. Tavernier states that the Armenian furriers of Iṣfahān were confined to the Armenian bazaar, which adjoined the ʿAlī-Qāpū. Although they had dominated and indeed monopolized the fur trade, a farman suddenly issued by 'Abbās II in 1053/1645 forbade the Armenian furriers to pursue this business, and as a result the royal treasury lost a considerable amount of revenue from the professional tax formerly paid by the Armenian furriers. It is not known when this prohibition was rescinded, but according to Āsaf, an Armenian furrier named Manūk Samūrdūz (sable trimmer) was ordered to make a fur cloak (bāla-pūsh) for 'Alī Mardān Khān Bakhtiyyārī, the regent of Shāh Ismā'īl III. A non-Muslim craftsman or artisan was not allowed to be the bāshi of a guild. Tavernier relates that an accomplished carpenter named Jacob Jan was appointed the bāshi of the carpenters' guild, but was soon dismissed because he refused to be converted to Islam.

In spite of all the road making and caravansarai building in the Ẓafavīd period, the inadequacy and high cost of transportation in the 17th and 18th centuries necessitated a large measure of provincial economic self-sufficiency and generally prevented any concentration or
monopolization of national industries in particular cities or districts. Certain places, however, specialized in the production of expensive and easily transportable goods, and through their reputations for good quality won virtual monopolies. Most of the production of silk cocoons and filaments was concentrated, for climatic reasons, in the province of Gīlān.38 The city of Qum was the main centre of the manufacture of swords and blades, which were exported to other cities.39 The best lambskin coats,40 pottery vessels,41 and carpets were made in Kirmān42 and sent long distances for sale. Shīrāz was principal centre of glass manufacture,43 and in other cities there was a big demand for the best Shīrāzū bottles and panes.44 At Yazd silk weavers (shaʿr-bāfān) formed the main part of the population.45 The shoemakers of Tabrīz were unequalled, and they produced so many excellent shoes that large quantities were exported elsewhere.46

Another restriction of economic liberty in Šafavid Iran arose from the official regulation of weights and measures. The tradesmen and shopkeepers apparently had to comply with the systems of weights and measures which the governmental authorities (particularly the muḥtasib)47 prescribed. No attempt was made to impose uniformity, however, and different measurement systems were used in different cities and provinces. This continuing diversity can be explained by the fact that the economy of Šafavid Iran was always basically decentralized. Tavernier states that liquids and most other goods were sold by weight.48 Lockyer, who was in Bandar 'Abbās in 1705, relates that sugar, drugs, and copper were measured by man-i Tabrīz (maund of Tabrīz = 6½lbs.),
and that fruits of all kinds, raisins and rice were sold by the man-i "copra" (= kubra) of 7\(\frac{1}{4}\) lbs, precious stones, metals, and spices by misqal (1/6 of ounce), carpets and cloths by the gaz (32\(\frac{1}{4}\) inches).

Discrepancy of the weights and measures in use in different provinces and for different categories of goods endured through the Qajar period until the introduction of the metric system by the fifth parliament of Iran in 1925.
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4.4. Judicial and Penal Institutions of the Guilds

In the sources from the Šafavid period concerning the conduct of internal guild affairs, there is nothing to suggest that guild courts rivalled or replaced the normal Islamic (šarī'ī) courts. A. K. S. Lambton contends that the guilds were to some extent forced to assume judicial functions on account of the incompleteness of the Islamic law (šarī'at), which made it difficult for the šarī'ī courts to take cognisance of many types of commercial disputes. The šarī'at, however, contains general provisions governing transactions, contracts, property rights, etc. Muḥammad Ghazzālī (450/1059-505/1111), who devoted one chapter of his celebrated work Kīmiyā-yi Sa'ādat to commercial matters, relates that the second caliph 'Umar, when passing through the bazaar of Madīna, said that "he who is engaged in trading must learn the šarī'at". While it is true that the Shi'ite and Sunnite law treatises do not give detailed guidance on all commercial matters, Muslim lawyers and judges would have been able to find solutions to detailed problems on the basis of analogy and precedent. It may, therefore, be concluded that inadequacies in the šarī'at were not the reason why the guilds were allowed to keep a large degree of self-regulation in the field of commercial disputes between their members. Partial autonomy of social institutions was inherent in pre-industrial communities, and it was one of the characteristics of Šafavid Iran, where even after Shāh 'Abbās I's successful efforts to strengthen the government's control, the structure of the state was
still partly decentralized.

The judicial autonomy of the guilds was limited, because the referees who settled the internal disputes between the members derived their power from the governmental authorities in their city. Through the grant of these powers, the authorities made sure that the tradesmen and artisans would maintain professional standards and comply with official policies, and that they would not disturb the city's security. Each guild had a particular court consisting of its bashī and its elders (rish-safīdān). Although there is no precise information, it may be assumed that the procedures and judgements of these courts were based on the principles of arbitration (kadkhudā-manishī), according to which oath-taking was only permitted when decisive evidence was lacking. Māfarrukhī, writing in the 8th/14th century, states that the kadkhudas settled the disputes between members of guilds, and that cases were heard in guild courts which set up at the char-sūq of the guild's section of the bazaar. The Taṣkīrāt ul-Mulūk states that one of the functions of the kalāntar was to judge important cases pertaining to the business (kasb-u-kār) of artisans and craftsmen. Kaempfer mentions that the malik ut-tujjār ("chief merchant", whose role has been discussed in Chapter 3) used to settle commercial disputes between big merchants at his own house. As regards disputes between individual craftsmen of the same guild, Chardin states that the bashī of every guild dealt with such matters summarily and investigated all serious complaints. A farman of Shāh Safī dated Zu'l-Ḥijja 1038/1629 exempting the barbers of Iṣfahān from certain
customary dues (rusūm) advises any barber from whom further rusūm are demanded to apply to the kadkhudā and the bashī for redress. Mirzā Hashim Āṣaf records that in 1173/1759 Karīm Khān Zand ordered that each guild (sinf) should set up a court consisting of several well informed and accomplished persons to settle its disputes. Kuznetsova has found evidence which suggests that in the 18th century there was a high court for important guild cases, which formed part of the sharʿī judiciary and was presided over by the naqīb, who also arbitrated in minor cases between tradesmen. She states that this high court heard complaints free of charge, and could seize and reassign a shop occupied by a master who had violated his guild’s regulations or honour by making shoddy goods or cheating, etc. There can be no doubt, however, that each guild still kept its own special court. 'Abbās Bihishtīyān, a modern specialist on Ṣafavid monuments, has found evidence that the char-suq of the dyer’s bazaar in Isfahān was the seat of the guild’s kadkhudā, who heard the complaints and pleas of the dyers and arbitrated their disputes. Naṣrābādī in his Taṣkira mentions that the leading craftsmen of each guild had shops in their guild's section of the bazaar, which was called its khāna (abode): for instance, Ḥājjī Sharīf, the kadkhudā of the confectioners (qannādān), had his shop in the qannād-khāna, and Mulla Mushfiqī, one of the kadkhudās of the drapers (bazzāzān) of Qum, had his shop in the bazzāz-khāna. From Naṣrābādī’s account, it appears that in cases involving guild regulations, the kadkhudā of the guild concerned would hear the complaints and pass summary judgement. There is no
documentary evidence about the kinds of punishment which were considered suitable for guild members who were found guilty; but it is still customary in the ancient bazaars of İsfahân and Yazd that a violator of guild regulations may make amends for his first offence by giving a sūr (i.e. a reconciliation feast) to his fellow members. For repeated violations a tradesman might be subjected to a severe penalty such as closure of his shop or a ban on his continuance in business in the bazaar.\textsuperscript{13}

General accusations against guild members were heard in the customary law courts (maḥkām-i 'urfī), which came under the jurisdiction of the divān-begī (minister of justice) and were administered by the kalāntar or the muhtasib.\textsuperscript{14} The responsibility for execution of sentences on offending artisans and traders lay with the ḍarūgha.\textsuperscript{15} Tavernier relates that, in the reign of Shāh 'Abbās II, when one of the gold bowls in the royal kitchen was lost, the ḍarūgha of İsfahân, Mīr Qāsim Bég, arrested some goldsmiths and baselessly accused them of stealing it. He then told them that they would not be freed unless they gave him a large sum of money. Mīrzā Muḥammad Bég, the bāshī of the goldsmiths' guild, appealed for mercy, but the ḍarūgha paid no attention and gave a harsh and abusive reply because Mīrzā Muḥammad Bég's plea was not accompanied by any money.\textsuperscript{16}

From time to time the muḥtasib and the ḍarūgha separately examined the weights and measures in use in the bazaar to make sure that shopkeepers were not overcharging or falsifying the government-approved scales. If any
shopkeepers were found guilty, they were sentenced to appropriate penalties, such as fines, floggings, imprisonment, nailing by the ears to their own shop doors, immurement in their own red-hot furnaces (a punishment inflicted on bakers), and even the death penalty. Normally the sentences of punishment were decided by the muḥtasib or some other official, and the punishments were carried out by the darūgha. A farman of Shāh Muḥammad Khudābanda ordered that cash fines (jarīma-hā-yi naqdi) due by offending artisans and craftsmen should be remitted, and that complaints against them, like complaints against non-craftsmen citizens, should be tried and sentenced in accordance with the shari'at. It seems that this farman was not enforced, or not for long, because there is evidence that shopkeepers throughout the country continued to be sentenced to pay fines. According to Du Mans, the fines were collected by the muḥtasib and delivered to the royal treasury.

The Šafavid government, which was always anxious to control retail prices, treated offending shopkeepers very harshly. An offending baker was liable either to be thrown and left inside his own red-hot furnace, or to be nailed to his shop door. Fraudulent craftsmen were often publicly flogged in an open space. Chardin reports that in the reign of Shāh Sulaymān, 'Alī-Quṭī Khān was made responsible for carrying out the punishment of bakers, and that he set up a great oven which was kept red-hot for a month. No baker then dared to sell bread dearer than the officially designated price. A more prevalent punishment of convicted craftsmen was the so-called takhta-kulāh (wooden hat)
which is described by Kaempfer and other contemporary observers. Kaempfer relates that the guilty shopkeeper was capped with a heavy wooden bowl, which was decorated with several hawk-bells and a fox's tail, and that he was then paraded around the city with a band of trumpeters marching ahead of him and crowds of jeering children running behind him. In the event of continuance or repetition of fraud or overcharging, the offender could be sentenced to death, but the sentence could only be executed after authorization by the governor.

The discipline and punishments which were imposed on guild members were of course intended to ensure quality and cheapness of manufactured goods and other supplies. It was the duty of the muhtasib and darūgha to protect the consumers rather than to help the producers. By inflicting spectacular punishments on shopkeepers, the authorities of a city sought to avert popular complaints and discontent.
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Chapter 5.

Social And Political Functions of the Guilds

5.1. Social Functions of the Guilds

5.2. Political Activities of the Guilds
5.1. **Social Functions of the Guilds**

"Whatever craft you have, try to be quick and honest! Be content with a modest gain! Do not turn away customers by over-insistence! You will earn more profits from your occupation, and more people will do business with you... if you show humility. Be honest both in buying and in selling and avoid avarice! Always keep true weights and measures...! Never have two hearts or two purses (i.e. never be distrustful or mean) with your family (i.e. wife)!. Never deal dishonestly with partners! In whatever craft you have, do nothing fraudulent, and do work of the same quality for the informed and the uninformed customer!"!

These words of advice given by Kay Kāvūs (441/1049-476/1083), the Ziyārid ruler, express ethical concepts which Iranian traders and artisans have cherished since ancient times. Unfortunately the available contemporary sources do not give detailed information about the ideology of the Iranian guilds, and at the present time, when the pressure of modern conditions has destroyed or weakened guild life, only a small number of these traditions have been conserved by Iranian craftsmen. Nevertheless, from the traditions which are still practised, it is apparent that the social, cultural, and ethical-religious functions of the guilds were very important. The guilds constituted one of the main social orders into which the urban populations were grouped. Since the government did not provide social welfare services, the craftsmen themselves, collectively or individually, provided such services, and they did so on a scale which was significant in comparison...
with other social or religious groups and town quarter groups.

An attempt must be made to describe the social functions of the Iranian guilds in the 17th and 18th centuries in so far as this is possible on the basis of the scarce documentary evidence and of oral evidence which has been transmitted from generation to generation down to the present time.

In the Iranian cities, the bazaar as the site of the artisans and traders was not merely the centre of trades and manufactures, but also the scene of many different activities. It was equipped with all kinds of facilities and amenities, such as mosques, schools, public baths, coffee houses, inns, and caravansarais. Struys, the Dutch visitor who was in Isfahān in 1671, noted that in the daytime the bazaar was exceedingly populous, so much so that a person wishing to walk through the bazaar and the Maydān-i Shāh often had to wait a long time before he could pass.

The most popular places where artisans and tradesmen gathered to discuss professional and municipal affairs were the coffee houses (qahva-khānas) and char-suqs (roofed crossroads in the bazaar). Fryer states that the coffee house was the hub of every bazaar or bāzārcha (small bazaar), and that people frequented it not only for the purpose of getting news and exchanging rumours, but also for the pleasure of hearing poets and reciters (naggālān), who attended regularly to declaim their poems and fables. Generally in every lane (rāsta) of the bazaar there was a char-suq, which was in fact a complex of public buildings
usually comprising a mosque, public bath (hāmmam), theological college (madrasa), gymnasium (zūr-khāna), and drinking fountain (saqqā-khāna). The char-sūq was considered to be the headquarter of the guild which occupied the particular lane, and the public business of the guild was conducted there. It also contained the residence of the head of the night-watchmen of the rāsta and the residence of the guild's kadkhudā. The emblem pole ('alāmat) of each guild was kept in its char-sūq, in the same way as a town quarter's emblem pole was kept in the local bāzārcha. Capital punishments were executed at the char-sūq, as shown for example by Rumlū's report that Khwaja Kalān Ghūriyānī, a Sunnite Islamic scholar, was executed at a char-sūq of Harāt in 944/1538. Besides the main bazaar, there were little bazaars (bāzārchas) which were established in every quarter (maḥalla) of a city and were provided with the same amenities as the char-sūqs in the main bazaar. The amenities of a bāzārcha were usually constituted as endowments (awqāf) of the quarter's mosque. At Iṣfahān, the bāzārcha of Sarū-Taqī (the grand vazīr of Shāh Ṣafī) was particularly well equipped with public facilities (which still exist).

Certain aspects of the relationship of the guilds with religion, and in particular with ḥarīqats, are discussed in Chapter 7. The relationship was all-pervasive, embracing everything from the sale of merchandise to the construction of mosques, schools, etc. Gibb and Bowen remark that this was a common characteristic of Islamic guilds in every country, and add that "the moral effect of this religious personality... was incalculable".
encouraged the qualities of honesty and sobriety which all
observers agree in attributing to Moslem artisans.¹³ No
account of religion in Safavid Iran would be complete
without a study of the role of the guilds and the deeply
religious nature of their activities. According to the
traditional concept of the guilds, every artisan and
trader should be a good Muslim. To a limited extent,
however, non-Muslims were admitted; their role in Safavid
Iran is discussed in Chapter 6.

One aspect of the general role of the guilds in the
Safavid period was their contribution to the building of
public edifices and amenities. Although the governmental
authorities in the towns shared in such tasks, their contribu-
tions were insufficient to meet all needs and were primarily
intended to display the government's benevolence or piety
to the people. The wealthier artisans and traders often
made good the deficiencies. For instance in Shāh 'Abbās I's
reign, Maqṣūd Bāgh, a simple coppersmith who had become rich
and acquired a great amount of property, built many amenities
such as a bāzār-e hafti, a chār-sūq and a caravansarai,¹⁴ all of
which still exist to the north east of the Maydān-i Shāh in
Iṣfahān and are still called by his name. Ḥājj Sayyid
Husayn Šabbāgh (dyer) built a cistern in the dyer's bazaar
for use by the craftsmen and tradesmen at all times of the
year.¹⁵ A similar cistern was built at Kāshān by Ḥājj
Bāqir Sha'rbāf (brocade weaver) in the reign of Shāh 'Abbās II.¹⁶
Mosques and schools built by craftsmen and traders were
numerous, e.g. the Masjid-i Ḥammālān (porters' mosque), the
Masjid-i Shīrā-pazān (grape juice makers' mosque), and the
Madrasa-yi Kaṣa-ma'rān (potters' college) at Iṣfahān, all of
which were built in the Șafavid period and still exist.\textsuperscript{17}

There is little or no evidence concerning the relations between guilds of the same trade or profession in different towns. It would appear that they did not cooperate in joint charitable undertakings or in joint approaches to the central government on behalf of their common interests throughout the country. More probably there was a certain amount of rivalry between them. Chardin mentions that there was a healthy competition between the potters of Yazd and șfahān. The potters of Yazd, in order to prove their skill, once manufactured a very fine glazed pot with a capacity of 12 livres and a weight of just one gros (1/16 of a livre), and presented it to their colleagues in șfahān. In retort, the potters of șfahān manufactured a beautiful glazed pot with a capacity of 12 livres and a weight of just one gros, and presented it to their colleagues in Yazd.\textsuperscript{18}

Within each guild, and to some extent between different guilds in a town, mutual help and cooperation were important moral and social functions about which there is also little documentary evidence. The Yazdī poet Maȟmūd Qārī (d. 993/1585) mentions that the tāilors (ahl-i lībās) held regular professional meetings to discuss their problems.\textsuperscript{19} 'Alī Bakhtīyār, a present-day architect who has made a thorough study of the Royal Bazaar of șfahān, states that the Masjid-i Khayyāt-hā (tailors' mosque), which according to Jabīrī Anšārī was built in the early Qājār period,\textsuperscript{20} served two purposes, a part of the mosque being set apart for religious ceremonies and daily prayers, while another
part, accessible through a secret door, contained rooms used by the administration of the guild for storage of documents relating to the tailoring trade. In the Qājār period, members of the guild of the biryānī-furūshān (mincemeat rissole sellers) at Isfahān cooperated to ensure the supply of biryānīs to the public. All the biryānīs for sale in the biryānī shops of the city were prepared and cooked in one factory (kār-khānā), where the cooking process required a very close cooperation among the biryānī sellers.

Although the guilds had no organized systems of mutual and internal consultation, there is some evidence that members helped one another and that guilds cooperated with other guilds of the same city. For instance 'Alī Aqā Dalv-dūz (leather bucket-maker), who represented all the guilds and had close connections with each, was appointed the kadkhudā-bāshī of the various guilds of Isfahān by 'Alī Murād Khān Zand. According to Malik Shāh Ḥusayn, who wrote in Shāh 'Abbās I's reign, the different guilds of Rashalak, which he describes as a large and populous city in Sīstān, held thronged joint meetings in the premises of each, at which they also enjoyed talking to each other and listening to poetry reciters (shāhnāma-khwānān) and story tellers. Chārdin mentions an example of cooperation within a guild, namely the guild of the bookbinders (ṣāḥāfān) at Isfahān. The binders held a special meeting under the presidency of one of their members for the purpose of choosing a fellow binder who would be required to open his shop on Friday. This meeting was usually held on Thursday evening every week. The bookbinders' bazaar was
not far from the Masjid-i Shāh and Masjid-i Shaykh Lutfullāh, which people frequented for daily and Friday prayers. The binder in question was appointed by lottery. He not only supplied the demands of the worshippers, but also made a good profit on Fridays, when he alone had his shop open. The emblem poles ('alāmat or ṭawq) of the various guilds and town quarters (maḥallat) were made and embellished on a cooperative basis. These poles had a religious significance and were carried in parades during the Muharram mourning (as they still are today). The possession and display of an emblem pole was regarded as a sign of dignity for a guild or quarter and its inhabitants. Different parts of an emblem pole would be made by at least ten guilds, such as ironsmiths, coppersmiths, braziers, steel fret workers (shabaka-sāzan), sword makers, locksmiths, engravers (ḥakkākan), metal embossers (qalam-zanān), and gold beaters. A few fine emblem poles from the 18th and 19th centuries still survive, having been preserved by certain families of craftsmen and elders of town quarters at Isfahān. Another example of cooperation was the payment of the wages of the night watchmen of a rāsta of the bazaar, which is mentioned by Fryer as having been customary in the Safavid period. Until about 1950 it continued to be a recognised collective obligation to which all members of the particular guild or guilds contributed. Kotzebue, the Russian traveller who sojourned in Iran in 1816-1817, states that at Tabrīz, if a retailer did not have available the articles which a customer requested, he would borrow them from his colleagues in order to satisfy the customer.
In the bazaars of present day Iran, wealthier members of a trade help poorer members who fall into distress; they regard such charity as a moral or religious duty and as a continuance of the custom of the old guilds. Although none of the sources from the 17th and 18th centuries say anything about the existence of guild funds for mutual help, there is some evidence that in those days the wealthier tradesmen and artisans similarly helped the families of colleagues stricken by illness or death. Probably such charity was not considered to be a collective obligation of the guild, but was traditionally acknowledged to be a human and Islamic duty incumbent on those who could afford. For instance, Naṣrābādī mentions that Ḥājj Bāqir Sha'rbāf (brocade weaver) allotted a part of his income for relief of distressed and needy persons, and if any member of the guild died indigent, his funeral expenses would be defrayed from this fund. Kuznetsova, without mentioning her source, states that in the early Šafavid period, whenever a member of a guild in a town of eastern Iran was kidnapped by Uzbek, Turkman, or Afghan raiders, the other members would ransom their colleague. It is customary today that on the death of an artisan, mourning ceremonies are held by his colleagues as a corporate body, and that after three days, the deceased man's son is escorted by them from his house to the bazaar and installed in his shop; this custom is believed to go back to the Šafavid period. In 17th and 18th century Iran, neither the central government nor the provincial governors acknowledged any responsibility to provide social services for individuals in distress. The
guilds, however, or at least their wealthier members, gave help to distressed artisans and tradesmen. Sometimes this help was given in fulfilment of personal obligations to professional colleagues, but generally it was given for the sake of maintenance of the guild's dignity and above all from respect for the religious and moral duty of charity.
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5.2. Political Activities of the Guilds

Louis Massignon, in an article on Islamic Guilds in the *Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*,\(^1\) states that the craftsmen and artisans in the Islamic realm were organized in professional groups called *ṣināf*, which except for the absence of any political significance had similar features and characteristics to the European guilds in the medieval period. Massignon's opinion that the Islamic guilds never had a political character is shared by those Western European orientalist scholars who deny the existence of free political institutions and parties in the Islamic countries. The opinion rests on two premises, (a) that the Islamic guilds were not democratically organized,\(^2\) (b) that the Islamic guilds, unlike the European guilds, performed governmental functions in certain fields such as tax collection and municipal administration besides their basic economic functions. While there is some truth in both these premises, it cannot be inferred from them that Islamic guilds did not freely engage in political activities. The involvement of religion with politics has generally been closer in Muslim societies than in European societies,\(^3\) and as D. Lewis has pointed out in an article on Islamic guilds in the *Economic History Review*, the religious links of the Islamic guilds necessarily drew them into political activities and movements.\(^4\) In the Iranian environment, certain factors which determined the form of guild activities in the European environment were absent, while other factors were present. On the whole, in Iran the guilds limited their political
activities to peaceful demonstrations and seldom engaged in violence. Although the sources are insufficient for a clear perception of their political role, scattered references show that they were capable of vigorous political initiative in defence of their economic and municipal interests.\textsuperscript{5}

In addition to power-seizures by tribal\textsuperscript{6} and foreign\textsuperscript{7} military groups, revolts or protests by city dwellers recur in the pages of post-Islamic Iranian history.\textsuperscript{8} These were revolts of the workmen and tradesmen, for the most part guild members, who formed the majority of the urban populations. The leaders, however, were usually members of the Islamic clergy (\textit{\'ulama}) who were not members of the ruling group, and who for religious or socio-economic reasons were dissatisfied with the government.

Demonstrations by a single guild are mentioned, but appear to have been rare. When the conduct of a governor, \textit{dar\'ugha}, or tax-collector was felt to have become intolerably oppressive, all the guilds normally acted in concert, even if some of them had not directly suffered.\textsuperscript{9}

In Safavid Iran, such oppression most often afflicted all the guilds in common. Their recurrent grievances referred mainly to (a) excessive tax demands (for \textit{bun\'icha}, \textit{tamgh\'a}, and occasional imposts), (b) unreasonable price control orders by the \textit{mu\'tasib} or his deputies,\textsuperscript{10} and (c) occasional abuses by \textit{bash\'is}.\textsuperscript{11}

The social links of the different guilds were very close. To a large extent they pursued their occupations in different alleys (\textit{r\'asta}) of the same quarter of a city, and their members met each other daily at places such as
the entrance gates of the quarter (e.g. in the Isfahan bazaar). They also met each other at coffee houses, at national celebrations, and above all at religious gatherings in the quarter, such as Friday prayer in the mosques and commemoration of the martyrdoms (rawża-khwānī) in the takiyas (meeting places for this purpose which craft guilds traditionally maintained). Thus an injustice done to an individual or to a single guild quickly became known throughout the entire bazaar.

