ii. IN PERSIA.
From the fall of the Il-Khāns to the end of the Safawids.

A characteristic change of the *kātib*'s position, already noticeable under the Il-Khāns, took place in the successor states of Mongol Persia. The Mongolian and Turkish terms remained to some extent the same as before, although not necessarily with the same meaning. New terms were of course also introduced, partly for institutions that continued as such or were slightly modified. Fluctuating usage, in which obsolete and current expressions were used simultaneously, makes understanding of the technical terminology difficult. It goes without saying that here only the most important outlines can be sketched of a development which has not yet been studied sufficiently.

The great number of secretaries in the Diala'irid administration should be related to two different facts: the tripartite division of the administration into a military, a civilian and a religious section on the one hand, and the specific ethnic composition of the army, most of the soldiers being Turks or Mongols, on the other. Following the Il-Khānid tradition, there thus existed, especially in the military administration, a class of secretaries especially knowledgeable in Turkish or Mongolian. It was their task to translate into these two languages original documents probably written in Persian, and in Trak also in Arabic. Though counted among the kuttāb, they were called by the Turkish term bitikčī, probably to distinguish them from the Persian-speaking secretaries. The most important secretary in the military administration was called bitikči-yi ahkām-i mughulī or kātib-i mughulī-niwis. But the continuance of Il-<u>Kh</u>ānid usage brought about the fact that even the secretary of the governmental financial administration, who served under the mustawfi al-mamālik or state treasurer, was counted among the bilikčiyan, with the title of ūlūgh bitikčī-yi mamālik. However, the local financial secretaries who served under him did not belong to the bitikčīyān. It is still dubious whether the last-mentioned were in fact of Turkish or Mongolian origin, or whether they were local inhabitants who has mastered Turkish or Mongolian. The first place among the Persian-speaking kuttāb was held by the munshī al-mamālih, who was in charge of the dār al-inshā' (the "State Chancellery"), a subsection of the Great Dīwān (dīwān-i a'lā, dīwān-i buzurg) directed by the grand vizier. In the different sections of the munshī al-mamālih's chancellery, two classes of kuttāb were employed: the munshīyān whose task it was to draft documents, and the so-called muḥarrirān charged with preparing fair copies; among the latter very skilled calligraphers were found. The archives formed a separate department of the dār al-inshā'.

The nomination of secretaries was probably reserved to the grand vizier. The kuttāb in general, and the munshī al-māmālik specifically, were expected to be trustworthy, to be masters of protocol and to possess both stylistic and calligraphic qualities. In the religious administration, mainly concerned with the maintenance of the religious law and the interests of pious foundations, a number of kuttāb were also to be found, e.g. the kātib-i dār al-kadā' (secretary of the supreme court) and the mu'arrikh-i hudjadi wa-kabālāt, an archivist who kept a permanent register of legal evidences and contracts of sale.

We may draw conclusions about the organization of the chancelleries in Timur's time from the situation under his successors. In their time, specific linguistic expressions continued to indicate the difference between the various groups of kuttab. Under Husayn Baykara, the secretaries of the socalled "Turkish diwan" had the title of bakhshī or niwīsandagān-i turk. This dīwān dealt with affairs concerning the army and the Turkish subjects. Distinct from them were the wazīrān or niwīsandagāni tādjīk, the Persian speaking kuttāb, who were the secretaries of the diwan-i mal, the "Persian diwan", responsible for finances and the affairs of the non-Turkish population. On no account could a kātib of the Turkish dîwān be called wazīr. It seems that relations had been similar under the Turcoman dynasties, as may be deduced from a remark of Hasan Rūmlū, a kizilbāsh chronicler, who says that one of his ancestors had served as bakhshī under the Ak-Kovunlu.

