

1937

Z. Avalishvili, T'eimuraz and his poem: The Martyrdom of Queen K'et'evan

Z Avalishvili

TEIMURAZ I AND HIS POEM "THE MARTYRDOM OF QUEEN K'ET'EVAN"

By Z. AVALISHVILI

I. CONCERNING THE POEM

“THE much tried and noblest among women, the valiant Queen and martyr, the highly praised K'et'evan”—this is the description of the mother of T'eimuraz I, King of Kakhet'i, in an eighteenth century Georgian chronicle. And, indeed, the daughter of Ashot'an, Prince of Mukhrani, is one of Georgia's greatest heroines. The story of her martyrdom (1624) is known to all; it has been told many times; the Church itself, both in the East and West has bestowed its love and admiration upon her. In England, for example, an account of her martyrdom was written by the Rev. John Mason Neale in 1850, and by Archdeacon Dowling in 1912. “A poem or a story ought to be written about K'et'evan,” says her contemporary, Pietro della Valle, the well-known Italian traveller, singing the praises of this Queen's noble personality and high character, “but to do justice to the greatness of the subject is beyond my powers and the little span that is mine.” P. della Valle missed the opportunity, but Andreas Gryphius, the noted German dramatist of the seventeenth century, inspired by the same subject, wrote *Catharina von Georgien* (1658). Nor was the burden too great for the son of K'et'evan, T'eimuraz, who dedicated a poem to the martyrdom of his mother. Though it was printed for the first time in 1928, that is some three centuries later, the manuscript was of course known to a few. It is a versified martyrology, lacking neither inspiration nor literary skill. But the poet is the martyr's own son, and this fact has naturally coloured his whole outlook. The poem, therefore, describes not only the sufferings of K'et'evan; it also conveys to us the poignant grief of T'eimuraz, his own personal sorrow and loss. The Queen and two sons of T'eimuraz, Alexandre and Levan (Leo), were taken prisoners by Shah Abbas in 1614 and held as hostages, because T'eimuraz himself had refused to appear before the Shah, his suzerain. Their fate was sealed from the very first owing to the pro-Turkish policy pursued by T'eimuraz in connection with the long-drawn-out Perso-Turkish war, in which Georgia, too, was often involved. T'eimuraz was consequently himself the cause, though involuntarily, of their ruin. The King-hagiographer does not, however, reveal that he was conscious of this. He deliberately leaves much unsaid, yet it is obvious that the sense of his guilt is the reason for the bitter penitence that makes his grief so overwhelming. The difficulty in writing this poem must have been very great. The poet is concerned with versification, the son laments his martyred mother, and the King-politician endeavours to tell in few words the true story of past events.

- 15, 1-2. Why lengthen the story, to the land of Shiraz she was taken,
In a fortress stronger than the K'ajis¹ castle was the sun-like to
be placed

No doubt some recollections trouble him when he speaks of the devastation of Kakhet'i, by Shah Abbas (in 1614-16); he makes no mention of what he himself was doing.

12. In fetters bound he² had left her at Ganja
as one of prisoners,
Where was then her King-son, or the
pursuivants' array
That they might have used their blades
upon her keepers,
And from fetters free the praiseworthy ray.

Where was "the king-son"? The answer is simple, T'eimuraz was hiding at the time in Imeret'i.

About the martyrdom itself, in 1624, he laments:—

67. Woe unto me! the mentioner of that day, forgotten are for me afore-gone days!
From breast to the spine hot iron bars unto her they thrust,
I, transgressor, sinner, was not nearby, and over this I now grieve,
With my right-hand the Cross I failed to defend, that is why I shed tears.

If his mother's fate was "the hot irons" and that of his sons the surgeon's knife (they were castrated in Shiraz, in 1618; one died immediately after the operation, the other survived for many years), it was the result of his compliance with the Turks, i.e. the Persian revenge for it.

In 1624, the year of his mother's martyrdom, he was the guest of Turkey in Gonieh, near Batum, and out of reach of the Shah. Therefore the penitence of T'eimuraz expressed in the above quotation is somewhat insincere and artificial. This, however, cannot be said about the whole of the poem.

The martyrdom is described with great dramatic force, and a contrast is drawn between "the valiant" Queen and her craven suite:

- 59, 2-3. They seized the star-like, the peerless-faced
And before her eyes her attendants they islamized,
None of them daring a voice of protest raise.

The last prayer of K'et'evan attains a high note of Christian exaltation. T'eimuraz, a devout and sincere orthodox Christian, was also a gifted poet, and his faith and talent helped him in the difficult task he had set himself.

¹ A fabulous race in Georgian folklore.

² i.e. Shah Abbas.

40. I am frightened somewhat strangely of the mighty guardians of the air,¹
 And of the unbearable torments at my expiration.
 O! Archangel Gabriel let me not out of thy hands
 Ye martyrs and saints deliver me from the darkness.
- 41, 11-2. O, Lord I pray thee at the last judgment
 Among the wise virgins me to reckon and of the standing on thy right-hand make me worthy.

In his penitence and confession of sins, too, T'eimuraz is greatly eloquent :—

80. One day I shall stand naked, with bowed head, silent,
 Shrouded in my sin of old, unhallowed by blessing,
 With hands and feet bound though outwardly resplendent.
 Unsleeping worm awaits me and the burning fire. . . .

The general trend or tone of the poem is, in some parts, of course, a little pious and bookish ; the writer had received two kinds of training, religious and secular—in the Greek orthodoxy, i.e. its Georgian form, and in the literary tradition of both Georgia and Persia (T'eimuraz was also a Persian scholar). To him salve is "emplastron". On the other hand, one reads in his description of the martyrdom such "Persian" ornaments as the following :—

- 68, 1-2. They spread under her and over her (hot) iron nails,
 These pierced through, cutting open the crystal, the ruby, the enamel.

A verse in such doubtful taste is, however, rare in this work, which is characterized by true depth of feeling as well as by moving rhetoric.

The following lines are also typical of his learning, secular and religious :

- 75, 1-2. Death her would not kill, her amorous of God, the jet, the enamel,
 Alive is she, and with a (martyr's) crown she is seated on the ladder's rung.

Here "the jet, the enamel" is of Rust'avelian style while the ladder is "the Paradise ladder" (*Scala Paradisi*) of John of Sinai (*Sinaita*), mentioned immediately after (82, 4) :

- 82, 4. To her the divines appealed and (even) John of Sinai himself.

This father of the Church, who flourished in the seventh century, was surnamed Joannes Climacus.

It is not my intention to dwell here at any length on the poem,

¹ In Georgian *haeris-mtsvelni*, who, according to Sulkhan-Saba Orbeliani (see his *Georgian Dictionary*, edited by Professors Joseph Kipshidze and A. Shanidze, Tiflis, 1928, p. 472), are the less evil devils who remained in the air, while the more evil ones descended into hell. So here, apparently, the old demonology is reflected.

though I shall quote a number of stanzas. The first edition, published in 1928 (*Anthology*, Book 2, Tiflis), appears to contain a number of interpolated stanzas. T'eimuraz himself stated :—

84, 1-4. Should one add "verses" (to this poem), will anger me not,
I have written eighty "verses", here's all the end and the beginning.

Here "verse" no doubt denotes stanza, and if he originally mentioned eighty, the extra four stanzas must have been added.

77. How shall be praised the King, by God guarded and protected !
Now his prosperity confirmed under no hidden constellation,
Upon him in full the earthly power was bestowed,
And away from him is the Dragon that walks upon the clouds.

T'eimuraz would not have said this of himself. These lines obviously allude to his return to Georgia and the reconquest of the kingdom in 1625, when Shah Abbas (the "Dragon") was elsewhere. They were certainly written by someone else, and "added".

The importance of the poem in Georgian literature is indisputable. It is probably the first example of a poetical treatment of a lively historical Georgian theme—no small achievement of T'eimuraz's poetic talent.