The traditional close links between the people of the Iranian bazaars and the Islamic clergy has a long history and would present an interesting subject for special study. In the present work a detailed discussion could be out of place, and the following observations must suffice. Traditionally the bāzāris, whether artisans or tradesmen, are more attentive to Islam than other classes of the Iranian urban communities. Their religious attitude, which combines piety with honesty and insistence on justice, was to some extent connected with their economic need for protection against unjust treatment by the ruling military and official classes. The strong influence of the 'ulamā in the bazaar similarly had economic aspects. In the first place, many 'ulamā needed to work for their living, and preferred to work in the bazaar rather than in the service of the government. Twelver Shi'ite 'ulamā, whose inward loyalty is to the Hidden Imam, have always feared loss of their religious integrity and independence through any acceptance of obligation to the worldly ruler, and even under the Shi'ite Safavid monarchy many of them held this
view. Secondly, literate 'ulama constituted a large proportion of the literate element in the urban populations, and were therefore employed by bazaris as accountants and clerks. Thirdly, the 'ulama received a major part of the religious taxes and contributions (khums, sahm-i Imām, etc.), on which they were to some extent dependent, from the wealthier bazaar traders and craftsmen. Fourthly, the bazaars were centres not only of commerce and industry, but also of cultural and social life. Side by side with the shops, workshops, and warehouses stood mosques, madrasas, and takiyas which members of the clergy directed. Finally, those 'ulama who served as sharī'ī lawyers and notaries had their offices (mahzars) in the bazaars. They held a monopoly of the business of notarial registration, and advised the guilds on their legal procedures which were much influenced by Islamic law. Since governmental oppression of guild members was usually accompanied with disregard for the law and for the legal prerogatives of the 'ulama, both classes usually began to feel grievances at the same time. When the grievances were not redressed, eloquent 'ulama naturally took the lead in preaching resistance and organizing protests. It was a protest of bazaris led by 'ulama which brought about the Iranian constitutional revolution of 1906. 12

Reports of bazaar demonstrations or revolts from the Safavid period are few. The course of such events appears to have been much the same as in the Qajar period. First the aggrieved bazaris, being unable to meet the tax demands of the central or provincial government, would send guild elders (rīsh-safīdān) to present their petitions to a high
official such as the divan-begi (minister of justice), or to the provincial governor, or even to the Shāh. If agreement could not be reached in this way, the guilds would then passively demonstrate their discontent by deciding on a closure of the bazaar (taʿīl-i bāzār), which may be compared with a modern strike. Such strike action was considered illegal by the government, but acquired a measure of legal validity when it was sanctioned by influential 'ulamā. A bazaar closure caused inconvenience to the city's other inhabitants, and also alarm, because when a demonstration occurred they might be dragged by striking craftsmen and shopkeepers into the mob. Sometimes angry demonstrators poured into the streets when the Shāh was passing. If they were threatened with punitive action, they took refuge in mosques and important government buildings. Often 'ulamā played the role of mediators and persuaded the governmental authorities to modify their unjust demands or ill-treatment of the guilds; sometimes they made compromises which enabled the authorities to continue their exploitation or misconduct.¹³ Such collusion, possibly involving hypocritical and self-interested 'ulamā, appears to have been more prevalent in the Šafavid period, particularly under the sanctimonious Shaḥs Tahmāsbl and Sulṭān Ḥusayn, than in the Qājār period. The Šafavid monarchs claimed religious authority as spiritual guides (pīr or murshid or mu'allim) and as descendants of the Imāms, and the assumed grandiose titles such as Shāh-i Dīn-panāh (refuge of the religion), Nuṣrat-i Qur'ān (supporter of Qur'ān) and Banda-yi Shāh-i Vilāyat (slave
of the first Imam 'Ali). These religious pretensions were used to justify the Safavid autocracy, and although it is not known to what extent they were taken seriously by the bazaris and the clergy, it is clear that the religious and social conditions of the time were exceptionally unfavourable to any political manifestation of independent organized groups such as guilds. In Kuznetsova's opinion, the guilds under the despotic monarchy of the Safavids were more strictly regulated than at any other time in order that they might serve the financial and administrative purposes of the state. In spite of this situation, the movement grew during the period through increase of the number of guilds and the number of members, and won some successes in achieving reductions of financial impositions and dismissals of oppressive officials.

A point of some interest is that the founder of the Safavid darvish order and ancestor of the Safavid royal dynasty, Shaykh Šafi ud-Dīn Ardabīlī (d.736/1334), had many craftsmen among his disciples, who supported him financially and politically besides following him as their spiritual guide. The Šafvat uš-šafā, a biography of Shaykh Šafi written in the 8th/14th century by Ibn-i Bazzāz, states that among those who followed him as their spiritual guide were numerous craftsmen and artisans such as shawl weavers, blacksmiths, jewellers, saddlers, shoemakers, barbers, dyers, carpenters, cotton-weavers, drapers, and soap-boilers. After the seizure of political power under Shāh Ismā'īl I, the Ṣafāvī order (ṭariqat) lost its
former character of a Sufi religious and radical social movement, and thereafter its membership was limited to the Qizilbash troops who had brought the régime to political power. Finally Shâh 'Abbâs I curbed the power of the Qizilbash and let the Safavi tariqat fade away. In so doing, he consolidated his own autocratic power but discarded the last vestige of the Safavid régime's democratic origin and connections. 18

The first important bazaar uprising against oppression by the Safavid government occurred in the reign of Shâh Tahmâsb I. Although this Shâh never adopted monopolistic policies like those of his grandson 'Abbâs I, he made the tax burdens more severe and found ways to deprive individuals who were growing rich of their wealth. He was so avaricious that it was said that he would send his own clothes for sale in the bazaars in order to obtain money. 19 Arthur Edwards, the Muscovy Company’s commercial agent, reported to London in 1569 that “at my coming to Casbin (Qasvin), I found no manner of any commodities made, but all lying there whole, and news given out that ye Shaugh (Shâh) would buy all such commodities as he had, and give him silk and spices for the same; but by report the Shaugh never tooke cloth into his treasure...” 20 The historian Hasan Rümî states that in 979/1571-981/1573 the people of Tabriz revolted under leaders whom he describes as ruffians and rogues (awbâsh va ajlâf). The governor, Allâh-Qułî Bîg Ustâjlû, who had been appointed by Shâh Tahmâsb I earlier in the year 979/1571, antagonized the people of Darjûya, one of the quarters of Tabriz, by his
brutal behaviour. Among these people were many artisans and shopkeepers. The infuriated people drew their swords and slew the magnates and nobles (َاےْن وَاشْرَف). Allah Quli-Beg Ustājlū was then dismissed from his post, and Yusuf Beg Shāmlū was appointed governor at the people's request. Yusuf Beg Shamlū conciliated the malcontents through their elders (کَدْخُوْدَیْن); but the accord was violated, and the struggle broke out again. Finally the army of the Shah's central government marched on Tabrīz and recaptured the city. The leaders of the revolt were then massacred. It is noteworthy that, according to Hasan Rūmlū, craftsmen and tradesmen played the chief parts, the most prominent rebel leaders being Ḥusayn, a greengrocer, Hasan, a shoe-maker, Nashmī, a fuller, and Shanji, the son of a shawl-maker. All of them were executed 979/1571-981/1573.21 Although Rūmlū says nothing about the consequences of this uprising, it is known that soon after the end of the two years of contention between the government and the people of Tabrīz, Shāh Tahmāsb I gradually remitted the professional taxes on the guilds at Tabrīz and other cities.22 In view of the importance of Tabrīz as a centre of craft industries and commerce, and of the high proportion of artisans and shopkeepers in its population, Rūmlū's statement gains deeper significance. After the surrender of Tabrīz to the Ottoman Turks in 920/1514, Sultan Sālim I had carried away 3000 families from the city to Istanbul, including the best artisans, particularly those who were skilled in weapon manufacture.23 Iskandar Munshī states that the majority of the population of Tabrīz consisted of artisans.24 According to Chardin, who wrote in the
The reign of Shāh Sulaymān, 15,000 shops were open in Tabrīz, more than 6,000 bales of raw silk were manufactured annually, and thousands of artisans were employed in 110 kār-khanās (workshops).

The next significant political action by the Iranian guilds against oppression by government officials is reported from Isfahān in the reign of Shāh 'Abbās II. The importance of this event was so great that it is mentioned in several Iranian chronicles. In 1066/1657 a converted Georgian named Parsīmadān or Parsīdān was appointed to the office of dārūgha of Isfahān. He treated the people, and in particular the guilds and craftsmen, very harshly. The craftsmen and artisans complained about the dārūgha's oppressive conduct to the dīvān-begī (i.e. the minister of justice, who supervised the administration of customary law ('urf)). The dīvān-begī, by name Ughūr Beg, failed to investigate the causes of the people's discontent. A movement of protest then began in the Royal Bazaar and spread to other quarters of Isfahān. The chroniclers, who were eyewitnesses, do not mention which guilds took the lead in organizing the demonstrations of protest, but state that the bazaar gradually came to an absolute standstill. Through wide-ranging deliberations, the craft guilds coordinated their peaceful political protest with fellow citizens who were not employed in the bazaar. The peaceful demonstrations, however, proved to be fruitless. The protesters then congregated along a route to be taken by Shāh 'Abbās II. The Shāh ordered the prime minister
(I'timād ud-Dawla), Mīrza Muḥammad Bég to investigate and find an appropriate and acceptable solution. The prime minister urgently summoned the guild representatives and the concerned ministers and high officials to a meeting, which was ineffective because free discussion of all the problems was not allowed. The protesters, who were mainly craftsmen, then took sanctuary (bast) inside the dawlat-khana (assembly hall of the ministers), where their representatives frankly asserted their complaints. They also sent a scroll containing their demands from the sanctuary to the Shah. Finally they turned to Mawlawā Muḥsin, an eminent and learned clergyman (mujtahid uz- zamān), who had a close relationship with the bazaar. Thanks to Mawlawā Muḥsin's mediation, Shah 'Abbās II dismissed the dārūgha, and at the request of the demonstrators, he later also dismissed the dīvān-bēgī. 27

The political significance of this event becomes clear when the high proportion of craftsmen and shopkeepers in the population of Iṣfahān at that time is taken into account. Although it can hardly be maintained that a single focus of economic activities existed in 17th century Iran, because in the predominantly rural society, agriculture and stock breeding remained essentially dispersed activities, nevertheless it is evident that Iṣfahān was then a uniquely important business centre. 28 Its long established community of artisans and traders had been enlarged by the immigration of businessmen from Tabrīz (Tabāriz) 29 and of Armenians from their native Julfā in Azarbāijān to a similarly named new suburb, and the skills and energies
of these two groups had further stimulated commercial and industrial activities. As the capital and biggest city, Isfahān was the obvious residence for ambitious entrepreneurs. Don Juan, whose account goes up to around 1600, states that Isfahān had 10,000 shops; Francisco Gemelli, who was in Isfahān in 1693-94, describes Isfahān as the centre of metal working and leather working; and John Bell reports that at the end of Shāh Sulṭān Ḥusayn's reign a considerable proportion of the population of Isfahān was employed in the manufacture of cloths and carpets. A bazaar closure, equivalent to a general strike, at Isfahān was thus a very powerful weapon.

Another example of political action by a guild at Isfahān is reported in the Dutch archives. Some confectioners (qannādān), who had delivered goods to a value of 1200 tumāns to the royal sharbat-khanā (soft drink-making establishment), were pressed to continue these deliveries on credit. The confectioners took sanctuary in the mosque of Imāmzāda Ismā'īl, and wrote to the Shāh and nāzir-i buyūṭat-i-salṭanatī (superintendent of the royal establishments) that this situation could not continue any longer. They would come out of their sanctuary if Shāh Sulṭān Ḥusayn would promise only to order more sugar after payment of the outstanding 1200 tumāns. They received no reply. The nāzir-i buyūṭat then fell into trouble at the royal court. Next the mustawfī-yi khāṣṣa (collector of the royal estates), at the order of the prime minister (I'timād ud-Dawla), tried to obtain sugar through the merchants of Khurāsān. Fearing that they likewise would have to deliver on credit, they
replied that they had no sugar. The mustawfī-yi khāssa then demanded an undertaking from the caravansarai keepers that they would not allow the merchants to sell a single pound of sugar and would accept liability to a heavy fine in the event of non-compliance. The Khurāsānī merchants were in a difficult position, because without giving some presents to the royal court they could not expect to sell their sugar. The mustawfī-yi khāssa next tried to obtain sugar from the Dutch East Company, who refused. He then ordered the harbour master (shāh-bandar) of Bandar 'Abbās to obtain sugar as soon as possible from the merchants there. How this conflict ended is not reported in the Dutch Company's letters. It would seem probable that in the end the court had to pay in cash. The incident, although it arose over a purely commercial dispute, shows that an Iranian guild in the Šafavid period occupied a position of sufficient strength to defend its members' rights against an absolute monarchy.

Probably the most powerful of the guilds in the Šafavid period were those of the weavers. They existed in large cities such as Isfahān, Tabrīz, Yazd, and Kāshān. Although this guild rarely intervened in the general affairs of a city, its influence was always taken into account by the authorities. Yazd was the biggest single centre of weaving, and so remained until early Qājār times when there were more than 1800 looms with 9000 weavers in the city. According to Steel and Crowther, the English East India Company's agents in 1615-1616, along the trade route from Yazd to Mashhad there were many small towns and villages which produced
high quality cloth and as much as 3000 maunds of raw silk yearly for delivery to the weavers of Yazd. A royal decree (farmān) dated Rabī‘ul-Awval 1015/1603, which is preserved in an inscription in the Masjid-i Jāmi‘ at Yazd, ordered that customary dues (rusūm) should be levied on the weavers’ guild of Yazd and paid to the officers of the local military garrison. The weavers had recourse to the vazīr of Yazd, as they were unable to pay such sums. The vazīr conveyed their representations to Shāh ‘Abbās I and appealed against the levy, emphasizing that the Yazdī weavers had always obeyed every royal command. Shāh ‘Abbās I consequently abolished the rusūm on the weavers’ guild of Yazd and forbade the military officers of Yazd to interfere in its affairs. This incident is not reported in the contemporary chronicles, but in view of the strict and comprehensive control which Shāh ‘Abbās I’s government exercised over the guilds, it may be inferred that the abolition of a royal farmān and the issue of a new one in favour of a particular guild would not have occurred unless the resistance of the concerned craftsmen had been strong and potentially damaging to the government.

The uprising of the people of Rasht and Lahījān in Shāh Ṣafī’s reign against the low prices paid by the royal silk monopoly is mentioned in chapter 8.

On critical occasions, the craft guilds and bāzārīs played a decisive part in the military defence of a city’s security. During the Ghalzāy Afghān insurrection, Amānullāh Khān, an Afghān general, besieged Qazvīn in 1136/1723. The bāzārīs of Qazvīn, i.e. the artisans and shopkeepers, defended the city with the backing of the masses and brought
the siege to an end after killing 4000 Afghan soldiers.38

The evidence which has been cited in this section shows that the Iranian guilds had a considerable political influence in the Safavid period, though not so great as in the Qajar period. Despite the autocratic nature of the regime, they were able on several occasions to prevent the imposition of unfair taxes or prices, to obtain the dismissal of unjust officials, and even to defend a city against invaders.
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Chapter 6.

Special Guilds

6.1. The Royal Guilds (Aṣnāf-ī Shāhī)

6.2. The Non-Muslim Artisans
In pre-industrial societies, the independent artisans and traders working with their own resources could only handle small scale business. The demands of the royal courts and ruling groups were too large, either in volume or, given their luxurious tastes, in cost, to be met by persons lacking security of patronage and time to acquire special skills. For this reason, royal courts and similar establishments engaged their own artisans from among the best skilled craftsmen. Governments in those days did not normally concern themselves with the needs of ordinary townspeople (except sometimes in cases of dearth or famine), but were always mindful of their own requirements.\(^1\)

In medieval and Şafavid Iran, the ordinary artisans and tradesmen were not equipped to meet royal and official demands, particularly for expensive goods and services. Consequently the court and also high dignitaries such as provincial governors and men of importance such as wealthy landlords and khāns set up their own workshops and employed highly skilled craftsmen in them. These establishments supplied the craftsmen's requirements such as tools and raw materials and usually provided good working conditions and remuneration.

The earliest documentary evidence concerning royal workshops appears in the Safar-nāma of Naṣir Khusraw (394/1004-470/1077). He mentions that the 'Abbāsid Caliphs maintained workshops, known as bayt ut-ṭirāz and controlled
by a șahib ut-țirāz, in which highly skilled weavers produced costly cotton, silk, and woollen cloths for the 'Abbāsid court, and that if any surplus was left over, the șahib ut-țirāz sold these cloths to private individuals. ²

The invasion of the Mongol Chingiz Khan in 616/1219 destroyed most of the important and populous Iranian cities, and forced many cultivators to abandon their villages and turn to nomadic pastoralism. This devastating blow to the traditional order of society was followed by a decline of urban life, which in some places was prolonged. Apart from a few regional centres such as Tabrīz, Harāt, ³ and Shirāz, and some smaller cities such as Yazd and Kāshān, where commerce and craftsmanship survived, most of the long established urban centres of Iran were reduced to the rank of rural market towns. Under the Mongol Ilkhanid dynasty and the Turkish Timurid and Black and White Sheep Turkman dynasties (789/1387-911/1506), the rulers obtained most of their needs through two institutions, namely camp bazaars (urdu-bāzar) and royal workshops (kār-khāna). The camp bazaar was developed to meet the economic needs of the nomadic armies which sustained these dynasties. Artisan labour was diverted to the camp bazaar, which followed the royal camp on military expeditions and duplicated and often competed with the city bazaars. ⁴ In addition to the camp bazaar, the Mongol and Turkish rulers set up royal workshops to produce important requisites. For instance a farman of the Ilkhan Abāqā Qā'ān dated 663/1265 made the governor of Harāt,
Malik Shams ul- Hasan, responsible for the construction of certain workshops in that city. Since Chingiz Khan (616/1219-624/1225), Ugatai (627/1229-639/1241), and Hulagu (654/1256-663/1265) had forbidden governors to start any developments, whatever their nature, within the limits of the existing cities, Malik Shams ul-Hasan erected extensive royal workshops outside the city wall of Harat. Besides the workshops, he also set up a large bazaar. These new developments were inaugurated by Abaqa Qa'an in the following year. Under a farman of the Ilkhan Ghazan, several workshops were built throughout the realm. The skilled artisans, arrow makers, bow makers, sword makers, chain mail makers, and others who were employed in these royal workshops worked exclusively on the execution of the government's orders. Each group of artisans of a particular craft formed a distinct unit and was supervised by an overseer (amin). The establishment of these workshops enabled the government to equip 10,000 soldiers with full armour.

In the Safavid period, workshops (karkhana-ha) belonging to the royal establishments (buyutat-i saltanati) were developed to a greater extent than ever before or after. Minorsky remarks that "In the absence of capitalistic industry, the Safavid kings, similarly to their predecessors and contemporaries, had to secure the production of certain necessaries and objets de luxe at the workshops of their own households. Many of these workshops were simply domestic departments, such as the kitchen, scullery, various stores, stables, kennels, etc. There were also, however, some buyutat which were run like real state-owned manufactories."
Kaempfer thought that the grandeur of the Safavid court could be appreciated from the fact that there were as many as 50 royal workshops, whose expenses amounted to 5,000,000 écus (approximately 350,000 tumans). The dynasty's founder, Shāh Ismā'īl I, set up a number of silk and cotton cloth factories at his own expense. Under Shāh 'Abbās I, a great expansion of the royal court and ruling class took place, and their demands exceeded the capacity of the bazaar and the independent artisans. In establishing royal workshops, the Safavid government had two aims: to escape from dependence on the individual craftsmen, and to make profits. Krusinski, who was in Isfahān from 1704 to 1729, noted that the royal workshops made large profits for the Safavid Shāhs; they not only produced goods such as textiles and rugs for the court, but also sent expensive silks and textiles to Europe and India, and paid the profits made in this way to the Shāh. Besides providing the needs of the Shāhs and the governors at their residential courts, royal artisans accompanied the authorities on their tours and military expeditions. In addition to skilled craftsmen from all over Iran, qualified artisans from abroad were employed in the Safavid royal establishments.

The administrative organization of the buyūtāt-i salṭanatī was an elaborate apparatus within the bureaucratic system of the Safavid régime. Officials competed for appointments in the royal kār-khānas, which gave an opportunity for profit as well as a respected position in the government.

Each workshop was administered by several high-ranking
officials. The highest position was that of the 'ālī-ḥāżrat-ināzir-i buyūtāt, who headed the thirty three royal workshops. The nāzir-i buyūtāt was appointed by the Shāh, and through his subordinates kept a strict control over all pertinent matters. He was responsible for the attendance, leave of absence, wages, and promotion of the craftsmen in the royal workshops, and for the investigation and judgement of offences relating to their professional conduct. Once a year the nāzir summoned the artisans and approved their salaries and set their leave. Kaempfer noted that although the bāshīs and master craftsmen in the royal workshops were nominally chosen by the Shāh, the nāzir had a decisive influence over their appointment and dismissal. As a result of the growth of the nāzir’s responsibilities from 'Abbas I’s reign onward, a colleague with the title 'ālī-ḥāżrat-i vazīr-i buyūtāt was employed to serve with him and assist him. In addition to the nāzir and vazīr, there were administrative officials in two other high-ranking grades called gāhib jam’ (chief collector, meaning roughly workshop master) and mushrif (overseer), who carried out their duties under the supervision of the nāzir-i buyūtāt. The gāhib-jam’ and the mushrif of each workshop estimated its needs and obtained its supplies of raw materials and fixed its internal arrangements. The technical affairs of each workshop were managed by its bāshī and master craftsmen (ustādān). The bāshīs and ustāds of the various royal workshops received their raw materials from the responsible mushrif or from a government agent holding the title malik ut-tujjār (whose role is discussed in Chapter 3). The number of
the masters in each workshop depended on its nature and capacity. For instance, in the fireworks (ātish-kārān) and gun powder (bārūt-sāzān) workshops there were several master craftsmen. Appointment to the rank of ustād in a royal workshop depended on seniority and past record. The malik ut-tujjār was in charge of the supply of raw materials for the royal textile workshops and also acted as a supervisor. He inspected the workshops of the shawl makers, tailors, stocking makers, cotton carders, cloak makers, and shoemakers, and chose the patterns to be used in cloth weaving. According to Mīrzā Rafīʿā, the number of artisans varied in different workshops. Chardin noted that the average number of the artisans in thirty two royal workshops was 150. The Taḵkirat ul-Mulūk counts 400 artisans who worked in the nine workshops of the royal mint, seventy two painters (artisans) in the painter's workshops, and one hundred and eighty tailors in the tailors' workshop.

The total number of the Safavid royal workshops is variously recorded. The Taḵkirat ul-Mulūk counts thirty three workshops, while Chardin counts thirty two. Minorsky gives a list of royal workshops totalling thirty four, but including subdivisions which were attached to other departments. According to Kaempfer, there were fifty workshops. Some of them, despite their designation kār-khāna, were not in fact workshops but only storehouses for raw materials. The following list of the royal workshops which were actually operated by artisans has been compiled mainly from the data given by Kaempfer:
a) CLOTHING

1. shawl-making workshop  
   
2. tailoring  
   
3. stocking-making  
   
4. furriery  
   
5. gold brocade weaving workshop  
   
6. shoemaking workshop  
   
7. cotton carding  

b) METAL WARES

1. goldsmiths' workshop  
   
2. coppersmiths'  
   
3. blacksmiths'  
   
4. tinsmiths'  
   
5. tin platers'  

C) TREASURY

1. mint  
   
2. treasury  
   
3. money changing house  

D) DRUGS AND FOOD

1. druggist's and perfumer's workshop  
   
2. kitchen  
   
3. butchery  
   
4. fruit juice factory  
   
5. syrup factory  

E) LIBRARY AND ARTS

1. Library  
   
   a. book-bindery  
   
   b. paper factory  
   
   c. book illumination
Entry into the royal workshops was not easy, even for well qualified artisans. Employment in them was governed by various conditions, and the employees fell into four main categories.

1) Those who acquired their skill through apprenticeship at the royal workshops. Some of them were unpaid artisans, who in general were prisoners of war employed as the Shāh's slaves (ghulāman). Many of these men served in the armed forces and were called gullar or qullariyān, while others were employed in the royal workshops. The ghulāms in the royal workshops received training and acquired professional qualifications in them before entering into permanent service. Simon, a Carmelite priest who was in ʿIsfahān in 1608, states that Shāh ʿAbbās I had a very great number
of slaves including artisans of all kinds, and in order not to feed them himself, he put them to work in crafts, so that not only they should earn their victuals, but he also should make money out of it.\footnote{23}

2. Sons of master craftsmen in the royal workshops naturally enjoyed priority over other applicants. According to Chardin, a master's son who obtained the requisite qualification often took over his father's position.\footnote{24}

3. Artisans were sometimes engaged from outside the royal establishments, but only after introduction by a person of rank and proof of complete mastery of the craft.\footnote{25}

4. Non-Iranian artisans were also employed, but only if they possessed skills not found among the Iranian craftsmen.\footnote{26}

Apprentices entered the royal workshops at twelve to fifteen years of age.\footnote{27} Appointments of artisans were confirmed by the Shah and the nāẓir-i buyūtāt.\footnote{28}

The artisans in the royal workshops were organized in royal guilds (aṣnāf-i shāhī) which had no connection with the independent bazaar guilds. They enjoyed numerous privileges, such as free board, lodging, clothing, and relatively good wages and work conditions. They possessed a form of unemployment and sickness insurance from which all members of royal guilds could benefit.\footnote{29} Once a year the nāẓir-i buyūtāt negotiated the wages of the royal artisans. They were paid annually, with the exception of cameldrivers who were paid every six months.\footnote{30} The wages of royal artisans differed according to their crafts. Kaempfer noted that an ordinary master craftsman was paid anything between ten and fifty tumāns per annum.\footnote{31} According to Chardin, some artisans received an annual salary of
800 écus besides free food. In addition to the agreed regular wages, rewards were given by the Shāh to meritorious artisans in recognition of their special skills. The wages and rewards of the royal artisans were paid in two ways, either with coins delivered at the royal workshops or with bills drawn on private traders or partnerships all over the country. Kuznetsova has found that the royal artisans were called "darbasta" meaning "tied", i.e. that they worked exclusively for the court. Chardin noted that the royal weavers seldom worked privately for their own profit.

