

## THE BABI CONCEPT OF HOLY WAR

Denis MacEoin

The religious movement known as Babism appeared in mid-nineteenth-century Iran following the promulgation of charismatic claims by a young merchant, Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad Shīrāzī, in 1844. In its earliest phase (to 1848), Babism grew rapidly among the Shīʿī populations of Iran and Iraq as an expression of extreme Islamic pietism animated by urgent expectation of the return of the Hidden Imam in his messianic persona as the Imam Mahdī, Sayyid ʿAlī Muḥammad being his agent or 'gate' (*bāb*) on earth. In its brief second phase (1848-49), the movement achieved a tremendous charismatic breakthrough when a gathering of Bābīs announced the abrogation of the Islamic legal code while the Bāb (by now in prison in the north west of Iran) proclaimed himself the promised Mahdī in person. A third phase followed, initiated by the Bāb's rapid assumption of the role of an independent prophet or divine 'manifestation' directly empowered by God to open a new religious dispensation after Islam, to reveal new scriptures and to ordain a new legal system. Between 1848 and 1850, some four or five thousand Bābīs died in fierce clashes with state troops, while the Bāb himself was executed by firing squad in July 1850.<sup>1</sup>

The following article seeks to clarify the background to the Bābī-state clashes in the form of a discussion of the theory of holy war as presented in early Bābī writings and to analyse these conflicts themselves within the context of that theory. It is hoped that this analysis will also provide a basis for a later discussion of the dynamics of the transformation which took place from the 1860s from Babism to Baha'ism.

.....

Although some form of holy war has been recognized at various times and in different places in most religions, it is a concept most typically associated with Islam, a religion in which it has played a central role and where it has developed what is probably its most distinctive form as well as its most elaborate theological justification. It is not surprising, therefore, that holy war or *jihād* came to be a major feature of Babism, particularly in its early 'Islamic' phase, and that a response to the problems raised by *jihād* in the contemporary

period, as well as to the complications engendered by Babi militancy, became a dominant element in the early development of the doctrines of the derivative Bahā'ī movement. Until now, however, the role of *jihād* in Bābī theory and practice has been largely ignored by scholars, and no serious attempt has as yet been made to define or analyse its relationship to the Islamic concept of religious warfare.

It has, for example, been common to speak of 'Bābī uprisings',<sup>2</sup> of 'Bābī-inspired revolt' and 'rebellion',<sup>3</sup> of a Bābī 'rebellion against the state' and of 'Bābī insurrection'.<sup>4</sup> Later Bahā'ī writers have, on the other hand, consistently characterized the military activities of the Bābīs as defensive measures taken in response to religious persecution and have rejected all suggestions of rebellion or, indeed, of militancy. Thus, one writer states that 'when they (the Bābīs) defended themselves, as they did in a few places where a large number of Bābīs had congregated, their enemies misrepresented them as rebelling',<sup>5</sup> and speaks of 'prolonged Bābī resistance to the attacks of vastly superior forces' and the 'heroic defence' of the Bābīs.<sup>6</sup> Each of the struggles in Māzandarān, Nayrīz and Zanjān is generally described as an 'upheaval',<sup>7</sup> 'conflagration',<sup>8</sup> or 'commotion',<sup>9</sup> and the participants in them as 'the victims of an intense and systematic persecution on the part of both civil and ecclesiastical authorities',<sup>10</sup> as 'martyrs',<sup>11</sup> and as 'the scattered disciples of a persecuted community'.<sup>12</sup> Emphasis is laid on the 'categorical repudiation, on the part of the Bābīs, of any intention of interfering with the civil jurisdiction of the realm, or of undermining the legitimate authority of its sovereign',<sup>13</sup> and on the denial by the Bābī leadership that they had sought to 'direct any offensive' against their opponents.<sup>14</sup>

Both these views—'rebellion' on the one hand and 'self-defence' and 'persecution' on the other—obscure the more fundamental issue of the nature, status, and function of *jihād* within the Bābī movement, as derived from Islam, from the writings of the Bāb, and from the expressed attitudes of the Bābī leadership in those localities where trouble broke out. A careful consideration of the doctrine of holy war is a vital factor in the study of the Bābī-Bahā'ī movement, for a number of reasons. Firstly, it provides us with an important focus for the consideration of the Bāb's attitude and the attitudes of his followers to Islam and to the Qājār state. Secondly, it enables us to carry out a reappraisal of the political and ethical issues involved in the struggles of Shaykh Ṭabarsī, Nayrīz and Zanjān, as well as in other outbreaks of violence on a smaller scale between Bābīs and Muslim civilians or military forces. Thirdly, it leads us directly to one of the most central questions around which the development of Baha'ism out of Babism revolves, and clarifies for us what is perhaps the most distinctive feature of early Bahā'ī doctrine.

### THE ISLAMIC CONCEPT OF JIHĀD

From the beginning, *jihād* has played a vital role in the expansion and consolidation of Islam and in the structuring of its world view.<sup>15</sup> M. M. Bravmann has convincingly demonstrated the close connections between the concepts of *islām* (submission, surrender) and those of holy war (*jihād*), war in general (*ḥarb*) and fighting (*qitāl*) in the earliest period.<sup>16</sup> More perhaps than the other major teachings of Islam, *jihād* bears a deep relationship to its image and function as a universal religion to which, in the end, all men must submit, and whose legal and political system must ultimately embrace the planet. Muḥammad is the last of the prophets<sup>17</sup> and, as such, commissioned by God with a message, not for one people or race, but for all mankind: 'We have not sent you save as a bringer of universal tidings and a warner unto men'.<sup>18</sup> Muḥammad's function as a bringer of tidings and a warner (primarily concerning the Day of Judgment) included the obligation to proclaim the message given him by God<sup>19</sup> and to summon men to God and to submission to Him (*al-islām*).<sup>20</sup> Although the duty of inviting men to Islam fell primarily on the shoulders of the Prophet (particularly in the early period when access to him was always feasible), and although the ultimate work of guidance was left in the hands of God, there gradually developed in both theory and practice an obligation for the believers to assist God and His apostle in the universal *da'wa*, the summons to Islam.<sup>21</sup> The nature of this *da'wa* was necessarily closely linked to the actual circumstances in which the Prophet and his followers found themselves and to the character of the response which it evoked.

During the Meccan period (about 610–622 A.D.), Muhammad and his companions found themselves in a position of extreme weakness *vis à vis* the possible or actual physical sanctions of the society in which they lived. Summoning to Islam was to be carried out wisely and in a spirit of loving persuasion: 'Summon to the path of your Lord with wisdom and goodly counsel; dispute with them in the most suitable manner'.<sup>22</sup> The punishment of unbelievers lay outside the sphere of action of the small Islamic community; it would be taken care of in due course by God—in the meantime, men were to be warned of the imminence of such punishment and invited to salvation through embracing the true faith.

The first sign of a marked change in policy coincided with the accession of some real strength to the Islamic community by the conversion of large numbers in the city of Medina between the summer of 621 and June 622. In this latter month, a party of seventy-five Medinan Muslims came to Mecca, met Muḥammad by night, and pledged themselves to accept him as their prophet, to avoid the commission of sins, and to fight on behalf of God and His messenger. This 'Second Pledge of al-<sup>c</sup>Aqaba' came to be known as 'the Pledge

of War'.<sup>23</sup> According to some Muslim authorities, it was not long after this that the first revelation concerning fighting was given to Muḥammad, in a passage which now constitutes verses 30 to 40 of the eighth chapter of the Qur'ān: 'Say to those that have disbelieved in God that if they should cease (from persecuting the believers), that which has gone before shall be forgiven them; but should they begin once more, then the example of those who went before them has already been given. Wherefore, fight them until persecution shall be no more and religion shall belong in its entirety to God. But if they should cease, God beholds all that they do'.<sup>24</sup>

In Medina, Muhammad's role changed gradually from that of prophet pure and simple to that of divinely-inspired legislator and de facto leader of a city state comprising Meccan and Medinan Muslims, pagan Arabs of Medina, and three allied Jewish tribes. In 623, having sufficiently consolidated his position in Medina, Muḥammad initiated the practice of sending out expeditions against Meccan caravans. These raids soon began to acquire something of the character of a holy war: the Quranic injunctions to take part in them emphasized the virtue of striving (*jihād*) in the way of God and were eventually addressed to the community of believers as a whole, rather than specifically to the Meccan emigrants originally involved in this activity. The term for thus striving on behalf of God and His prophet against the unbelievers came, before long, to be the technical term for the holy war waged by Islam against the world of infidelity. 'The change from the *razzia* (expedition) to the *jihād*', writes Montgomery Watt, 'may seem to be no more than a change of name, the giving of an aura of religion to what was essentially the same activity. Yet this was not so. There was a change in the activity which came to be of the utmost importance as time went on. A *razzia* was the action of a tribe against another tribe . . . . *Jihād*, however, was the action of a religious community against non-members of the community, and the community was expanding. If the members of the pagan tribes raided by the Muslims professed Islam, they at once became exempt from further Muslim raids. Consequently, as the Islamic community grew, the raiding propensities of the Muslims had to be directed ever further outwards.'<sup>25</sup>

The open outbreak of hostilities between the fledgling Islamic state and the city of Mecca and the subsequent escalation of the conflict in the battles of Badr (624) and Uḥud (625), leading to the Siege of the Trench in 627 and culminating in the final capitulation of the Meccans in January 630, must all be studied in the standard histories. There is, similarly, no room here to enter in any detail into the discussion as to the dating of those passages of the Qur'an which elaborate the rationale and method of the holy war.