2. CAPTIVITY IN SHIRAZ

In his versified account of K'et'evan's martyrdom, T'eimuraz refers to Shah Abbas's activities in Georgia, to the captivity of the Queen in Shiraz and her tragic end ; he also refers to the stories that sprung up about her relics. Let us clarify some obscure passages in this poem by means of information derived from other sources, and throw light on certain allusions which have hitherto been given but little attention. These must be kept in mind if we are to get a true picture of the events described, and not a one-sided and modified version.

I will not refer here to the earlier activity of K'et'evan who was at the head of Kakhet'i, in 1605 and later ; nor will I enlarge upon the circumstances that ended the alliance between Shah Abbas and T'eimuraz, or those under which T'eimuraz's brother-in-law and friend, King Luarsab II, grandson of that Svimon (Simon), King of K'art'li (1558-1600 with interruptions), who had rendered so much service to Persia, died by the hand of an executioner, somewhat earlier (in 1620) than K'et'evan, in the same country of Shiraz. To dwell upon these would involve a general survey of the political and international situation both of *Likh't'-amieri* (Eastern) and of *Likh't'-imieri* (Western) Georgia, during the first

quarter of the seventeenth century; and also of the celebrated exploits of Giorgi (George) Saakadze, the "Grand Constable", etc. For such a study we have, however, no space here. We will first touch, briefly, on the life of the Queen in Shiraz, referring, *en passant*, to the question of her relics, but will chiefly dwell on the political aftermath of K'et'evan's martyrdom, which throws a revealing light upon the Georgia of the time. We must, however, turn back again to T'eimuraz's *Martyrdom*.

As to the conditions under which K'et'evan lived for seven years (1617-1624) in Shiraz, the information contained in T'eimuraz's poem is of course incomplete. Besides the martyrdom itself, the poem also describes with great pathos K'et'evan's despair and lamentation when she was deprived of her only hope, her grandsons, "the tender gifts" (9, 1).

15, 4. The sojourn in Egypt seemed light to her, she was rearing her son's issue.

When these were taken away from her—

21. A, me! broken-hearted, lost! How came I to the shore of the sea!
Wo! into a pit I have fallen, into the mud of the abyss.
In my patrimonial homeland I live not, but in someone else's,
Woe is me! for I am parted from Alexandre, and look at Levan I can no longer.

It is, however, only in the writings of the European authors that we find plain, straightforward accounts of the Queen's life in captivity. Figueroa, the Spanish Ambassador, describes how she was brought to Shiraz and housed there; he gives us the motives for her removal thither, as well as describing T'eimuraz's affairs, and the devastation of his kingdom. Upon the arrival of the Ambassador, K'et'evan had sent a messenger to inquire about him; and she maintained this courteous attitude while the Ambassador was in Shiraz (from the end of 1617 till April, 1618). The Ambassador himself dared not make inquiries about the Queen through his own messenger. He reciprocated greetings and conveyed his thanks and good wishes through K'et'evan's own servants. He was afraid to arouse the suspicions of the Persians, particularly as he was a Christian himself. The Queen appointed from her suite her personal confessor, a monk of the Basilian (Eastern) order, Moses by name, to carry out the delicate task of continuing communication between herself and the Ambassador. This man seemed to the Ambassador, judging from his conduct and manner of life, to be a monk of the ancient Christian Church. He has high praise for him and speaks at length of his martyrdom. Moses showed him two Georgian books, beautifully bound and adorned, the Bible, with psalter, and the Gospels, including the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul.

This monk, although not mentioned by name, is also referred to by P. della Valle, in his *Informatione della Georgia* (1627). From him we learn that K'et'evan lived in Shiraz in circumstances befitting her rank, surrounded by numerous attendants of both sexes; she had her own place of worship, containing many icons, sacred vases, much church furniture, and books. During the last period of her life, however, she employed neither priest nor monk. Her former priest was martyred by the Persians, because they believed that he strengthened the Queen in her Christian faith and hindered her conversion, as well as that of the two sons of T'eimuraz to Islam. Reference to Moses the monk is also intended, I think, in a passage (56) of T'eimuraz's poem: ("There a cross-bearer in a strange manner existent. . . . by Pharaoh apprehended . . . staunch like Moses. . . .") Moses was put to death because it was thought that he advised the Queen against embracing Islam. This information is probably correct. The same cause, apart from the motive of vengeance, must also have brought about the martyrdom of K'et'evan herself. Arakel, the well-known Armenian historian, surnamed "of Tabriz", relates the following story of her martyrdom: In the course of a conversation at the court of Shah Abbas, where a young and recently converted Georgian was present, the question arose as to why it was that, while all young Georgians were forced to embrace Islam, their mothers were not. The explanation given by one of those present was that since the Queen would not change her faith Georgian mothers likewise refused. This remark of Arakel is noteworthy. It is quite possible that the main object of the Persian Government in putting K'et'evan to death was to remove a powerful personality whose steadfastness could only strengthen by example the determination of other Georgians residing in Persia and thus delay their conversion. It was exactly this conversion that the Persians desired. Especially the apostasy of the Georgian kings and of leading personages for political and military reasons. This end had, indeed, already been partially achieved. The idea of embracing Islam, whether for political or personal reasons, had found supporters among the Georgians even in Georgia, but it was among those residing in Persia that it was more seriously considered; their numbers and influence were considerable at the time, and the determination of the Queen and her courage therefore appear all the more striking.

According to P. della Valle, K'et'evan herself often discussed with her friends at her Shiraz residence the question as to which religion was the better—Christian or Muhammadan. Moreover she was persistently advised, by Persians and Georgians alike, to embrace Islam; "Embrace it, what does it matter (so long as you only) embrace it *outwardly*," they urged her. This was no doubt the spirit

of compromise which must have prevailed among the Georgians there. Similar advice, given to K'et'evan by the lord of Shiraz, is recorded in the poem itself :—

35, 2-3. Convert thou too, become a Tatar, as if it's no worse,
Jesus what harm will do thee, whilst this one¹ is against thee incensed.

In T'eimuraz's poem, mention is also made of a *Giorgi, or George, the priest*. Neither the latter nor any of the Georgians who surrounded K'et'evan had the strength to profess Christ as did K'et'evan at the moment of her martyrdom. As soon as they saw the flaming fire and the "irons", "tongs", "bars", etc., thrown into it, they chose to renounce their religion.

61. When the priest saw he took fright of the fire,
Of those spearheads, nail-shaped irons frightful,
And turning pale he trembled seized with terror;
His heart sank, he failed to settle the torture's account.

In P. della Valle's account, this Giorgi the priest, an Imer(et'ian), becomes a very real character. The Roman nobleman was very much attracted by the personality of the Queen, and was grieved by her fate: but he did not of course dare to go to see her. Once in Shiraz—it was in June, 1622—della Valle noticed a man of honourable appearance enter a tailor's shop at the same time as himself, and although he spoke Persian and Turkish, Valle at once suspected (from the kind of Bukharan hat he wore) that he was a Georgian and also (from the characteristic beard) an ecclesiastic. He formed the impression that the man might have been the Queen's priest. Valle's one great desire had been to establish contact with one of the Queen's attendants, and he naturally missed no opportunity of getting acquainted with the stranger. But this priest, *chusesi Ghiorghin*, as Valle calls him, was not a real priest (he did not officiate, Valle remarks in his *Informations*). He proved to be the Queen's table-steward and major-domo. Valle later asked him to dinner and afterwards recorded their conversation. Valle had married a Syrian Christian, Maani by name, and they had under their care a Georgian girl who conversed with Giorgi in Georgian. Later, this *Mariuccia*, formerly called T'inat'in, was presented to the Queen, who received the Georgian orphan with motherly tenderness. There must have been a great number sharing T'inat'in's fate at that time in Persia.

Giorgi the "priest" was also a horticulturist. In this science the Georgians, according to Valle, were considered to be more expert than the Persians. Once Giorgi had even been invited to Ispahan in

¹ i.e. Shah Abbas.

this capacity. It is clear, however, that this horticulturist and table-steward was not likely to face martyrdom.

Through the medium of Giorgi K'et'evan had presented two books of prayers to della Valle, one Latin, with gilt covers, and the other Portuguese, both undoubtedly part of the booty captured from Ormuz by the Persians and the English in 1622, and redeemed by the Queen. The books contained marginal notes in her own hand (see P. della Valle's letters, xvi, and xvii, from Shiraz, dated 27th July, 1622, and 18th January, 1623).