An interesting point, attested in certain sources, is that despite the expansion of the royal workshops, the Safavid court obtained part of its needs from the Isfahān bazaar. Sometimes finished goods were selected and purchased for the court, sometimes raw materials were supplied and commissions were paid for piece-work done in the process of manufacture. According to Chardin, at some date, possibly during Shāh Sulaymān's reign, certain royal workshops such as the dye works and silk factories were closed and thereafter, under new arrangements which were made, linen to be dyed for the royal court was sent into the town, and silk, gold thread, and woollen and cotton yarns for the royal weaving and carpet making workshops were purchased from private tradesmen at fixed prices.

Not all the industrial enterprises of the Šafavid court were concentrated in Isfahān. The Šafavid Shāhs possessed many other factories throughout their realm. According to della Valle, the Shāh built factories in Isfahān and also
in the provincial cities, which not only made all kinds of textiles and carpets needed by the court, but also produced a surplus from the sale of which the Shāh obtained a very good profit. Another point which della Valle notes is that sometimes the management of royal factories in provincial cities was entrusted to men of standing in the government.\(^50\) Paul Simon, who visited Kāshān in 1608, describes it as a rich city in which all sorts of cloths and carpets were made on looms owned by the Shāh.\(^51\) The royal workshops in Mashhad and Qum were administered by the custodian of the holy shrines in those cities, namely the 'ālī-jāh mutawallī-yi Āstān-i Rażāvī and the mutawallī-yi Āstānā-yi Qum.\(^52\) A plea addressed in 1013/1604 by Mīrzā Muhammad Ḥasan, the vażīr of Yazd, to Shāh 'Abbās I for compassion towards the silk weavers of Yazd, shows that most of the looms in that city belonged to the buyūtāt-i saltanatī.\(^53\) A large proportion of the carpets in use at the royal court were made in villages. The rural carpet weavers worked for the Shāh with raw materials which were usually provided by the court; they did not receive wages, but were given tenure of crown lands for which they paid the rent in kind with their carpets.\(^54\) Steel and Crowther, two factors of the East India Company who sojourned in Iṣfahān in 1615-1616, mention that the main occupations of the villages and towns on the desert road between Bīrjand and Yazd were carpet making and production of raw silk.\(^55\) Although the road which Shāh 'Abbās I constructed through this arid district on the edge of the salt desert was useful, the inhabitants can scarcely have profited from their labour.
if all that they got in return was rent-free tenure of such unproductive land.

Establishments similar to the royal workshops were maintained by the provincial governors. Malik Shāh Ḥusayn, writing in Shāh 'Abbās I's time, states that the governor of Sīstān set up various workshops such as an arsenal, a tailoring department, and a goldsmiths' workshop, and appointed Amīr Haydar to be the chief of the tailoring department (qaychāji-khāna). Nasrābādī mentions that a tailor named Yaghmā, who was unequalled in his craft, worked in the tailoring department of Imām-Qulī Khān, the governor of Fārs, and that Nawrūz 'Alī Bēg Shāmlū, a skilful goldsmith, was appointed the bashī of the goldsmiths' workshop by 'Abbās-Qulī Khān, the governor of Harāt. Mar'ashī, writing in the reign of Shāh Sultān Ḥusayn, mentions that Gurgīn Khān, the governor of Harāt, had several workshops of his own.

The highly skilled artisans of the royal workshops had good reason to be pleased with their privileges, but probably were also worried about the risk of dismissal.

In regard to the general economic and industrial development of Iran, the removal of a large proportion of the skilled artisans from the relatively free market of the bazaar to the privileged confines of the royal workshops probably had long-term harmful effects; it certainly restricted the opportunities of the ordinary craft guilds.
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6.2. The non-Muslim Artisans

The occupations of the non-Muslim minorities in the Islamic countries were to a large extent determined by religious ordinances. The Qur'an and the shari'at (Islamic law) prohibit consumption of alcoholic drinks and certain foods by Muslims, regulate dress, and forbid or condemn certain practices such as lending money for interest, production of gold and silver eating and drinking vessels, and wearing of silk garments by men. When the sale or purchase of a commodity or service was subject to a religious restriction, such business, if conducted at all, was normally left to individuals from the various non-Muslim commodities. It was in the professions which the Muslims were reluctant to enter that the minorities prospered. Their opportunities in these fields were only limited by the religious requirement that they should remain politically and socially inferior to the Muslims.

Under Shāh 'Abbās I, the position of the religious minorities in Iran was improved both in the field of commercial opportunity and as regards political and social status. Although the Jews and Christians normally resided in specific quarters, they did not carry on their occupations in professional ghettos. Their shops were scattered in the main markets, and their ambulatory vendors did business in all parts of the towns. The indigenous and foreign minorities played important parts in the commercial economy of Iran in the later Šafavīd period. Contemporary sources give information about trades and professions pursued by members of non-Muslim socio-religious groups
and foreign nationalities, mainly Armenians, Jews, Georgians, Italians, Indian "Banyans", Greeks, English, Dutch, French, and Chinese. Although the identification of non-Muslim groups with specific activities is not always precise, the evidence shows that besides the professions which were strictly confined to the non-Muslims there were certain branches of other professions which were typically associated with particular minorities. For instance, furriery was not confined to the Armenians but to a large extent was in their hands. Armenian furriers were specially expert in making the best fur coats. From the available sources it can be reckoned that more than fifty professions were pursued by the various minorities. This high figure confirms the existence of a large measure of occupational freedom in Safavid Iran. The relevant contemporary sources indicate that the percentages of the Christian and Jewish craftsmen and traders in the total populations of the principal cities were large enough to be significant.

The Iranian guilds in the Safavid period were in principle not interconfessional. At that time non-Muslim craftsmen did not formally participate in such professional bodies. They paid their taxes separately from the Muslim craftsmen.

Among the non-Muslim city-dwellers the most numerous were the Jews and the Armenians; others were of less importance. The Jews during the whole of the Safavid period, particularly in and after Shāh 'Abbās I's reign, were active in both crafts and trades. Contemporary documents mention about twenty occupations in which Jews were
engaged. Large numbers of them were silk weavers, dyers, goldsmiths, jewellers, druggists, wine makers and wine sellers, brokers, second hand dealers, ambulatory vendors, musicians, dancers, and singers. A definite preponderance of Jews was observed in midwifery and in certain highly remunerated female occupations, e.g. brokeresses (dallālahā) who carried messages and negotiated between Muslim harīm ladies, suppliers of recipes for love potions and magic concoctions, and story-tellers. In the light of estimates of the Jewish population of Iran in the Şafavid period, the significance of the Jewish economic activities becomes apparent. Pedro Teixeira, who was in Iran in and after the year 1587, estimated the total number of the Iranian Jews at 8,000 to 10,000 families, and later Chardin reckoned that there were about 30,000 to 35,000 Jews throughout Iran. There is no record of any special professional or commercial tax levied on Jews, apart from the poll tax (jizya) to which all Jewish citizens were liable. It is clear, however, that in each town all taxes due by Jews were gathered and paid through the Jewish community as a collective body and sole agency. At the head of the community in Isfahān stood a layman called the nasi, who cooperated with the religious chief called the rabbī-mullā or dayyān (i.e. religious judge). The nasi was responsible for payment of the taxes to the local authorities. If he could not deliver the due taxes within the time limit, he might be dismissed by the government. Usually the collection of the taxes of the Jews was farmed out to a high ranking government official,
who promised to pay the treasury a certain sum; at one time during the reign of Shāh 'Abbās I, it was assigned to a Jewish renegade who succeeded in squeezing fifty percent more tax out of the Jewish community than in the previous year.\textsuperscript{12} Within the community at Isfahān a committee headed by the nasi and the dayyān not only assessed and gathered the tax due by the individuals, but apparently also settled all internal disputes between the Jewish artisans and traders.\textsuperscript{13}

Certain crafts and trades were particularly popular within the Jewish community, and in some of them the Jews obtained an important and considerable role.\textsuperscript{14} The silk industry in the 17th century was an example. According to Tavernier, a great part of the population of Lār consisted of Jews engaged in silk manufacture; in particular they produced fine shawls.\textsuperscript{15} Trading in both raw silk and finished silk products was another lucrative occupation of many Jews. The Jewish activity in the silk business lasted into the Qājār period. Tahvildār wrote that in Isfahān there was a group of Jews who selected raw silk and distributed it to the guilds of the brocade weavers (sha'īr-bāfān), weavers of mishkī (black silk cloth), lace-makers (‘allāqa-bandān), and others.\textsuperscript{16} The preparation of drugs and processing of medicinal herbs was to a large extent a Jewish speciality.\textsuperscript{17} Fryer mentions that he found some Jewish druggists in the main bazaar of Isfahān who retailed all sorts of drugs and spices.\textsuperscript{18} The distribution of these commodities in local commerce was largely performed by Jews; at Isfahān they carried on this business at the Jārchī
caravansarai in the royal bazaar. Other Jewish specialists were cutting precious stones, engraving on metal, and carving wooden stamps and seals. Wine making, a forbidden business for the Muslims, was almost exclusively carried on by the Jews. Tavernier asserts that the Jews of Shīrāz alone annually produced more than 100,000 to 110,000 maunds (man) of wine. Finally, in Iran as in other countries at that time, brokerage, money lending at interest, and dealing in second hand articles (simsārī) were Jewish pursuits. Abbé Carré, who was at Bandar Kung in 1672-1674, mentions that the brokers in that part were all Jews, and were very cunning in their business. (Bandar Kung, now overshadowed by nearby Bandar Linga, was a pearling centre and the site of the "factory" which 'Abbās I allowed the Portuguese to establish after their loss of Hurmuz in 1622).

The Armenian traders and craftsmen played a very important part in the economic life and internal and external trade of Iran in the Šafavid period. They had had a long experience of commercial activities in the towns of the Caucasian provinces. A considerable number (5000 families) were transplanted by 'Abbās I in 1604 from their home town Julfā in Āzarbāijān and settled at New Julfā, a suburb in the southern outskirts of Išfahān, and at villages in the province of Išfahān. The Armenians were most prominent as merchants, but many of them worked in highly qualified crafts. Tavernier states that the Armenian artisans brought some hitherto unknown industries to Iran; in particular Jacob John (Jan), an Armenian craftsman from New
Julfā who had learnt printing during a stay of a few years in Europe, set up a printing press at Isfahān after his return. Carpentry and furriery were crafts in which the Armenian craftsmen excelled. A skilled Armenian carpenter was appointed the chief (bāshī) of the carpenters' guild by Shāh 'Abbās I, but was not finally able to keep the post. The Armenian furriers produced the best fur caps and cloaks. Armenians also worked in other crafts such as the sewing of leather buckets, pharmacy, and wine-making. Abraham Gurginiyan, a modern Armenian researcher, and A. Haniyaniyan, a learned Armenian scholar who died in 1960, have through a patient study of the grave-stones of the Armenian cemeteries in Julfa and Firīdan (a small district west of Isfahān), been able to enumerate about 43 crafts and professions which were pursued by the Armenians of Isfahān from Shāh 'Abbās I's reign onwards, as follows:

1. goldsmith 
2. tailor 
3. founder 
4. plaster-carver 
5. brick-maker 
6. watch-maker 
7. merchant 
8. woollen weaver 
9. cotton weaver 
10. cotton carder 
11. packsaddle maker 
12. carpet maker 
13. gardener 
14. boot maker

zargar
khayyāt
rikhta-gar
gach-bur
kūra-paz
sā'at-saz
bāzargān
pārcha-bāf
jūlā
ḥallāj
pālān-dūz
gālī-bāf
bāgh-bān
chakma-dūz
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>mud wall constructor</td>
<td>chīna-kash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>horse trainer</td>
<td>tarbīat-kunanda-yī asb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>printer</td>
<td>basmachi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>tanner</td>
<td>dabbāgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>musical instrument player</td>
<td>navāzanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>sable furrier</td>
<td>samūr-dūz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>butcher</td>
<td>qaṣṣāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>camel driver</td>
<td>sārbān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>mirror maker</td>
<td>āy'īna-sāz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>enamel maker</td>
<td>mīnā-kār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>sieve maker</td>
<td>gharbāl-sāz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>candle maker</td>
<td>sham'-sāz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>barber</td>
<td>salmānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>baker</td>
<td>khabbāz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>carpenter</td>
<td>nājjar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>shoemaker</td>
<td>kaffāsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>house painter</td>
<td>naqqāsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>stone carver</td>
<td>sang-tarāsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>glass maker</td>
<td>shīsha-gar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>blacksmith</td>
<td>āhangar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>arms maker</td>
<td>asliḥa-sāz and shamshīr-gar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>coppersmith</td>
<td>misgar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>builder</td>
<td>banna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>hat maker</td>
<td>kulāh-dūz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>medical practitioner</td>
<td>pizishk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>surgeon</td>
<td>jarrāḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>ship's captain</td>
<td>nākhudā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>headman of the Armenian</td>
<td>kadkhudā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>villages in New Julfā and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Firidan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>historian</td>
<td>mu'arrikh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The settlement of commercial disputes and other affairs of the Armenian artisans and tradesmen was recognized as an internal task of the community and was therefore entrusted to its representatives. At Isfahān, the kalāntar of New Julfā was made responsible for this task. He assessed and collected the taxes of the individual artisans and tradesmen with proper regard to their incomes. Thévenot states that in return for the payment of a collective tax of 500 tumāns, which went straight to the Shāh's treasury, the Armenians had the right to elect their kalāntar. Muhammad Yusuf Vālih states that the tax of the Armenian furriers was delivered to the head of the royal lands department (sarkār-i khaṣṣa). This was probably one of the customary dues (rusūm) to which, as a decree of Shāh Sulaymān shows, the Armenian craftsmen were liable.

There were two communities of Hindu Indians in Ṣafavid Iran, namely the Bānyāns and the Multānis (Hindus from Multān in the Southern Panjāb and from Sind). They were numerous in the southern Iranian ports and other commercial cities. The former were lenders of money at high rates of interest, the latter were traders in cloths and spices. None of the Hindus were artisans. Their role is described in chapter 8 and will not be discussed here.

A small, but significant number of European and Asian artisans worked in Iran in the Ṣafavid period, mainly at the capital Isfahān. European goldsmiths, silversmiths, watch-repairers, gunsmiths, and artisans were welcomed by successive Shāhs. A letter in the London East India
Company's archives records that Shāh Ṣafī requested the Company to send out artisans, particularly clock makers and limners (artists), for the royal court, and that the English king, Charles I, recommended that they should be sent. The East India Company sent a goldsmith named Clement Evans and a very competent and skilful limner named Benjamin Webb. Chardin noted that the European artisans did not have special workshops but were counted as employees of the arsenal department (jāba-khana or asliha-khana). The European artisans enjoyed good conditions, at least until the economic decline in the later decades of the period. Kaempfer states that in the reign of Shāh 'Abbās II the French goldsmiths were pleased with their comfortable life and received a salary of thirty to forty tumāns annually, which was as much as the salary of a bashi, in addition to free meals. The European artisans dwelt in New Julfa. Manucci, during the reign of Shāh 'Abbās I, noted the presence of six French goldsmiths at Ḩeṣāb. They were highly regarded by the Shāh, and each received an annual salary of 150 patacas (dollars or Pieces of Eight), besides free meals. Shāh Ṣafī also gave them presents and even deigned to chat and drink with them. In the reign of Shāh Sulṭān Ḥusayn, however, the position of the European artisans deteriorated. The contemporary European sources show that about ten professions were pursued by European artisans in Safavid Iran. Olearius, in his report on the Holstein ambassador's mission to Shāh Ṣafī's court, mentioned that he met an English watchmaker named Festy who had made a striking
clock which was hung over the entrance of the qaysarīya. The two English adventurers, Anthony and Robert Sherley, who were received by Shāh 'Abbās I at Qazvīn in 1007/1598, brought with them a number of artillery experts and gun founders, some of whom entered the Shāh's employment. William Hedges, who was in Ḣ/tabān in 1685, noted the presence of several French jewellers and watchmakers working at Shāh Sulaymān's court, and Pietro della Valle found a Greek weaver working in a royal workshop. Tavernier enumerated the European artisans in the royal workshops as follows: two Dutch diamond-cutters, a Swiss watchmaker named Rodolphe Stadler, two French watchmakers named Varin de Lyon and Lagis, two gunsmiths (arquebusier) named Marais and Bernard, and four French goldsmiths. Stadler was later condemned for killing a Muslim burglar and put to death when he refused the offer of a pardon in return for his conversion to Islam.

Shāh 'Abbās I was a patron of the art of pottery. His collection, which still exists, was formerly kept in the shrine of Shaykh Ṣafī ud-Dīn Ardabīlī at Ardabil and is now in the Ancient Iran (伊朗-باستان) Museum at Tehran. He invited a number of Chinese potters to Iran, who not only worked in the royal workshops but also instructed Iranian craftsmen in the art of porcelain making. Sanson noted that in Shāh Sulaymān's time there were Chinese artisans in Ḣ/tabān. H. E. Wulff, the eminent German authority on Iranian arts and crafts, states that the chief of the Chinese potters was probably a person mentioned in the Iranian annals as Man-oo-har, but he does not name the annals.
One of the factors which strengthened the European and Chinese influences on the Iranian painting, ceramic, and carpet designs of the later Şafavid period must have been the presence of the foreign artisans. These are complex questions, outside the scope of this thesis.
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Chapter 7.

7.1 Public Ceremonies

7.2 Cultural and Religious Aspects

7.3 The Guilds and the Darvish Orders
7.1. Public Ceremonies

Participation in public processions and ceremonies on the occasion of national and religious festivals was an important function of the guilds in Safavid Iran. Private ceremonies also were a feature of the life of certain guilds. This subject is well documented, because the festivities on such occasions were the most striking aspect of guild activity and were therefore noted by local historians and European travellers who were eye-witnesses. Moreover, in spite of the modern changes in the character of the guilds, their participation in public ceremonies still continues at the present day.

The most prominent of the annual public ceremonies were the *Id-i nawrūz*, the Iranian spring festival\(^1\) at the vernal equinox, and the *Id-i sipand* at the beginning of the solar month of Ispand\(^2\) or Isfand, (i.e. one month before the first day of the *nawrūz* festival), when all the guilds took part in a public gathering at Isfahān in the Qaysariya and the Maydān-i Shāh. According to Iskandar Munshī, during the twelve days of the *nawrūz* festival season, the ahl-i ārifā and san'at-garan (artisans) and tujjār (traders) illuminated their shops throughout the bazaar. At the qaysarīyas and čahr-sūqs, lavish festivities were held and visitors were entertained with fruits and sherbets and sweets.\(^3\) Kotov, the Russian traveller who was in Isfahān in Shāh 'Abbās I's reign, relates that during public festivals, the traders and craftsmen of Isfahān decorated their shops with beautiful flowers and coloured lights, and that candles and tapers were lit on every night of a festive season. The shopkeepers
did no trading on such nights, but entertained the people, for whom they provided all kinds of sports and amusements. Le Brun, who was in Iran in 1703-04, gives the following description of a public festival (possibly 'Id-i nawrūz).

"Their bazaar strikes the eye in a very agreeable manner by candle-light, since all the shops in general are prettily decorated, but those more especially of the fruiterers and confectioners, which have a charming effect. There is plenty of all sorts of provisions. Likewise in the cookshops which are sent about all the town over, which is an uncommon custom and what I never saw practised in any other country. However, notwithstanding such a profusion, the shops are soon stript of all their stocks through the vast concourse of strangers who resort from all parts to Isfahān on this solemn occasion."^5

For the guilds of the capital and the other cities of Šafavid Iran, 'Id-i Nawrūz and the 'Id-i sipand were occasions when they could present themselves to the public and make closer contact with society. Āṣaf states that the royal family used to visit as many bazaars as possible in the course of 'Id-i nawrūz festivities. During the reign of Shāh Sultān Husayn, the royal family would visit the central bazaar of Isfahān on three successive days every year. These days were announced in advance, because during them no man was permitted to go out of his house. An interesting point which Āṣaf notes is that on these three days the craftsmen's wives and daughters served in their husbands' and fathers' shops and offered the goods demanded by the royal family. Āṣaf adds that the royal family comprised 500 wives and daughters of Shāh Sultān Husayn, who
were accompanied by 4500 slave girls (kanīz) and eunuchs (khawāja) and 100 black eunuchs. The royal family not only enjoyed seeing the bazaars and the Qayṣarīya and the caravansarais, but also would buy more than 100,000 tumāns worth of various luxury articles. Don Garcia de Silvay Figueroa, the Spanish ambassador at Iṣfahān in 1617-1620, mentions similar visits of the royal family to the bazaar in Shāh 'Abbās I's reign.

In addition to the annual national festivals, there were royal and official ceremonies to which the guilds contributed. These were intended to glorify the state or to make propaganda for the government, and brought no advantage to the guilds, but on the contrary imposed heavy burdens on them. On occasions such as a coronation, a royal wedding, or the arrival of a foreign guest of the Shāh, orders for the holding of celebrations were issued from the royal court and strictly enforced by officials such as the vazīr, the dārūgha, and the kalāntar. If a ceremony was to be held in a public place such as the Maydān-i Shāh, the Qayṣarīya, or one of the bridges of Iṣfahān, the expenses of the illuminations, decorations, etc. were levied on the craftsmen, artisans, and merchants. Sometimes the expenses were so heavy that the craftsmen were unable to pay them and had to complain. Pietro della Valle, the Italian traveller, mentions that in 1028/1619, when Shāh 'Abbās I returned to Iṣfahān from Māzandarān, the Maydān-i Shāh and the royal bazaar were by official command attractively decorated at the collective expense of the various guilds, and that craftsmen and shopkeepers who could not
immediately afford their contributions had to borrow the required ready cash from the royal treasury. On the arrival of Nadar Khan, the "ruler of Turkistan" in 1056/1646, the artisans and tradesmen of Isfahan illuminated and decorated the Qaysariya and the Maydan-i Shah alternately in honour of Shah 'Abbas II's guest. For the wedding ceremony of the son of Mirza Mahdi Sadr ul-Mamālik with the daughter of Khalīfa Sultan, the grand vazīr of Shah 'Abbas II, the splendid Allahvirdī Khān bridge at Isfahan (built in the reign of Shah 'Abbās I) was decorated with candles, lamps, and different coloured objects, and a large part of the expense was contributed by the merchants and craftsmen. Gemelli, who was in Isfahan at the time of Shah Sultan Husayn's coronation, vividly describes the illumination and decoration of the Qaysariya and the Maydan-i Shah and of the different bazaars and chār-suqs of Isfahan which the different guilds provided. The shopkeepers had to stay at their shops until midnight. Mar'ashi relates how the coronation of Shah Sulaymān II, a Safavid pretender, in 1163/1749 was celebrated by the craftsmen and traders of Mashhad. The different guilds of that city decorated the bazaars and squares under the supervision of their headmen (kadkhudāyān) and "grey beards", i.e. elders (rīsh-safīdān).