In general, there would appear to have been a gradual movement from injunctions to fight on a defensive basis to more explicitly aggressive ordinances in the later years of the Prophet's life. The early period seems to

have been characterized by a certain distinction between the military role of *jihād* on the one hand and religious conversion by peaceful means on the other: 'there is no compulsion in religion'.<sup>26</sup> Nevertheless, even if it was recognized that conscience could not be compelled by force (at least in days when the techniques of brain-washing had not been thought of), Islam was a system in which church and state, religion and politics formed a unity. To spread the faith, it was necessary to spread the Pax Islamica within which the law and polity of Islam might hold sway. To engage in *jihād* was a religious act of the greatest piety in a world divided in almost Manichaean fashion between God and the devil, belief and unbelief: 'Those who believe do battle for the cause of God, while the unbelievers wage war on behalf of idols'.<sup>27</sup> Following the capture of Mecca, an unremitting war against all idolaters was enjoined on the Muslim community: 'When the sacred months are past, slay the idolaters wherever you may come upon them, and seize them, and lay siege to them, and prepare ambushes for them; but if they are converted and perform the obligatory prayer and pay the alms-tax, then leave their way open'.<sup>28</sup> Jews and Christians, who had previously been looked on with some favour, were regarded now as, for the most part, unbelievers (*kuffār*) and enemies of Islam,<sup>29</sup> and war against them was prescribed, until they would pay a submission tax or impost known as *jizya*.<sup>30</sup> Islam was to be the universal religion, before which all others were to give way: 'He (God) it is Who has sent His messenger with guidance and with the true religion, that He may make it supreme over all religions, even though the unbelievers may be averse to it';<sup>31</sup> 'fight then until mischief is at an end and all religion may belong to God'.<sup>32</sup>

As is well known, *jihād* played a fundamental role in the physical expansion of Islam after the death of the Prophet in 632. The doctrine of the abrogation of earlier Quranic texts by later ones meant that, in practice, *jihād* was waged in accordance with those scriptural injunctions which reflected an intransigent, uncompromising attitude towards pagans and 'people of the Book' (Jews, Christians and, later, Zoroastrians). The former were normally given a simple choice between conversion and death; the latter were given three choices: they could submit to the authority of the Islamic state, pay the poll-tax and land-tax, and be treated as protected but definitely inferior subjects of the Islamic state (whose only true citizens were Muslims); they could fight but, if defeated, might be enslaved and their property be taken as booty, four-fifths of it belonging to the Muslim army; or they could embrace Islam and become full citizens.

Over the centuries, *jihād* has remained a duty binding on the community of believers, rather than an individual duty. In theory, this duty cannot be relaxed until the faith of Islam holds universal sway or 'until the Day of Resurrection'. Traditionally, the world is divided into two sections: the *dār al-ḥarb* (realm of war) and *dār al-islām* (realm of Islam),<sup>33</sup> and it is the function

of *jihād* to transform the former into the latter; theoretically, therefore, a state of perpetual war exists between the Islamic world and the rest of mankind, although it has not always proved possible in practice to maintain this position in an active sense, particularly in the modern period. Nevertheless, any war between a Muslim and a non-Muslim state, whether offensive or, as has occurred more frequently in recent centuries, defensive, has the status of *jihād*, and those who die while waging such a war are accounted martyrs. In principle, war between Muslim states is prohibited; where it does occur, however, it is referred to as 'war', 'fighting' or 'conflict', but never as *jihād*. In general, this principle also applies in the case of conflict between an army of an orthodox Islamic state and the members of a heretical group, within or without the state, although on more than one occasion *jihād* has been invoked as a means of sanctioning a struggle against sectaries and rebels, defined as 'people of rebellion' (*ahl al-baghy*).

The Twelver Shī'ī doctrine of *jihād* is, for the most part, identical with the Sunnī theory, but the peculiar conditions under which Shi'ism developed created a number of differences, some of which are of considerable importance.<sup>34</sup> The Shī'ī theory presents two features of particular interest, namely: the identity of the individual empowered to lead the faithful in the prosecution of such a struggle, and that of the enemies against whom it may be waged. With respect to the first of these, Shī'ī theory limits the leadership of the holy war to one of the twelve Imāms or to his lieutenant designate. In practice, only the Imāms 'Alī and Ḥusayn ever led an army into battle, and the failure of the latter's rising against the Ummayyad state resulted in the adoption of a quietist position by his successors. *Jihād* came to be regarded as being held in abeyance until the moment arrived for its revival—that is, on the return of the twelfth Imām as the divinely-guided Mahdī who would conquer the world for Islam. Since the hidden Imām did not delegate his authority directly to anyone except the four 'gates' (*abwāb*, sing. *bāb*) who followed him during his 'lesser occultation', *jihād* could no longer be declared, since for anyone to do so would be for him to usurp the prerogative of the Imām of the age. In practice, however, this theory required modification in cases where the survival of a Shī'ī state might depend on its ability to launch a legitimate holy war against its enemies. Abū Ja'far al-Tūsī argued that *jihād* of a defensive nature might be waged in the absence of the Imām, a view that had a powerful influence on later theorists. Certain jurists of the Īlkhānī period stated that the believers could be summoned to *jihād* by the Imām or by a person appointed by him to do so, in a context implying that the duty of issuing such a summons rested with the 'ulamā, the religious scholars, as representatives of the Imam.<sup>35</sup>

In the Ṣafavī period, the establishment of a powerful, centralized Shī'ī state capable of waging both offensive and defensive warfare, was combined with the claim by the monarchs of the dynasty to be descended from the Imāms and

to possess the authority needed to assume many of their prerogatives, including that of leading *jihād*. The situation changed somewhat under the Qājārs in the nineteenth century; in this case, the ruling dynasty was considered illegitimate by much of the religious establishment, while the latter waxed considerably in their influence, particularly during the first part of the nineteenth century.<sup>36</sup> Individual *‘ulamā* such as Shaykh Ja<sup>c</sup>far al-Najafī, Mullā Muḥammad Bāqir Ḥujjat al-Islām Shaftī, and Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥasan al-Najafī possessed personal power to a degree unmatched by even the greatest of their Ṣafavī predecessors. The newly-powerful *mujtahids* and, in particular, those of them who could lay claim to the function of *marja‘iyyat* (acting as a model and authority for the behaviour of others), came to be regarded as the de facto representatives of the Imām. Coinciding with this novel situation came the threat of Russian aggression on the northern borders of Iran, leading directly to the outbreak of the Russo-Persian wars of 1804–13 and 1826–28. In 1809, five years after the start of the first of these wars, Mīrzā Buzurg Farāhānī Qā‘im Maqām, the vazir of crown prince <sup>c</sup>Abbās Mīrzā, either on his own initiative<sup>37</sup> or on the instructions of Fath <sup>c</sup>Alī Shāh,<sup>38</sup> obtained decrees from several of the leading *‘ulamā* at the Shī‘ī shrines in Iraq, declaring the war against Russia to be a *jihād*. These decrees were collected by Mīrzā Buzurg in a volume entitled *Risāla-yi jihādiyya*, which was one of the first books ever printed in Iran.<sup>39</sup> In 1826, Russian atrocities committed against the Muslim population of the Caucasus stirred the religious authorities in Iraq and Iran, led by Āqā Sayyid Muḥammad Isfahānī, to declare a second *jihād*. Reluctant to declare war on Russia, Fath <sup>c</sup>Alī Shāh was, in the end, forced to do so by religious pressure from the *‘ulamā*, which included the issuing of a decree to the effect that opposition to *jihād* was a sign of unbelief.<sup>40</sup> In 1836, an attempt was made to preach holy war against the Sunnī Afghans and Turkomans;<sup>41</sup> in 1843, following the sack of Karbalā by Najīb Pāshā, a similar attempt was made to wage a Shī‘ī *jihād* against the Ottomans;<sup>42</sup> and in 1856/57 a more intensive effort was made by the state itself to launch a full-scale *jihād* against the British, who had declared war on Iran after the sack of Herat in 1856.<sup>43</sup> Among those impelled by the British attack on Iran to advocate the launching of a holy war was Ḥājī Mullā Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī, the leader of the Shaykhī sect in Kirmān, who wrote a lengthy treatise entitled *Risāla-yi Nāṣiriyya*, in which he outlined the nature of *jihād* and its varieties and called on Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh and the people of Iran to defend the faith of Iran against the incursions of the unbelievers.<sup>44</sup>

*Jihād* has also been invoked on occasion during the present century. In 1912, for example, following the Italian invasion of Libya, some of the Iranian *‘ulamā* of Iraq called, somewhat quixotically, for a holy war against the invaders, as much to stir up feelings against the British and Russians then occupying parts of Iran as to offer real support to the people of Libya.<sup>45</sup> In 1914, during the

British occupation of Iraq, the Shīcī *‘ulamā* there declared *jihād* in reinforcement of a call to holy war made by the Shaykh al-Islām of the Ottoman Empire,<sup>46</sup> and their opposition to non-Muslim rule continued during the period of the British mandate in Iraq.