It is said that during the last days of her life the Queen was consoled and her spiritual needs were administered to by the Augustinian monks (M. Tamarati, *L'Église Géorgienne*, etc., Rome, 1911). T'eimuraz makes no mention of this, nor is the fact directly stated in Valle's report to Pope Urban VIII; what Valle reports is that he was convinced (particularly since their padres—the Carmelites and Augustinians—had a hostel and a church in Shiraz), that they would have taken care of her, etc. But this seems hardly possible since, according to the Valle's own statement, the Queen could not be approached even before the days of her martyrdom. A friend "Whom I will not name", the Italian traveller states, had sent her clandestinely—this may have taken place in 1622–3—an icon of the Virgin. But there would have been no free access to her during her last days.

The Spanish Ambassador, Figueroa, on his way back to the Persian Gulf, passed through Shiraz, where he remained for two weeks. He was very eager to learn more about the fate of the Queen—the news of her martyrdom was then still quite fresh—but the members of her household had been forbidden to leave the house, nor could any of them be seen. The Persians, it is evident, did not want the Ambassador of a great State such as Spain then was to know much about the martyrdom of the Queen.

And the event could not have been a matter of mere passing curiosity on the part of the Spanish Ambassador. He probably knew that when the question of a common Hispano-Persian action against Turkey was discussed, towards the end of the sixteenth century, it was understood that Persia would have the Christian kings of Georgia as allies as well. This was asserted as early as 1595 by Svimon (Simon), King of K'art'li, in his reply (the letter was recently discovered in the Castilian archives near Valladolid) to Philip II.

The same statement was also made by the Ambassadors of Shah Abbas in Europe. One of them, called Don Juan the Persian, embraced Christianity. He remained in Spain, where he wrote a book on Persia, from which book Don Garcia Sylva de Figueroa would have learnt something of Georgia and her kings. Here in Shiraz he would regard the Perso-Georgian alliance as nothing out of the way. And the

method of bringing pressure upon a human being by ordeal of fire would have been no novelty to him.

3. IN SEARCH OF RELIQUIÆ.

The question as to what happened to the dead body of K'et'evan after her martyrdom would not have become a question of importance (and, indeed it is not), but for the fact that superstition, religious exaltation, and sometimes worldly and mundane consideration usually endow relics of persons martyred for Christ's sake with peculiar significance. Hence the adoration of relics, the appeal to their miraculous power, etc. The martyrdom of K'et'evan proved no exception to this custom, and the relics of the martyred Queen have a history of their own. It is not our intention to write this history; we wish merely to note differences in the traditions concerning these relics, and certain contradiction, quite usual in these cases.

In the first place we shall hear T'eimuraz, who knew every detail of his mother's martyrdom, and whose poem is almost contemporary with the martyrdom. The poem was probably written in the years 1627-8, in any case not later than 1633; from the poem it appears that, probably, Shah Abbas and certainly Imam-Quli-Khan of Shiraz were then (i.e. when the poem was being written) still alive, and we know that the dates of their death were 1629 (January), and 1633 respectively.

According to T'eimuraz, immediately after K'et'evan "commended her soul to the Lord, her God" (69, 2), and ascended to Paradise (69, 3-4):—

70, 1-2. Light from heaven descended, visible to all the people
And Jesus Christ they glorified, both the young and old.

T'eimuraz here follows the old obligatory manner of a hagiography. Then he adds:—

71, 1-2. On the anniversary her grave they opened, of her comparable
to Nino,
Fragrant smell was perceived, but the deceased was nowhere.

If they buried her, how did it happen that on the first anniversary "the deceased was nowhere?"

71, 3-4. They said: "The Franks must have stolen..."
I say: she is ascended and on this earth she is nowhere.

and, combining here the religious-mystical and erotic languages, the poet declares:—

75, 3-4. Death her would not kill, her, amorous of God, the jet, the enamel,
Alive is she, and with a (martyr's) crown she is seated on the
ladder's rung.

This is the immaterial crown of the martyrs. Her remains, however, "are nowhere on this earth," he asserts (71, 4). And by this declaration T'eimuraz seems clearly and definitely to reject the legend of the saintly relics of K'et'evan; he denies the existence of these relics, that is of the earthly remains of the Queen.

"The Franks must have stolen," is stated in the quoted verse (71, 3) as a mere hint. That the remains of K'et'evan fell into the hands of the Catholic monks is an old and well-known story. Very astonishing is the fact that this version (i.e. that the remains had been discovered by the Catholics) is mentioned also in the poem of T'eimuraz in the following form :—

72. The soul-bell of this saint is there heard everywhere,
And for her relic ardently wished every cross-adorer.
Twelve thousand *tomans* the Franks would offer,
Shah Abbas yielded not, else a great sin he would commit.
73. Secretly they discovered the relic hidden by the spade,
Recognizing it, they spread rumours in search the Nimroz(ian) scribes
had failed;
They placed it in a reliquary, and before it amber and musk they burnt.
It healed the sick if one the door approached.

This is a usual story of relic finding and adoration. It implies that the relic did exist, that a sum of 12,000 *tomans* (120,000 gold francs, approx.) was offered for it, which the Shah, however, would not accept, "Shah Abbas yielded not," and that the Franks "secretly found it". This version, therefore, flatly contradicts the first declaration of T'eimuraz :—

71, 4. I say : She is ascended, and on this earth she is nowhere,

and of course such a view, that is, the non-existence of the relic, though for quite other reasons (its possible loss after the martyrdom, or rather its complete destruction) was not absolutely groundless. But in the first place it must be also borne in mind that the story of the discovery of the relics is based chiefly on the tradition of the Catholic missionaries—the Nimrozian scribes of the poem (73, 2). Brosset admitted that he did not understand what this strange name, *Nimrozeli'a*, "Nimrozians," denoted. And, indeed, who are these *Nimrozian Scribes* (72, 2) ? *Nimruz*, a bookish word borrowed from the Persians, denotes "the meridian", and *nimruzeli* or *nimrozeli* has the same meaning as the French *méridional*, i.e. a Southerner. T'eimuraz probably has in view those Augustinians who, according to tradition, kept in Ispahan the relics of his mother. The headquarters of the Augustinian order were indeed in that part of the world, in the south, in India, at Goa, the then well-known and flourishing Portuguese colony. Antonio de Gouvea, the Ambassador of Philip III, King of Spain and Portugal,

who, in 1602, received the Shah Abbas's permission to found a monastery in Ispahan, had himself been a rector of the Augustinian College at Goa.

One would expect from M. T'amarashvili (= Tamarati) the more detailed information on this question. In his work, *A History of Catholicism among the Georgians* (in Georgian, Tiflis, 1902), he states: "When Father Ambrosio and his brother, Peter, monks of the order of St. Augustine, arrived in Gori, on the first of June, 1628, they must have brought with them the relics of Queen K'et'evan," because "when he (i.e. T'eimuraz) made peace with the Shah of Persia (i.e. Shah Abbas) he asked him for the body of Queen K'e'tevan to be restored to him; it was kept with great honour in Ispahan in the Monastery of the Augustinian monks". This information T'amarashvili must have taken from the report which the Rome Congregation of Propaganda received later, in 1640, from the Augustinians in Persia. Father Ambrosio is mentioned in this report, too, and the story is found also in T'amarashvili's other work, in French, namely, in *L'Eglise Géorgienne*, etc. (Rome, 1910, pp. 432-485).