The above-described ceremonies were national festivals or royal and governmental occasions in which the guilds together with other social groups took part. There were also ceremonies which were conducted solely by the guilds. For instance, the annual Islamic festival of the ʻId-i qurban (feast of sacrifices) was celebrated with a special ceremony
by the guilds in Safavid times and up to the end of the 19th century, when changes in social conditions and attitudes led to its abolition. The camel slaughter ceremony on the Id-i qurban at Isfahan has been described by Chardin, Kotov and Kaempfer, by the Iranian chroniclers of the Safavid period, and in great detail by Tahvildar, who was an eyewitness of the event in the Qajar period. Tahvildar remarks that the origin of the ceremony was not definitely known, but appeared to go back to Safavid times. H. Brugsch, who was in Iran in 1858, states that the slaughtered camel was divided according to ancient custom among the guilds, the smiths receiving the legs, the tailors the head, and the other guilds all the remaining parts. Tahvildar states that the votive offerings (nuzûr) which were collected during the ceremony were allotted to the various groups in traditional proportions which corresponded with their shares of the aggregate tax liability. Floor thinks that the holding of the Id-i qurban ceremony was first promoted by the Haydarî and Ni'matî factions and only later taken over by the guilds. (See Appendix I). The sources from the Safavid period give few examples of ceremonies peculiar to single guilds. One ceremony which survived into the 19th century was the annual coppersmiths' celebration on the 13th day of the solar month of Tir (4 July). This celebration was called the jashn-i ābrīzān, jashn-i ābpašān, also jashn-i misgarān and litū-yi misgarān (litū means "watering"). Shah 'Abbās I was fond of this celebration and sometimes attended in person. It was held throughout Iran, but with the greatest
enthusiasm in the cities with the driest climates. At Kāshān, where the climate is extremely dry and the coppersmiths' guild played an important part in economic and social life, the ābrīzān celebration proceeded as follows. Early in the morning of the 13th day of Tīr, when the craftsmen opened their shops, the coppersmiths began to throw water onto each other and into the shops of their guild, and then closed their shops and formed a procession. Singing songs, and followed by a large and cheerful crowd, they walked to the dawlat-khāna (governor's house), where they gathered around the pool in the garden and again joyously sprinkled each other. The governor thanked them and gave them presents, and they then departed and passed through the city, singing special songs with words taken from guild folklore. When night fell, the crowd again left the city and walked to Fīn (a beautiful village in the suburbs), where the merrymakers stayed for three days, enjoying various pleasant and amusing games.27 According to Kotov, the celebration at Kāshān was held in the presence of Shāh 'Abbās I: "On the 15th day of that August, the Shāh had an entertainment, not a festival. All the people gathered in the Maydān opposite the Shāh's great gate (i.e. the 'Ālī Qāpū), and all had large pitchers and bowls and drinking vessels and cups, and the Shāh himself was on the balcony which is over the great gate, and with him were ambassadors and merchants, and in front of the gate they themselves blew great trumpets like bulls bellowing, and played on pipes and beat drums and kettledrums, and all the people in the Maydān danced and clapped their hands and leapt in the air. And when the Shāh himself from the balcony
poured water onto the ground and onto the people, then all the people in front of the gate and all over Maydan began to pour water onto each other and to push one another into water and to plaster each other with mud, no matter who they might be; they plastered everybody, even the Shah's relatives. And the Shah had ordered everybody to come in their best clothes, (and this went on) for about two hours, while the Shah watched the sport from the balcony." Another festive occasion was a special ceremony held by the sword-makers of Isfahān from the time of Shah 'Abbās I until the end of the 19th century in commemoration of Asad-i Shamshīr-sāz, a skilled swordsmith in Shah 'Abbās I's reign. According to Chardin, whose statement is confirmed by present-day artisans in the Isfahān bazaar to whom the story has come down orally through the generations, Shah 'Abbās I received a gift of a strong helmet from the Ottoman Sultan, who challenged anyone to break it with a sword. It was a symbol of Ottoman military strength. Shah 'Abbās I offered a reward to any man who could make a sword which would break this helmet. The swordsmith's guild was informed of the Shah's offer, and a swordsmith (shamshīr-sāz) named Asad made a sword which spilt the strong helmet. The reward given by 'Abbās I was a remission of the bunīcha of the swordsmiths' guild of Isfahān. Asad was honoured by his fellow artisans as long as he lived, and after his death and burial in the cemetery of Sīchān (a southern suburb), his death was annually commemorated by visitation of his tomb and presentation of votive offerings (nuzūr). No other instances of a ceremony of a particular guild are
recorded in the sources from the Šafavīd period. If, as seems probable, such ceremonies existed, they must have been abandoned and forgotten in later times.

The craftsmen and shopkeepers of the bazaar had specially close links with religious institutions. Their relationship with Šufī orders (ṭariqatāt) is discussed later in this chapter. The strength of religious feeling and traditionalism in the bazaar is still a noteworthy feature of present-day Iranian society. For instance, the most impressive of the mourning assemblies (majlis-i rawža-khwānī) for the commemoration of the martyrdom of the Imām Ḥusayn in the first ten days of the lunar month of Muḥarram are those which are held by bazaar artisans and shopkeepers. One such assembly is held annually in the Takya-yi Gul-bandān at Isfahān, which was built in the Šafavīd period and is situated southeast of the Maydān-i Shāh. (A takya is a large walled enclosure with many small rooms built into the surrounding walls used mainly for Muḥarram mourning ceremonies). According to a long existing tradition, the Iṣfahānī guilds collectively hold a mourning assembly in the Takya-yi Gul-bandān. Every small room in this takya is decorated by a particular guild, whose identity is shown through the use of its signs and implements in the decoration. Moreover every guild has its own cups, teapots, samovars, etc., and receives mourners from its own membership separately. According to the general belief of the older craftsmen, the collective mourning assembly in the Takya-yi Gul-bandān is a practice which dates from Šafavīd times. At Tāhrān in Qājār times, a similar collective mourning assembly of the guilds was held in the
Takya-yi Patūq. 31  'Abdūllāh Mustawfī, a modern historian, states that 'Alī Qulī-Khan Ḍāshānī, a merchant of Tehran, held an annual assembly in the month of Muharram in his house at which recitations of the martyrdom were given for the benefit of members of important guilds, and that every guild attended the assembly on a particular day. 32

Although the contemporary reports are scarce, they suffice to show that participation in festivals and ceremonies was an important feature of guild life in the 17th and 18th centuries, as it is still in some degree in Iran today.
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7.2. Cultural and Religious Aspects

There was a special branch of literature, described as guild literature, of which a considerable amount has survived. The relationships of these writings with guild life have been investigated by certain present-day scholars, particularly Ahmad Gulchin Ma'āni and Muḥammad Ja'far Mahjūb. The guild literature is influenced by Sūfī literature, and is full of Sūfī terms and concepts, such as pīr, which means both patron saint of a guild and spiritual guide of a Sūfī order. Nevertheless it is a unique branch of Persian literature. Its typical genre is the so called shahr-āshūb poem or prose piece. Shahr-āshūb, which literally means "city-disturbing", is an epithet used by Hāfīz and other poets to denote a beautiful singer or other person whose presence fascinates and disturbs a city. Gulchin Ma'āni defines the shahr-āshūb poem as a kind of poem which includes a description of the artisans and traders and their professions.

For knowledge of the technical and social affairs of crafts and trades in the Timurid and Safavid periods, the shahr-āshūb literature is a valuable source, because it mentions the tools and technical terms used in different crafts and the traditions and characteristic customs of particular guilds. It is composed in correct metrical and rhymed verse and usually in the rubā'ī (quatrain) or ghazal (sonnet) form. The following examples are two rubā'īs by Lisanī Shīrāzī:

(1)  Bazzās pisar bar ān du rukhsār chu māh
    Sar saya-yi zulfat dil u jān rāst panāh

    Tamghā-yi qumāsh-i ḥusn rūz-afzūn ast
    bar aṭlas-i ʿāriżat būvad khāl-i siyāh
O young draper with those two moon-like cheeks,
the shadow of your curls is truly the refuge of hearts
and souls!

The tamgha-stamp on the cloth of ever-growing beauty
is the beauty-spot on the satin of your cheek.

(2) Āhangar-i man dast-i man u dāman-i tu'st
khūn-i dil-i man chū jawq dar gardan-i tu'st
Āh-i man-i mubtalaā ki zanjīr-i balāst
dar gardan-i man k'az dil-i chūn āhan-i tu'st

O blacksmith, it is I who beg from you (literally "it is
my hand and your skirt")!
my anguish is like the necklace on your neck.
The sigh of my afflicted self, which is a chain of
affliction,
is on my neck because of your iron-like heart.

The best known early writers of shahr-āshūb verse are
Sayfī of Bukhārā (d.910/1504), the author of Ṣanā'ī' ul-
Badāyī', who has left 120 ghazals, each about an artisan of
a different craft;9 Līsānī of Shīrāz (d.940/1534), who lived
at Tabrīz and used the tūbālī form; and the already mentioned
Qārī of Yazd (d.993/1583), the poet of clothes, whose full
name was Niẓām ud-Dīn Maḥmūd Qārī, and whose Divān-i Albisā,
consisting mainly of ghazals, shows a thorough knowledge of
tailoring.10 In Shāh 'Abbās I's time, the principal shahr-
āshūb poets were Mīrzā Ǧasīm Bēg Tehrānī11 and Mīrzā Ǧāhīr
Vāḥīd Qazvīnī (d.1110/1699).12 The latter, who wrote a work
in the masnavī (rhymed couplet) form named Masnavī-yi āšiq
va ma'shuq as well as ghazals, mentions 98 guilds in his
writings. (See Appendix 2).

Besides the shahr-āshūb poets, there were many artisans
and tradesmen who wrote conventional poetry in the Šafavid
period. Among those whose quoted poems have been preserved
are: Mawlānā Ḥisvātī-yi Sha'īr-bāf (brocade weaver),13
Sirājā Ḥakkāk (engraver),\(^{14}\) Amīr Ṭūḥī Astarābdī-yi Qaṣṣāb\(^{15}\) (butcher), Sayyid Ya'qūb-i Khayyāt\(^{16}\) (tailor), Nīrā Shūkrī-yi Ṣaḥḥār\(^{17}\) (bookbinder), Khawāja Khalīl-i Zargar\(^{18}\) (goldsmith), Darvīsh Dihākī-yi Julā\(^{19}\) (weaver), Mānī Nashhādī-yi Kāsagar\(^{20}\) (potter), Gulshanī Tabrīzī-yi Pustīn-duz\(^{21}\) (furrier), Bazmī-yi Kafsh-duz\(^{22}\) (shoemaker), Mawlānā Dāmī-yi Āhangar\(^{23}\) (blacksmith), Fayżī-yi 'Aṣṣār\(^{24}\) (oil crusher), Tazrīqī-yi Kolāh-duz\(^{25}\) (hatter), Hijrī-yi Shamshīr-gar\(^{26}\) (swordsmith), Shawqī-yi Tīr-gar\(^{27}\) (arrowsmith), Zayn ul-ʿAbidīn-i Murakkabfurūsh\(^{28}\) (ink seller), and others.

The shahr-āshūb poetry and other literary sources give information about another feature of guild life which has persisted until the present time, namely, the use of a special language or jargon which each guild created for itself. These jargons were and still are used when customers are in the shop. Each guild differed from the other in the vocabulary, grammar, and sound, pitch and stress of its special language. The most noteworthy guild jargons were zargarī (goldsmiths'), misgarī (coppersmiths') and gūshī (butchers'). Līsānī Shīrāzī alludes to the goldsmiths' jargon (zabān zargarī) in the following rubāʿī:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Zargar ki samand-i dilbari mi-rānād,} \\
\text{aḥ bas ki ṭariq-i dilbari mi-dānād,} \\
\text{mi-rānādam az kirishma rūzī ṣad bār} \\
\text{bāzam bi zabān-i zargarī mi-khānād.}
\end{align*}
\]

The goldsmith who rides the bay horse of charm, who knows the path of charm so well, drives me away with his glances a hundred times every day, (and) calls me back in the language of the goldsmith's trade.

The main features of the goldsmiths' jargon are as follows:
a) It is based on correct Persian grammar and vocabulary.
b) A z followed by an intrusive vowel is inserted after every vowel sound of the correct language. Thus the word pîrâhan (shirt) becomes pîzîrâzâhazan. c) The vowel following the z is determined by the vowel which precedes it. Thus saq (dog) becomes sazag. d) Two-consonant clusters are left unchanged, no z being inserted between or after the consonant. Thus chashm (eye) became chazashm.

For the keeping of accounts, the notation called siyâq, i.e. symbols derived from Arabic letter-combinations and having numerical values, was commonly used in the bazaars of Safavid Iran and is still quite widely used in the bazaars today. In the Safavid period, siyâq was also used in the government offices concerned with revenue and expenditure and in the royal establishments. Special tax collectors called bunîcha-dârân registered the guild tax (bunîcha) liabilities and payments of every guild in siyâq notation. Every guild member kept books in siyâq in which he entered his cash and credit transactions, as many shopkeepers still do today. Mirzâ Abû Turâb Mustawfî, Mirzâ Sulaymân, and Abû’l-Ḥasan, who were considered to be outstanding specialists in siyâq, were all in the service of the royal guilds.

According to the modern historian 'Abdullâh Mustawfî, the accountants who kept the books of the Arab governors in the time of the Umayyad Caliphate (41/661-132/749) were Iranians, and the Arab governors, being unable to understand the old Persian system of numerical notation, compelled them to devise a system in Arabic. Gradually the old Persian
system fell into disuse, and the system based on modified forms of Arabic letter-combinations which the Iranian accountants had devised came into general use. It is remarkable that the Indian numbers, which were introduced by Muḥammad ibn Mūsā al-Khwārazmī (169/780-125/850) and which provided a much better system, were not used in book-keeping until modern times, though they were used in mathematics, astronomy, etc. In book-keeping, sīyāq figures are taken to mean dīnārs, of which ten thousand equal a tūmān. Sīyāq is read from right to left. A table of sīyāq with English equivalents appears on the following page.

Another aspect of the traditional life of the Iranian guilds is their use of symbols. The existence of this practice in the 17th and 18th centuries is attested by the graves of craftsmen of that period in the old cemeteries of Iṣfahān. For instance, the tombstone of Asad-i Shamshīr-sāz (swordsmith), who died in Shah 'Abbās I's reign, is engraved with a sword. A coffee house owner's tombstone bears a carving of a coffee pot, cups and saucers, a wrestler's a carving of wooden weights (mīl), etc.

Another practice of shopkeepers in the bazaars was the illumination (chirāghānī) of their shops with lighted candles and lamps. Illumination was customary as an expression of joy on festive occasions, but it also served the purpose of advertisement. Floor states that in the Qājār period, whenever meat became cheap, the butchers would announce this cheapness by burning tallow in the fronts of their shops. Although there is no documentary evidence of this practice in the Šāfāvid period, it probably goes back to that time or
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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even earlier. The traditions of the Iranian guilds were transmitted from generation to generation, and have in many cases endured until the present day. Evliya Efendi relates that all the cookshops of Tabriz were adorned with china plates bearing inscribed phrases such as "there is no nobility above Islam", "the nobility of a place depends upon who occupies it", "the nobility of a house depends upon its inhabitants". This old custom is still observed in the cookshops of the main bazaar of Tehran.

The common patron saints whom particular guilds venerated everywhere, and the local patron whom they also venerated, were figures from the Qur'an and the early days of Islam, or from the folk-memories of the particular city or guild. According to the traditions of the guilds, a chain (silsila) of blessings (barakat) from God passed through Jibril, Adam, Nuh, Ibrahim, and Muhammad to 'Ali and Salman Farsi, the two great patron saints of all guilds, and from Salman Farsi to each guild's particular pir ("elder", i.e. guardian and guide, a term also used by the Sufi orders). According to Khajeh Khurasani, every guild had its own special pir, while 'Ali was the common patron and Salman Farsi was venerated by all. The barbers' guild regarded Salman Farsi as their private patron, because he had shaved Muhammad's head after the conquest of Mecca. A legendary friend of 'Ali described as Javanmard-i Qassab (the valiant young butcher) was the patron of the guild of the butchers, who hung up (and still hang up) an imaginary portrait of him in their shops. In this connection, the question arises to what extent the guilds in the Safavid period had local saints
also. There is no documentary evidence from the period which answers this question. Ja'farī, writing in the 9th/15th century, mentions that Shaykh Ḍḥmad and his brother Shaykh Muḥammad, whose profession had been the starching of cloth (šu-mālî), were the local saints of the starchers' guild of Yazd, where their tombs were a revered shrine at which the šu-mālîwan made votive offerings (nuzūr). Similarly Asad-i Shamshīr-saz, whose tomb was in the takya (which in this context means cemetery) of the swords smiths at Isfahān, was the local saint of the swordsmiths' guild. Finally, the family relationship and intermarriage traditions among the members of each guild in a town were very important. Traditionally all the members of a single guild resided in a separate alley of quarter. It has been mentioned in Chapter 5 that an apprentice usually married the daughter or niece of his master. Rūmlū mentions several such quarters at Tabriz, e.g. those of the paper-makers (kāghaz-kunān), hatters (kulāh-dūzān), and potters (kūzagarān).
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7.3. The Guilds and Darvīsh Orders

Many of the politico-religious movements which have appeared in the history of Iran drew their memberships from the urban working people. Their aims were expressed in religious terms, but their motives were basically or at least partly social. Although the diversity of these movements and the obscurity of the writings about them makes study of the subject difficult, the available evidence shows that they had certain common features and in many cases some kind of connection with guilds or other urban organizations. They strove to disseminate their beliefs and ideas among the city dwellers, especially among the artisans and tradesmen,\(^1\) and at the same time tried to voice the aspirations of these classes. Scholars have noted the importance of Šūfī (mystic religious) elements in the ideology of the guilds in the Islamic countries. Beliefs, and also practices such as ritual initiation, similar to those of Šūfī orders permeated the ceremonies and celebrations which were a permanent fixture of guild life.\(^2\) For instance, the sīrvağ (ceremonial trousers), after being an outward symbol of the early futūvat movement, passed into the usage of the guilds; until quite recently the ceremony of initiation into a guild took the form of putting on certain garments, the sīrvağ, the shadd (girdle), and the pīsh-dāman (apron).\(^3\)

It has been mentioned in Chapter 1 that during the centuries before the Mongol invasion, various branches of the Ismā'ilī Shī'ite movement\(^4\) took the lead in revolutionary propaganda and won converts in Fārs and among artisans in the cities of Ray, Nīshāpūr, and Nīrv.\(^5\) Although Massignon's
hypothesis that it was the Qarmatî movement which created the Islamic guilds and gave them the distinctive character which they retained until modern times is not supported by adequate documentary evidence, nevertheless it seems likely that the Qarmâtis, the later Ismâ'îlis, and the various Šûfî tariqâtâ, who all venerated the Imâm 'Alî, had connections with the urban craftsmen at different times. A reference has also been made in Chapter 1 to the role of 'ayyârân (urban militia). The word, which means "rascals", was a disparaging name given to them by their opponents. The first movements of 'ayyârân were organized to resist exploitation and misgovernment by the 'Abbâsâids and other rulers. They had links with early Šûfî preachers, and also showed a Shi'ite inclination in their choice of the Imam 'Alî as their model of probity (futûvat or javân-mardî). Although the first 'ayyârân came from the lower classes, afterwards higher ranking people also joined. The role of Ya'qûb-i Layâ the coppersmith (or rather brazier), who began his career as an 'ayyâr leader in Sistân, and the resistance of the artisan 'ayyârân of Harât against the Mongols, have been mentioned in Chapter 1.

Gradually the artisans and their guilds took over the concept of futûvat, probably from the 'ayyârân, and the veneration of 'Alî, probably from the Qarmâtis and other Shi'ites. They also formed links with the increasingly well organized Šûfî tariqâtâ (darvîsh orders). The 'Abbâsid Caliph Nâşir (515/1180-623/1226), who wished to reconcile the Sunnites and Shi'ites in support of the caliphate, chose futûvat as the motto of a pro-caliphate movement which he sponsored. The guilds were probably drawn into this
movement. In Turkey, where the Mongols caused widespread anarchy, a movement of craftsmen and tradesmen called akhi (brethren), with some similarities to the earlier 'ayyârân of Iran and Iraq, sometimes played an important role. The rule-books of the Turkish guilds were called futûvat-nâma.

In the post-Mongol period, the 'ayyârân finally disappeared from the scene and the darvish orders (tarîqâts) gained widespread influence. They showed a special eagerness to recruit members among the urban artisans and craftsmen. The bazaar was always a centre of political as well as economic life in every city, and the leaders of orders which won followings in it often acquired strong political positions. From the contents of Sûfî literary works such as the Tażkîrat ul-Awlîyâ of Farîd ud-Dîn 'Aţţâr (d.617/1220), it may be inferred that the Sûfî orders enjoyed wide support among the artisans and shopkeeping classes. Moreover the artisans and shopkeepers provided useful financial help for the tarîqâts which they joined. Both the guilds and the tarîqâts gained from this mutual support.

The similarity of the ceremonies and the ranks and titles used by the Iranian guilds to those of the futûvat brotherhoods also points to the existence of close links between them. Authors of the 7th/13th, 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries, when they mention ahl-i futûvat, appear to mean groups of seekers of this ideal who were organized in either tarîqâts or guilds or both. A work by the well-known author of the Timûrid period, Ọlusayn Vâ'îz Kâshîfî (d.910/1504-5), entitled Futûvat-nâma-yi Sulţânî, shows that at Harât in his time the artisans and craftsmen cherished the ideal of futûvat.
that many of them were what he calls ahl-i futūvat (i.e. adherents of the futūvat movement). He classifies the artisans and craftsmen in two groups: a) ahl-i ma'raka (performers, apparently meaning providers of services), and b) ahl-i qabža (hand-tool users). The ahl-i ma'raka comprised the following professions: maddāhan (eulogists, perhaps meaning popular eulogists of the Prophet Muhammad and the Imam 'Alī rather than court poets), saqqāyān (water-carriers), khavāś-gūyān (perhaps meaning orators and poets employed by the court and the aristocracy), bisāṭ-andāzān (itinerant showmen), kushtī-gīrān (wrestlers), ḡammālān (porters), rasan-bāzān (rope-acrobats), ṭās-bāzān (providers of a gambling game played with sheep's knuckle bones, today called qāp-bāzī), huqqa-bāzān (jugglers), nāvakishān (hodmen), etc. The ahl-i qabža comprised sipāhiyān or ahl-i qabža-yi shamshīr (cavalry men, or soldiers generally), ahl-i qabža-yi māla (trowel users, i.e. plasterers), ahl-i qabža-yi khāysak (hammer users, i.e. blacksmiths, coppersmiths, braziers, goldsmiths, and silversmiths), ahl-i qabža-yi kamān (carding bow users and felt-makers), ahl-i qabža-yi kūda (awl users, i.e. shoemakers, shoe repairers, pack saddle makers), ahl-i qabža-yi uţū va ṭaqīya (ironers, tailors, and hatters), ahl-i qabža-yi kafcha (ladle users, i.e. confectioners and ḥalva makers), ahl-i qabža-yi kulang va dās (pick wielders and sickle users, i.e. diggers, qanāt tunnelers (muqannūs) and agricultural labourers), ahl-i qabža-yi kārd va sătūr (knife wielders, i.e. slaughterers, butchers, and cooks), and ahl-i qabža-yi sīkh (skewer users, probably meaning kabāb-grillers). Although Kasfī does not use the word šīn
(guild), it seems likely that he based his classifications on the existing guilds.

The craftsmen and artisans had a significant role in the Sarbidārān movement. The Sarbidārān, who rebelled against injustice of the local rulers and set up an independent state at Sabzavār in Western Khūrāsān which lasted from 738/1337 to 781/1379, are important because they were a militant Šūfī order with definitely Shī'ite beliefs, inspired by the preaching of Shaykh Ḥasan Jūrī (d.739/1338), and supported both by the townsfolk, particularly the artisans, and by the villagers. They acquired the name because they said that they would rather have their heads on the gallows (sar bi-dār) than endure further oppression.

Although the Safavid order's historical importance lay in its indoctrination and military organization of nomadic Turkish tribes, the biography of Shaykh Šafi (d.735/1334) entitled Šafvat us-Safā, written by Ibn Bazzāz in the middle of 8th/14th century and rewritten by Abu'l-Fath Ḥusaynī in the reign of Shāh Tahmāsb I, indicates that the founder also won a following among urban craftsmen and shopkeepers. Under Shah Ismā'īl I and Shāh Tahmāsb I, however, membership of Šafavī ṭariqat appears to have been limited to the Qūzilbāš tribal troops, and not to have been extended to other classes such as artisans. These troops did not always respect the Shāh's claim to their obedience as the head (pir or murshid) of the order, and often split into factions supporting rival claimants to the throne. Shāh 'Abbās I therefore abolished the Šafavī ṭariqat and deflected other Šūfī orders away from their proper spiritual functions.
Hostile pressure from formalistic (qishri) 'ulama and interference by the government greatly restricted all true spiritual activity by Iranian tariqats in the period.\textsuperscript{23} W. Ivanow, who has studied the poems of Khākī Khūrāsānī (probably written in Shāh 'Abbas II's reign), has noted that one of Khākī's verses clearly indicates and regrets a weakening of the traditional connection of the guilds with Ṣūfī orders at that time:

\begin{equation}
\text{Hadīs az šāhir u 'unvan-i bātin}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{nā-shud bī-pīr u bī-ustād-i aṣnāf}
\end{equation}

"Discussion of outward observance and declaration of inward belief became impossible without pīrs (i.e. of tarīqats) and master craftsmen of guilds."\textsuperscript{24}

By the time of Shāh Sulṭān Ḩusayn, the majority of the Twelver Shī'ite 'ulama were hostile to Ṣūfīsm in any form, and the government, under the influence of the mulla-bāshi, Muḥammad Baqir Majlisī, began to persecute Ṣūfī-minded Shī'ites as well as non-Shī'ite social-religious groups.\textsuperscript{25} The collapse of the tarīqats deprived the craftsmen and artisans, and other classes also, of the moral and cultural stimulus which they had formerly drawn from these independent spiritual centres. According to the interpretation of 'Abdul-Ḥusayn Zarīnkūb, a present-day scholar, Shāh 'Abbas destroyed the real strongholds of futūvat (langar-hā-yi fītyān), and replaced them with socio-religious associations or factions of a deformed kind which the Safavid state thereafter encouraged and supported with material benefits.\textsuperscript{26} The most prominent of these factions were the Ni' matīs, Ḥaydarīs,\textsuperscript{27} Lūṭīs,\textsuperscript{28} and Mashhadīs. Engelbert Kaempfer, who was in Isfahān in Shāh Sulaymān's reign, noted that the Ḥaydarīs enjoyed that Shāh's
support. The only ṭariqats then existing were the Ni'matī and Ḥaydarī, who had been active in the bazaar of Iṣfahān and other Iranian cities throughout the Šafavīd period. They were allowed to exist by the Šafavīd state, but had lost their spiritual vitality and acquired the character of factions. The government's motive for tolerating or supporting them appears to have been a desire to exploit their rivalry in order to deprive the bazaars of political unity and strength. 29

J. T. P. de Bruijn, in his article on Iran (Religion) in the second edition of the Encyclopædia of Islam, notes that the qalandaran or wandering darvīshes, who never were well organized, regarded Jamāl ud-Dīn Sāvī (d.630/1223) as their first founder, but in Iran generally gave allegiance to the successors of Quṭb ud-Dīn Ḥaydar (d.690/1291), who was buried at Zāva (subsequently known as Turbat-i Ḥaydarī). Under the Šafavīd, they became Shi'ite, and won considerable followings in the bazaars under the name Ḥaydarīya. The Ni'matullāhīya order was founded by the Šūrī poet Shāh Ni'matullāh Valī (d.834/1431), who is buried in the khāngāh which he founded at Māhan 30 in the province of Kirmān.