The second distinguishing feature of the Shīcī view of *jihād* is the problem of identifying those who may be regarded as legitimate enemies in a religious war. Both Sunnīs and Shīcīs are agreed that *jihād* may be waged against polytheists, apostates, scriptuaries (Jews, Christians and Zoroastrians), and dissenters. But, whereas Sunnī theory defined the latter as those who rebelled against the legitimate religious or secular ruler and regarded it necessary to fight only when the state was actually threatened by such elements, Shīcī doctrine applied the term without discrimination to all those who opposed the twelve Imāms—in other words, to all non-Twelve Muslims. The duty to fight against these dissenters was not dependent on any specific threatening circumstances, but remained a constant element of doctrine. ‘... while the Imamīs concurred in the need to fight the infidels, they regarded as an essential step the conversion of all Muslims into true believers (i.e. Imāmī Shīcīs).’<sup>47</sup> This belief is closely related to the distinction drawn in Shi‘ism between *islām* (which is professed by all Muslims) and *īmān* (true faith, professed only by the Shīcā).<sup>48</sup> In this way, the world is divided for the Shīcā, not between infidelity and Islām, but into three areas: the realms of faith, Islam and unbelief.<sup>49</sup> So important is the idea of *jihād* against dissenters for Shīcī thinkers that references to it in their writings ‘probably outnumber references to other kinds of *jihād*’.<sup>50</sup> The wars between the Imām cAlī and his enemies are regarded by Shīcī theorists as *jihād*, as is the subsequent rising of his son Ḥusayn against the Umayyad caliphate. Justification has, therefore, always existed within Shīcī doctrine, not only for war against non-Shīcī Muslims of another state, but for any rising against a state which is deemed to have usurped the rights of the Imām and his people. A novel development of this attitude has occurred in the last two centuries under the ostensibly Shīcī rule of the Qājār and Pahlavī dynasties in Iran. In the course of the agitation which led to the granting of a constitution in 1906, the Qājārs were sometimes compared to or even identified with the hated Umayyads,<sup>51</sup> while the struggle for a constitution was decreed as being ‘like a Holy War under the command of the Hidden Imām’.<sup>52</sup> The recent Iranian revolution against the Pahlavī regime serves as the most telling example of the power of the *jihād* concept as a factor in political opposition within a Shīcī state, nor is it insignificant that the opposition to the revolutionary authorities continues to style its members *mujāhidīn*, ‘fighters in the holy war’.

We may, then, identify in Shīcī theory several factors which, as will be seen, are relevant to the formulation of the Bābī *jihād* doctrine. There is, firstly, the traditional view that *jihād* is illegitimate during the period of the Imām’s



concealment and that, conversely, the waging of a universal holy war to purify the earth from unbelief and 'to fill the earth with justice after it has been filled with injustice' was one of the central acts to be performed by the Mahdi in his parousia. Side by side with this, there is the apparently contradictory nineteenth century experience of the issue of decrees for the waging of *jihād* against Christian enemies and a growing tendency to legitimize internal revolutionary struggles by classing them as *jihād*. There is, secondly, the notion of a tripartite division of the world into the realms of faith, Islam and unbelief coupled with the duty of *jihād* not only to bring the world of infidelity within the realm of Islam, but to transform the world of rebellious, 'covenant-breaking' Islam into that of true faith through allegiance to the Imam and his representatives.

### THE DOCTRINE OF JIHĀD IN THE BĀBĪ WRITINGS

The writings of the Bāb, with which we shall concern ourselves here, may conveniently be divided into two periods: from 1843 to 1848, during the time of the Bāb's claim to be the 'gate' (*bāb*) and 'remembrance' (*dhikr*) of the Hidden Imam, and his insistence on the observance of Islamic law and practice in preparation for the parousia of the 'Lord of the Age', the Imām as Mahdī and universal saviour; from 1848 to 1850, the period of the Bāb's claims to be the Hidden Imām in person and an independent prophet, his instruction to abrogate the Islamic legal code, and his elaboration of a Bābī code to replace it. The first period, in which the *jihād* element figures largely in written doctrine, coincided with the early development of Babism as a schismatic movement within the Shaykhī school of Shi'ism and was characterized by extreme pietism and orthodoxy, numerical weakness, and mild persecution in one or two isolated instances; the second period, in which *jihād* plays a less significant role, corresponds to the open abandonment of Islam (notably at the enclave of some eighty Bābīs at Badasht in July 1848) by large numbers of the Bāb's followers, considerable numerical strength in some areas, and outbreaks of large-scale struggles between Bābī fanatics and Muslim troops and civilians leading to the execution of the Bāb (July 1850), a Bābī attempt on the life of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh (August 1852), and the subsequent repression of the movement within Iran.

The first reasonably systematic elaboration of Islamic law by the Bāb in an extant work occurs in his early 'commentary' on the twelfth chapter of the Qur'ān, known as the *Qayyūm al-asmā'*. This work was, apparently, commenced on the evening of the Bāb's announcement of his first claims (May 22, 1844),<sup>53</sup> and, according to some sources, was completed within forty days of that date,<sup>54</sup> although the present writer would maintain, on the basis of internal evidence, that it may have been completed in the course of the Bāb's pilgrimage to Mecca in the winter of 1844–45. This work contains fuller references to *jihād* than any other of the Bāb's writings; these are, for the most

part, concentrated in the later section of the work, but several earlier allusions to the subject occur in passing. A study of the *Qayyūm al-asmā* provides us, then, with a clear picture of the Bāb's attitude to *jihād* at this early stage of his career.

The gate and representative of the Imām, the Bāb was also, in a sense, the Imām himself 'in the worlds of command and creation',<sup>55</sup> and, as such, was entrusted with a mission on behalf of the Imām to all mankind.<sup>56</sup> He himself constantly addresses 'the peoples of the earth'<sup>57</sup> and 'the peoples of East and West',<sup>58</sup> and calls on his followers to 'spread the cause to all lands'.<sup>59</sup> Towards the very beginning of the book, he summons 'the concourse of kings' to take his verses to the Turks and Indians and to lands beyond in the East and West.<sup>60</sup> God Himself had assured him of sovereignty over all lands and the peoples in them,<sup>61</sup> had written down 'the dominion of the earth' for him,<sup>62</sup> and, indeed, already ruled the world through him.<sup>63</sup> The Bāb, clearly, did not conceive of his message as limited to Iran or to the Shi'cī or even the Muslim world, but envisioned a universal role for himself complementary to that of Muḥammad and the Imāms. Since the laws of Muḥammad and the decrees of the Imāms were to remain binding 'until the Day of Resurrection',<sup>64</sup> there was no question but that *jihād* was to be the principal means of bringing men to the true faith.

The first explicit reference to *jihād* occurs about a quarter of the way through the book, when the Bāb speaks of those who have 'repented and turned to God, followed the Remembrance (i.e. the Bāb) and the Book, and aided the most great Remembrance of God in *jihād*'.<sup>65</sup> This passage is followed several lines later by what is significantly, the first reference to the notion that 'the victory of God and His days are, in the Mother Book, near at hand'.<sup>66</sup> Messianic expectation and exhortation to *jihād* were clearly linked for the Bāb in the role of the Imām as the victorious leader of the holy war of the last days. On the one hand, it is clear that aiding God (*naṣr*—a term widely used in the Qur'ān to mean fighting in the path of God) was seen by the Bāb as a means of anticipating the Day of Judgment and of helping to hasten its advent—of 'immanentizing the eschaton' as it has been facetiously expressed in a recent novel. He speaks of 'the man who has submitted himself to God and who aids our cause and anticipates the dominion of God in the Remembrance of God, the Exalted, through and by God, the Almighty, as drawing near'.<sup>67</sup> Elsewhere, he calls on 'the peoples of the East and the West' to 'issue forth from your lands in order to come to the assistance of God through the truth, for, truly, God's victory is, in the Mother Book, near at hand'.<sup>68</sup> More explicitly, the Bāb links the waging of holy war with the necessary preparations for the advent of the promised Imām: 'O armies of God!', he writes, 'when you wage war with the infidels (*al-mushrikūn*), do not fear their numbers . . . Slay those who have joined partners with God and leave not a single one of the un-

believers (*al-kāfirīn*) alive upon the earth, so that the earth and all that are upon it may be purified for the Remnant of God, the Expected One'.<sup>69</sup>

On the other hand, the Bāb anticipated *jihād* as one of the events prophesied in the traditions relating to the appearance of the Mahdī.<sup>70</sup> In a relatively early passage of the *Qayyūm al-asmā'*, the Imāms prophesy that they will wage war on behalf of the Bāb: 'We shall, God willing, descend upon the Day of the Remembrance, upon crimson thrones, and shall slay you, by the permission of God, with our swords, in truth—just as you have disbelieved and turned aside from our mighty word (i.e. the Bāb)'.<sup>71</sup> The *Qayyūm al-asmā'* itself was 'revealed', it states in one passage, 'in order that men might believe and assist him (the Bāb) on the day of slaughter'.<sup>72</sup> The Bāb himself was, it seems, awaiting permission from the Imām to 'rise up in the cause' when the time came.<sup>73</sup>

The regulations governing the conduct of *jihād* are set out in a number of places in the *Qayyūm al-asmā'*, principally in *sūras* 96 to 101. For the most part these consist, like a great many passages of the book (notably those dealing with legislation), of verbatim or near-verbatim reproductions of existing Quranic passages or echoes of such passages, with only occasionally novel features introduced by the Bāb himself. It is obviously outside the scope of this paper to illustrate all of the Quranic parallels, but we shall attempt to outline the main features of the Bāb's directions concerning *jihād*, with brief references in the notes to what seem to be the Quranic originals, where appropriate.

