

'done without Tahmasp Quli Khan's consent. When the general returned from his last 'attack on Baghdad, on the owner of the house making complaint to him personally, 'Tahmasp Quli Khan had his own son strangled on the spot in dispute. After the execution' (perhaps done inefficiently, on purpose) 'the son showed signs of life and was revived: the 'news was taken to Tahmasp Quli Khan, who again gave orders for his son to be killed.'

This story was told by the Carmelite Religious in connection with the terrible justice meted out by the tyrant, so that, as Fr. Leander experienced on his own journeys, all along the roads anyone could travel without fear of robbers, for Tahmasp Quli Khan made the head of each village responsible for any complaint of incidents in his boundaries.

After leaving Isfahan for the north in June 1734 Tahmasp Quli Khan appears to have first turned his attention to the eastern side of the Caucasian provinces, which had fallen into Russian occupation during the previous years of anarchy and inroads by the Turks to the west, and to have forced the Russians to retire from Shirwan by September of that year (as indicated by a Gāmbun diary):¹

Then he had turned west to deal with the Turks and, before April 1735, laid siege to Ganjeh,² which was at last taken.³

Fr. du Cerceau's *History of the Revolutions, etc.*, makes a brief mention of "another action "between Tabriz and Erivan which also ended in favour of the Persians and in the death of " 'Abdullah Kupruli". A letter of Fr. Emmanuel of S. Albert, from Baghdad, 9.9.1735,⁴ permits that battle to be dated about 1.8.1735:

"Our Fathers at Isfahan write too that they are enjoying at present great tranquillity "because Tahmasp Quli Khan, the Persian general, being constantly victorious over the "Turks, the country, especially the capital, is being set on its feet again day by day. *About "forty days ago there was a great battle near Erivan, in which the Turks were totally defeated "and more than 20,000 men, together with the commander-in-chief"* (i.e. 'Abdullah Kupruli) "and six other Pashas, were left dead on the field of battle. This great rout will "oblige the Turks to make peace with Tahmasp. . . ."

In fact, from Fr. Leander's book it is learnt that, although the

'Sultan of Turkey had a force of 116,000 men assembled, and put under Ahmad Pasha 'of Edessa, peace was made near Erzerum on the following terms:

- '(a) Tabriz and its district, seized by the Turks during the Afghan hostilities, was 'to be Persian,
- '(b) the boundaries between the two empires were to be as in the time of Shah 'Sultan Husain,
- '(c) the Turks were to give back all Persian prisoners.'

Fr. du Cerceau adds that provision was also made for the Shiah Persians to visit on pilgrimage Makkeh and Madineh free of the impositions till then exacted.

Readers will marvel how, with the continual carnage of those previous ten years of civil wars and campaigns on the frontiers and the drain on the manhood of the country—no matter how great a reduction for exaggeration be allowed in the figures of those said to be slain—a tribal leader, risen from the ranks like Tahmasp Quli Khan, was able constantly to replenish his armies and keep them drilled and equipped, above all obedient and content to serve. One

¹ e.g. "8.10.1734. Rejoyccings have been made for Thomas Caun takeing Shirwan, who was then at Shamakha, where "he had raised in ten days 50,000 Tumans and as many horses. He demands of the Muscovites three years' revenue "of the country they are possessed of, and that they evacuate all these places. . . ."

² A letter from the linguist, or interpreter, of the East India Company at Isfahan, received 15.4.1735, had it that "Thomas Caun has raised the siege of Ganjeh to go out to meet the Turks, who were approaching with very numerous "forces."

³ Then, in another communication: "19.4.1735. "Ganjeh at last taken."

⁴ *S.N.R.*, IV, p. 370.