In the Šafavīd period, the Ḥaydarī and Ni'matī factions were a wholly urban phenomenon. 31 According to Chardin, the members of each faction had special ties with particular wards of a city and gave their loyalties first to their faction, then to their ward. 32 Jabirī Anṣārī, in his history of Iṣfahān and Ray written in the Qājār period, mentions the Ḥaydarī-Ni'matī strife and adds that such enmity between fellow citizens had antecedents in pre-Šafavīd times; in the
Saljuqid period, there had been hostility between the Sunnite and Isma'ili sects and between followers of the Shafi'i and Maliki schools (magâhib) of Sunnism. After the conquest of Iran by Shâh Isma'il I and establishment of Twelver Shi'ism as the official religion of the Iranians, the old enmities were replaced by a new hostility between the Ni'matî and Ḥaydarî factions. The two factions recruited a large proportion of their members from among the artisans and craftsmen. Fasa'i, writing late in the reign of Naṣir ud-Dîn Shâh Qâjâr, mentions that the Ḥaydarî and Ni'matî factions had strong followings amongst the craftsmen of Shirâz.

At Isfahân under Shâh Sulaymân and Shâh Sulṭân Ḥusayn, seventeen of the wards were occupied by Ni'matîs (Ni'matî-khâna) and the rest by Ḥaydarîs (Ḥaydarî-khâna). Tabrîz had nine wards, some Ḥaydarî and some Ni'matî. Each ward was headed by a kadkhudâ or bâbâ who belonged to the locally dominant faction and was called the kadkhudâ-bâshî or bâbâ of the Ḥaydarî-khâna or of the Ni'matî-khâna.

Kaempfer, after noting that the inhabitants of the cities of Iran were divided into Ḥaydarî and Ni'matî factions who dwelt in separate wards, commented that the most striking point about their rivalry was that hostilities between them broke out during religious ceremonies. For instance, at the 'īd-i Qurban ceremony and in the annual commemorative mourning for the martyrdom of the Imam Ḥusayn on the ninth and tenth days of the month of Muḥarram, violent clashes between the two factions used to occur. Kaempfer gives some vivid pictures of the Ḥaydarîs and Ni'matîs in the years 1683-1685, when he was in Iran. The Ḥaydarî darvîshes wore turbans and
covered their backs with a lamb skin, and also carried a stick and a trumpet (būq). The dress of the Ni'matīs was not so remarkable. Between the two factions, games and matches were often held, and sometimes passed off peacefully, but sometimes led to bloody clashes like those which took place after their participation in religious ceremonies. The dārūgha, with the armed forces at his disposal, was the only authority who could quell such violent disturbances.⁴⁹
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Relations between the Merchants and the Guilds
and Impediments to Economic Growth in Şafavid Iran

In Şafavid Iranian society, merchants held a relatively privileged position. On account of the importance of their contribution to the state's revenue, they generally enjoyed better governmental protection than other socio-economic groups, and they were not hampered in their activities by guild regulations and restrictions. On the other hand, they were subject not only to the tamghā (internal customs) and other heavy taxes (see Chapter 3, Malik ut-tujjār), but also to frequent casual imposts, e.g. on the occasion of royal weddings and receptions of guests (see Chapter 4, Fiscal and financial and tax aspects of the guilds); and above all they were weakened by the spread of state monopolies. The Şafavid state sought to manipulate Iranian trade with a view to its own immediate financial and political advantage, and therefore pursued policies such as the use of governmental trading agents, the grant of privileges to individuals, and the encouragement of foreign enterprises.¹ These short-sighted policies led to a concentration of external trade in the hands of Armenian merchants, Indian moneychangers, and the Dutch and English East India Companies, and made it difficult or impossible for the Iranian merchants who carried on the internal trade to benefit fully from the security and the facilities such as roads and caravansarais which the Şafavid Shāhs provided.² Moreover it is probably true to say that the popular notion of the Şafavid period, particularly 'Abbās I's reign, being a period of economic and commercial prosperity is incorrect or exaggerated, and that the volume of the external and
internal trade of Iran was less than that of many other countries at the time (i.e. India or Ottoman Turkey). The French traveller Thévenot was probably correct when he wrote that scarcity of money was the cause of slight trade in Iran, and that the only considerable sources of money-making were silk and carpets. Thus it is not surprising that the Iranian merchants failed to evolve into an enterprising and influential capitalist class or "bourgeoisie", and that social relations in 17th and 18th century Iran remained very largely feudal.

The important and complex subjects of Safavid Iran's external trade, and of the role of the East India Companies and the Armenians and Indians in it, lie beyond the scope of this study; but an attempt must be made here to examine the effects of the changing situations of Iranian and other merchants on the fortunes of the craftsmen's and shopkeepers' guilds in the bazaars.

The term "merchant" is used by contemporary and later European writers to denote many different categories of traders. In the Persian language of the Safavid and early Qajar period, the word tājir (plural tujjar) meant a wealthy wholesale trader engaged in interprovincial and/or international transactions. The word sawdāgar, though sometimes used as a synonym for tājir, generally meant a trader of similar type but less wealthy. The word bunakdār meant a local wholesaler and no more. In this chapter, "merchant" is used solely as the equivalent of tājir or sawdāgar, and "wholesaler" as the equivalent of bunakdār.

Although there is evidence that foreign trade had grown in importance before the reign of Shāh 'Abbās I and the
establishment of the capital at Isfahān in 1006/1597, and although European merchants had already begun to appear on the scene, Iranian merchants still handled the great bulk of the business in the early Ṣafavid period. Arthur Edwards, the English agent of the Muscovy Company who was in Iran in 1568-69, states that Iranian merchants carried on an extensive foreign trade; they travelled to Venice, bartered their goods, and brought back all kinds of European goods.² Aleppo was another centre which Iranian merchants frequented. Since the early part of the 16th century, Iranian merchants had organized a considerable trade with Russia, to which they exported Iranian goods such as silk and linen cloths, and from which they imported mainly sheep skins, wooden vessels, bridles, saddles, etc.⁷ Lippomano, the Spanish ambassador at Shāh Muḥammad Khudābanda's court, mentions that among the Iranian traders there were merchants of considerable wealth and standing; they supplied cloth to the government (reluctantly and under compulsion) for the clothing of its troops, and dealt in many kinds of goods but mainly in textiles, because weaving was the occupation of a very large number of Iranian workers; and in addition, some of them had sidelines in other fields and exported a wide range of goods including carpets, books, turquoise, lapis lazuli, precious stones, manna, and archino fiori (perhaps a kind of arrow and bow).⁸

Before Shāh ʿAbbās I's reign, importation of Western European goods into Iran through Turkey, Russia, and Hurmuz (under Portuguese control 1515-1622), though probably growing, was not sufficiently voluminous or regular to upset the traditional economic and social equilibrium. The large-scale and
medium-scale trade remained in the hands of Muslim Iranian merchants, who supplied both manufactured goods and raw materials to the neighbouring Muslim countries. Only in the Āzarbaijānī and Caucasian cities and in Hurmuz and its dependencies were Armenian and Indian merchants of any significance.

During and after 'Abbās I's reign, this equilibrium was upset by two main factors, both of which weakened the position of the Iranian merchants and thus adversely affected the guild craftsmen with whom they dealt. One factor was the greatly increased importation of European goods, particularly woollen textiles, and exportation of Iranian raw materials, particularly silk and wool, through non-Iranian channels. The other was the bureaucratic interference and stranglehold of the Șafavid state.

Although the Western European industrial revolution, i.e., the introduction of mechanically operated processes and factories, did not occur until later, namely in the 18th and 19th centuries, and production was still generally manual and house-based, the Western Europeans achieved big improvements in technique and organization during the 16th and 17th centuries. Merchant entrepreneurs of the Western European bourgeois class promoted the output of larger quantities of better quality goods and sought new markets for the growing output, and at the same time they required larger supplies of raw materials. In 17th century Iran, they were represented principally by the English and Dutch East India Companies. Both companies were at first interested above all in the purchase of Iranian silk and wool at a price somewhat lower than the price at Aleppo, which had previously been the main
market place of this trade.  

Shāh 'Abbās I, through his establishment of a royal silk monopoly, supplied their requirements of silk at prices which they found profitable, and achieved his purposes of raising revenue for his government and diverting trade from the territory of his Ottoman enemies; but in so doing he took away the business of the Iranian merchants who had previously exported the silk to Aleppo. The companies were also interested in the purchase of Iranian wool, which was in demand for the industries of Western Europe. To compensate for the silk and wool purchases, and to avoid the necessity of payment in scarce silver or gold coin, the companies offered Indian and Indonesian goods such as spices and sugar, copper, tin, lead, ivory, chintz, bath-towels, etc. and European goods such as woollen cloth, quicksilver, iron articles, Russian leather, etc. The English company successfully promoted the scale of English woollen "broadcloths", which were unsuitable for India but suitable for Iran with its cold winter climate. Since silk production and cloth weaving were the two most important sources of cash income in Safavid Iran, the penetration of the East India Companies into these fields must have had far-reaching economic and social repercussions. Contemporary sources, which do not provide any statistics or detailed evidence, indicate that the importation of European textiles and luxury goods adversely affected the Iranian merchants and guilds. The loss of trade to the European East India Companies and later also to European "interlopers" was probably one of the reasons why Iranian merchants in the Safavid period could not accumulate sufficient capital, and therefore could
not provide finance for the expansion and improvement of the output of handicraft industries such as textiles, in the way that contemporary merchant-entrepreneurs did in England and other Western European countries. Thus the Iranian handicraft industries were already in a weak and retarded state, due at least in part to foreign competition, when they had to face the shattering impact of the European industrial revolution in the 19th century.\(^\text{13}\)

In V. Minorsky's opinion, considering the known wealth of the Safavid state and the reported size of private hoards, the overall trade of Iran in the early 18th century "could not be considered vast".\(^\text{14}\) Probably the main reason for this was the Safavid state's rapacity. Shāh 'Abbās I needed large sums to pay for the Ottoman wars, for the reorganized bureaucracy and splendid court, and for the treasure-hoard\(^\text{15}\) which he, like other 17th and 18th century rulers, wished to amass. His preferred method of raising funds was through monopolies, and his basic motive for granting privileges to the European East India Companies was probably the consideration that the royal monopolies or governmental trading agencies could control the activities of foreign companies more easily than the activities of individual Iranian merchants.\(^\text{16}\) A second motive, as already mentioned, was to divert trade from Ottoman territory.\(^\text{17}\) The European companies, for their part, at first accepted the limitation of their business to dealing with the royal monopolies or agents, because it gave them a privileged position and obviated difficulties which might have arisen in dealing with individual Iranian merchants, for instance in cases
when an Iranian merchant might not possess sufficient capital.\textsuperscript{18}

After Shāh 'Abbās I's death, his monopolistic policy, which had caused great discontent, was to a large extent discarded. In 1036/1629 his successor Shāh Ṣafī proclaimed the abolition of the state monopoly of the purchase and sale of silk.\textsuperscript{19} From then onward, two important developments can be observed. Firstly, Iranian merchants, if they could show that they possessed sufficient capital, were allowed to deal directly with the Dutch and English companies.\textsuperscript{20} Secondly, the number of individual European traders, and the volume of their transactions, began to increase. From the viewpoint of the companies, many of these men were "interlopers", i.e. contraband traders. There is some evidence that the individual European traders dealt mainly with "native" merchants.\textsuperscript{21} The presence of growing numbers of European and also Indian, Tatār, and Bukhārīan traders in the Ḩīfahān bazaars is mentioned in several sources. Fryer states that merchants from many different countries did business in the royal bazaar, supplying the native wholesalers and retailers with various goods such as cloth, tin, copper, etc.\textsuperscript{22} European traders were to be found in many cities of Iran, but the largest number resided in three caravansarais at Ḩīfahān, namely the Kārvānsarā-yi Jadda (Grandmother's Caravansarai, built by the grandmother of Shāh Sulaymān and still surviving), the Caravansarai of New Julfa, and the Farangi (European) Caravansarai.\textsuperscript{23}

The activities of the East India Companies and private European traders directly affected some of the Iranian guilds.
As already mentioned, weavers were hit hard by the competition of imported woollen cloths of better quality and perhaps lower price than their own products. Fryer saw large quantities of English cloth in the royal bazaar of Isfahān, and paid four shillings per yard for some of a quality which would have cost twenty shillings in England; he does not say how it could be brought all the way to Iran and sold at such a greatly lower price. The trade grew so much that a new guild came into being in the Isfahān bazaar, called the landara-duzān or landara-furūshān ("London" cloth tailors or sellers); they dealt exclusively in English woollen cloth and garments made from it. Since cloth weaving was the most important of the industries pursued by Iranian craftsmen, the harmful effect of the English competition can readily be surmised. For instance, a tablet in the Masjid-i Jāmi' of Yazd surviving from Shāh 'Abbās I's reign mentions that the majority of the population of Yazd were weavers, and Evliya Efendi, who passed through the northwest of Iran in the late 17th century, reports that the whole population of Marāgha was employed in cloth weaving. Another guild which flourished from trading in European manufactures was the guild of the haberdashers (kharrāzī-furūshān). Among other things they sold European luxury goods such as spectacles and handbags.

Nevertheless, the competition from the European traders and European imported goods was probably not the main reason why the Iranian merchants and traders remained weak and could not accumulate the capital which would have been required for an expansion of the indigenous industries. A much more
important factor was the rapacity of the Safavid state. The belief that commerce prospered, particularly under Shāh 'Abbās I, is clearly an exaggeration if "commerce" is taken to mean "private commerce". The belief is based on the historical fact that the Safavid kings, particularly 'Abbās I and 'Abbās II, sponsored the construction of numerous bazaars, caravansarais, water-cisterns (āb-anbārs), and bridges, the improvement of thousands of miles of roads, and the provision of road guards (rahdārān) to ensure the safety of the commercial routes, etc. Although it is probable that these developments were intended primarily to serve royal and official needs, it is possible that they were also meant to help private commerce. Nonetheless, the help given to Iranian private commerce through the Safavid state's public works and services was greatly outweighed by the harm done to it through the Safavid state's monopolies, restrictions, and exactions. Through appointed agents, such as the malik ut-tujjār or tājir-bāshī, the government kept all important trading activities under close supervision. In addition to the regular taxes such as the tanghā and the casual imposts, the government exacted a large customs revenue from the Iranian merchants. At every port and frontier post the collection of the customs was normally farmed out to a contractor, called the shāh-bandar (see below), and the holders of this office were usually close associates of the royal court. The government also conferred many commercial privileges on the Dutch and English East India Companies, and on Armenian and Tabrīzī merchants, and in return obtained a large income from these sources. The Armenian merchants
and the Tabrīzī merchants, who owed their position to Shāh "Abbās I and were very dependent on him, shared their profits with the government, which through this direct involvement in commerce acquired a distinctly capitalistic character. One interpretation, which John Emerson has suggested, is that "Shāh 'Abbās I endeavoured, in a manner somewhat similar to contemporary mercantilistic practice, to promote commerce and industry inside Iran so as to prevent money leaving the country".31

The silk trade was a very important source of national wealth and state revenue, and the provinces of Gīlān and Shīrvān, which were the main centre of silk production, were exposed to Ottoman attacks.32 Although the earlier Safavid Shāhs repulsed the Ottomans, it was only after the establishment of firm control over these provinces by 'Abbās I that the government was in a position to launch the policy of monopolizing the silk trade. At the same time the arrival of the English and Dutch East India Companies offered secure outlets for the sale of the monopolized silk. Edward Connock states that "the king was desirous to pass all his silks into Christendom by sea, to the weakening of his enemy the Turk."33 These arrangements were highly profitable to the Safavid government, but according to contemporary sources did great harm to the Iranian silk merchants and silk weavers. The English East India Company's factor who was in Isfahan in 1614 reported that by order of the Shāh "all silks made throughout his dominions shall be brought into his treasuries."34 If any silk producer sold to private merchants and the sale happened to be discovered, the silk would be confiscated.35
Thus the Iranian silk merchants were deprived of their livelihoods, while the sale of raw silk to the East India Companies for export abroad took work out of the hands of the Iranian silk weavers. Certain reports suggest that the exportation threatened to weaken the indigenous silk weaving industry.

Olearius reported that the total silk production of Iran was estimated at around 20,000 bales (each of 215 pounds), and that only 1000 bales were processed and woven in the country. A few decades later, an unknown European traveller stated that the Iranian silk growers produced 22,000 bales of raw silk annually, but only 2000 bales were processed locally in the form of cloth and carpets. From Ottoman sources there is evidence of a decline in the commerce traditionally undertaken by Iranian merchants through Ottoman territory, due partly to the diversion of the silk route from Turkey to the Persian Gulf ports, and partly to the hostile behaviour of the Ottoman administration towards Iranian merchants.

Another important source of employment and national wealth, namely the Kirman wool trade, also fell gradually into the hands of the Safavid administration and its governors of Kirman, and thereby into the hands of officially supported Armenian merchants and to some extent of the European companies and private traders. This process reached its peak in the reign of Shah Suljan Husayn, when the poverty of the Kirman wool weavers, who formed the majority of the working class of that city, was noted by foreign observers.

The mercantilist belief that a government ought to accumulate a financial reserve in the form of a hoard of treasures appears to have been held independently by Muslim
and Christian statesmen alike during the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries. Contemporary reports mention huge amounts of gold and silver coins, bullion, and vessels which the Șafavid Shāhs hoarded in the castle of Tabarak and elsewhere in Isfahān. If these treasures, or reserves, had been spent in time of crisis, e.g. on defence against the Ottoman invasions or the Ghalzāy Afghān rebels, the policy of hoarding might have served a useful purpose. In the event, the policy did nothing but harm to the Iranian economy, because it withdrew productive capital from circulation and unnecessarily aggravated the burdens on entrepreneurs and producers. The biggest single source of the royal wealth was the profit from the royal commercial and industrial establishments (buyūtāt). The combined policies of state trading and hoarding had the effect of transferring capital from the hands of the Iranian merchants and artisans, who might have invested it productively, into the royal treasure stores, where it lay idle. Contemporary reports also mention the great wealth of the Armenian merchants and the Indian moneychangers (sarrāfān). In so far as the royal monopolies or trading establishments gave part of the business which they had taken away from the Iranian merchants to the Armenian merchants, they transferred capital accumulation opportunities from the former to the latter. The exportation of precious metals, which brought wealth to the Indian moneychangers, perhaps arose because the overburdened Iranian craftsmen and merchants could not produce and export sufficient quantities of low enough priced goods to counterbalance the importation of goods from India or elsewhere. In any case, the non-appearance of a "bourgeois"
class of capitalist merchants and entrepreneurs, and the stagnation of the Iranian craft industries, were clearly due above all to the rapacity and oppressiveness of the Safavid régime. V. Minorsky, discussing this régime in his preface to the Tazkira ul-Muluki, writes: "The Shāhs are now the capitalists. They amass goods in their buyūtāt, they attract the European merchants, they use their Armenian subjects as their trading agents for disposing of the chief exportable commodity, namely the silk." Far from encouraging free enterprise and the growth of a national middle class, the Safavid policies crippled both.

Contemporary European observers noted how difficult it was for Iranian merchants to find sufficient resources of capital, and the English East India Company's factor in Isfahan reported to his court (i.e. board of directors) in 1617-18 that "this King is a merchant, here commeth not any commodities to Towne but hee by his Ministers hath the refusall; any profitt thereby, the Merchant shall have none of it. Hee knows his Merchants, for forceinge his Subjects to take it again at his price." It was partly for this reason that Shāh 'Abbās I in 1598 selected Isfahan as his capital "beinge the Chiefe Marte Towne and Intended staple of the Kinge of all merchants, every day beiuifienge and enlarginge it with newe and stately Caravanserais, and places of conveyency for Marchants." It was accepted that "Marchants muste hazard that will trade", but one fact was "most consequential for yourhonour's knowledge and consideration, if God should call this Kinge it would bee a question whoe should suckceed." One instance of 'Abbās I's mercantile
aspirations was his dispatch of royal agents to Venice, London, and Russia to procure manufactured goods and luxuries for the royal stores - a practice which was continued under his successors. The Šafavid Šahs sometimes made profitable deals in such goods with private buyers. According to the chronicle of the Carmelites, the King often sold jewels and dealt in other merchandise, buying and bartering "with that subtlety a passable trader might use".

The extent of the interference by the central and provincial governments was so great that the Iranian merchants lost heart and restricted their activities to relatively small-scale trading. Even if they were sometimes able to do direct transactions with the English Company's factors, the restrictive attitude of the authorities towards wealthy Iranians outside the ruling group made it very difficult for a capable Iranian merchant to do business with the Company. The English factor who exhibited the Company's goods at Išfahān in 1617 reported that "since our coming, as yet we have not made any sale. The reason is that it was desired by Lala Beg, the King's Treasurer, to have the first sight of our cloth, promising he would give us ½ cash and ½ silk." It seems clear that as time passed, the restrictions on native merchants became more severe. The levying of import and export duties at ports and frontier posts, and the appointment of a shāh-bandar (harbour master, but in fact a holder of a farmed-out customs office) at all these places brought foreign trade under increasingly firm official control. Iranian merchants who took goods to the frontier posts suffered such harassment from the shāh-bandars that they did
not dare to deal directly with foreign merchants, but instead were forced to engage in contraband dealings. Many of the contraband dealers were Georgians, and according to Herbert many of these were actually royal agents, who smuggled goods such as china, silk, precious stones, and spices in and out of the country. In order that the trading profits of the royal establishments might be maintained, Iranian merchants were liable to prosecution if they sold goods at prices cheaper than the royal prices.

The abolition of the silk monopoly and other restrictions on freedom of trade by Shāh Ṣafī in 1629 ought in principle to have improved the position of the native merchants, but for reasons which are discussed later in this chapter, the improvement was slight and impermanent. In the case of silk, the English and Dutch companies were told, during their contract renewal negotiations, that they might henceforth buy silk direct from private merchants if they found the conditions satisfactory. In practice both companies found that they could not buy silk on a large scale except from the royal court or its agents. Their freedom to bargain with native merchants and obtain goods from them in exchange for ready cash was counterbalanced by the risk of official obstruction. For instance, at Isfahān when the Dutch company acquired a cargo of silk in the free market, the governor raised the question of the liability of goods bought from private merchants for export duty, and at Gombroon likewise the customs officials began to call for duty payments on silk which private merchants had sold to the Company. John Emerson thinks that the Iranians in the Safavid period seldom
used money productively; they generally either hoarded it, spent it on presents or on "conspicuous consumption", or donated it for religious and charitable purposes such as the construction of mosques, madrasas, bridges, caravanserais, etc. Those who put money to productive use, particularly the merchants, usually invested it in buildings to let or lent it to Indian moneychangers. It is true that throughout history Iranian merchants and other wealthy men have given generously to religious and charitable causes, partly with sincere motives of piety or benevolence and partly also with the consideration that religious endowments (vAQf's) were legally protected against governmental depredations. In fact the number of vAQf's instituted by unofficial persons such as merchants in the Safavid period was not very large. Their preference for rent-producing or interest-yielding investment in buildings and loans can be attributed to the Safavid restrictions on mercantile and industrial enterprise. Chardin states that the priorities of a successful merchant in those days were firstly acquisition of a house to dwell in, secondly acquisition or contribution to the cost of a bazaar or bath or caravansarai to rent out, and thirdly, but only for the richest, endowment of a college, caravansarai, bridge, or mosque, provision of income for "priests" (i.e. 'ulama), and distribution of charity to the poor.