The orthodox Church of Georgia has also, of course, a word to say on this question, and where else are we to look for it if not in the *Martyrology* of Anthony I, the learned Catholicos of Georgia, wherein are described "the deeds and passions" of Queen K'et'evan and King Luarsab II of K'art'li? On the question as to what became of the remains of the martyr, this important and very interesting work (see Tchubinashvili, *Chrestomathy*, St. Pb., 1846, vol. i) repeats, in the light of the Italian information and of the story of Arakel of Tabriz, the legend of the discovery of the remains made with the aid of a miraculous "luminous pillar". (T'eimuraz says: "Secretly they discovered the relic. . . .", see above.) By this means the "believers in Christ even though schismatics", that is the Catholics, knew where the remains were to be found. Consequently, in Anthony's opinion, too, the Catholics were the discoverers of the remains. And what followed? Anthony, too, says (and, according to him, his opinion was shared by "all the historians whether our own or Armenian or Latin") that the Frank monks had offered T'eimuraz half of the relics of his mother, which he (T'eimuraz) had accepted with great delight, and had laid to rest in the Alaverdi cathedral, "under the holy altar, as they say." The expression "as they say" is rather astonishing: does it imply that Anthony had no definite knowledge of this? But, besides this tradition, which may be called foreign, Catholic, and which is accepted by Anthony, there exists also another tradition which is Georgio-Greek and orthodox. These two contradictory traditions were dealt with by the learned Prince T'eimuraz, a descendant of K'et'evan, in his *Martyrdom of St. K'et'evan the Queen of Kakhet'i*,

written in 1832. He expands the story told by his ancestor and namesake, the poet (see above), and states that the "Nimrozian" priests were very eager to find K'et'evan's remains and that they promised Shah Abbas 220,000 roubles (!) which he, however, rejected. "But these catholic priests, out of their great love for Christ, stole the remains of the saint, and, embalming it by means of spices, took it away clandestinely." Then, after consulting the unpublished studies of the Georgian Catholicos Bessarion and a priest-monk, Giorgi, he makes quite a different statement, to the effect that the Queen, after the martyrdom, had been buried "within her own house of prayer, where she lived during her life", that is, in Shiraz itself, and not in the Augustinian monastery at Ispahan. The remains, when brought to Georgia, were laid to rest by T'eimuraz with great ceremony at Alaverdi; there were present "Zak'aria the Catholicos, the Archbishops and the clergy of All Georgia", etc.

But these later scholars merely compiled their stories from books. For us, however, the evidence of the contemporaries is more important. There exists a writing which, so far as I am aware, has not yet been noticed, and in which the "Georgian" tradition is more fully represented. It is a small book, printed in 1632 (where, is not evident, but probably somewhere in Italy), containing an epistle written in Greek, with a Latin Translation; its title is: *De Ketabae Teimurazis Georgiano- rum principis matris martyrio & Insigni quadam hac de causa Jesuitarum impostura*.¹ The writer of the epistle is a priest-monk, Gregory, *Gregorius Hieromonachus et exarchus Patriarchicus*, a resident of Trebizond, and it is dated 16th May, 1626; the epistle is addressed to the *sanctissimum doctissimumque Protosyncellorum Sophronium*, in Constantinople. It describes briefly the overrunning of Kakhet'i in 1614 and following years, an event well known to historians; the deportation of the population, particularly that of K'et'evan to Persia; the extermination of the great nobles; and, of course, the martyrdom of K'et'evan. One of the female attendants of the Queen, whose name is given as *Moakhla* (= *moakhle*, that is an attendant, here used as a proper name), decided, according to this epistle, to save the remains of the martyr and, having found the body, kept it in the house of her new master, a grandee. The Jesuits were also anxiously looking for the body, but having failed to find it, they severed the head of a corpse, and took it to T'eimuraz representing it as the relic of his martyred mother. It was received, of course, with great rejoicing in Georgia, where they laid it to rest, with great solemnity, in the St. George's Cathedral at Alaverdi. The adoration of the relic was instituted, and the Jesuits concealed their fraud with great cunning.

¹ See Plate facing p. 38.

These facts soon became known throughout Georgia, and the news reached "Moakhla" in Persia; she immediately informed T'eimuraz that K'et'evan's remains were in her safe-keeping. When, later, peace was concluded with Persia, the Georgian Ambassadors successfully negotiated the repatriation of many Georgians, among whom was "Moakhla", who brought with her K'et'evan's remains. The body was examined and definitely identified as that of K'et'evan. Soon, the evidence of two Georgians, just returned from Persia, finally exposed the fraud of the Jesuits. T'eimuraz was much enraged, but, as he anticipated at this time a clash of arms with the *Mourav* or Grand Constable (George Saakadze), he had no time to inflict due punishment upon the wrongdoers; he forbade, however, the adoration of K'et'evan's remains, ordaining that, at Alaverdi, only St. George was to be adored. K'et'evan was a saint, he said, and would anyhow be reckoned with the saints on the All-Hallow day. This doubt on T'eimuraz's part about his mother's remains perhaps accounts for his statement "she is nowhere on this earth", made in his poem.

This "Greco-Georgian" story accuses the Jesuits of dishonesty (how far justifiable is, however, another question), and it does not agree with the version of the Augustinian brothers either (see above), from which, indeed, it differs in important essentials. Which of these versions is the earlier? Both appeared almost at the same time. The former we found in the epistle of the year 1626; the latter, although it has been connected with a report written in 1640, is nevertheless of an earlier date. The Augustinian version was already known in Rome in 1627 from that important *Information concerning Georgia* which P. della Valle submitted to Pope Urban VIII on his return from Persia. He had learnt of the martyrdom of the Queen for the first time at Basra, from Padre Gregorio Orsino, who, some time before, had sent a special and extensive (and, to my knowledge, as yet unknown) report on the subject to Rome.

To gain the sympathy of these Georgians who had surrounded the Queen at the time of her martyrdom, and who remained in Shiraz, and knew that her relics were in the safe-keeping of "our Augustinian fathers", was, in the opinion of Valle, very important for Catholic propaganda in Georgia.

So, the "discovery of the remains" by the Catholics must have had some connection with the propaganda and its aim, in Georgia, particularly in Kakhet'i. Help was even to be expected in this matter says P. della Valle from the relatives of the Metropolitan of Alaverdi, and other Georgian grandees (about the Catholic sympathies of this Metropolitan we have some information in one of the reports of L. Granger. The latter, a Jesuit, had been in contact with T'eimuraz and the Metropolitan already from 1615 in Megrelia. This was known

to Valle also. So, the mention of the Jesuits in the Greek letter is not quite so groundless).

In any case, T'eimuraz himself confirms the story of the Augustinians in a letter, written in Latin, to the Pope in 1635 ; and his purpose in making the confirmation was in all probability inspired by diplomatic motives.

Even apart from the complicated and fabulous history of these relics, the Greek pamphlet is invaluable ; it contains many details of great interest ; moreover, it is written with sound knowledge of the matter and of Georgia, which is testified by such words used in Greek as *T'eimuraz*, *K'et'evan* (just as they were used in Georgian), *Moakhle*, *Alaverdeli* (= of Alaverdi, the title of the Metropolitan of Alaverdi), *Kakhet'i*, *Gremi*, *Mouravi*, etc. The author had been to Alaverdi. Particularly important is the writer's political information. The contents of the letter tally with the known course of the great events of the time, such as the martyrdom of K'et'evan in September, 1624, at Shiraz ; the bloody and victorious rebellion of the Georgians at Norio-Martqop'i seven months later, engineered by the *Mourav* (Grand Constable), in which twelve military commanders of Persia, including the Commander-in-Chief, were killed in March, 1625 ; the heavy but glorious defeat at Marabda in June of the same year, followed by discord among the Georgians, complicated rivalry, T'eimuraz's conclusion of peace with Persia ; and finally the defeat by T'eimuraz of G. Saakadze (the *Mourav*) at Bazalet'i, inglorious for everyone concerned—all this during the year 1626. And the epistle of "Gregory, the monk-priest", was written at a time when coming conflict was expected. It must be connected in some way with the presence during those years in Europe, especially in Rome, of the well-known and learned Georgian Abbot, Nicephorus Irbach-Tcholoqashvili, himself a Kakh(et')ian.