Sura 96 opens with the words: 'O believers! God has written down for you warfare (*al-qitāl*) in the path of this mighty Remembrance'.<sup>74</sup> If the believers should encounter a party of the unbelievers, they should make their hearts firm for meeting God in the hereafter and for its benefits.<sup>75</sup> The Bāb himself is told by the Imām to spur the believers on in fighting,<sup>76</sup> and he accordingly addresses them, telling them not to fear to be slain.<sup>77</sup> There is to be no fighting in the four sacred months (i.e. Shawwāl, Dhū 'l-Qa<sup>c</sup>da, Dhū 'l-Ḥijja, and Muḥarram),<sup>78</sup> and it is expressly forbidden to slay the unbelievers in the month of Muḥarram or in the house of the Ka<sup>c</sup>ba.<sup>79</sup> The peoples of East and West are to issue forth from their countries in order to assist God, Whose victory is stated to be near at hand.<sup>80</sup> Those who fight for God are superior to those who sit at home,<sup>81</sup> and those who die as martyrs will receive their due reward.<sup>82</sup> The unbelievers have made no compact with the followers (*shū<sup>c</sup>a*) of the Imām and are not to be permitted entry to the sacred territory (around Mecca).<sup>83</sup> The believers are to pray, give alms and fight with the unbelievers,<sup>84</sup> and are enjoined to 'conquer the countries and their people for the pure faith of God', while being forbidden to accept a submission-tax from the unbelievers.<sup>85</sup> The armies of God are not to fear in battle nor are they to leave a single unbeliever alive, in order to purify the earth for the coming of the Imām.<sup>86</sup> Weak men, boys, women, the sick, the blind and the deaf are all

exempted from fighting in the *jihād*.<sup>87</sup> The infidels are to be slain anywhere except in the Ḥarām Mosque (of Mecca).<sup>88</sup> The believers are called on to purify their clothing for the day of war and are to issue forth when the trumpet sounds.<sup>89</sup> They are, specifically, told to purify the 'holy land' (i.e. Karbalā) from foulness,<sup>90</sup> and are instructed to 'purchase arms for yourselves for the day of gathering together'.<sup>91</sup> Angels will be sent to aid them in battle,<sup>92</sup> and they are assured that God, not they, shall slay the unbelievers.<sup>93</sup>

Two major questions occur at this point in our discussion: against whom did the Bāb envisage waging holy war? And who was to lead the *jihād*? It is clear from the *Qayyūm al-asmā'* that, as in orthodox Shi'ism, war could be waged against several distinct categories of people, although these groups are not at all times defined precisely—the *Qayyūm al-asmā'* is not, after all, a work of jurisprudence. In general, the terms *kuffār* and *mushrikūn*, which occur throughout the passages on *jihād*, may certainly be taken to have their obvious meanings of 'unbelievers' or 'polytheists'; strictly speaking, a *kāfir* is one who denies the favours or even the existence of God, a *mushrik* one who 'joins partners' with Him. Taken in this sense, these terms would apply, as they normally do in Islam, to pagans, Buddhists, Hindus and any others not accounted 'people of the book'. These latter, whom the Bāb seems to limit to Jews and Christians, are certainly condemned in the *Qayyūm al-asmā'*,<sup>94</sup> but it is not until a later date, as we shall see, that the Bāb makes clear his intentions with regard to them. On the basis of this later attitude, however, we may assume that they were regarded in the early period as automatically subject to the declaration of *jihād*, particularly in the absence of any specific command abrogating the Islamic injunction to that effect. It is clear from several references, however, that the Bāb by no means restricted the terms *kāfir* and *mushrik* to atheists or polytheists, but applied them to Muslims, whether Sunnī or Shī'ī, who held what he regarded as heretical doctrines or, more particularly, who refused to recognize him.<sup>95</sup> In one place, he refers to the 'polytheists' (*al-mushrikūn*) from among the people of the Qur'ān.<sup>96</sup> He himself is the 'pure faith' and those who wish to accept Islam must do so by embracing his cause, while the deeds of those who disbelieve in Islam will not be accepted by God.<sup>97</sup> To disbelieve in him is to disbelieve in Muḥammad and the Qur'ān (and, accordingly, to be considered a non-Muslim)<sup>98</sup> This same idea occurs in an earlier work of the Bāb's, his commentary on the second *sūra* of the Qur'ān (*Sūrat al-baqara*), where he states that 'not every Muslim is a believer (*mu'min*)', and speaks of the tripartite division of the world into the realms of faith, Islam and unbelief.<sup>99</sup>

Leadership of the *jihād* appears to rest with the Bāb himself or with a king who fights on his behalf. The believers are to 'assist the mighty Remembrance of God in the *jihād*'.<sup>100</sup> As indicated above, the Bāb was awaiting permission from the Imām to 'rise up in the cause'. In the course of the directions on the

waging of *jihād*, men are called on to ‘gather together about the mighty Word, around the Remembrance’,<sup>101</sup> and the Bāb is instructed by the Imām to ‘urge the believers to fight in your presence’.<sup>102</sup> As I have noted elsewhere,<sup>103</sup> news reached the early followers of the Bāb in the Karbalā region of Iraq that, on leaving for Mecca in September 1844, he had promised to reveal his cause in the holy city, after which he would enter Karbalā and fulfil the prophecies. In various letters, he summoned his disciples to gather together in Karbalā in order to aid the Mahdī when he would appear,<sup>104</sup> and, accordingly, large numbers of Bābīs headed for Karbalā—where there was already a heightened sense of messianic expectation and considerable tension—to await the Bāb’s arrival. Many, very possibly in accordance with the Bāb’s instructions in the *Qayyūm al-asmā’* (which was being distributed in the region) to ‘purchase arms for the day of gathering together’, bought weapons with which to wage the anticipated last *jihād*. In the event, the Bāb was unable or unwilling to go to Karbalā; many of his followers there dispersed, some to await a later summons to *jihād*, others to abandon the Bāb as an impostor.

On almost the first page of the *Qayyūm al-asmā’*, the Imām calls on the reigning monarch of Iran, Muḥammad Shāh (to whom he refers as ‘king of the Muslims’) to come to the aid of the Bāb, warns him not to oppose him, asks him to purify Karbalā of those who have rejected the previous book ‘on the day when the Remembrance shall come suddenly’, and urges him to ‘submit to the Remembrance and his cause and to conquer the countries of the earth for the truth, by God’s permission’.<sup>105</sup> When the Bāb’s first disciple, Mullā Ḥusayn Bushrū’ī, travelled to Tehran on the Bāb’s behalf in 1844, he attempted to deliver a copy of the *Qayyūm al-asmā’* and other works of the Bāb to Muḥammad Shāh. Also in his possession was a letter from the Bāb to the king: I<sup>c</sup>tiḏād al-Saltāna, a state official, writes that this letter contained a passage stating ‘if you pledge allegiance to me and regard obedience to me as obligatory, then shall I make your sovereignty great and bring the foreign powers under your command’.<sup>106</sup> In a further letter, written to Muḥammad Shāh from Būshihir in 1845, the Bāb writes that ‘God, your Lord, has willed that the Turks (*al-Rūm*) and most of the peoples of the earth should believe in the verses; aid, then, the faith of God, that you may be of those who are triumphant on the Day of Resurrection’.<sup>107</sup> The Bāb continued to write letters to the Shāh, but later examples of these, written from prison in Ādharbāyjān, indicate that the king’s consistent rejection of the Bāb and his instructions to have him imprisoned had dashed any hopes the latter might have entertained that he would adopt the role of royal warrior on behalf of the Bābī cause. Nevertheless, as we shall see shortly, the Bāb’s later views on *jihād* centred very much on the hope that a Bābī monarch would arise to carry out the task of converting mankind to his religion.