The privileges conferred by Shâh 'Abbâs I on the Armenians whom he forcibly transplanted to Iľfahân in 1604 were another source of harm to the Iranian merchants. Although Armenians had long been active in the trade of the ーターbâiğani and Caucasian provinces, they had never previously played an
important part in national trade. The transplantation of the Armenians was part of the Shâh 'Abbâs I's long-term plan for enrichment of the monarchy through direct royal participation in trade. While the native İsfaḥānī merchants suffered from legal and illegal harassment, 'Abbâs I granted a loan of 4000 tumans, repayable within three years, to the merchants of the recently established suburb of New Julfâ. Depending on the position of their families, the loan was made partly in silk, partly in coin. In the event they were not required to repay, and they took the Shâh's silence as a sign that he had excused them and waived their debt. In reply to some of his ministers who asked by he had been so generous, the Shâh said that the Armenians were more competent than the Iranians in commercial business, and that it would be better to train the Iranians for fighting and not let them be spoiled by commerce. The Armenian merchants of New Julfâ played a double role, as royal merchants or agents of the Shâh, and as traders on their own account. In this position they were soon able to accumulate considerable amounts of capital. The abolition of the royal monopolies and restrictions by Shâh Ṣafî opened new opportunities for the Armenians, who strengthened their grip to such a degree that the Dutch and English Companies and private traders found that they could not buy their requirements or sell their goods without the consent of the Armenian merchants. According to Le Brun, there were two thousand Armenian merchants at New Julfâ and some of them were described as immensely rich. They did their business in the so-called Julfâ Caravansarai, which was an Armenian
bazaar adjacent to the 'Alī Qāpū palace, and the bazaar and caravansarai of New Jūfā. They had numerous links with the Iranian craftsmen's guilds; e.g. they were the exclusive suppliers of Russian furs, sables, hides, and leathers to the guild of the furriers (pūstīn-furūshān) and fur sellers (khaz-furūshān), and of seeds, coral, spectacles, and miscellaneous luxury items to the guild of the haberdashers (kharrāzī-furūshān). ⁶⁴

Lastly, the native Iranian merchants had to contend with the Indian (i.e. Hindu) moneychangers (ṣarrāfān), whose presence and proliferation in the markets of several important cities of Iran in the Ṣafavid period is an astonishing and unexplained episode of Iranian economic history. It was suggested above that their success may perhaps be attributed to a growing imbalance in the trade between Iran and India which necessitated payment in silver and gold for the excess of imports over exports. Later the issuing of debased coins by Shāh Sulaymān enabled them to make big profits from the export of good Iranian coins to India. To a large extent, the Indian-Iranian trade was organized by the Indian money-changers resident in Iran. For this reason they were particularly numerous at Bandar 'Abbās. Herbert found a large number of Indian residents there, ⁶⁵ and Chardin reckoned the town's population to be two thirds Indian. ⁶⁶ At Shīrāz one of the finest bazaars belonged to the Indians. ⁶⁷ They did not normally keep stocks of goods in the way that the merchants did, but acted only as commodity brokers (dallālān) and currency dealers. They charged usuriously high rates of interest, ⁶⁸ and exported the best coins as well as silver and
gold bullion to India. Chardin states that they often doubled their capital in eighteen or twenty months. There were two main communities of Indians, the Banyāns, who specialized in moneychanging and brokerage, and the Mūltānis, who specialized in the importation of Indian textiles. Their presence must certainly have helped to weaken the development of Iranian private enterprise. The trade imbalance which appears to have initially made their activities possible must have been at least partly caused by the restrictions which impeded growth of the Iranian national product in the Safavid period.

The extent to which credit was used instead of cash, and the types of loan and rates of interest which were current, in Iranian commercial life during the Safavid period cannot be fully ascertained on account of the scarcity of evidence. While the Qurʿān strictly prohibits usury (riba) (Qurʿān, 2, 275; 3,130; 4,161) and the Islamic laws of sale generally require prompt delivery and payment, the acceptability of certain kinds of legal device (hiba) in Islamic jurisprudence gives some latitude in matters such as forward sale, deferred payment, premiums, discounts, etc. In periods of stability, merchants (tujjār) and moneychangers (ṣarrāfān) had long been able to make credit transfer arrangements which may be regarded as early forms of banking. Nevertheless, in all Muslim countries, including Iran, the uncertainties of the sharīʿa and customary laws, together with religious scruples, inhibited progress by Muslims in the provision of what would now be called commercial banking services. One result was that investment in this field was generally inadequate and that
rates of interest (under whatever name was used) were generally high. Another result was that banking business tended to fall into the hands of non-Muslim minorities.

The sources show that in Safavid Iran much of this business fell into the hands of Indian (Bānyān) and Iranian Jewish moneylenders. Thevenot states that in Isfahān there were 15,000 Bānyāns, who did not engage in commerce or crafts but lived solely from usurious moneylending. Chardin gives their number as 10,000 and states that they milked the people's wealth and cleverly smuggled it in the form of pure silver coins out of the country. The offices of the Bānyān moneylenders and moneychangers in Isfahān were situated in the 'Alī-Quī Khān caravansarai in the royal bazaar. The money which the Bānyāns lent consisted not only of their own capital but also of funds which they borrowed from "men of substance" at 8 to 10 per cent annual interest and lent at 30 per cent annual interest. They would only lend at extremely high interest rates. The rate, which depended on various factors such as the amount of the loan and its duration, rose even higher than 30 per cent when money was tight.

Two classes of financiers in Safavid Iran can be identified: those who lent large sums, and those who lent medium-size and small sums. According to Tavernier, the large-scale Bānyān moneylenders had head offices at Isfahān, Lār, and Shirāz, and branch offices or agencies at the ports of Bandar 'Abbās and Kung. For transactions which they approved, they made loans to merchants which were secured on the merchandise and were repayable in three months at
6 to 12 per cent interest (for the three months). The conditions which they imposed placed heavy burdens on the shoulders of the merchants. The class of small moneylenders, which also included Banyans, is described in some detail by Fryer. They resided in all the main cities. Their business was partly commercial and partly pawnbroking, i.e. lending to individuals on the security of pledged private possessions. They never made any sort of loan without security. On a one-year loan of 10 tumans, they normally made a profit of 13 tumans per year, which included a deposit of a month's interest at one tuman that every borrower had to pay before a loan was granted. A lender could obtain legal certification of a loan contract, even though it involved a payment of a high rate of annual interest, by registering it with a qazī (Islamic judge). He would bring the agreed sum of money, e.g. 100 tumans, and declare before the qazī that he gave it to the borrower, and when the borrower consented by saying "yes", the contract would become binding; but at the same time, the lender would bring some article, e.g. a knife or a book, and declare that he would sell it at this price. Another common form of lending resembled the modern mortgage loan. The borrower pledged his house to the lender in return for a loan, and then rented the house from the lender, at a rent which the lender fixed, until the loan was repaid. Repayment of loans, including the disguised interest, usually had to be made in monthly instalments. Defaulters were liable to severe punishment, such as flogging. Tavernier mentions an incident in 1662, when a street draper, who had borrowed six or seven tumans at 2½ per cent per month interest, was unable to pay the
next instalment in time. Fearing punishment, the draper led other borrowers who could not afford their due payments in a murderous conspiracy against the Bānyāns.  

Māhmūd, the Afghān victor of the siege of Iṣfahān in 1722, despoiled the Bānyāns and other Hindu Indians of their properties. They were so afflicted that some took poison or died of grief, and others fled. Māhmūd seized all the contents of the closed shops belonging to the Indian shopkeepers who had fled. They never again played an important part in the economic life of Iran.

In addition to the political and institutional restrictions which have been discussed, certain geographical and social factors impeded the formation of capital and development of large-scale commercial and industrial enterprises in Šafavīd Iran. Like all other countries at that time, with a few exceptions such as Venice and Holland, Iran was a primarily agricultural country; but the geographical conditions of Iran imparted some peculiar characteristics to Iranian society. The extensive deserts and mountains gave rise to a topographical dispersion of the urban centres, and made communication between them difficult and expensive. In general, an Iranian town was surrounded by a detached and relatively small irrigated area, whose village-dwelling inhabitants supplied to the town-dwellers raw materials such as cereals, wool and silk, and also manufactures produced by village artisans such as carpets, cloths, earthenware, etc. On account of the small scale of the output and the short distance to the town, it was often possible for the villagers personally to transport their
own or the landowner's products or wares to the town's markets and to deal with the town's shopkeepers or craftsmen. It was also possible for peddlers to play a considerable part in the trade between a town and its surrounding villages. Olearius states that much of the rural produce, such as silk, wool, and fresh and dried fruits, was brought to the markets by the villagers who produced it. At Iṣfahān special daily and weekly bazaars for the peasants of the surrounding villages were set up in the Maydān-i Kuhna (Old Square) and the Maydān-i Shāh. As a result of the prevalence of this simple method of collection and distribution, there was not so great a need in Iran as in other countries for capital and organization in the commerce between town and country. Only in trade between the urban centres of distant provinces were more elaborate methods necessary. The interprovincial trade was the main sphere of activity of the Iranian merchants.

While the Iranian merchants as a class were injured by the policies of the Şafavid government, one group of them enjoyed favour and financial aid. This was the group of Tabrīz merchants resident at Iṣfahān. The merchants of Tabrīz had for a long time played a big part in the development of the import and export trade through Turkey, and they had acquired valuable commercial experience and knowledge. The decline in the importance of the traditional trade route from Tabrīz to Turkey, resulting from the wars and from 'Abbās I's economic policies and the transfer of the capital to Iṣfahān, impelled a number of the more able Tabrīz merchants to migrate to Iṣfahān in 1015/1607. They were housed in the 'Abbāsābād quarter, which was (and still is)
one of the pleasantest quarters of Isfahān, and were helped by the government in various ways, including loans or credits and an annual allocation of wheat amounting to 20 man (120 kilograms) per head from the royal granaries. Thanks to this aid, their community acquired a firm foundation, and subsequently remained a cohesive group with considerable influence in economic and social life.

The Iranian merchants held a respected place in society, and were not subject to the jurisdiction of the muhtasib which regulated and restricted the activities of the craftsmen's guilds. On the other hand, they worked individually, and with the possible exception of the Tabrīzī merchants of Isfahān, they did not organize any strong or lasting collective associations. After Shāh Šafī's decree of 1629, while most of them still only did inter-provincial business, some began to venture into new fields of external trade and in the course of time acquired an increasing, though probably still relatively minor, share. They revived the trade with the Ottoman Turkish territories to a considerable extent, and set up communities abroad, particularly in India and Russia, as well as at Baghdađ, Aleppo, Bukhārā, etc. Našrābādī names a number of these enterprising individuals, e.g. Mīrzā Amīn, Mīrzā Ma'ṣūm, and Ḥājjī Ismā'īl Khān in the Indian trade, and Muḥammad Qāsīm Lāhījī, Sa'īd Lāhījī, and Muḥammad Shafī' Rashtī in the Russian trade. A handful of Iranian adventurers even travelled to the Western European countries in search of business. According to the East India Company's correspondence, four Iranian merchants, named Āqā Ḥusayn, Fīr 'Alī, Muṣṭafā, and Āqā Kamāl, arrived in London
in 1636 to buy English goods and stayed until 1637. It must be emphasized, however, that royal trading still continued after the abolition of the royal monopolies, and that the Armenian merchants managed to retain the dominant position in the silk and wool trades which they had acquired in Shāh 'Abbās I's reign, with the result that the Iranian merchants could not effectively compete with them.

The more favourable conditions existing after 1629 for the growth of the business of the Iranian merchants, and for their emergence as an independent social force, were brought to an end by the deterioration of the Iranian economy in the reigns of Shāh Sulaymān and Shāh Sulṭān Ḥusayn, which contributed to the collapse of the Safavid régime. The causes of this deterioration have not yet been fully analysed and assessed by scholars. One generally recognized cause was the wasteful extravagance of the royal court, and another was the hoarding of silver and gold bars and vessels by the royal court and also by wealthy members of the ruling class. The main external cause was a continually sharpening decline in the foreign demand for Iranian silk, and another was the constant outflow of good coins which the Indian moneychangers exported to India. This outflow was greatly aggravated by the issue of debased coins under Shāh Sulaymān. The insecurity of the trade routes due to brigandage, piracy, and insubordination of tribal chiefs under Shāh Sulṭān Ḥusayn severely injured the merchants of all nationalities. The Polish priest Krusinski states that at that time merchants found the roads so unsafe that when they complained about the brigandage to a governor, he would only reply "show me
the brigands, I will oblige them to make restitution to you". 96

Business between the merchants or wholesalers and the guild craftsmen of Safavid Iran appears to have been conducted mainly through a system of special markets for interprovincial trade. These markets were located not only in the capital and the provincial cities, but also at points along the trade routes. They were set up weekly or in some cases monthly. In them the craftsmen bargained and dealt directly with the buyers, who might be either wealthy merchants or their agents, or local wholesalers, or peddlers. It has already been mentioned that the requirements of villagers were to a large extent supplied by peddlers. The reason why bargaining prevailed was probably that the goods on offer were too varied in quality and too small in volume to permit the establishment of recognized market prices.

A striking feature of the Safavid period was the rise of certain markets in small towns situated on the caravan routes. One of these was Khūr, at the edge of the Kavīr (salt desert) on a route then in use between Yazd or Iṣfahān and Mashhad. Its market grew around a caravansarai and water-storage cistern (āb-anbār) reputedly built by order of Shāh 'Abbās I. The caravansarai became the market for the scattered small villages of the area, whose main occupations were silk weaving and carpet making, 97 and merchants stopped at Khūr to buy these goods and to sell requisites to the producers. Although Khūr does not lie on the present main road, it still has a market with the same functions.

In the principal cities, the central bazaar was the normal market place where the merchants and wholesalers met
the craftsmen and shopkeepers, and the caravansarais and the khāns or tīmchas (vaulted or open-air enclosures adjoining the bazaar) were the places where the merchants and wholesalers negotiated their deals, stored and packed their goods, and kept their books. The Ottoman Turkish traveller Evliya Efendi states that he found seventy caravansarais at Tabrīz in the occupation of merchants and wholesalers. The tīmchas resembled caravansarais, but were smaller and better equipped; some of those which survive in Isfahān from the Šafavid period and in Tabrīz from the early Qājār period are fine specimens of Iranian architecture. Rich merchants, however, sometimes did business in their private mansions to show off their wealth and gain prestige.

Every craftsmen's guild had connections with one or more of the caravansarais or tīmchas, where their representatives negotiated sales of their products or purchases of their raw materials with individual merchants or wholesalers.

The British Library in London possesses a magnificent scroll, undated but from Shāh Sulaymān's reign, which gives particulars of the main caravansarais in Isfahān at that time and of the categories of merchants (tuğjār va sawdāgarān) and wholesalers (bunakdārān) who occupied rooms in them. Since this is the only known document giving details of the relationships between merchants and craftsmen in Šafavid Iran, its contents are summarized below:

1. Kārvānsarā-yi Anār-furūshān (pomegranate sellers):

occupied by the wholesalers (bunakdārān) who supplied fresh and dried fruits and different kinds of juices to the confectioners, fresh fruit sellers, dried fruit sellers (khushkbar furūshān), and juice sellers (shīra-pazān).
2. Kārvānsarā-yi Shāh: occupied by merchants from Tabrīz and Ardabil, who supplied the craftsmen and shopkeepers with Tabrīzī goods such as cloths, shawls, and mats.

3. Kārvānsarā-yi Lālā Beg: occupied by the pearl merchants who supplied unbored pearls to the pearl-stringers (murwarīd-kashān). This is a surviving and particularly well built tīmcha.

4. Kārvānsarā-yi 'Arabān: occupied by travelling merchants from Baghdād and Mesopotamia (Bayn al-Nahrayn) who during their stays sold many articles to several craft guilds, e.g. pearls, coral, carnelian ('aqlīq), amber, prayer mats (jā-namāz).

5. Kārvānsarā-yi Muḥammad Bēg: occupied by merchants and traders from Kirmān, Mashhad, and Samarkand. The Kirmānī traders (sawdāgarān) supplied china vessels such as bowls, plates, coffee pots, saucers etc. to the pottery sellers and jug sellers (kuza-furūshān). The merchants from Mashhad and Samarkand offered paper, perfumes, lamb-skin cloaks, and other goods. In addition, some of the rice merchants from Gilān sold their rice in this caravansarai.

6. Kārvānsarā-yi Gilāniyān. This caravansarai had formerly been occupied by the fried sheep's head sellers and had been called the Kārvānsarā-yi Kalla-pazān, but had later been transferred to Gilānī merchants who sold products of their province, not only foodstuffs such as smoked fish and rice, but also raw spun silk and thick rough silk cloth.

7. Kārvānsarā-yi Qazvīnīyān: occupied by merchants from Qazvīn who provided the drapers with ordinary linen cloth (katān) and fine linen cloth (qaṣāb).
8. Karvānsara-yi Jārchī: occupied by Jewish merchants who sold to the druggists and perfumers (attārān) different kinds of drugs and spices such as herbs, ginger, pepper, cardamom, cloves, cinnamon, coffee, and many other imported varieties.

9. Karvānsara-yi Ardistāniyān: occupied by merchants from the small town of Ardistan east of Isfahān, who provided the tentmakers and drapers with canvas and cloths for linings and women's veils, etc.

10. Karvānsara-yi Kāshī-hā: occupied by traders and whole-salers from Qum and Kāshān. The traders from Qum supplied the tentmakers and soap retailers with their goods. Some of the Kāshānī merchants supplied copper implements to the retail coppersmiths, others sold carpets and cloths.

11. Karvānsara-yi Sāgharakchīyān: occupied by leather merchants (possibly from Hamadan) who supplied leather and hide for the shoe-makers, saddlers, and saghari-dūzān (shagreen shoemakers).

12. Karvānsara-yi Bavanātīyān: occupied by traders (sawdā-garān) from Bavanāt (a long established market town in Fārs) and from Shīrāz, who supplied juices, flower essence and rose water, fresh and dried dates, and also bottles and vessels of various sizes and shapes, for use by confectioners and juice-makers.

13. Karvānsara-yi Jadda. This well equipped and extremely large caravansarai was built in Shāh Sulaymān's reign and named in honour of his grandmother (jadda). It was managed directly by government officials. European merchants, wealthy Armenian merchants, and some of the more affluent
Iranian merchants ran their businesses from this caravansarai. It was there that merchants of the landara-dūzān and landara-furūshān and other drapers obtained their supplies of English cloth. Part of it has survived, but is somewhat dilapidated.

14. Kārvānsarā-yi Khurāsānīyān: occupied by merchants and traders from Khurāsān and Harāt who offered carpets, mats (gilīm), Harātī hats, lambskin cloaks, and other goods from Khurāsān. The hatters and cloak-makers (pūstīn-dūzān) obtained either raw materials or ready-made articles at this caravansarai.

15. Kārvānsarā-yi Maqšūd Bēg: this well-built caravansarai was erected at the expense of Maqšūd Bēg, a rich self-made coppersmith, at the request of Shāh 'Abbas I. In it were lodged the merchants from Lār, Hurmuz, and Bihbahān, who supplied coffee, tobacco, and different kinds of spices. It survives in good condition.

16. Kārvānsarā-yi Khwānsārīyān: occupied by wholesalers from Khwānsār (a small and beautiful town in Isfahān province) who supplied the retailers with fresh and dried fruits.


18. Kārvānsarā-yi Yazdīyān: occupied by cloth merchants from Yazd who sold expensive Yazdī cloths such as zarbāf (gold brocade), and fabrics for shawls (shāl), kerchiefs (mindīl), etc.

19. Kārvānsarā-yi Kāshānīyān: the rooms of this caravansarai were occupied exclusively by Kāshānī merchants engaged in selling velvets and other fine textiles from Kāshān and carpets from the Kāshān district.
20. **Karvānsarā-yi Abarqu'iyan**: occupied by wholesalers of pottery made in Abarqu (a town on the road from Shīrāz to Yazd) who supplied the pottery sellers with many kinds of earthenware.

21. **Karvānsarā-yi Nakhjavānīyān**. In spite of its name (Nakhjavān being a town north of the Aras river, now in Soviet Russian territory), this caravansarai was occupied by merchants and sawdāgarān of Mazandaran, who sold products of their province such as rice, charcoal, and wooden planks.¹⁰⁵

The wealthy merchants who transacted business in their own mansions had to adapt them for this purpose. The usual layout was a compound containing a family house (andarūnī), a group of so-called private rooms (khālvat), and a warehouse (anbār or bār-andāz).¹⁰⁶ Negotiations were conducted in the khālvat. The historian Muḥammad Ḥāshim Āṣaf has described the grand style of business of a leading Iranian merchant in Shāh Sulṭān Ḥusayn’s reign, Muḥammad Taqī 'Abbāsābādī, who held the title of tājir-bāshī (chief merchant) of Isfahān. Whenever a large consignment of his goods was about to reach the city, he employed a band of musicians (naqqāra-chīyān) to make the news known to the craftsmen, drapers, and shopkeepers, and in the early morning of the next day they would rush to his mansion to get the best choice because he served his customers on the basis of the order of their arrival.

The craftsmen and shopkeepers of the bazaar did not always buy directly from the big merchants; they more often obtained goods from intermediary wholesalers or even peddlers.¹⁰⁷ This practice probably arose from problems of distribution and of financial capacity. The quantities which shopkeepers
required or could afford to buy were usually small. A draper (bazzāz) requiring 250 yards of cloth in ten or fifteen yard lengths would want the lengths to be in different colours so that his customers might have a choice. The transactions of craftsmen likewise were generally small, because their volume of output was limited. The wholesalers probably performed a useful function in buying large lots from the merchants and splitting them into smaller lots for sale to craftsmen, shopkeepers, and peddlers. The peddlers supplied goods to craftsmen and small shopkeepers as well as to urban and rural consumers. It is difficult, however, to form an accurate and complete picture of the relations between the merchants, wholesalers, retailers, and producers, because documentary evidence is scarce.

Josaphat Barbaro, a Venetian merchant who was in Iran during the reign of ʿUmūn ʿHasan Āq Quyünlū, states that cloth merchants from different parts of Iran used to visit Yazd, where the finest fabrics were woven. They stayed in the rooms lining a large caravansarai, and weavers bearing their goods appeared in the caravansarai one hour after sunrise. The prices of the goods were then determined, and each merchant picked items of the quality and price of his choice. The seller, if satisfied, left the item in the merchant's possession without demanding immediate payment, and reappeared later in the same day when he called on the merchant and received payment. Buying and selling in this way is still practised in certain trades in Iran today, e.g. between wholesalers and retailers of charcoal, fruits, vegetables, dairy products, and flour, but with variations
in the customary terms; in some cases payment falls due on the following Thursday, in the case of the butchers of Isfahān in the evening of the same day.

Du Mans states that the craftsmen who worked in their own houses or in workshops in remote alleys and did not have retail shops in the royal bazaar generally sold their products either to wholesalers or to the members of the same craft who possessed sufficient capital to maintain stocks of goods. This arrangement was clearly necessitated by the financial weakness of most craftsmen, who needed immediate payment and could not afford to store for later sale at a better price. Sometimes a craftsman who was forced by bankruptcy or ill-health to give up his work could earn a subsistence by acting as a broker of the products of his guild. Brokers played an important part in arranging meetings and conveying information between merchants or wholesalers and craftsmen or shopkeepers. They still play such a part in the craft industries and markets of present-day Iran. The brokers (dallālān) of the Šafavid period fell into distinct categories: brokers of large-scale transactions in all sorts of goods, and local specialist brokers. The large-scale brokers generally resided in the ports such as Bandar 'Abbās and Kung, and the overwhelming majority of them were Hindu Indians and Jews. They obtained information about the likely times of arrival of ships, about the ships' cargoes, and about the estimated prices and the states of supply and demand in the provincial markets. As soon as a ship arrived in the port, they transmitted the news to the merchants. Whenever a merchant lacked sufficient cash or credit, they would arrange the necessary
facilities (presumably loans) from the Indian moneylenders or other sarrāfs. They made sure that they earned good profits in the form of commission for these services. 112 Tahvildar, writing in the Qajar period, states that at Isfahān in his time there were four kinds of brokers: 1: The cattle market brokers (dallāl-i suq ud-dawābb) who acted as intermediaries between buyers and sellers of cattle. 2. The fruit-market brokers. 3. The trade brokers, who arranged transactions in all kinds of goods and merchandise. 4. The opium brokers, who had come into the market recently. 119 It is not precisely known how large-scale trading operations were carried out, but according to an unknown European traveller, all such business was arranged by brokers, who were very cunning, after they had agreed on the matter at the seller's house. 114 The local brokers were highly specialized in particular branches of business. Every guild in a particular alley (rāsta) of a city's bazaar had its own broker. 115 Although there is no documentary evidence that they had any professional organization, they were subject to many regulations (as they still are today), which they probably on the whole respected. The brokers in each branch had close ties with the guild concerned and were often retired or bankrupted artisans of the same craft. In general, business depended to a great extent on personal acquaintance and trust. 116 For large and important transactions, however, documents were signed in the presence of a qāzī. 117 In the case of ordinary transactions, if commercial documents were used, they were not necessarily signed, but the names of the parties were included in the text and affixed by seals at the foot of the page. 118
The reports which have been cited in this chapter are fragmentary but sufficient to permit certain general conclusions. It might by supposed that the peace and stability which Iran enjoyed in the century before 1722 would have stimulated commercial and industrial growth. The evidence, however, indicates that in this period, Iranian commerce underwent a change of character and direction but did not expand, and indeed began to contract, in total volume, and that the guild industries did not increase their output and did not introduce new products and techniques. This stagnation was certainly to some extent caused by the restrictiveness of the guilds and by the heavy burden of the taxes and imposts on them. Other, and probably more important, causes were inadequacy of capital investment and of enterprise and organization. A class of bourgeois entrepreneurs did not arise from the ranks of the merchants or of the shopkeepers and craftsmen during this period when such a class was arising in Western Europe. Although it does not necessarily follow that such a class would have arisen in Iran if the Safavid state had pursued different policies, it is evident that Iranian private investment and enterprise were impeded by the Safavid policies, which are recapitulated below:

1) The royal monopolization or semi-monopolization of important contemporary sources of national wealth such as silk.
2) The grant of discriminatory commercial privileges, particularly to the English and Dutch East India Companies and to the Armenian merchants of New Julfa.
3) The maintenance of royal workshops and commercial agencies, which supported a dependent royal trading community but deprived the Iranian private sector of good sale outlets.
and also of good artisans.