4. THE FEAST AT SHIRAZ

The Queen was martyred at Shiraz on the 12th (28) September, 1624, by order of the Shah. The order was carried out by the Khan of Shiraz, and that this person was *Khanlar-Khan Imam-Quli-Khan*, the great lord of Shiraz and other lands, is referred to in T'eimuraz's poem as follows :—

29, 1-2. To the Khanlar-Khan of Shiraz Shah Abbas this message sent :
" Lettest thou not Queen K'et'evan a long time live

30. If a Muslim become this hale intrepid spirit,
And embrace the Muhammad's faith, commending herself to
Azrael,

I swear by Murt'uz-Ali¹ to let no harm upon her befall,
But should she not renounce Christ a great pain on her inflict."

The lord of Shiraz performed the unpleasant duty thrust upon him. It is true at first:—

31. Imam-Quli-Khan hearing this order so distressing
Was highly astonished, "How can she be treated with such indignity," he said,
I know she a Muslim won't become though a hard time she has;
How can I T'eimuraz's mother affront in so unbecoming a manner?

But these sentiments on his part did not save K'et'evan. Nor was the Khan's advice:—

35. This we hold the faith by Muhammad established,
Convert thou too, become a Tatar, as if it's no worse,
Jesus what harm will do thee, whilst this one (i.e. Abbas) is against thee incensed;
Do not submit to these tortures it's not your wont.

of any avail. The Queen chose to suffer. And the suffering inflicted upon her was the most terrible of its kind. In the poem of T'eimuraz it is described with an almost exaggerated realism. To suffer as K'et'evan did was not "his wont"; he knew this well. Martyrdom had never been his ambition, nor was Dimitri the Devoted (martyred by the Mongols in 1289) his hero. He loved Christ and believed in Christianity, but he also loved hunting, poetry, and wars. But to "praise" in verse the martyrdom of his mother he considered as a performance of especial merit. Does he not make K'et'evan say, in her last prayer: O, God,

- 46, 3-4. Grant my son, T'eimuraz, the victory over the enemies,
In Eden enthrone him, the describer of my deeds.

Of Imam-Quli-Khan, lord of Shiraz, at the time of K'et'evan's martyrdom, by order of whom the executioners cruelly demonstrated to the Queen the "supremacy" of Muhammad's creed, by means of hot iron bars, T'eimuraz says:—

32. The praise of the Khan of Shiraz the tongues of the wise cannot say,
He is modest, sweet, and gracious, all of this earth high him raise
Deserving of God and therefore by upper powers protected.

Such an outburst in praise of Khan of Shiraz is indeed unexpected, and even somewhat out of place in the poem; it is almost startling. There must have been some hidden tie between the Khan and T'eimuraz; the King-poet, however, throws no light on it; nor is it revealed by his brilliant biographer, Artchil—a King-poet, too—nor in Georgian documents.

¹ *Murt'uz-ali* means "Ali, favoured by God", and Ali, son-in-law of Muhammad, is the pre-eminent saint of Shiah Muslims; *Azrael* (= Israp'il) is an archangel in Muslim mythology.

This Imam-Quli-Khan was a Georgian by origin, but, of course, a Muhammadan by religion. There were then in Persia many Georgian converts, brought up in Islam, or made Muslims by force. But the career of Imam-Quli-Khan as also that of Allahverdi-Khan, his father, was a very unusual one even for those days. Allahverdi-Khan had been Shah Abbas's principal officer and commander-in-chief, and the foremost man of the reign; he had received the Khanship of Shiraz as a reward for his numerous services. He extended the sovereignty of Safavid Persia towards Arabia and the Persian Gulf, and established it so firmly that his dominion was considered by far the largest in the whole of Persia. Our Imam-Quli-Khan was his son and heir. In 1622, that is two years before the martyrdom of K'et'evan, he triumphantly carried out one of the greatest military and political enterprises of Shah Abbas's reign. With the aid of England, or rather with the co-operation of the warships owned by the recently inaugurated East India Company, the Persians conquered, under the leadership of Imam-Quli-Khan, the Portuguese fortress on the Island of Ormuz, in the Persian Gulf, near Gombrun, afterwards named Bander Abbas. Thus a southward route for Persian trade, which then consisted principally of silk, was opened. This was an important event in the "imperialistic" rivalry between England and Portugal. The preliminary negotiations and military preparation for this action took place in Shiraz.

In 1628 English envoys on their way from the Persian Gulf to Ispahan arrived in Shiraz. Accompanying Sir Dodmore Cotton, the Ambassador, was Robert Shirley, one of the English brothers who played such a prominent part in Shah Abbas's diplomatic and military history. With this Robert Shirley's advice and assistance, the Persian standing army was reorganized in the first years of the seventeenth century by Allahverdi-Khan, father of Imam-Quli-Khan, and became the deciding factor of Persia's political ambitions under Shah Abbas. The Persians also learnt from the English at this time the art of cannon making. It is, however, Thomas Herbert, a young attaché to the English Embassy who now claims our interest. From his pen, we have a remarkable and detailed account of the journey and activities of the English envoys.

They reached Shiraz, the town of Hafiz, at the end of February, 1627. This is what Herbert has to say about Imam-Quli-Khan. "This man is a *Georgian* by descent, a Mussulman by profession, and one of the *Tetrarchs* that rule the Empire under Abbas. His territories reach every way well-nigh four hundred miles." He next proceeds to enumerate the titles held by Imam-Quli-Khan—"Arch-Duke of Shiraz, Sultan of Lar, Lord of Ormuz, of Kerman, of Khuzistan, Seistan, of Farsistan, etc.; Prince of the Persian Gulf and of the

islands therein, the Great Beglar-Beg, Commander of 12 Sultans, 50,000 Horse, Slave to Shah-Abbas, Protector of Mussulmen, Nutmeg of comfort, and Rose of delight."

These titles convey to us an idea of eminence of Imam-Quli-Khan.

But our interest in the "Arch-Duke" of Shiraz lies in the fact that he was in some way connected with the fate of T'eimuraz and so with Georgian history; which connection made the King of Kakhet'i write:—

"The praise of the Khan of Shiraz the tongues of the wise cannot say," etc. Is it to be supposed that T'eimuraz merely praises Imam-Quli-Khan because the order that K'et'evan was "either to embrace Islam, or" . . .

32, 4. He did not let her for three months know, he had as much regard. No. T'eimuraz must have had a closer and more direct connection with the mighty Muslim Georgian lords of Shiraz (there was then a galaxy of them in that city). Herbert describes the banquet given by Imam-Quli-Khan in honour of the English Ambassador. Imam-Quli-Khan himself, however, was lacking in courtesy; he did not appear in the banqueting hall until the feast was almost over, and only then did he deign to drink the health of the English King. In all other respects the feast appears to have been magnificent. Herbert mentions the twenty gilt columns adorning the banqueting hall, the gilt ceiling and exquisite paintings representing the outstanding events of the past five years, such as the conquest and laying waste of Ormuz by Imam-Quli-Khan, with the aid of English warships. From the pavilion, where the distinguished foreigners, such as the junior members of the embassy, the Sultans, the Princes of Ormuz, the principal officials, Qizilbash chiefs, and great merchants were seated, could be seen two courtyards, one where notable citizens were being entertained at a sumptuously spread table, and the other where about 500 of the humbler people were also being feasted.

In the stately main Hall the English Ambassador was seated beside the Khanlar-Khan. As we have said, Imam-Quli-Khan arrived very late. He was preceded by thirty youths, richly attired and armed, falcons chained to their wrists.

On the left of Sir Dodmore sat the 18-year-old son of Imam-Quli-Khan, who held the office of begler-beg; next to him was a distinguished prisoner, the King of Ormuz. At the head of the table was the host himself, the lord of Shiraz. On his right sat "a Prince of Tartary", and a certain *Threbis-cawn*. Opposite Imam-Quli-Khan, between the King of Ormuz and "Threbis-cawn", was Robert Shirley, who knew Persia so well.

