

still in 1747 contributed so much: and also for a certain 'privilege' in trade to be obtained for them from the king of Spain.

After his death sore trouble was caused by his having drawn on the Sacr. Congregation for his usual allowance through an Armenian in Venice: and, the amount being disallowed as in excess of the correct figure by the secretariat of the Congregation, the Armenian threatened through his relatives in Julfa to have summary justice done on the other Carmelites in Julfa. It is not clear that all the pleading of the heavy expenses Bishop Philip Mary had sustained in his journeys was accepted in Rome as warranting a special grant in aid: in that period of administration there appears to have been little elasticity for inevitable expenditure and war depredations.

* * * * * *

Those references in the letter of the Shah's physician, the Capuchin Fr. Damian from Isfahan, 22.11.1742, "the king is due to turn his might against the Turks", and in the Carmelite Fr. Leander's book, *Secondo Viaggio*, to the Sultan of Turkey reinforcing the frontier garrisons at Kars and Erzerum, and to Nadir Shah, after his campaign in the Caucasus of 1742, making preparations for a declaration of war, amongst others by buying and building sailing vessels in the Persian Gulf proved to be, as it were, the small clouds on the horizon which soon were to become heavy with war over the western marches of Persia. Daring exponent of attack that he was the Persian autocrat struck first: even by September 1742 he had planned it, down to the very month (*vide* the letter of Fr. Damian:

"with the army in the mountains above Darband. . . . In the month of *March* the king "will turn his arms against Baghdad. . . .")

From Aleppo, 30.6.1743,¹ Fr. Emmanuel of S. Albert wrote:

"By letters" (of 7.5.1743) "from Baghdad, and by those from the French consul at Basra dated 21.5.1743, we have had news that shortly the city of Baghdad will be besieged "by Quli Khan: that the scarcity there is already so great that famine was feared before "long, and indeed various Pashas have had instructions from the Ottoman Porte to leave," (for Baghdad) "as we hear from letters from Constantinople which arrived ten days ago: "the Pashas of Damascus, Aleppo, Adana and others are already out on campaign to "march on Persia to the succour of Baghdad, and here in Aleppo one sees nothing else but "soldiers and munitions of war. . . ."

Simultaneously Mausil in the far north, and the river port of Basra were attacked. In a rhetorical vein, *Cont. Basra Chron.*² for the year 1743 relates:

"By the orders of Nadir Shah, alias Tahmasp Quli Khan, who at that time was besieging "the town called Mausil³ with innumerable forces of soldiers, the Persians laid siege to "this town (Basra) on 25.8.(1740). . . . 'Is this that town?'—the reader in every age will "rightly exclaim—"is this that town which, though hardly fortified by mud ramparts and " "destitute of any weapons and garrison, without any soldiery, without discipline, more " "by making a noise than by fighting for three months and thirteen days offered resistance " "to a force of 30,000 Persians, not counting the three [*? sic*] very powerful tribes of the

¹ *S.N.R.*, V, p. 86.

² Folio 39.

³ While calling at Rhodes on his way to Malta Fr. Emmanuel (letter of 14.11.1743) had an interview with the last Grand Vizir but one, in exile there, who stated he "had freshly received news that the town of Kirkuk had been taken by Quli Khan, Shah Nadir. . . ." ". . . There was general consternation in Mardin, Diarbakr," etc., he added in a letter of 13.11.1743.