4) The use of the profits of the royal monopolies and establishments for unproductive hoarding of gold and silver.

5) The failure to issue adequate quantities of coins of good standard, and the issue of debased coins, in the last half-century of the period.

6) The imposition of regular taxes which were high in relation to the monetary circulation and of occasional imposts which were harmful to business confidence.

7) The unawareness of the need for better laws and practices in the field of commercial credit, which consequently fell into the hands of usurers such as the Banyāns.

8) The generally unhelpful or hostile official attitude towards native merchants, which caused potentially successful entrepreneurs to conceal their wealth or invest it in real estate rather than in commerce and industry. Fryer was probably right when he wrote that the growth of the King's treasuries diverted wealth from circulation and made the people uninterested in commerce.
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CONCLUSION

Under the Šafavid régime in the 17th and 18th centuries, the people of Iran enjoyed the benefits of unprecedented political unity and stability. Šāh Ismā'īl I acquired political control of nearly all the provinces which traditionally constituted Iran, and his successors were generally able to defend the territory against external aggression and to maintain internal order. The spread and popularity of Shi'ism in most of the territory after its official establishment by Ismā'īl I also led, on the ideological plane, to greater national unity.

As in the other great empires of those centuries, the régime in Iran pursued policies which were intended to increase the power and wealth of the central government and to eliminate or suppress dissent. These policies in fact had the long-term effect of weakening the economy and provoking opposition, and were among the factors which contributed to the Šafavid régime's sudden fall.

To a large extent the Šafavid régime was able to eliminate local or tribal potentates in the provinces and to replace them with its own bureaucracy. The establishment of security in the provinces and along the roads created a favourable environment for trade, which was further promoted by 'Abbās I's encouragement of the building of costly bridges, caravansarais, bazaars, etc. Factors such as currency stability and favourable price conjunctures probably also contributed to the relative prosperity of his reign. It was a period of expansion in internal trade, in the craft industries, and also in external trade. This expansion stimulated urban growth and led to increases
in the populations of the chief cities.

On the other hand, no significant improvements in the technique and organization of agricultural and industrial production were achieved. The peasants and nomads continued to practise traditional methods and to live hard lives under the domination of landowners and khāns. The artisans continued to use slow manual processes, and the merchants and traders neither attempted nor were able to develop new corporate systems appropriate for business on a large scale. It is clear that the prosperity of Iran in the reigns of Shāh 'Abbās I, Shāh Ṣafī, and Shāh 'Abbās II was limited to the cities and did not extend either to the countryside or to the mass of the urban workers. This prosperity disappeared in the course of the reigns of Shāh Sulaymān and Shāh Sulṭān Ḥusayn, when the Iranian economy went into a progressive decline.

In the present study, an attempt has been made to collect and analyse data on the position of one of the main component groups of Iranian society in the 17th and 18th centuries, namely the artisans’ and traders’ guilds of the urban bazaars. In spite of much searching, the subject remains ill documented. Interpretation of the scanty data can therefore only be tentative.

The method of comparison with European guilds has not been considered appropriate, because the Iranian and European guilds did not operate under similar conditions. Not only the religious and cultural heritages, but also the social and economic environments, were fundamentally different. The rise of the European guilds to powerful positions in municipal
life coincided with the growth of the importance of merchant capital in European national and international life. In Iran merchant capital did not begin to acquire comparable importance until the second half of the 19th century; it played no part in the country's socio-political evolution in the 17th and 18th centuries.

The policies of the Safavid régime gave rise to significant, but not basic, changes in the traditional class structure of Iranian society. This consisted of the ruling class or élite (khavāğ), comprising the Shāh and his courtiers and relatives, the top ranks of the armed forces, of the bureaucracy, and of the Shi'ite Islamic clergy, and the more powerful landowners and khāns and surviving semi-autonomous local governors. The remainder or "generality" ('avāmm) of the people, who were the ruled class, worked in various activities and obtained different levels of income, but had no share of political power. The Safavid régime strengthened and enlarged both the bureaucracy and the clergy, with the result that officials and 'ulamā came to form a bigger proportion of the ruling class. This made it easier for individuals from the ruled class, especially literate sons of bazaar artisans or traders, to rise through the ranks of the bureaucracy or the clergy into the ruling class. The Armenians of New Julfā may be said to have become part of the ruling class in so far as they served the government as managers of its monopolies. With few exceptions, members of the ruling class owed their position to the Shāh's favour rather than to their own strength. They could not always be certain of the Shāh's favour, and they were often divided by factional or personal rivalries which made their positions unstable. Even so, the
ruling class kept its hand on the strings of political and economic power.

The ruled class (ra'âyâ) consisted of two main categories, which in the terminology of today may be called middle class and lower class. The middle class category comprised the possessors of some measure of financial independence and the possessors of literacy, numeracy, and other superior skills: i.e., the majority of the officials or officers and clerks in the service of the central and provincial governments (ahl-i dîvân), the majority of the clergy and clerical teachers and lawyers (ahl-i 'ilm), the indigenous merchants, and the artisans and shopkeepers who were members of guilds and masters of their own businesses in the bazaars (ahl-i bâzâr). The lower class category comprised peasants working on estates owned by landlords, tribal nomads, and urban workers possessing no capital and no skills or only inferior skills.

The distinction between the classes and categories became somewhat blurred in the Šafavid period, probably because the demand for literate and numerate officials and 'ulamâ was increasing. There were overlaps between the ahl-i dîvân, ahl-i 'ilm, and ahl-i bâzâr. Skilled artisans or their sons were frequently given employment in the royal workshops or in government departments. Traditionally the ahl-i dîvân served the ruling class, while the ahl-i 'ilm had economic and family ties as well as spiritual links with the ahl-i bâzâr. Among the ahl-i bâzâr, merchants who traded directly with India and other foreign countries were wealthier than those engaged in internal trade, while the money-changers, goldsmiths and jewellers at bazaar entrances (qayşariyas) were
wealthier than other shopkeepers and artisans. The difference of wealth and interest between the various groups in the bazaars, and their links with the bureaucracy and clergy, may be among the reasons why the ahl-i bāzar did not develop into a national bourgeoisie and why they seldom acted in concert. From time to time, however, they joined in common protests against governmental restrictions and impositions, and against oppressive conduct by officials. After the fall of the Ṣafavids, the ahl-i bāzar gained greater independence, until in the late Qājār period the bazaars became centres of political opposition and upheaval.

The lower ranks of the urban working people either belonged to loosely organized associations or guilds which were generally controlled by government officials, or else pursued their activities without the protection of any collective body. Many poor city dwellers retained links with villages and with agriculture. All considered, the social and political significance of this class in Ṣafavid Iran was remarkably small.

The fiscal policies of the Ṣafavid state, like those of other contemporary states, were not intended to promote economic growth or social welfare, but to provide for the government's financial needs. Apart from the extravagance of the royal court, it seems probable that these needs increased from the time of 'Abbās I onward because the process of centralization and bureaucratization was expensive. Moreover, in Iran as elsewhere at that time, it was thought desirable that the state's accounts should show a surplus and that the surplus should be accumulated in treasure hoards.
The reasons for the decay of the Iranian economy under Shah Sulaymān and Shāh Sulṭān Ḫusayn are fairly clear, although the relative importance of the various factors cannot be assessed. In such an autocratic régime, the ineptitude of the reigning monarchs was of course a major factor. Among the other factors were falls in the relative value of silk and other Iranian exports, foreign competition and rising imports, technical and organizational stagnancy, renewed insecurity on roads and sea routes, burdensome taxation, and governmental restrictions and monopolies. The last-mentioned factors stemmed from the fiscal policies initiated by 'Abbās I and maintained without significant change by his successors. It seems justifiable to conclude that, even if all the other factors had been favourable, the restrictions imposed by the Šafavid régime would have prevented the evolution of the indigenous merchants and the ahl-i bāzār into an economically enterprising and politically influential national bourgeoisie.

V. Minorsky (T.M.p.19), in his observations on the fall of the Šafavids, has written: "Neither is much known about the town bourgeoisie. The Shāh was the largest capitalist. The merchants traded exclusively for cash, but money was short." While the purpose of 'Abbas I's intervention in the silk trade was to raise money for the government and to switch the export trade away from Ottoman Turkey; this action at the same time deprived the indigenous merchants of important business by concentrating the trade in the hands of the foreign East India companies and the government's Armenian agents. Later the Kirmān wool trade also fell into the hands
of the foreign companies. Indigenous merchants consequently lost opportunities to accumulate capital and marketing experience. The exportation of silk and wool in the raw state had the further effect of depressing the indigenous handweaving industries. The government's transactions were not always settled for cash, as probably more than half were barter deals in which silk and wool were exchanged for European manufactured goods. The privileged importation of European luxuries and broadcloths and Indian cotton textiles similarly curbed or set back the indigenous handicraft industries. Contemporary European observers likened Iran to a caravansarai in which the wealth entered through one door and left through the other. It can be concluded from the available evidence that the balance of the trade with Europe and India became increasingly unfavourable for Iran and that the profits of the trade were not invested in Iranian industry and commerce, but went to European companies, Armenian and other middlemen, and Indian coin exporters, and into royal treasure hoards and official pockets.

The evolution of the guilds under the Safavid régime, in so far as it can be traced, shows trends typical of the evolution of contemporary Iranian society as a whole. Their numbers and memberships grew when the economy expanded, and their internal arrangements probably became more institutionalized, but their basic aims and functions underwent no change. At the same time they were subjected to increasingly strict governmental supervision. The government used the guilds as agencies for tax collection, price fixing, and performance of municipal functions, and supervised them
through the appointment of guild officers (bashis and kalantars) responsible to itself rather than to the members. The construction of royal bazaars to accommodate the more important guilds was another instrument of state control.

Nevertheless, the guilds in the Safavid period retained the essential character which Iranian guilds had possessed throughout their history, namely their spontaneity. They were formed from below by the members, not from above by the government. In regard to the assessment of guild tax (bunicha) and fixing of prices, they were to some extent able to negotiate and bargain, and in cases of official injustice and oppression they were able to make effective protests, usually with the support of independently minded 'ulama. In extreme cases, they could use the weapon of a bazaar closure, equivalent to a strike, though in the Safavid period they did this very seldom.

The internal affairs of the guilds were managed by bashis (chiefs) and kadkhudas (headmen). The bashi was chosen from among the most highly skilled members of a guild, but was appointed by the government and was therefore considered by the members to be on the side of the government. The kadkhuda, whom the members regarded as their own representative, enjoyed much greater respect and made every effort to defend his guild's interests.

The importance of a guild depended on the nature of its trade or craft and on the number of its master craftsmen (ustadan). The masters formed the backbone of every guild. The number of the masters in a guild was one of the main criteria in the assessment of its guild tax.
It seems that the internal regulations of the guilds in the Safavid period were not recorded in writing; in any case, none have survived. It can be taken for certain that such regulations existed and were strictly observed. Traditionally they have always been held in high respect. One questionable feature of the guilds in this period was their practice of limiting the number of shops and therefore the number of master craftsmen allowed to do business in the particular guild's ṭasta of the bazaar. This was made possible by the guild's collective responsibility for the apportionment of the bunīcha, which was not only a liability for payment of a tax (or in the case of a royal bazaar, tax and rent), but also a privilege to operate a shop and a trade. Through payment of the bunīcha, a shopkeeper not only secured his own position, but was usually able to transmit his shop and his business to his heir. Although there is some evidence that when trade was expanding, guilds were willing to increase the number of their shops and masters, the general effect of this practice was to restrict guild membership and make it hereditary.

A characteristic of the Iranian guilds which was noted in the Safavid period and continued to be prominent in the Qājār period was their role in social and religious life. According to the long established tradition of the guilds, a craftsman or shopkeeper must first and foremost be a faithful Muslim. His behaviour should be modelled on that of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, whose virtues of honesty, generosity, and courage are summarized in the word jāvānmardī (Arabic futūvat; literally youthfulness). For this and other reasons,
the guilds maintained close links with the Islamic clergy and held their own private religious ceremonies. They also played prominent parts in public celebrations and festivities, generally of a religious or semi-religious nature. The bazaars were not only centres of business and handicrafts, but also centres of social intercourse. They contained mosques, takyas, schools, caravansarais, guild guesthouses, şar-suqs, and coffeehouses as well as shops and warehouses. The şar-suqs (cross-roads) and coffeehouses were favorite meeting places. On the anniversaries of the Imām Ḥusayn's martyrdom, large crowds came to the commemoration ceremonies in the takyas (special assembly halls). The customary illumination of the bazaar on religious and national festive occasions also attracted many visitors. The bazaar was the place where people exchanged gossip and obtained news. This did not have political repercussions in the Šafavid period, but was to do so in the Qājār period.

In the decades of war and disorder which followed the Šafavid collapse, the economy of Iran suffered immense damage, but the restrictive and monopolistic policies of the Šafavids ended with them. When the economy began to revive in the Qājār period, the people of the bazaars enjoyed greater freedom and acquired greater social and political influence. In the protest against the tobacco monopoly in 1891-1892 and in the struggle for constitutional government in 1906, they played the decisive role. Under the two Pahlavī Shāhs, the importance of the bazaars and the guilds was reduced by various factors such as the growth of modern factory industries which replaced handicraft industries, the spread of
modern shops in the boulevards and suburbs, and the imposition of governmental controls. In the years 1975-1978 the government unsuccessfully attempted to check inflation by fixing prices and to use the surviving guilds as price control agencies. The people of the bazaars generally supported the Islamic revolution of 1979, and in spite of their reduced economic and social importance, their support seems to have contributed a good deal to its victory.
Appendix 1.

Celebration of the 'Id-i Qurbān

Hereunder is a literal translation of Tahvīldār's description of the ceremonial slaughter of a camel on the 'Id-i Qurbān as it was performed at Isfahān in Qājār times. In this ceremony the craft guilds played an important part. Tahvīldār states that it followed exactly the same procedure as in Şafavid times.

"(As for) the categories of workers having a share in the sacrificial camel, it is not known whether there was a procedure for this in earlier times. The rules and regulations which have survived up to now have a Şafavid basis. According to the ancient decree, all the workers and participants get a share in the proceeds, having their status and function in regard to the said camel by right and entitlement inherited from generation to generation.

"At Isfahān this ceremony has peculiar features. From the first day of Zul-Hijja to the eve of the 'Id-i Aţžā, the participants march in procession with the camel around the houses of the quarters. (They consist of) two knife bearers, each with three ancient, precious, and strangely shaped steel knives, together with the hone and other tools and gear; two axe-bearers, each with an embossed steel axe; one lance-bearer; two persons bearing cleavers, two bearing iron staffs (bayḍag); one bearing a basin with a large lid, embossed inside and out with Qur'ānic verses and charms, in which the proceeds of the appeal for charity and alms are collected every day (on the tenth day the proceeds are
divided according to the traditional apportionment of the bunîcha among all the members); an orator who goes to every house delivering a sermon in the name of pādīshāh-i zamān and a fatiḥā for the householder's deceased relatives; a bearer of the camel's halter, to whom the trappings of the sacrificial beast are entrusted for ten days and who leads the camel around; a band leader together with dancers, drummers, trumpeters, and blowers of (other) wind instruments, each (present) in (large) numbers. It is a strange but widely known fact that all of these workers swear oaths of honesty on this occasion, because differences have repeatedly arisen between the professions inheriting the foregoing tasks. Some who really lacked any title fraudulently and deceitfully seized the tools of the knife-bearers and others who had a good claim to possession by law or custom. They did not see the year out, and their families were ruined, as the title of the rightful owners was again confirmed. The sharers in the camel, in detail, are those who according to the ancient decree are entitled to parts of the body of the sacrificial camel. Each piece is the right of the leader of a group, and the possessor of such a piece is called a mūchadār. Every mūchadār has a group and (performs certain) ceremonial functions. Half of the mūchadārs are of the Haydārī faction (Haydārī-khāna) and the other half are Ni'matī. These two factions are always in dispute and rivalry with each other. Extraordinary turmoil and remarkable uproar occur when the groups march in the procession. The parts of the camel are divided into six, and likewise the groups of the mūchadārs, who are, in detail, two groups from the Haydārī faction, two
from the Ni'matī, and two from two large villages close to the city, each affiliated to one of the two factions. Each group, as it sets out, challenges the other by assembling a great abundance of trappings and a large retinue in rank and order. Each numbers more than a thousand. In the van are the ruffians of the mob. Then come the riders, accoutred and armed, on camelback. They are followed by the lance-bearers of the opposing army and the actors of the religious tragedy (shabīb-khwānī) in black garments representing the captives of Karbalā with golden camel litters and scenes of the bazaar of Shām, i.e. Damascus. After these, the Mīr ʿĀjj, splendidly and gloriously equipped, rides at the head of many bands of horns and trumpets, cymbals and brass instruments, all on camelback with their retinues of stave-bearers on foot and armed riders bearing flags. Then come files of camels ridden by bareheaded, shawled pilgrims in white (iḥrām), and spare mounts and pack animals with their drivers in front of them. After these come the possessors of the mūchas, each in special dress with his servant and butler (ʿabdār) and a group of mob ruffians with shields and daggers on foot, marching on the right and the left. The groups from the villages also, each consisting of three or four thousand people, with musical instruments, horns, trumpets and cymbals - and with huge banners and lofty emblems swarm (through the city) and join forces with the Ḥaydarī and Ni'matī factions. On the day of ʿĪd-i Qurban, following the same pattern every year, each faction sets out from its own place passing through the quarters and bazaars until it enters the Maydān-i Naqsh-i Jahān. At the gate of ʿAlī Qāpū, a khaṭīb delivers an oration.
Group by group, passing before the governor of the province who is enthroned above on the balcony of the 'Alī Qāpū, they proceed by way of the Chār Bāgh of Shāh 'Abbās. From the deputy governor, seated on a marble bench before the porch of the Madrasa of the (Mother of the) Shāh, they receive confectionery and bounty. Then by the Chār Bāgh and the Pul-i Sī u Sīh Chashma, they cross the river and proceed down the river bank until they reach the Musallā and the slaughtering place of the camel. All those concerned with the camel, such as the knife bearers and others, each with a different ceremonial befitting the circumstances, approaches the camel in the presence of the mūchadārān. The spectators from Iṣfahān, who in these years are fewer, but in former years were more than fifty thousand souls, follow the camel along the Chār Bāgh-i Ṣadr and into the Musallā. After the camel’s meat is divided, they return in groups and parties by the Ḥasanābād-i Khwājū bridge and the Chār Bāgh-i Ṣadr and so back into the Maydān-Naqsh-i Jahan, whence they disperse to their own quarters. Every year the 'Īd-i Qūrbān involves great turmoil through the assembly of these louts and followers of Dajjal. On the one hand the dignitaries and authorities protect and accompany the factions; on the other hand the dārūgha of Iṣfahān guards the vulnerable points of the city with three hundred infantrymen, and the governor’s cavalry and soldiers protect the quarters of the city. When the factions come and go (through the streets), when they encounter each other at intersections, and when the meat is divided, disturbances generally occur and ruffians make themselves conspicuous. For some years (now), by order of
the government, the commotion and disturbance have on the whole been reduced and their excessive uproar has been abated. Before this, there was never a year in which forty or fifty persons did not receive injuries and at least three or four persons were not killed."
Selected shahr-āshūb verses from the Dīvān-i Rizvān of Mīrzā Ṭāhir Vahīd (Central Library of the University of Tehran, ms. no.4344 (Catalogue, vol.13, p.3300).

**Sifat-i simsār**

Na-dānam zi simsār yak kas fuzūn,  
ki uftāda dar fann-i khūd zu-funūn.

Chū jūshān āsāl bāshadash kār-u-bār,  
zi yak chashma jūshīdā šad chishma kār.

**The Second-hand Dealer**

I have met nobody more skilled than the second-hand dealer,  
nobody so well versed in the arts of his business.

His business bubbles like springs of honey;  
each spring is the source of hundreds of deals.

**Sifat-i khayyāt**

Chi gūyam zi khayyāt chasbān-qabā?  
Mara dūkht bar khāk chūn naqš-sh-i pā.

Buvad dar dīlam az nigāhash rūsūm,  
kashīdand khayyāt gūyā bi-mūm.

Zi āhammām dārad dukānash nishān,  
ki bāshand Gabr u Musalmān dar ān.

**The Tailor**

What shall I say about the tailor who makes such close-fitting robes?  
I am stamped by the garment he sewed, just as the ground is stamped by a foot-step.

His glance leaves imprints on my heart,  
in the same way that tailors draw threads through wax.

His shop has the semblance of a public bath,  
since there are Zoroastrian as well as Muslim customers in it.  
(The word Gabr [Zoroastrian] was also used to mean lax, e.g. wine-drinking, Muslims).
Şifat-i baqqāl

Chi gūyam zi baqqāl-i șāhib jamāl, 
az ăn khaṭṭ-i sabz u az ăn rang-i ăl?

Asīrān bar āṭrāfash az shahr u dih, 
namad-pūsh az gard-i kulfat chū bih.

The Grocer

What shall I say about the handsome grocer 
with that youthful down on his cheek and that plum-like 
complexion?

He is surrounded by captives from the city and the villages, 
whose felt-like figures resemble quinces, since they have 
a thick nap of dust from the fatigue (of their journeys 
to his shop).

Sifat-i qannād

Chi gūyam zi qannād u ăn nūsh-khand 
ki shud maghzam az yād-i ă kalla-qand?

Az ăn shikkārīn khanda bar rū-yi man 
chū ālva-yi pashmak būvad mū-yi man.

The Confectioner

What shall I say about the confectioner and his sweet smile, 
which turns my brain into a sugar loaf when I think of it?

His sugary smile, when he looks me in the face, 
turns my hair into candy floss.

Şifat-i pūstīn-dūz

Shud az pūstīn-dūz dardam davā 
chī ğham az zimistān-i pīrī marā.

Gar uftad bi-sangam dar ān kūr rāh, 
kunam narmash az puf-nam-i ashk u āh.

The Furrier

My illness was cured by the furrier, 
and the sorrow was removed from the winter of my old age.
If my way to that street is stony, 
I shall smooth it with the moisture of my tears and sighs 
(as the furrier smoothes his furs).

**Şifat-i javahiri**

Chi gūyad kāsī az javāhir-furūsh, 
ki yārī na-mī-āyad az 'aql u hūsh?

Tanash sīm u lab la'īl u dandān guhar, 
bi īn ganj az jān ghanī shud bashar.

The Jeweller

What is to be said about the jeweller, 
when reason and wit give me no help?

His figure, handsome as the silvery moon, his ruby lips, 
and his jewel-like teeth, 
are treasures which enrich the souls of human beings.

**Şifat-i 'attar**

Zi 'attar girand mardum dava, 
valīkān marā hast dardī judā.

Shifā yābad az khū-yī tundash 'alīl, 
ki parvarda dar shahdash īn angabīn.

The Druggist

The people get medicine from the druggist, 
but my affliction is different.

His sharp temper cures the patients, 
because he sweetens the pill with this honey.

**Şifat-i tīrgar**

Dilam-rā hadaf kard tā tīrgar, 
nafas hamchū tīram khūrad bar jigar, 
Labash hamchū tīr ast khandān mudām, 
valī ghayr khūn-rīzī-ash nīst kār.
The Arrowsmith

As soon as the arrowsmith aims at my heart, a gasp strikes my bosom like an arrow.

His constant smile resembles an arrow notch, but his work only sheds blood and causes tears.

Şifat-i kamāngar

Kamāngar ki jānam shud ū-rā nishān,
sitam mi-kashad dil az ū chūn kamān.

Marā chūn kamān sākht az ham du tā,
na-dānam sar-i khwīshtan-rā zi pā.

The Bowmaker

The bowmaker has made my soul his target, like a bowstring, my heart suffers the strain of his tyranny.

He has bent me like a bow; I cannot tell my head from my foot.

Şifat-i kafshgar

Magū kafsh-dūzām bi kār-i farang,
kaz ū khāna bar man buvad kafsh-i tang.

Na-ranjam zi ū gar burīdast dūst,
ki burrīdan u dūkhtan kār-i ľust.

The Shoemaker

Do not mention the European-style shoemaker, who makes my home uncomfortable by making such uncomfortable shoes!

I shall not be distressed if he cuts off his friendship with me, because cutting and sewing are his profession.

Şifat-i zargar

Buvad shikva-yi man zi zargar bi-jā,
ki bugdākht ān būta-yi gil ma-rā.

Tavān khwānd kaz kīst tāb u ṭabam,
chū angushtar az saj' muhr-i labam.
The Goldsmith

My complaint about the goldsmith is well founded, for that fire-clay crucible has melted me. You can infer who has caused my passion, from the seal, like a signet-ring, on my lips.