Who was "Threbis-cawn"? Thomas Herbert says that he was "A disconsolate Prince of Georgia, a gallant Person, expert in Arms, and a constant Christian". He can be, of course, no other than T'eimuraz himself; the characterization fits him so well, and the fact that the name is not correctly given may be regarded as a natural mistake for a foreigner to make. There can be no doubt about this because T'rebis-Khan is the same as T'ebris-Khan, and T'eimuraz is referred to by this name in the report of the French Jesuit Louis Granger, who, in 1615, had arrived in Megrelia to make investigations. According to him Dadiani (the ruler of Megrelia) was then engaged in hunting. He (Dadiani) would have had no time to receive him in any case, for he had with him, recently arrived, a guest, the Georgian King (Prince) Tebris-Khan, who, a year ago, had been expelled from his domains by the Persians. It is clear that this Tebris-Khan is T'eimuraz I. In 1615, he was, indeed, in Western Georgia, chiefly as a guest of Giorgi (George), King of Imeret'i. Levan Dadiani had given a great banquet in honour of his first cousin, T'eimuraz, which had also been attended by Louis Granger and a colleague. The Jesuit had even conversed with T'eimuraz. The two Catholic priests, it seems, had quite a gay time; after the talk, they drank and sang. The feast at Shiraz, in 1627, was a very different affair; T'eimuraz was naturally sorrowful and pensive, following the tragic events of 1624. Herbert also knew of this meeting between T'eimuraz and L. Granger, S.J.

But what had taken King T'eimuraz I, whose kingdom had been laid waste and whose mother had been martyred by Shah Abbas, to Persia, whose Shah in his own words, was:—

14, 12-3. Torturer of Christians, of the innocent blood shedder,
In the place of Herod sinner, etc.?

So tortuous and obscure are the paths of politics!

5. DAVID UNDILADZE.

T'eimuraz, G. Saakadze and their Georgian followers, were defeated at the battle of Marabda, after which the King of the Kakhs concluded peace with Shah Abbas. How did this come about?

Herbert has preserved some information on Georgian affairs of the time given him by his co-traveller R. Shirley. He mentions the well-known surprise attack on the Persians by the Grand Constable (at Norio-Martqop'i, March, 1625) during which the latter, he adds, with only 500 men at his disposal, exterminated 700 of the enemy, including eleven Khans and Begler-begs. Of the Marabda battle, however, he either knew nothing, or Herbert may have forgotten to

record it. Shirley, however, had added that Shah Abbas had convinced the Georgians, with the aid of the Georgian Qizilbashis (i.e. renegade Georgians), that he desired peace with them; he posed in fact as the apostle of peace. This is an important statement, and it seems to be confirmed by Iskender Munshi. The Persian historian says that when G. Saakadze, defeated by T'eimuraz during an internal strife, turned finally to Turkey, T'eimuraz chose to re-establish friendly relations with the Shah. To this end he enlisted the help of *Daud-Khan*, a brother of Imam-Quli-Khan of Shiraz, son of Allahverdi-Khan, and Begler-beg of the province of Fars; he must have been at the time—probably 1626—in Tiflis.¹

The desire for a compromise on the part of T'eimuraz can be explained by his caution; the Grand Constable, backed by the Turks, would represent a real danger to him; he could have invaded and occupied K'art'li, perhaps even Kakhet'i. With only his own forces, without help from Persia, T'eimuraz could not have fought his rival aided by the Turkish troops. The compromise was regarded with equal favour by Shah Abbas, who was then also fighting the Turks in the region of Baghdad, and T'eimuraz's vassalage and friendship would be of immense value to him. Therefore, he recognized the King of the Kakhs as the lord of both K'art'li and Kakhet'i by conferring on him the title of *Vali*. T'eimuraz had himself already conquered the two kingdoms in 1625-6, and Shah Abbas was only confirming a *de facto* situation. Nevertheless, such a formal recognition on the part of the Shah was of great importance to T'eimuraz. Thus, in spite of the Norio-Martqop'i rebellion and the battle of Marabda, T'eimuraz sought for and obtained in 1626 the protection of Persia as of old. In order to strengthen himself against Saakadze he deliberately thrust from him the memory of the devastation of Kakhet'i in 1614-16; the castration in Persia, approximately about 1618, of his two sons, taken as hostages with Queen K'et'evan, by Shah Abbas, in 1614; the strangulation with a bow cord of his friend, ally, and closest relation, Luarsab II, King of K'art'li, near Shiraz, in 1620; and, crowning all, the martyrdom of his own mother of whom he says:—

8, 4. Like her has not been born either a boy or a girl.

¹ The portrait of Daud-Khan, facing page 38, is published here after Castelli's original drawing preserved in the *Biblioteca Comunale* of Palermo. The inscriptions on the drawing itself, under the portrait, read as follows: αὐθέντης τοῦ γανξιδᾶ and *Daud Kan Persiano*. The Greek words render "the Beglarbeg of Ganja". On the right-hand margin and under the drawing, on the sheet of paper on which the latter appears to be fixed, we read: 1. *Daud Kan fra[te]lo dell Kan di Siras, benefattore dei nostri Padri nel Regno di Georgia*; and 2. *Daud Gangie Provincie Regni Iberie Ducis seu Chan frater (Mamuli Chan de Syras Provincie Persarum qui a Persarum Rege occisus est) pro timore illius propriae occissionis ab eodem Rege ad Turcas fugiens in itinere Domum nostram visitans intravit qui tractatus est a Patribus Nostris et ratione tratationis eleemosinam dedit eis*. So the portrait was drawn by the Catholic missionary Castelli in Georgia (probably about 1633).

This belated reconciliation with Shah Abbas reopened the road to Persia for T'eimuraz (see the evidence of the Greek pamphlet mentioned above) and made possible his visit to Shiraz in 1627, referred to by Herbert (see here § 4). The part played by Daud-Khan, Imam-Quli-Khan's brother—seems to confirm still further his presence in Persia. This visit is not, however, mentioned in *The Life of T'eimuraz* "told" by Artchil, although he does refer to T'eimuraz's intention to visit Shah Abbas. After relating how Zurab, the Erist'avi of the Aragvi, "went over to Svimon II, helped him to occupy K'art'li, then killed him, and sent his severed head to the lord of the Kakhs, and how he aided T'eimuraz to reoccupy the whole of K'art'li" (how eloquent the heading of a chapter in the rhymed *History of T'eimuraz*) the poet makes T'eimuraz say:—

496, 1. The head reached me in Up'adar, *while on the way to the Shah*,
and then, changing his mind:—

497, 1. I did not go to the Shah and to K'art'li I turned again.

That he finally did go to Persia is now established beyond doubt. He could easily have stayed in Shiraz with Imam-Quli-Khan, without seeing the Shah at all. Their personal meeting, after what had happened, after the "torrents of blood", would have been neither desirable nor felicitous!

How was the Arch-Duke of Shiraz to know that his friendship with T'eimuraz would prove so costly to him?

It will be remembered that Daud-Khan, brother of Imam-Quli-Khan, was instrumental in bringing about the reconciliation between T'eimuraz and Shah Abbas. He held a high office in his brother's domain. His name, like that of his brother, was remembered throughout Southern Persia even after half a century had elapsed. In 1674, Chardin mentions Daud-Khan's bazaar, and the *caravanserai* or palace, containing 200 rooms for the Indian merchants, accommodation "built by order of Daud-Khan, brother of the renowned Imam-Quli-Khan". On his way from Ispahan to Bander Abbas, Chardin had passed through the village of *Amnabad*, the meaning of which is "a reliable, safe station" and so called, according to Chardin, after a fortress-like building formerly erected there by Daud-Khan. This place is also described by Herbert, a contemporary of Daud-Khan, who was there in 1627; it had then a population of thirty families, consisting mostly of Georgian renegades. The village was walled round, and bore some resemblance to a fortress. It was the seat of Daud-Khan: "Here is a neat Carravansraw," states Herbert, "and his own Banqueting Houses for his own delight; that I went into had five rooms upon a floor, which were well painted with imagery and embossed

with gold." The gardens, too, were beautifully laid out ; " and being the spring which as Virg. 2 lib. Georg. faith makes all things fair ; amongst other flowers were Tulips and Roses. . . . So as of House and Gardens I may say ; With various forms and curious figures there, The House and Gardens of Dout Chawn appear " (here follows the Latin version of this distich. Herbert is a product of the English Renaissance, and his youthful work is too frequently interspersed with Latin and Greek quotations).

A Georgian Muslim in the land of Shiraz praised in Latin verses by an Englishman almost contemporary with Shakespeare ! It seems almost incredible !