The Bāb’s views about military assistance for the *jihād* from the state seem to

have been somewhat ambiguous, however. When in Iṣfahān, for example, he is said to have turned down an offer of military aid or the arrangement of a marriage with one of the Shāh's daughters or sisters—an offer made by the governor of the city, Manūchihr Khān Mu<sup>c</sup>tamad al-Dawla, with whom he had entered into close and cordial relations.<sup>108</sup> On the other hand, it is recorded that, when on his way to prison in ādharbāyjān, he sent one of his followers to Zanjān to enlist the support of Sulaymān Khān Afshār Sāhib-i Ikhtiyār, one of the country's leading military men and an admirer of the late Sayyid Kāẓim Rashtī (the second head of the Shaykhī school out of which Babism had emerged), to one of whose daughters his son was married.<sup>109</sup> The request was turned down and Sulaymān Khān, who later became a follower of Ḥājj Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī, the then head of the Shaykhī school and the Bāb's chief rival, soon played a major role in the defeat of the Bābī defendants at the shrine of Shaykh Ṭabarsī

The Bāb next attempted a fairly systematic discussion of the regulations concerning *jihād* in his *Risāla furū<sup>c</sup> al-<sup>c</sup>Adhiyya*, written in late 1261/1845 or 1262/1846, while he was living in Shīrāz after his return from the pilgrimage to Mecca. The sixth chapter of this work is devoted entirely to *jihād*; brief as it is, it provides several details as to the early Bābī doctrine of *jihād* which do not appear in the *Qayyūm al-asmā'*. At the beginning—and most significantly—he states that *jihād* is one of the branches (*furū<sup>c</sup>*) of religion and that it resembles formal prayer.<sup>110</sup> This is important in that it indicates that the Bāb explicitly raised *jihād* to the rank of a sixth pillar of the faith. He then refers to the idea that, when God sent Muḥammad, it was with five swords, and that three of these would not be returned to their scabbards until war came to an end. This would not happen until the sun rose from the west. The first of these swords was that drawn against the pagan Arabs, who were given a choice between death and conversion.<sup>111</sup> The second sword was that drawn against the Jews and Christians; the Bāb quotes a Quranic verse (9:29) in this connection: 'fight those who do not believe in God nor in the Last Day, who do not make unlawful what God and His Prophet have made unlawful and who do not practice the true religion, yet are of those to whom the Book has been given—until they pay the tribute out of hand and are brought low'. He then states that the Imām or his representatives have the authority to accept this tribute from the rich but not the poor, the stupid or the insane.<sup>112</sup> The third sword is that drawn against the peoples of the earth; the Bāb again quotes a Quranic verse (47:4): '(when you meet the unbelievers) smite their necks until, when you have made a great slaughter among them, make fast the bonds; then either act with liberality afterwards or take a ransom (until the war comes to an end)'. These too have a choice only between conversion and death.<sup>113</sup>

The Bāb then goes on to say that, after these three swords, there is that drawn against the 'people of dissent'. This position is supported, like the

others, by a Quranic verse (49:9) 'If two groups among the believers fall to fighting one another, make peace between them; but if one should act unjustly [from the same root as the term here translated 'dissenter'] against the other, then fight the unjust one until it returns to the cause of God'. <sup>c</sup>Alī and the Imāms fought according to the decree in this verse and the hidden Imām shall slay the dissenters on the strength of it when he appears.<sup>114</sup> *Jihād* is not permitted to anyone except the Imām, unless he gives permission.<sup>115</sup> The fifth sword is sheathed for the purpose of punishment, as indicated in the Quranic verse (5:45): 'We wrote down for them in it (the Torah): "a life for a life, an eye for an eye, a nose for a nose, an ear for an ear, a tooth for a tooth, and retaliation for wounds"—but whoever remits it as alms shall have it as an expiation. They who do not judge according to what God has sent down are unbelievers'.<sup>116</sup> The decree on this matter rests with the Imam. Whoever denies these swords is an unbeliever; the decrees concerning them show that the ordinance of *jihād* is binding on whoever believes in God and His verses.<sup>117</sup>

Up to 1264/1848, 'Bābī' doctrine was essentially that of orthodox Shi'ism, with differences only in some subsidiary matters and then only to a limited degree. From 1848, however, following the Bāb's assumption of the office of Qā'im (i.e. the Mahdī) and his announcement of the inauguration of the Resurrection, the entire system of Islamic revealed law had to be dismantled and a new Bābī structure erected in its place. As far as *jihād* is concerned, the proclamation of Resurrection and the substitution of a new code of laws for those of the Qur'ān and traditions meant a sharp change in practice together with various doctrinal changes which remained theoretical. We shall discuss the practical consequences of the announcement that the Qā'im had appeared in the next section of this article; let us continue for the moment with our survey of the doctrinal basis for *jihād* in the Bābī writings. The main laws of Babism following the break with Islam are contained in the Persian *Bayān* (*Bayān-i-Fārsī*), the much shorter, telescoped Arabic *Bayān* (*al-Bayān al-ʿArabī*), both written during the Bāb's imprisonment in Mākū between 1847 and 1848, and the *Haykal al-dīn*, an extremely late work which effectively represents the Bāb's final thoughts on these matters. Since neither of the latter two works adds anything particularly remarkable on this subject, however, we shall refer the reader in the footnotes to passages in them paralleling those of the Persian *Bayān*.

In keeping with the discursive, allusive, even rambling style of this work, no particular section of the Persian *Bayān* is exclusively devoted to *jihād*, nor is there, indeed, any specific injunction to wage *jihād*, in terms comparable to those found in the Qur'ān or the *Qayyūm al-asmā'*. Nevertheless, several passages exist which rest on the assumption that *jihād* may be waged, while others command it in a form very different to that of the Quranic injunctions. The later Bābī doctrine of *jihād* rests largely on a passage in section 5 chapter 5, in

which it states that 'the possessors of power (i.e. kings) must not wait for something to descend from heaven in order to bring all that are on earth into the faith of God, but it should be as all entered the faith in Islam, by reason of what was shown forth at the command of the Prophet of God; in every dispensation this must be shown forth in this way'.<sup>118</sup> Had the kings of Islam acted on the commandments of the Qur'ān, the whole earth would have been converted.<sup>119</sup> It is made a duty for every king who believes in the *Bayān* not to allow any unbeliever to live in his country, with the exception of traders, who bring benefits.<sup>120</sup> This duty is also incumbent on all men.<sup>121</sup> Elsewhere, the Bāb asks how a king can drink water while there still remains on earth one person who is an unbeliever?<sup>122</sup> Permission is given to conquer other countries in order to bring men into the faith, although, if possible, other means should be used to convert people, such as giving them the goods of the world.<sup>123</sup> It is, nevertheless, made clear that the prohibition on killing which is laid down in the *Bayān* applies only to the murder of believers.<sup>124</sup> In every dispensation, it is said, no-one has the right to anything, not even his own life, if he does not believe, and the same applies in the Bābī dispensation. As a result, the property of unbelievers may be taken by the Bābīs and only returned to them if they convert. This decree is only to be carried out by the kings.<sup>125</sup> Detailed instructions are given concerning the distribution of property taken from unbelievers, as follows: whatever is unique belongs to the Bāb, while he lives; on his death, it is to be kept by traders 'until the rising of the sun' (the appearance of the messianic figure whose advent at a distant date the Bāb alluded to); one fifth of the total value of other goods must be given to the Letters of the Living (i.e. the body of the Bāb's chief disciples, originally eighteen in number) to spend on the believers; the remainder goes to the general of the victorious army and to those who have assisted him, each according to his station and needs; if there is any left, it is to be spent on the holy shrines, or else all the believers are to be given a share, this latter course being preferable unless a given shrine has not yet been erected, in which case its construction has priority.<sup>126</sup> One important regulation must also be noted here, if only because it forms the basis for later Bahā'ī legislation with somewhat wider implications: believers are forbidden to have arms or armour except in time of need or holy war (*mujāhada*), unless, of course, they are engaged in their manufacture.<sup>127</sup>

*Jihād*, it would seem, could be waged against any group who did not believe in the *Bayān*; the questions of unbelief, Islam, faith, dissidence, and so forth no longer apply here since the entire non-Bābī world is now the 'realm of unbelief'. In the *Haykal al-dīn*, the Bābī monarch of the future is exhorted 'not to leave upon the earth, if possible, anyone save the Bābīs',<sup>128</sup> while in the *Dalā'il-i sab'ā*, written in Mākū, the Bāb states with regard to the Jews and Christians that 'unless a powerful king shall cause them to enter the faith of



God, there shall be no way for their salvation'.<sup>129</sup> The Shi'ī population of Iran was now regarded as subject to the decree of holy war: in the Persian and Arabic *Bayāns*, the Bāb explicitly states that God as forbidden non-Bābīs to live in the five central provinces of Iran (Fārs, Iraq, Ādharbāyjān, Khurāsān and Māzandarān), since it was from these areas that the faith spread to other lands.<sup>130</sup> Obviously, the Shi'ī inhabitants of these regions would either have to be expelled by force from their homes or converted.