Under the Şafawids also, the head of the State Chancellery was called munshi al-mamālik (under the Timurids, as well as having this title, he is said to have also been called sāhib-dīwān-i inshā'). The Safawid administration was characterized by a duality in the civil service—the State Chancellery and the Treasury—, which had already existed before. Each single department of the Safawid treasury (daftarkhāna), which was headed by the mustawfi al-mamālik, consisted of the financial section proper and a chancellery. The lashgarniwis, head of one of the most important subsections of the daftar-khāna, corresponded to the Il-Khānid and Djalāyirid ūlūgh bitikčī-yi mamālik. He was the paymaster of the troops of the provincial governors and also of the court and provincial officials, and had an imposing chancellery at his disposal. On the other hand, the dar al-insha, the State Chancellery of the munshī al-mamālik, was in charge of the state correspondence such as diplomatic letters and all kinds of charters. When under Abbās I a special royal administration (the sarkār-i khāssa-yi sharifa) was set up at the side of the already existing governmental administration, a special chancellery had of course to be created 758 KĀTIB

for this purpose. A number of duties were transferred from the munshī al-mamālik to the head of the new chancellery, the wāķi a-niwīs or madīlisniwīs. In the course of the rith/17th century, the madīlis-niwīs surpassed the munshī al-mamālik both in rank and sphere of competence. Moreover, the madīlis-niwīs enjoyed to a much greater extent the confidence of the ruler. Only in so far as the number of the subordinate kuttāb was concerned was the munshī al-mamālik superior to the madīlisniwīs.

A handbook of administration, the Tadhkirat almulūk, shows that in the early 12th/18th century, 28 kuttāb were subordinate to the munshī al-mamālik: one munshī-yi dīwān who prepared drafts, and 27 muḥarrirān who wrote out the fair copies. In the chancellery of the $ma\underline{dilis}$ -niwīs, the rakam-niwīs-i $d\bar{i}w\bar{a}n$ -i $a^cl\bar{a}$ corresponded to the $mun\underline{sh}\bar{i}$ -yi $d\bar{i}w\bar{a}n$; he was assisted by three assistants. In this chancellery a further six kuttāb were also employed, among whom was a registrar and a nāma-niwīs, who was most probably responsible for the fair copies of the diplomatic letters (nāma or maktūb). Thus ten kuttāb were subordinate to the madilis-niwīs. The daftar-khāna too was influenced by the division of the administration into a governmental and a royal demesnial sector. Although the division within the daftar-khāna was not complete, the interests of state and crown were assigned to different subsections. Under the Safawids, charters were occasionally written in Turkish, but nothing is known about a classification of the huttab according to linguistic criteria.

Bibliography: H. Busse, Persische Diplomatik im Überblick, in Isl. xxxvii (1961), 202-245; idem, Untersuchungen zum islamischen Kanzleiwesen, Kairo 1959; G. Doerfer, Türkische mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen, ii, Wiesbaden 1965, s.v., bitikčī and baķšī; <u>Gh</u>iyā<u>th</u> al-Dīn b. Humām al-Dīn Khwāndamīr, Nāma-yi nāmī (selected parts in Persian and German with scholarly comment by G. Herrmann under the title Der historische Gehalt des "namä-ye nāmī" von Ḥāndamīr, doct. thesis, Göttingen 1968); W. Hinz, Die persische Geheimkanzlei im Mittelalter, in Westöstliche Abhandlungen (Fest-Die Resălă-ye Falakiyyă, Wiesbaden 1954, 342-56; idem, Die Resălă-ye Falakiyyă, Wiesbaden 1952; Djahāngīr Ķā'im-Maķāmī, Tahkīk dar bāra-yi shughl wa-wazīfa-yi munshī al-mamālik, in Barrasīhā-yi tārīkhī, v/2 (1349 sh.), 181-208; Maḥmūd Mirāttāb, Dastūr al-kātib fī ta'yīn al-marātib (des Moulānā Hendūšāh Nahšawānī), doct. thesis, Göttingen 1956; Momin Mohiuddin, The Chan-cellary and Persian Epistolography [under the Mughals: Bábur to Sháh Jahán], in Indo-Iranica, xvii (1964), no. 1, 1-28, no. 3, 1-16, xviii (1965), no. 2, 1-40, no. 3, 48-70, no. 4, 13-50, xix (1966), no. 1, 27-42, no. 2, 29-60, no. 4, 16-56; Muhammad b. Hindushāh Nakhčawānī, Dastūr al-kātib fī tacyīn al-marātib, i/1-2, ed. A. A. Alizade, Moscow 1964-71; H. R. Roemer, Staatsschreiben der Timuridenzeit, Wiesbaden 1952; R. M. Savory, A Secretarial Carreer under Shāh Tahmāsp I. (1524-1576), in Islamic Studies, ii (1963), 343-352; Tadhkirat al-Mulūk, A Manual of Safavid Administration (ca. 1137/1725), tr. and explained by V. Minorsky, London 1943. (B. Fragner)