Like other European travellers in Persia of that time, Herbert mentions the Georgians recently deported by Shah Abbas to this part of Persia. It was perhaps owing to the fact that Georgian Muslim grandees held sway there, that colonies of the Georgians, carried off from Georgia, were to be found in this region.

On the Shiraz-Ispahan road was a halt called Aspas (" Assepose "). It was a place " observable only in an old Castle in and about which inhabit (as we were told) no fewer than 40,000 Georgians and Sarcashes (Circassians ?) who by profession are christian. They were little better than captives, being forcibly transplanted hither ".

Aspas (Asupas, Asepas) and its Georgian inhabitants, first mentioned by P. della Valle in 1621, is referred to in many itineraries. Half a century later, another English traveller, John Fryer, a doctor, employed by the East India Company (1672-1681) had visited it when on his way from Shiraz to Ispahan ; " Asspass," he states, " is now inhabited by Georgian Christians, who are Tillers of the ground and Planters of Vines, which are very productive on the Sides of the Hills.¹ They are whiter than the present Persians and of a florid complexion, being portly, well-limb'd fellows. Many of them have embraced the Mohometan Faith after the Persian sect, being Vassals to the Emperor." ²

But to return to Daud-Khan.

During the great rebellion of 1625, though holding a high office in the neighbourhood of Georgia, his conduct was not such as befitted

¹ The viticultural occupation of the Shirazi Georgians provides a simple answer to the question raised by Professor I. Javakhishvili (*An Economic History of Georgia*, Tiflis, 1934, vol. ii, pp. 412-413) ; how did it happen that the Shiraz variety of the grape is known to the Europeans under a Georgian name (*Shiraz-uli*, Shiraz-ian) ? The Europeans must have learned it from the Shirazi Georgians.

² A curious trace of this struggle of the Georgians to maintain their old faith is recorded in an additional note to the old *Georgian Dictionary* of Sulkhani-Saba Orbeliani (Tiflis, 1928, p. 260), according to which " *Nu-gat'at'rdebi* is an Egyptian pigeon, a small bird, similar to the turtledove, common in Misir (i.e. Egypt) and Shiraz. When they see a passer-by they cry in Georgian *nu gat'at'rdebi* (= ' dost not thou become a Tatar ', i.e. a Muslim), and on this account the Muslims call this bird *giaur-qush*, that is, ' infidel bird.' "

a loyal servant of the Shah. He was actually supporting G. Saakadze. In 1625-6, however, his mediation brought about peace between the King of the Kakhs and the Shah. Later, as we saw, T'eimuraz was in Shiraz as the guest of Daud-Khan's brother. This was after the battle of Bazalet'i. About this time the Grand Constable adopted finally the Turkish orientation, and T'eimuraz, the Persian. This final "choice" proved to be less onerous for Saakadze (for he died soon after, in 1629) than it did for T'eimuraz. Shah Abbas died at the beginning of the same year, 1629, His son and heir, Shah Safi, secured the throne with the help of Khosrow-Mirza, the *darugha* of Ispahan. Khosrow-Mirza was a descendant of the Kings of K'art'li, the lawful heir in the eyes of the K'art'lians to the throne of K'art'li, and one of the greatest grandees in Persia. He was thus a formidable rival to T'eimuraz.

This was the man, aged and growing weary of Persia, to whom T'eimuraz himself gave the pretext and opportunity for the seizing of K'art'li (later also Kakhet'i), and for becoming King of Georgia under the name of Rostom.

T'eimuraz thought that the Persia of Shah Abbas the Great was declining, that a new era was beginning, and that the renewed war with Turkey would finally ruin Persia. He invaded Ganja-Qarabagh, the provinces "on this side of the Aras", which he devastated. Levan Dadian, with his army, and the Imers and Meskhs, also took part in this plundering expedition. This act pointed to a revival of "Turkish" orientation. History repeated itself in this invasion by united forces of Georgia.

At this time Daud-Khan was with T'eimuraz. Artchil makes the latter say:—

523, 1-2. Daud-Khan sat at Ganja, Undiladze, as Begler-beg
He moved from there and came to stand by me.

Thus it is clear that his name was Undiladze. P'arsadan Gorgijanidze, a Georgian historian, speaking of this duplicity of Daud-Khan and his treachery towards Persia, stated definitely that he was brother of Imam-Quli-Khan, lord of Shiraz. There can be no doubt that Daud-Khan Undiladze and the brother of Imam-Quli-Khan of Shiraz are one and the same. This Daud-Khan had under him the Qajar nomads, whom he brought to the banks of the Yori; in Artchil's words:—

523, 4. Then he let Kakhs raid them to be ruined, exterminated.

By this act they revenged themselves upon those who took part in the unexampled devastation of Georgia, and in particular of Kakhet'i, avenging also the "torrents of blood", the bitter memory of which was still fresh even in the nineteenth century.

УПЕГӨРӨҮ ТЕРӨМӨ:

ΝΑΧΟΤ ΚΑΙ ΕΞΑΡΧΟΤ ΠΑΤΡΙΑΡ-

പ്രാർത്ഥനാ നിർവ്വഹനകരമായ നീതി
 പ്രാർത്ഥനാ നിർവ്വഹനകരമായ നീതി

Enrico

ПЕРІОД МАРТИПЛОТ КЕТАВАН

ος τις εἴς· βίβλον ἀντίστου τμήματος· ἡ μαρτυρία
 καὶ λαλοῖς παρ' εἰς ἡσυχασίαν
 τρεπόμενος.

GREGORII HIEROMONACH-

CHI ET EXARCHI-PATRIAR-

chiciad sanctissimum doctissimumque
Protosyncellorum Sophronium

Protoyicellorum Sophrenum



DE KETABATULIMURAZIRATOP

signi quodam hac de causa lectu-
rum innotuit.

figui quadam hac de causa totius
tatem innotuit.

carpenter, mason

MDG XXXI



Artchil represents this invasion as one of the "heroic deeds" of T'eimuraz himself :—

522, 1-3. Hence I went to "cis-Arasia," this I devastated and pillaged
The disloyal and the disobedient, these I punished and ruined.

The real circumstances of this invasion are explained by Gorgijanidze in his *History*. He states that Levan Dadiani, Alexandre, King of Imeret'i, and the Meskhs, K'art's, and Kakhs took part in this invasion; he also lays particular stress on the council which the Armenian Catholicos of Gandzasar had given to T'eimuraz: "You have at your disposal the forces of *seven Georgia*, and I will place at your service another 40,000 riflemen (!) March at their head on Tabriz, and *let them pillage Tabriz for the space of seven days*. The loot you will reckon to the forces as seven years' salary and before the Shah has time to muster his forces you will have replaced the Governors of Azerbaijan with those of your own choice. Furthermore, *bid me go to the Sultan and I will arrange with him for still more troops to be sent to your aid.*"

T'eimuraz, however, rejected this ambitious and tempting plan; he no doubt knew what such a Turkish "aid", under the then prevailing conditions, would mean. The disappointed Armenian prelate protested justly and with bitter sarcasm: "... The King of Iran will see to it that you do not have another opportunity to muster a similar army!"

But T'eimuraz would not listen; he chose the better alternative, moved from Ganja, and headed for Gori with Daud-Khan and the Armenian Catholicos. At Gori "he feasted Dadiani and the King of Imeret'i and the Princes of the Meskhs . . . he hunted with them, entertained them royally, and, presenting gifts to all of them, took leave of them".

In one respect the Armenian Catholicos was right. A whole century was to pass before a King of the Georgians was again able to muster, in the same region, a large Georgio-Armenian force. It did not become possible until Peter the Great's invasion of Persia but like T'eimuraz, King Vakhtang VI did not attain his object.

6. EPILOGUE.

The invasion of the land "on this side of the Aras" cost T'eimuraz and Daud-Khan very dear. It was used as a pretext for handing K'art'li to Khosrow-Khan or Rostom, of whom mention has been made. Full of determination he arrived from Persia with a large suite, a powerful army, and ample supplies of money. He achieved what his father, Daud-Khan, brother of Svimon I, and also his kinsman Constantine the Kakh—Kustendil-Khan, uncle of T'eimuraz, had failed to

achieve in their time, namely, Perso-Georgian accord or compromise. He followed the policy of Svimon I, his uncle, Persia's stubborn supporter.