The regulations in the *Bayān* and elsewhere are part of a generally harsh policy on the part of the Bāb towards all that did not belong to the true faith. Thus, for example, the shrines and holy places of previous religions must be demolished, including the Shi'ī shrines in Kūfa and elsewhere,<sup>131</sup> all books except those written on the Bābī religion are to be destroyed,<sup>132</sup> the believers are to sever all relations with those not of the people of the *Bayān*, in order to avoid contamination,<sup>133</sup> they are not to sit in their company,<sup>134</sup> and they are not to marry them.<sup>135</sup>

We see, then, that the Bāb had, by the end of his short life, moved beyond even the harshest Islamic measures against unbelievers. A Bābī *jihād* was to be an ongoing process, each Bābī monarch striving to eliminate all traces of infidelity from his dominions and, ultimately, from the earth in order to establish a totalitarian Bābī state. Such a monarch was, above all, to be a holy warrior fighting for the victory of his faith and awaiting the opportunity to wage *jihād* on behalf of 'him whom God shall make manifest', the future Bābī Messiah.<sup>136</sup> The role of the king here is significant in view of the Bāb's earlier disappointment with Muḥammad Shāh; clearly, he still looked forward to gaining military support from such a source. God, it was anticipated, would 'send' one or more kings to fight on behalf of the Bābī cause.<sup>137</sup>

#### THE JIHĀD ELEMENT IN THE BĀBĪ-STATE STRUGGLES AFTER 1848

Despite the exhortations to *jihād* in the *Qayyūm al-asmā'* and the abortive attempt to initiate what may have been intended as an armed rising in Karbalā in 1845, it soon became clear to both the Bāb and the Bābī leadership in the provinces that the movement was numerically and, following the arrest of the former, psychologically weak. Between 1844 and 1848, there were no incidents of serious persecution directed against the Bābīs which might, of themselves, have sparked off a conflict, nor did any Bābīs initiate direct action—although, as we shall see, tension between them and non-believers was slowly building up and many of the faithful were actively preparing themselves both mentally and physically for an imminent struggle. In the meantime, the Bāb instructed his followers to confront their opponents in *mubāhala*, a form of trial by faith in which two parties would call down the wrath of God on each other.<sup>138</sup> This practice was not uncommon in Shi'ism and had been used by the Shaykhī leader Sayyid Kāẓim Rashtū as, in his view,

the only valid means of putting claims to the truth to the test.<sup>139</sup> The Islamic practice was ratified early in *Qayyum al-asmā'*, where the Imām instructs the Bāb to challenge the unbelievers to *mubāhāla* if things should become difficult for him.<sup>140</sup>

The earliest recorded instance of a challenge issued on the directions of the Bāb took place when his emissary, Mullā <sup>c</sup>Alī Baṣṭāmī, arrived in Iraq in the autumn of 1844. According to one source, Mullā <sup>c</sup>Alī had been instructed by the Bāb to summon a meeting of the religious leaders in Karbalā and to issue such a challenge to them.<sup>141</sup> While in Mecca on pilgrimage, the Bāb himself issued a *mubāhāla* challenge to two leading Shaykhī scholars from Karbalā who were also on pilgrimage at that time.<sup>142</sup> In 1262/1846 in Iṣfahān, the Bāb challenged the religious leaders of the city to present themselves for *mubāhāla* on the day of <sup>c</sup>Arafa (9 Dhū 'l-Hijja/28 November), although they did not, in fact, respond.<sup>143</sup> It seems probable that, when he wrote to the clergy of Qazvīn during his stay at the nearby village of Siyāh-dihān in 1847, calling on them to meet with him, he had in mind the possibility of engaging in *mubāhāla* with them.<sup>144</sup> This may also have been his purpose in requesting Muḥammad Shāh in 1264/1848 to summon the clergy of the country to meet with him so that he might 'confound' them.<sup>145</sup>

The Bāb encouraged his followers to adopt the same course of action as a means of seeking non-violent confrontation with a numerically and psychologically more powerful opposition. He himself refers to a *mubāhāla* challenge issued on his behalf, probably sometime in 1845, by Mullā Muḥammad Mahdī Khū'ī to Mullā <sup>c</sup>Abd al-<sup>c</sup>Alī Harātī, an early apostate from Babism.<sup>146</sup> In 1846, following instructions from the Bāb, Qurrat al-<sup>c</sup>Ayn (one of his leading disciples, a woman noted for her intransigence and irascibility) called a meeting of the religious scholars and leading divines of Karbalā in order to challenge them either to produce verses like those of the Bāb or to engage in *mubāhāla*,<sup>147</sup> although the meeting never took place, she remained eager for such a direct confrontation and, in 1847, while in Baghdād, wrote a letter to the Shī'ī clergy there, in which she said 'if you are not satisfied with these conclusive proofs, I challenge you to *mubāhāla*'.<sup>148</sup> Again, in Kirmānshāh in the same year, she issued a challenge to the <sup>c</sup>ulamā of the city to meet with her for *mubāhāla*—'and let the curse of God fall on those who speak falsely'.<sup>149</sup>

Although *mubāhāla* functioned in theory as a means of avoiding unnecessary physical conflict in situations of religious disagreement, relying for its effectiveness on psychological and social pressure, it did not always succeed in its aim. Relations between Shaykhīs and other Shī'īs had, for a period of about twenty years, been extremely tense and occasional violence had broken out when feelings ran high. Now, the introduction of a new and even more apparently heretical element into the situation added fuel to the fire. The Bābīs themselves pulled few punches in their letters and sermons and, in some

cases even threatened physical violence against those who would not accept their message. Thus, for example, Mullā Muḥammad <sup>c</sup>Alī Qazvīnī, one of the Bāb's original hierarchy of 'Letters of the Living' and a brother-in-law of the fiery Qurrat al-<sup>c</sup>Ayn, wrote to his aged father that, if he did not accept the Bāb's message, he would break his neck 'like a dog'.<sup>150</sup>

The preaching of Babism sometimes led to physical assaults being made on individual Bābī propagandists, either spontaneously by their audience or on the instructions of the civil or religious authorities. Thus, Mullā <sup>c</sup>Alī Bastāmī, the Bāb's legate to Iraq, was handled roughly by the followers of the outstanding scholar Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥasan al-Najafī,<sup>151</sup> arrested by the civil authorities in Karbalā, imprisoned and tried in Baghdad, and finally sent to Istanbul, where he was sentenced to labour in the docks.<sup>152</sup> Mullā Muḥammad Ṣādiq Khurāsānī, Mullā Muḥammad <sup>c</sup>Alī Bārfurūshī and Mullā <sup>c</sup>Alī Akbar Ardīstānī caused an uproar in one of the mosques of Shīrāz in 1845, were arrested on the instigation of some of the local clergy, punished and expelled from the city by the governor.<sup>153</sup> In 1847, Mullā Ibrāhīm Maḥallātī was badly beaten by the pupils of the leading cleric of Hamadān, on the latter's instructions.<sup>154</sup> In the same year, Mullā Jalīl Urūmī, a 'Letter of the Living' who had been teaching Babism secretly for some years in Qazvīn, was taken by a mob to the house of Mullā Muḥammad Taqī Baraghānī, where he was bastinadoed.<sup>155</sup> In 1846 in Karbalā, Qurrat al-<sup>c</sup>Ayn was arrested and her house looted by a mob acting on the orders of the governor, in order to prevent an outbreak of more serious trouble by reason of her open expression of what were regarded as unusually extreme views.<sup>156</sup> In Kirmanshah, despite the favourable attitude of the governor, she and her followers were attacked, beaten and expelled from the town by a force independently organized by the local military commander, who appears to have been bribed to act by relatives of Qurrat al-<sup>c</sup>Ayn from Qazvīn.<sup>157</sup> During the *mubāhala* period, therefore, outbreaks of limited violence between Bābīs and non-Bābīs began to grow in frequency and seriousness—although no-one actually died before 1847—while the numbers involved on both sides steadily increased. Whereas early violence tended to be 'legal' violence' directed by the civil authorities against potentially seditious elements, the later trend is towards mob violence, controlled to some extent by the religious leadership and, less often, the civil authorities.

In the meantime, numbers of Bābīs in various regions were engaged in making preparations for the *jihād* that must inevitably come. We know that many early Bābīs possessed and carried arms. The Arab and Iranian Bābīs who escorted Qurrat al-<sup>c</sup>Ayn from Baghdad to Iran in 1847 were armed,<sup>158</sup> and those who stayed with her in Qazvīn appear to have remained so. While the Bāb was staying at the village of Siyāh-dihān, en route to prison in Mākū in Ādharbāyjan, Mullā Muḥammad <sup>c</sup>Alī Zanjānī Ḥujjat sent an armed force of

Bābīs from Zanjān in the hope of effecting his rescue; this force was joined by others from Qazvīn and Tehran.<sup>159</sup> In Mashhad in 1848, when a group of seventy-two Bābīs set out to rescue a young co-religionist who had been imprisoned by the chief constable of the city, they all carried arms in readiness for a clash with anyone who might seek to oppose them (which would, clearly, have included the forces of law and order).<sup>160</sup> Most significantly, in Qazvīn Āqā Muḥammad Hādī Farhādī, a member of a wealthy family of Bābī merchants, constructed sword-making apparatus in the basement of his home, where he made weapons for himself and his fellow-believers for the purpose of engaging in a holy war in the company of the Bāb.<sup>161</sup>

Not surprisingly, perhaps, it was in Qazvīn that the increasing tension finally erupted into serious violence. The leading figure of the religious establishment in the city, Mullā Muḥammad Taqī Baraghānī, an uncle of Qurrat al-<sup>c</sup>Ayn and the man responsible for initiating the excommunication of Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsā'ī (the founder of the Shaykhī school), identified himself quite early as an opponent of the Bābīs and preached against them in his mosque. The Bābī community of Qazvīn continued to grow, however, and numbered among its members both clergy and influential merchants. The arrival of Qurrat al-<sup>c</sup>Ayn and several companions from Iraq in the autumn of 1847 brought matters to a head. About this time, Āqā Muḥammad Ṣādiq, a Bābī merchant, was beaten in the bazaar, arrested, and bastinadoed on the orders of the governor.<sup>162</sup> Baraghani had a Bābī cleric, Mullā <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Ḥusayn Rūdbārī, arrested, interrogated, and bastinadoed<sup>163</sup> and, as we have mentioned above, was responsible for the arrest and bastinado of the leading Bābī of the city, Mullā Jalīl Urūmī. The arrest of Mullā Jalīl was regarded as a serious act of provocation on the part of Baraghānī; Āqā Muḥammad Hādī Farhādī (to whom we have referred as engaged in the manufacture of swords), his brother Āqā Muḥammad Jawād and a group of Bābī extremists attacked the house in which Mullā Jalīl was being held and rescued him after a brief struggle.<sup>164</sup> It was probably not long after this, on 15 Dhū 'l-Qa<sup>c</sup>da 1263/25 October 1847, that a group of perhaps three Bābīs, including Āqā Muḥammad Hādī Farhādī, surprised Baraghānī while praying alone in his mosque at dawn, fell on him, and stabbed him repeatedly with daggers; he died two days later.<sup>165</sup> Large numbers of Bābīs in Qazvīn were arrested, homes were broken into and looted, and several individuals were eventually put to death in retribution for what was held to be a general Bābī plot. Rightly or wrongly, many Iranian Muslims must now have begun to fear that the Bābīs were planning to use force to attain their objectives, objectives that were still far from clear to the majority of the populace.