Şifat-i ḥakkāk

Zi ḥakkāk bāshad dil-i man ghamīn, buvad chūn niqīn sar-nivishtam hamīn.

The Engraver

My heart is saddened by the engraver; my fate resembles the fate of a signet-ring.

Şifat-i khūrda-furūsh

Zi khūrda-furūshām dil-i zār sūkht, zi gham khūrda chūn shud bi hīchash furūkht.

Muzayyan shuda hamchū ḫusn-i butān, zi āyina u shāna u vasma-dān.

The Peddler

My heart was saddened and pained by a peddler; when it was smitten with grief, he sold it for nothing. His (stand) is adorned like a beauty's (dressing-table), with mirror, combs, and cosmetic pots.

Şifat-i sarraj

Savār ast sarraj bar kār-i khwīsh, ki az khūb-rūyān fitād'ī pīsh.

Namayad agar rū-yi sihr-āfarīn, chū mūr-ī savārī shavad zinda-pīl.

The Saddler

The saddler rides his trade, and gallops ahead of (other) good lookers. Whenever he shows his fascinating face, warriors, mighty as elephants, swarm around him like ants.
The Chest Maker

My heart is saddened by the chest maker,
whose secrets lie in the chest of my bosom.

He has the appearance of the new moon,
like the gold lock which he attaches to his chests.

The Scissors-maker

What shall we say about the scissors-maker,
who has cut my heart to pieces?

The Maker of archer's thumb-stalls

When I saw the face of my friend the maker of
archer's thumb-stalls,
his arrow made me blush.

Shudam pūst az gham dar ān rū-yi yār,
'ayanast chūn kaghaz-i muhra-dār.
The Bookbinder

My bookbinder friend, since he trapped me, has been taking books out of his paper-press, but has not released me.

I have been reduced by my grief to skin on which his face is stamped as clearly as the stamp on fine paper.

šifat-i na'lband

Bi-īn ḥāl uftāda az na'lband,
mah-i naw ki gardūn zi chishmash fakand.

Nazad putk yak bār bar na'l-i sard,
ki ū-rā dam-i garm chūn kūra kard.

The Blacksmith

I have fallen into this state because of the blacksmith, who resembles the new moon and sheds stars from his eyes.

He never hammers a cold horse-shoe, He speaks warmly, for he has heated his breath in a furnace.

šifat-i najjār

Zi najjār yābad dilat gar futūh,
kunad dīda-at kār-i ṭūfān-i Nūh.

Bi-tahrik-i īn randa, ān tīz chang
zi rukhsār -ī 'āshiq tarāshīd zang.

The Carpenter

If the carpenter shows you favour, your eye will shake like the storm which brought Noah's flood.

With a stroke of the plane, his sharp hand, will remove the wrinkles from his admirer's face.

šifat-i ātābākh

Zi ātābākh bāyad sukhan pukhta guft,
ki natvān bi-ātash zadan dast muft.

Zi ātābakhi-yi ū shudam ghuṣṣa-khur,
dīlī dāram az ghuṣṣa chūn chamcha pur.
The Cook

A statement about the cook must be well done,
and not just fit to be thrown into the fire.

His cooking grieved me so much,
that my heart is as full as his ladle of grief.

Sifat-i khabbāz

Zi khabbāz bishnaw ḥadīsī zi man,
ki afrūkht fikram tanūr-i sukhan.

Buvad sangakash āchunān dilshikār,
ki dil-hā khūrad āb az ān chashma-sār.

The Baker

Listen to what I have to say about the baker,
for my thoughts have kindled the oven of eloquence!

His punctured crispbread is so delicious,
that hearts are refreshed by those springs.

Sifat-i khayyām

Chi ġiyām zi khayyām-i khūrshīd-vash,
ki gardān chū gardūn buvad khāna-yash.

The Tentmaker

What shall I say about the sun-like tentmaker,
whose house, like the sky's vault, is mobile?

Sifat-i shamma'ī

Zi ashkī ki rīzad zi sham'-i qalam,
furūzān namāyam chīrāgh-i raqam.

Pay-i khūd-namāyīsh angīkhtand
ki az mūm āyīna-ash rīkhtand.

The Candlemaker

With the tears dripped by the pen-shaped candle,
I kindle the lamp of my pen.

It was moved to self-display
when its mirror-like form was moulded from wax.
The Opium-seller

How shall I describe the fair opium-seller, who makes me drowsy and takes away my sense?

His eyelashes show the poison of his eyes like the stick with which you grind opium.

The Bleacher

What shall we say about the bleacher? We have a happy recollection of him, because he washed the imprint of the alien off the slate of our memory.

The Water-carrier

I do not say that I have no complaint against the water-carrier, because he leaves blisters on my heart like those on a water-skin.

His shop is freshened with oranges and flowers, and water is seldom accompanied by fire.
The Butcher

How can I describe the butcher with his plum-like complexion?
May a lover's tears be licit wine for him!
His hook resembles a tooth, his mouth a shop, and his block a toothpick.

The Braid-maker

What shall I say about the gentle silk cloth dealer, whose cloud-like silky face puts his shop to shame?
His multicoloured silk cloths make his shop as bright as a European picture.

The Oilseed Presser

The oilseed presser fattens my ribs and makes my face glow like a lamp with emotion.
Thanks to the camel which turns (his press), his shop makes the universe as full of oil as a cruet.
The Surgeon

What shall I say about that unfaithful friend who is a healer of eyes and a surgeon (i.e. wounder) of hearts?

The Plum Seller

What shall I say about the fair plum-seller? My inability to describe him keeps me silent.

The Boiler of Peas

The boiler of peas has such a heavenly face, that he has roasted my sick heart.

The Cotton Carder

When the carder came in through my door, my brain was battered like a cotton seed.
The Turner

How shall I describe the turner, whose face and hair, made my heart spin like a ball.

Sometimes he produces a (wooden) bowl, sometimes a goblet, sometimes pain, sometimes joy.

Şifat-i lavvāf

Man-i 'āshiq-i khasta-yi mustmand, 
zī lavvāf uftāda am dar kamand.

The Seller of Camping Equipment

Sick and helpless with love, 
I fell into the noose (rope) of the seller of camping equipment.

Şifat-i naqqāsh

Chi guyam zi naqqāsh-i Mānī-nizhād, 
ki naqshi chu ā kilk-i Mānī nazād.

The Painter

How can I describe the painter, the heir of Mānī, 
when even Mānī's brush could not produce such paintings as he does?

Şifat-i kūza-gar

Dil-i man khūrad āb az kūza-gar, 
buvad nā'īb-i kūza īn chashm-i tar.

The Potter

The potter has filled my heart with water, 
My tearful eyes act as the jug.

Şifat-i kārdgar

Kasī gar sukhan guyad az kārdgar, 
khūrad kārd bar dil ma-rā zīn khabar.

The Cutler

If anyone speaks about the cutler, 
my heart is wounded as if with a knife.
Šifat-i shamshīrgar

Shahīdam az ān shūkh-i shamshīrgar,
dil-i man zi ā karda qaṭ'ī naẓar.

The Swordsmith

I am a martyr to that impudent swordsmith, whose disregard has humbled my heart.

Šifat-i bakhya-duz

Chi guyad kas az shūkhī-yi bakhya-duz,
kaz ā bakhya-yi chashm-i man gasht rūz?

The Stitcher

What can be said about the impudence of the stitcher, who let daylight into my eyes by removing their stitches?

Šifat-i suqurlāt-duz

Chi qūyad kāsī az suqurlāt-duz,
vaz ān sham'-rū-yi shabistān-furūz.

Zi mulk-i Farang īn ṯarf kard rū,
chū sawghāt āvard īmān bi ā ā.

The Scarlet Robe maker

How can anyone describe the scarlet robe maker, whose radiant face illuminates the shabistān (night prayer room) of the mosque like a candle?

Scarlet cloth came straight to this country from Europe, and the robe maker pinned his faith on it as if it was a traveler's gift.

Šifat-i shīshagār

Dilam āb gardīd az shīshagār,
bi-dih may ki buqzasht ābam zi sar.

The Glass-maker

The glass-maker has melted my heart, give me wine, for I am gasping.
The Masseur
What shall I say about the masseur and the nature of his glance?
A glance at him makes the heart let out a sigh.

The Trouser Maker
When I passed through the trouser maker's bazaar, my trouser belt fell to my feet (with wonder).

The Coppersmith
The coppersmith and his cheerful face echoed in my head like the noise of a copper workshop.
Even before he had beaten out those ladles and scoops, all (the customers) gave him allegiance.
Şifat-i rangraz

Sirishkam zi gham surkh rukh zard kard,
marā rangraz Ḯın chunīn rang kard.

The Dyer

If my tearful eyes have become bloodshot and my face has become pale,
It is the dyer who has dyed me these colours.

Şifat-i āhangar

Chi guyam zi āhangar u rū-yi ū
ki chūn kūra-yi ū buvad khū-yi ū?

The Smith

What shall I say about the appearance of the smith, when his temper is as hot as his forge?

Şifat-i daqqāq

Zi daqqāq rūzam chunīn tīra shud,
bi-daqqāqi-yi sīna 'umram guzasht.

The Miller

My days have been darkened by the miller,
I have passed my life being thumped on the chest (i.e. like grain in a mill).

Şifat-i tala-kūb

Dilam shīva-yi yār-rā pīsha kard,
ki gashtam tala-kūb-i Ḯın rū-yi zard.

Bi-tadbīr dar jild-i āhū khazīd,
bīyābān-i dil-rā chū majnūn burīd.

The Goldbeater

I adopted the style of my friend;
my pale face has been stamped with gold (leaf).

Like Majnūn he has stamped his imprint on the desert of my heart,
in the same way that he skilfully stamps (the title in gold) on the gazelle-leather binding (of a book).


\section*{The Needlemaker}
My life was made miserable by the needlemaker, who cast steel thorns on my path. After ruffling my hair in a fabulous way, he combed me with his needle paper.

\section*{The Block Printer}
My heart was astonished by the block printer, who has left an imprint of wonder on my eyes.

\section*{The Gold Wire Drawer}
My friend, the gold wire drawer becomes a fiery red rose, when he draws gold from my pale (face). My idol performs his craft so skilfully, that he could trap a fairy with these hairs (of gold wire).
The Foundryman

The foundryman has upset me; he has removed the colour from my face and soul from my body.

Whether he makes you a chafing dish or a water jug, you will find both equally (good).

§ifat-i chīlāngar

Zi chīlāngarān shu'la dar jān girift, dil-am ātash az āb-i ḥayvān girift.

Juz anbur kāšī shākh-i khushkī nadīd, ki šad rang ġardad samar zu padīd.

The Forge Master

The forge master has set my soul aflame; the water of life has set my heart on fire.

Nobody has seen a dry branch comparable with his tongs, which pick hundreds of varieties of fruit.

(The word chīlāngar is often translated locksmith, but has a wider meaning; he makes tongs, chains, and skewers as well as locks).

§ifat-i naqqār

Chi guyam zi naqqār-i nīkū-liqā, ki khūrd ustūkhān-i marā chūn humā.

The (Bone) Carver

What shall I say about the fair faced (bone) carver, who has eaten my bones like an osprey (i.e. carved a favourable impression).

§ifat-i rufūgar

Rufūgar jahān-rā dar-avard bi-band, gusasta'st bā ānkī ū-rā kamand.

The Darner

The darning stitches up the world, even though his lassoo is broken.
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**Şifat-i şarrâf**
Bi-şarrâf shud şarf-i 'umram tamâm,  
az ü gasht chūn nuqra-am kār-i khām.  
Dil-i khalq-rā ḥalqa-yi īst dām,  
ki girand mardum bi-Īn kār vām.

The Moneychanger
My whole life has been devoted to the moneychanger,  
who has turned my crude work into silver.

His curls trap people's hearts,  
when they get loans from him.

**Şifat-i palūda-sāz**  
Bibīn nard-i fikrī ki Īn ṭīfl bākht,  
ki az dāna-‘Ī gandum ān dām sākht.  

The Pālūda Maker
See what a clever game of backgammon this boy has played,  
by making this trap from grains of wheat!
(Pālūda is a concoction of jelly-like threads or hairs made  
from wheat starch and sweetened with sugar).

**Şifat-i kalla-paz**
Marā kalla-paz karda bī dast u pā,  
khabar nīst az pā u az sar marā.

The Sheep's Head Fryer
The sheep's head fryer has disconcerted me (taken away  
my head and feet),  
I do not know where my head and feet are.  
(The sheep's head fryer also fries sheep's trotters).

**Şifat-i kabābī**
Kabābī az ān rū-yi pur-āb u tāb,  
marā karda bar ātash-i dil kabāb.

The Kabāb Griller
The kabāb griller with his bright, glistening face,  
has grilled me in the fire of emotion.
§ifat-i zarnishāngar

Bi-jānam magū zarnishāngar chi kard,
marrā zar-nishān kard az rang-i zard.

The Gold Inlayer

Don't ask what the gold inlayer has done to my heart!
He has put an inlay of golden paleness onto my complexion.

§ifat-i zira-sāz

Agar az zira-sāz pursī sukhan,
barad chashm bar chashm-i dil-rā zi man.

Zira-sāz-rā barg-i gul kun qiyās,
ki ī-rā buvad chasm-i bulbul libās.

The Chain-Mail Maker

If you ask me to speak about the chain-mail maker,
he captivates my heart with every glance of his eye
(meaning also every link of his chain mail).

You may compare him with a rose petal,
because his clothes are made of nightingale's eyes
(i.e. the chain mail which he makes has links
as small as nightingale's eyes).

§ifat-i utū-kash

Zi bīdād-i yār-i utū-kash magū,
ki afkanda dar ātasham chūn utū.

The Ironer

Don't ask me about the wrong doings of my friend the
ironer!
He has put me, like his iron, onto the fire.

§ifat-i mīva-furūsh

Furūshanda-yi mīva an shākh-i zar,
ki šād rang dārad chū jannat āmar.

The Fruiterer

The fruiterer resembles a golden bough,
which like (the boughs of the trees in) the
garden of paradise bears hundreds of sorts of fruits.
Şifat-i sha'r-bāf

Dilam dar bar-i sha'r-bāf ast band
ki har tār bāshad bi dastash kamand.
Chū zarbāft ānjā chū shud maskanam,
shavad pur zi gūl khud bi-khud dāmanam.

The Brocade Weaver

My heart is captive to the brocade weaver,
in whose hand every thread is a noose.
Like a piece of brocade, I made his shop my abode,
and since that time my skirt is of course being filled with roses.
(i.e. flower patterns used in brocade weaving).

Şifat-i tukhma-furūsh

Chi' guyam zi bīdād-i tukhma-furūsh,
ki dar ūnām sūkht dilrā zi jūsh?

The Seller of Roasted Water Melon Seeds

What shall I say about the wrongdoings of the seller of roasted water melon seeds?
He has roasted the heart in my bosom with the fervour (of the emotion which he caused).

Şifat-i jadval-kash

Zi jadval-kasham bāgh-i dil khurram ast,
az ān jūy dāyim bi-chashmam nam ast.

The Measuring Ruler Maker

The garden of my heart is freshened by the measuring ruler maker;
like an irrigation ditch, he constantly makes my eyes damp.

Şifat-i maftūl-kash

Zi maftūl-kash rūz-i man shud siyāh,
shudam hamchū maftūl-i ū madd-i āh.
Chū az dast-i ustād zaḥmat kashīd,
bi-dān pāya kārash zi diqqat rasīd.
The Wire Rope Maker

My days have been darkened by the wire rope maker; I have been stretched, like his wire rope, by my sighs.

His work has attained this degree of precision, because he had to put up with so much pestering by the master (who trained him).

Şifat-i ghalyan-furūsh

Chi guyam zi ghalyan u ghalyan-furūsh kaz u hamchū ghalyan dilam dāsht jūsh.

The Hookah Seller

What am I to say about the hookah and the hookah seller? He has made my heart bubble like a hookah (water pipe).

Şifat-i namad-māl

Buvad az namad-māl nālīdağam, rukh az hijr bar khāk malidamam.

Kunam, chūn buzurgi bi-gardūn rasad, bi-pā u bi-ghaltānadam chūn namad.

The Felt Maker

My grievance against the felt maker makes me rub my face in the dust out of (grief for my) separation (from him).

When my neck proudly reaches to the sky (i.e. when I feel extremely proud), he rolls me, like felt, with his feet.

Şifat-i sabzī-furūsh

Marā shūkh-i sabzī-furūshī-st yār, ki sabzī furūshad bi-bāgh u bahār.

The Greengrocer

I have a greengrocer friend who is an impudent fellow; he does his vegetable business with gardens and with springtime.

Şifat-i kāghazgar

Zi kāghazgarān būshad ān iżṭirāb, ki sharḥash nagunjad bi chandīn kitāb.

Zi āb-i tanūr ast kārash rava, kaz İn āb migardadash āsyāb.
The Papermaker

To describe the trouble which the papermaker causes (in my heart), several books would be needed.

His business depends on the water of his tank, which makes his business flourish.

Şifat-i jurāb-dūz

Zi jurāb-dūzan dil-i zār sūkht,
ki chashm-i marā bar rukh-i khwīsh dūkht

Kamanash buvad ḥalqa u chillā dār,
bi-pā mīkunad chūn rasad vaqīt-i kār.

The Stocking Knitter

My heart was pained and saddened by stocking knitter, who fastened my eyes on his face.

His lasso is the rope and his bow the gallow, when the time to use it comes, he erects it in his shop.

(In Persian the frame on which stockings are knitted is called a "bow").

Şifat-i mushk va 'aṭr-furūsh

Dilam az shamīm-i butī shud fagār,
ki bū mīfurūshad bi-bāgh u bahār.

The Seller of Musk and Perfume

My heart was wounded by the scent of the idol, who sells fragrance to the garden and springtime.

Şifat-i muhr va tasbīh-sāz

Chi guyam man az muhr u tasbīh-sāz
ki rūyam buvad sū-yi ū dar nīyāz.

The Maker of Prayer Tablets and Rosaries

What can I say about the maker of prayer tablets and rosaries, to whom my face is turned in supplication.

(Prayer tablets, onto which the head is lowered in prayer-prostration, are made with dust from Karbalā where the Imām Ḥusayn is buried).
Sifat-i hana-saz

Hana-saz zad bar dil az ghuṣṣa nīsh,
az ān kard rangīn rukh-i kār-i khwīsh.

The Henna Manufacturer

The henna manufacturer stamped my heart with his glance;
the same glance with which he has dyed (i.e. adorned)
the face of his business.

Sifat-i 'allaf

Dilam-rā chu 'allaf az gham fishurd,
rag-i man bi-ham tāb chūn burma khurd.

The Hay Dealer

My heart was weigh ed down with grief about the hay dealer,
my veins were twisted like a coil of hay.

Sifat-i davāt-gar

Davātī ki jānān bi-bāzīcha sākht,
dilam-rā barā-yi maṣāliḥ gudākht.

The Inkwell Maker

The inkwell which my dear friend made to tease me,
has melted my heart into (ink) ingredients.

Sifat-i ātash-bāz

But-i ātash-afshan-i mūshak-davān,
ki bāshad nīshanash dil-i āsmān.

The Pyrotechnician

My flame-scattering idol, who fires off rockets,
makes the sky's heart his target.

Sifat-i qumārbāzān

Chi qūyam man az vaṣf-i ahl-i qūmār,
ki īn qawm-rā pāk bāzist kār.

Hama shusta az khwīshtan chirk-i pūl,
bi-ṣābūn-i yak ustūkhān-i bajūl.
The Gamblers

What can I say to describe the gamblers? Risking all is the job of these people.

They wash their hands clean of filthy lucre with ankle-bone soap.

(Sheep's ankle-bones are used in Iranian gambling games (gāp-bāzī). Bars of hand-made soap used to be shaped like sheep's ankle-bones).

Sīfāt-i ahl-i ma'ārīk

Chū ūflān digar ṭabar bazīchagar, zī ahl-i ma'ārīk sukhan kard sar.

The Entertainers

I have a cheerful temperament, like a child's; so I will again start to talk about the entertainers.

Sīfāt-i kushtīgīr

Zī kushtiyi bā dil sukhan sar kunam, khiyālātishān-ra musavvar kunam.

The Wrestler

I will start by talking about wrestling with my heart, before I depict my notion of wrestlers.

Sīfāt-i tās-bāz

Shud az tās atraf-i ū lālā-zār, bi-rang-i nihālī ki rizad bahār.

The Dicer

The dice have surrounded him with a tulip bed, coloured like the fresh blossom which spring sheds.

Sīfāt-i huqqa-bāz

Chi ġūyad kas az shūkhi-yi huqqa-bāz, ki paydā-yi ū hast pinhān chū rāz?

The Juggler

What is to be said about the impudence of the juggler, whose visible show is as hidden as a secret?
**Sifat-i buryā-bāf**

Man az buryā-bāf didam jafā,  
bi-haddī-ki shud pūstam buryā.

**The Rush Mat Weaver**

The rush mat weaver has treated me so harshly  
that my skin has become (yellow and shrivelled)  
like a rush mat.

**Sifat-i sang-tarāshān**

As īn yār-i shīrīn-i Farhād-fann,  
dilam chūn zi yak sang shud dar badan.

**The Stonemason**

This charming (shīrīn) friend, skilful as Farhād,  
has turned the heart in my body into a piece of stone.  
(Farhād is the ill-fated stonemason who loves Queen Shīrīn in  
Nizāmī's Khusraw va Shīrīn).

**Sifat-i kūra-paz**

Na-shud pukhta az kūra-paz nān-i man,  
az ū sukht har chand īmān-i man.

**The Brick Maker**

The brick maker has not baked my bread,  
but he has burnt my (religious) faith (i.e. I have  
become so fond of him that I have forgotten my religion).

**Sifat-i Khisht-māl**

Chu qālib bi-yak musht gil khisht-māl,  
dahān-i marā bast az qīl u qāl.

**The Mud Brick Maker**

The mud brick maker silenced my mouth with his loud argument,  
as he might have done with a handful of brick-moulding mud.

**Sifat-i qiṣṣ-khwān**

Chi gūyad kas az khūbī-yi qiṣṣā-khwān,  
ki dar mulk-i khūbī-st sāḥibqirān.
The Story Teller

How can the kindness of the story teller be described? His horoscope has made him the king of the empire of kindness.

Şifat-i tāj-duz

But-i tāj-duz ast tāj-i saram, chū sham' ast az ān tāj bāl u param.

Kasī-rā ki nabvad zi jang ihtirāz, zabānash chū tāj ast dāyim dirāz.

The Taj Maker

The handsome tāj maker is my crown; my wings and feathers (i.e. arms and hand) are drawn (like those of a butterfly) towards the candle-like (beauty of) his tāj.

Those who do not shun war constantly stick their tongues out like the (frontward bulge of a) tāj.

(Tāj means crown, and was also the name of the red-coloured hat, made by sewing together twelve gussets each representing one of the twelve Imams, which were worn by the Qizilbash troops of Safavid army. This hat had a frontward bulge comparable with a tongue.

Şifat-i pālān-duz

Khirad gar chi bāshad falāfūn-shi'ār, kashīd ast pālān-garash zīr-i kār.

The Packsaddle Maker

Wisdom, even when equal to Plato’s, is brought under the control by the pack-saddle maker.

Şifat-i qāshuq-tarāsh

Chi guiym az ān yār-i qāshuq-tarāsh, nadīdam ki qāshuq bi-sūzad chu āsh.

The Wooden Spoon Carver

What shall I say about my friend the wooden spoon carver? I have never felt a spoons burning (my mouth) as hot soup does.

The carving of wooden spoons (mostly small ladles for serving sherbet) is still an Iranian craft. Its centre is the small town
Abāda in the north of Fārs, which has pear orchards. The spoon is chiselled out with a fretwork handle, all from a single piece of pear tree wood).

**Šifat-i sa’lab-furūsh**

 Chi gūyam man az yār-i sa’lab-furūsh,  
 ki chūn dīg dārud marā garm jūsh?

 Tamūshā-yi rukhūs-rī ān dil-rūbā,  
 buvad sa’lab-i garm khurdan marā.

**The Seller of sa’lab**

What shall I say about the fair sa’lab-seller whose good looks keep my feelings as hot as a pot of boiling sa’lab?

Seeing his charming appearance,  
gives me the same pleasure as drinking his warm sa’lab sherbet.

(The seeds of a wild plant named sa’lab are used to make a sherbet).

**Šifat-i shāna-i tarāsh**

Bi-man tā but-i shāna-gar shud duchār,  
marā rūz u shab shāna bīnī’st kār.

**The Comb Maker**

Ever since I came across the adorable comb maker,  
you can see that my nights and days have resembled the teeth of a comb.

**Šifat-i qalandar**

Marā ān qalandar, qalandar namūd,  
zi man ṣabr u īman u ṭāqat rubūd.

Malūl az dil u jān mukaddar shudam,  
guzaštam zi dunyā qalandar shudam.

**The Qalandar (Wandering Darvish)**

That qalandar has made me a homeless wanderer (qalandar);  
he has snatched away my patience, my faith and my endurance.

I am now annoyed with my heart and soul,  
because I have become a homeless wanderer (qalandar) and have renounced the world.
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