Daud-Khan (the Shirazian) was compelled to flee to Turkey. As a result of his treachery towards Persia his entire family and that of his brother, Imam-Quli-Khans', was exterminated, and their estates laid waste. "Shah Safi had Imam-Quli-Khan put to death, together with his children, while the Daud-Khan's children he had castrated. . . ." "It has been said of old that no good will accrue to one who is false to his master," concludes P'arsadan, and this is his last word on one of those turns of fate which greatly shocked contemporaries.

At that time the East India Company were trying to bring about the weakening of the Portuguese influence. In 1622, with the help of the Persians, they had destroyed their fortress on the island of Ormuz ; now they wished to expel these rivals from Muscat (situated across the water, on the coast of Arabia, in the Persian Gulf). On the Persian side, we know, such matters came under the province of the lord of Shiraz.

On the 27th January, 1633, the Company's agents informed their Board of a rumour to the effect that the forces of the "Duke" of Shiraz had been sent, by personal order of the Shah, against the Georgians who had invaded and devastated Persian provinces ; they had defeated Persian forces and taken prisoner the brother of the lord of Shiraz. Whatever the source of the rumour, they knew that Daud-Khan was Begler-beg of Ganja, and must at first have thought he had fallen prisoner to the Georgians ; for they could not as yet have heard of his treachery.

In a letter dated 15th March, 1633, and addressed to the President and the Board of the Company, at Surat, it is stated that "the project for Muscat is quite dissolved, as also the chief instrument, their ancient friend, the Duke of Shiraz and his three sons, who were by this King's command in Cosbeen (Kasbin) most miserably executed. Besides, all forces are bent towards the wars of Georgia, who lately, upon some discontent with this King, made great insurrections in this Kingdom", that is in Persia.

On 24th March fuller information is sent by a captain from Gombrun (on the sea coast) to the effect that the Khan of Shiraz and his three sons were beheaded by the King of Persia, and their domain distributed to others. "Some of his sons," the agent reports, "are escaped to the Arabs, and his brother, whose revolt to the Georgians was the cause of this tragedy, is now up in arms with the people against him" (i.e. the Shah). It is pointed out in the report that Turkey intended to move against Baghdad, and that the Shah had not more than 10,000 troops.

The Shah inspired such fear that none of the Princes dared to appear before him, or send contingents to him. The East India Company was thunderstruck. The cunning murder of the Khanlar Khan is explained in the letter by the fact that although he did his utmost to induce his brother (Daud-Khan) to return and submit to the Shah, he failed; and that on this account the enraged Shah had him executed.

The author of the report, an Englishman, also gives the reason for Daud-Khan's treachery. He had once talked too freely at a banquet, had been led away immediately, by order of the Shah, and beaten with a stick. Insulted or fear stricken, Daud-Khan had fled to the Georgians.

This agrees in essence with the account of P'arsadan Gorgijanidze, who states that the Shah had once expelled Daud-Khan from the banqueting hall out of respect for King Rostom (then Khosrow-Mirza), and that the affront was more than Daud-Khan could tolerate. "He began, therefore, to send emissaries to T'eimuraz" in order to establish relations with him. The date of this incident is not known. We find that, in 1626, Daud-Khan is still Persia's sentinel in Georgia. In an English letter, addressed to the East India Company and dated 19th May, 1626 (from Ispahan), it is stated that the Shah and the Khan of Shiraz were sending large reinforcements to Baghdad, which had been besieged for the past eight months by the Turks. "The Georgians stir little, being pent up by the brother of the Khan of Shiraz," states the letter in question; while the Kurds, allies of the Turks, were harassing the neighbourhood of Tabriz in order to compel the Persians to withdraw part of their forces from Baghdad. It is evident how important it was to keep the Georgians within their own bounds during these complicated military operations, and this task was performed by Daud-Khan.

When, in 1627, the English Ambassador saw Imam-Quli-Khan in Shiraz, his political career was at its height, and his position unassailable. The humiliating treatment meted out to Daud-Khan must have taken place after the ascension of Shah Safi in 1629. And as Khosrow-Mirza or Rostom appears to have been the cause of his disgrace, it may be assumed that the former, knowing of the friendship between T'eimuraz, his rival, and the Shiraz brothers, may have intrigued against them. The sequel was the treachery of Daud-Khan, the devastation of Ganja and Qarabagh by the Georgians, and the extermination of the Shiraz brothers. This treachery secured K'art'li for Rostom; actually, it was his by right, for was he not a descendant of the K'art'lian kings? Those of the Georgian grandees who knew of his power and influence with Shah Safi, and who were themselves advocates of Persian orientation, sided, of course, with Rostom.

Shah Safi, for his part, found in the treachery of Daud-Khan a

pretext not only for placing K'art'li and later the whole of Eastern Georgia in reliable hands, but also for confiscation of riches and for the reduction of Khanlar Khan's huge domain ; he divided the latter into ordinary Khanates.

The extermination of Imam-Quli-Khan and his family must have taken place in February or March, 1633 (this is determined by the dates of the afore-mentioned English documents), and the devastation of Ganja and Qarabagh by the Georgians and the joint action of Daud-Khan and T'eimuraz, in 1632. King Rostom must also have acquired K'art'li in the same year (1632).

To the English operating in the South of Persia, the sudden eclipse of the " Duke " of Shiraz must have been of great moment. Even the Georgian " tailpiece " to this event was not devoid of interest for them. The East India Company were informed by their representative, from Shiraz, under the date of 28th to 30th September, 1633, that " almost the whole of Georgia (only K'art'li and Kakhet'i should be understood) now grows under this Emperor's government, betrayed, as report goes, by its own nobility, so that King Tamoris-Canne, with his wife and children, was fain to fly to a place invincible where he remains for better times ".

In fact, King Rostom was at this time approaching Tiflis, with his loyal K'art'lian grandees and an Iranian army, commanded by Rostom-Khan Saakadze ; and T'eimuraz, with no troops at his disposal, no assistance forthcoming, could not risk a battle. He crossed into Imeret'i, where he stayed with King Alexandre. He lived, however, to see " better times " and again reigned in Kakhet'i.¹

¹ Additional sources of information : P. della Valle's well-known *Letters or Voyages ; L'Ambassade de D. Garcias de Silva Figueroa en Perse*, etc., Paris, 1667 ; P. della Valle's *Informazione della Giorgia*, 1627 (see the original text in M. Melchisedec Thevenot's *Relations de divers voyages*, etc., 2 éd., Paris, 1696, vol. i, part i) ; Arakel de Tauriz, *Livre d'histoires*, translated by M. F. Brosset (*Collection d'historiens arméniens*, vol. i) ; *Letters of Simon I of K'art'li, addressed to the Court of Spain*, published by M. F. Macler in *Revue des études arméniennes*, Paris, 1920, vol. i ; Anthoine de Gouvea, *Relation des grandes guerres et victoire obtenues par le Roy de Perse Cha (sic) Abbas*, etc., Rouen, 1646 ; Thomas Herbert's *Travels*, London, 1677 (3rd edition) ; Chardin, *Voyages*, etc., 1711, vol. iii ; *The Journal of Robert Stodart* . . . published . . . by Sir E. Denison Ross, London, 1935 ; J. Fryer, *A New Account of East India and Persia*, etc., London, 1698 ; *The Life of King T'eimuraz I*, by King Artchil (part of the so-called *Artchiliani*), published by Platon Ioseliani, Tiflis, 1853 ; P'arsadan Gorgijanidze's *History*, published by S. Kakabadze, Tiflis, 1924. M. F. Brosset, *Mémoires inédits*, etc., Paris, 1833 (for *The Martyrdom of St. K'ete'van*, by Prince T'eimuraz) ; *Calendar of State Papers. Colonial Series. East India and Persia, 1630-1634*, London, 1892 ; id. 1625-1629, London, 1884.