Meanwhile, in the shrine centre of Mashhad, an important Bābī community had grown up under the tutelage of two of the Bāb's leading agents, Mullā Muḥammad Ḥusayn Bushrū'ī and Mullā Muḥammad <sup>c</sup>Alī Bārfurūshī Quddūs. Gatherings of large number of Bābīs at a house in the main street of

the city excited the uneasiness of the many clerics of the region, who made complaints to Ḥamza Mīrzā, a new governor who had arrived in Mashhad in October 1847.<sup>166</sup> The civil authorities were concerned at the possibility of trouble; the region was still unsettled because of the rebellion of Mīrzā Ḥasan Khān Sālār on behalf of his father, the former governor of the city, while the physical condition of Muḥammad Shāh was giving much cause for concern regarding the general stability of the Qājār state. Two apparently unconnected incidents increased the agitation of the local population with regard to the Bābīs. In the first of these, a servant of Mullā Ḥusayn Bushrū'ī, named Ḥasan, was arrested by the civil authorities for some reason which remains unknown; a group of armed Bābīs attacked and killed the guards escorting him, thereby securing his release.<sup>167</sup> The second incident occurred shortly after this, while Bushrū'ī was staying as a 'guest' of the governor in his camp outside the city. A young Bābī named Muḥammad Ḥusayn became embroiled in an argument with a servant of Ḥājī Mīrzā Ḥasan, a local religious leader, was arrested and, it seems, tortured by the chief constable of Mashhad. Mīrzā Muḥammad Bāqir Qā'inī, the owner of the Bābī house there, obtained permission from Mullā Muḥammad 'Alī Bārfurūshī to intervene, on condition that they should not strike until struck by the enemy—hardly a severe restriction since they could count on resistance once they began their rescue attempt. A party of seventy-two Bābīs set off with swords bared after the youth and, in the course of effecting his rescue, engaged in several clashes with his captors.<sup>168</sup> We shall see again how a determination to take the law into their own hands led the Bābīs of Zanjān and Nayrīz into direct conflict with the local authorities and populace.

In order to avoid further trouble, Ḥamza Mīrzā ordered Bushrū'ī to leave Mashhad and, on 19 Sha<sup>c</sup>bān 1264/21 July 1848, he set out with a large body of fellow Bābīs, ostensibly heading for the Shī'ī shrines in Iraq. Travelling towards Māzandarān, this party, swelled somewhat in numbers by new arrivals along the route, reached Bārfurūsh on 12 Shawwāl/12 September and there clashed seriously with local inhabitants trying to prevent their entry to the town. Penetrating more deeply into the forest region of Māzandarān province, they reached the shrine of Shaykh Abū 'Alī al-Faḍl Ṭabarsī on 22 Shawwāl/24 September. Here they constructed a fortress of sorts and were joined gradually by other Bābīs from various parts of the country, including Mullā Muḥammad 'Alī Quddūs. The continued presence of what was by now a band of almost five hundred armed men created considerable anxiety in the minds of the people of the surrounding region and, before long, the newly-crowned Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh sent the first of several detachments of state troops to confront the Bābīs at Shaykh Ṭabarsī. The details of the ensuing struggle, which continued to May 1849, are well known and have been described in numerous accounts, to which the reader is referred.<sup>169</sup>

Leaving aside the many historical questions raised by this whole incident—

or, more correctly, this series of incidents—let us try to examine as far as possible the motives and objectives of the Bābī defenders of Shaykh Ṭabarsī. Our best sources for this are Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Zavāraʿī's *Waqāyīʿ-i mīmīyya* and Luṭf ʿAlī Mīrza Shīrāzī's history of the struggle—both unpublished eye-witness accounts. Before turning to these, however, it will be in order to consider first some general points which have a bearing on the outlook of most of the Bābīs at the shrine. We shall find that some of these are also relevant to the question of the motivation of the Bābī insurgents at Zanjān and Nayrīz, whom we shall discuss a little later.

In the first months of 1848, towards the end of his confinement in Mākū, the Bāb wrote an important letter to Mullā Shaykh ʿAlī Turshīzī ʿAzīm, in which he proclaimed himself to be the Qāʾim and announced the abrogation of the laws of Islam. On the Bāb's instructions, ʿAzīm copied and circulated this letter, and it would seem that news of the inception of the Resurrection spread rapidly among the Bābīs of Iran.<sup>170</sup> At an enclave held at the village of Badasht in Māzandarān in July 1848, several Bābī leaders, including the controversial and iconoclastic Qurrat al-ʿAyn, openly announced the advent of the Resurrection to some eighty of their followers.<sup>171</sup> Among those who played an active role at this gathering was Mullā Muḥammad ʿAlī Bārfurūshī, who was later to take effective control of the fort at Shaykh Ṭabarsī. It is, I think, unnecessary to labour the point that the advent of the Qāʾim had long been regarded as the signal for the final *jihād* against the hosts of unbelief and that the Bāb's followers had been daily expecting such apocalyptic upheavals for some four years.

An unforeseen problem existed, however, in the fact that the Bāb was still in prison and, therefore, unable to lead the *jihād* in person, as was proper. The Bābīs gathered at Badasht had, in fact, as one of their aims the possibility of formulating plans for the release of their chief from Chihriq, where he was now held;<sup>172</sup> Āvāra maintains that they decided to send out messengers to summon the Bāb's followers to go to Chihriq as pilgrims—once there, it was proposed that they should try to exert pressure on Muḥammad Shāh to free the Bāb, failing which they intended to take the latter from his confinement by force.<sup>173</sup> It has been plausibly suggested by A.L.M. Nicolas that, when Mullā Ḥusayn Bushrūʿī and his force left Mashhad about this time, it was with the aim of heading ultimately for Ādharbāyjān, in the hope of effecting the Bāb's rescue.<sup>174</sup>

It is vital to bear in mind, however, that the Bāb's particular role was far from clear to his followers and that Babism in this period was far from being a doctrinally homogeneous movement. Bābī leaders such as Qurrat al-ʿAyn, Bushrūʿī, Quddūs, Ḥujjat Zanjānī, and others were accorded considerable respect and veneration and were regarded by many as incarnations of the Imāms or other sacred figures of Shiʿī hagiography. It is significant to note in

the present context that Bushrū'ī is referred to consistently by Zavāra'ī as 'the Qā'im of Khurāsān' and Mullā Muḥammad °Alī Quddūs as 'the Qā'im of Jīlān'.<sup>175</sup> The latter in particular seems to have been widely regarded as holding the station of Qā'im: Bushrū'ī is reported as saying in a sermon that Quddūs was 'the one whose advent you have awaited for one thousand two hundred and sixty years',<sup>176</sup> while the latter is stated to have advanced this claim in his own behalf<sup>177</sup> or even, according to the Bahā'ī patriarch °Abbās Effendī, to have claimed to be God in his (no longer extant) commentary on the letter *ṣād* of the divine name *al-Ṣamad*, written mostly in Shaykh Ṭabarsī.<sup>178</sup>

As Qā'im, whether in a universal or restricted sense, it was held to be legitimate for these two men to lead their followers in *jihād*. That this was not merely Zavāra'ī's personal view is indicated by several references in Luṭf °Alī Mīrzā's history. The latter notes, for example, that some of the Bābīs at Shaykh Ṭabarsī regarded Quddūs as the point towards which prayers were to be directed and turned to him when they performed their devotions; on the night of the °Īd al-Qurbān, Mullā Ḥusayn Bushrū'ī and others performed ritual circumambulation around the house of Quddūs, a practice which they continued on other nights.<sup>179</sup> The *Kitāb-i nuḡḡat al-kāf*, written in the early 1850's, similarly speaks of Quddūs and Bushrū'ī in terms such as these: the former is stated to have claimed to be the return of Muḥammad<sup>180</sup> or of Jesus,<sup>181</sup> and is referred to as the 'promised Qā'im', whose gate was the Bāb.<sup>182</sup> The latter is consistently spoken of as 'the Prince of Martyrs', identifying him with the Imām Ḥusayn,<sup>183</sup> is said to have been given the rank of *bāb* in 1848 by the Bāb,<sup>184</sup> and is described as the 'bearer of Yemeni pillar' and the 'fourth support', the first a term from Shī'ī apocalypse, the second a Shaykhī designation for the representative of the Imām on earth.<sup>184</sup> Bushrū'ī's messianic role was considerably enhanced by his carrying of a black banner on his journey from Khurāsān,<sup>186</sup> a gesture whose significance would hardly have been missed by anyone even vaguely familiar with Shī'ī prophetic traditions. Even the enemies of the Bābīs were given eschatological roles to play, most notably Sa'īd al-°Ulamā, the leading cleric of Bārfurūsh and the man responsible for the execution of Quddūs there at the end of the Shaykh Ṭabarsī siege, who is described as the 'bearded woman' who, it was prophesied, would kill the Qā'im.<sup>187</sup>

It is impossible to tell what may have been in Bushrū'ī's mind as he left Mashhad. In all likelihood, he aimed at meeting his associate Mullā Muḥammad °Alī and others at Badasht, but the meeting there had been broken up and dispersed by local residents by the time the contingent from Mashhad reached nearby Shāhrūd. As has been suggested above, they may have continued into Māzandarān with the intention either of reaching Tehran in the hope of forcing the Shāh to release the Bāb or of going on via Gilān to Chihriq in order to effect an immediate rescue. Bushrū'ī seems to have been

eager to conceal the identity and plans of his group. On several occasions, he gave strict instructions to his followers to refer to him as Āqā Sayyid ʿAlī Makkī, a resident of Karbalā, and to say that they were all headed for the shrines in Iraq, with various pretexts to explain their choice of such an unlikely route.<sup>188</sup>

Whatever their immediate aims, it is clear that the Bābīs under the leadership of Bushrūʿī harboured general hopes of spreading Babism, by preaching if possible, by force if necessary. In the course of a sermon on the Aḏḥā festival (10 Dhū ʿl-Ḥijja/8 November), Bushrūʿī stated that his aim in leaving Mashhad had been to exalt ‘the word of God’ and to seek martyrdom.<sup>189</sup> Some time later, a more militant tone can be observed in his reply to the new governor of Māzandarān, Mahdī Qulī Mīrzā, who had enquired as to the motives of the Bābīs. They had come from Mashhad, said Bushrūʿī, with the aim of spreading the truth, in whatever way might prove possible, whether by overcoming falsehood (apparently in argument) or by means of the sword or by suffering martyrdom.<sup>190</sup> In this same reply, he refused to leave Māzandarān as requested by the prince, stating that ‘until the cause of God is manifested, we shall not depart from this province; we shall make manifest God’s cause by means of the sword’ and that ‘we few companions who are here shall not disperse until we have overcome all (of you) or have ourselves been slain’.<sup>191</sup> Luṭf ʿAlī Mīrzā goes on to describe how, in his communications with the prince, Bushrūʿī referred to Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh as a ‘puppy’, made threats of terror and sent harsh messages.<sup>192</sup>

The twin themes of martyrdom and *jihād* alternate throughout the Shyakh Ṭabarsi struggle. Shortly after their arrival at the shrine, Bushrūʿī addressed his followers, comparing their intention to reveal the truth through martyrdom with events in the time of the Imām Ḥusayn (martyred in 680).<sup>193</sup> According to Zavāraʿī, Quddūs stated that his followers were the army of Ḥusayn and the enemy the army of Kūfa<sup>194</sup> (a reference to the debacle of Karbalā when Ḥusayn and a small band of followers were massacred almost to a man by imperial troops loyal to the Caliph Yazīd, against whom the Imām was rebelling). This same theme recurs in most later accounts.<sup>195</sup> Evocation of the Karbalā motif provided an excellent focus for a drive towards charismatic martyrdom and *jihād* against the Qājār state, identified with the Umayyad dynasty against which Ḥusayn had rebelled.<sup>196</sup> The death of Muḥammad Shāh in September 1848 was regarded by the Bābīs as a cause for rejoicing: ‘praise be to God, the foul tree has gone to hell’,<sup>197</sup> but, while Nāṣir al-Dīn remained on the throne, true government could not be established. According to the author of the *Nuqtat al-kāf*, Quddūs wrote to Prince Mahdī Qulī Mīrzā, stating that ‘Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh is a false king and his helpers shall be punished in the fires of God; we are the true sovereign, who seek for the good-pleasure of God’.<sup>198</sup>



Our sources contain numerous explicit references to the struggles of the Bābīs with both local residents and state troops as *jihād*. Refused entry to Bārfurūsh by the inhabitants of the town, the Bābīs 'began to wage *jihād*' and succeeded in killing over one hundred and fifty of the enemy.<sup>199</sup> Throughout Zavāra'ī's account, the Bābīs are described as being 'engaged in *jihād*',<sup>200</sup> while Bushrū'ī orders them to 'fight the holy war'.<sup>201</sup> The purpose of this *jihād* is to 'empty the earth of corruption',<sup>202</sup> while the enemy troops are variously described as 'unbelievers', 'hypocrites', and 'polytheists',<sup>203</sup> or as 'the forces of Satan' and the 'army of satans'.<sup>204</sup> Although Luṭf 'Alī Mīrẓā uses the term *jihād* very little, he ascribes to Bushrū'ī an interesting speech in which he states that 'now two matters are determined: one is *jihād*, the other defence. Whoever turns aside is an unbeliever'.<sup>205</sup> 'Whoever turns his back on *jihād*, he goes on, 'is an unbeliever, according to the decrees of all religions', and he promises that there shall be 'either victory or martyrdom'.<sup>206</sup> According to the same source, when asked by Mahdī Qulī Mīrẓā why the Bābīs were building a fort and why they ate the food of others (i.e. food taken from the people of the vicinity), Bushrū'ī replied that the spoils of *jihād* were religiously lawful to the believers.<sup>207</sup>

It seems clear, then, that the Bābīs at Shaykh Ṭabarsī harboured a variety of interrelated aims. The hopelessness of their numerical position and the existing role of martyrdom as a major element in Shi'ī piety led them to emphasize a desire to die as martyrs in a defensive *jihād* for the purpose of upholding the true faith; at the same time, offensive *jihād* against a government which had shown itself to be the enemy of the truth by its treatment of the Bāb was a duty, and it was clearly regarded as an obligation on the part of the defenders of Shaykh Ṭabarsī to send as many as possible of the enemy 'to hell'. If the figures given in most accounts are accurate, there is no doubt that here, as elsewhere, the Bābīs proved a formidable fighting force and succeeded in despatching considerably larger numbers of the enemy than they themselves lost, often showing great brutality not only to the hostile soldiery but to civilians in the region as well.

There were two further major outbreaks of violence between Bābīs and Muslims in Iran after the suppression of the Shaykh Ṭabarsī rising in May 1849. The number of Bābīs in the country was growing rapidly; in February 1849, Prince Dolgorukov, the Russian Minister in Tehran, wrote to his Minister for Foreign Affairs: '... no matter how serious this question (the military rebellion in Khurāsān) may be, it has not preoccupied society to the same extent ever since the sectaries of the Bab have apparently had the tendency to grow in all parts of the Kingdom. The Amīr (the new Prime Minister, Amīr-i Kabīr) confessed to me that their number can be already put at 100,000; that they have already appeared in southern provinces; that they are to be found in large numbers in Tehran itself; and that, finally, their

presence in Ādharbāyjān is beginning to worry him very much'.<sup>208</sup> This figure of 100,000 is, curiously, the same as that given by the Bāb himself in the *Dalā'il-i sab'a* as having been converted during the first four years of his career.<sup>209</sup> In Dolgorukov's report of February 1849, he referred to rumours that the numbers of Bābīs in Zanjān to the west of the capital had reached 800 and that 'by their presence, they threaten to disrupt the public order'.<sup>210</sup> By March 1850, Dolgorukov reported that the number of Bābīs there was now 2000, and noted that 'the harmful doctrines of these dangerous sectaries find a response among the masses and do not cease to worry the government'.<sup>211</sup>

According to °Abd al-Aḥad Zanjānī, the number of Bābīs in Zanjān rose to 3000 before trouble broke out.<sup>212</sup> Leadership of the sect there was in the hands of Mullā Muḥammad °Alī Zanjānī, a religious firebrand who had already fallen foul of the secular authorities well before his conversion to Babism.<sup>213</sup> Following his adoption of the new faith, his position was investigated by the authorities at Tehran, but he seems to have been able to persuade them of his loyalty to Islam and to the state and was allowed to return to Zanjān.<sup>214</sup> It soon became apparent that his role as the Bāb's representative in the city threatened the existing religious and civil authorities. Shortly after his return, he assumed the functions of Imām-Jum'ā (the leader of the main Friday prayers), a position normally conferred by the ruling sovereign; the incumbent naturally protested, but was told that his right to the office 'has been superseded by the authority with which the Qā'im Himself has invested me. I have been commanded by Him to assume that function publicly, and I cannot allow any person to trespass upon that right. If attacked, I will take steps to defend myself and to protect the lives of my companions'.<sup>215</sup> This behaviour led to further protests on the part of the local clergy, and Zanjānī was taken to Tehran and held there under house arrest for about one year. While in Tehran, in reply to queries from one of his followers in Zanjān, he 'enumerated a series of observances, some of which constituted a definite departure from the established traditions of Islam', maintaining that these were based on instructions of the Bāb.<sup>216</sup> In the autumn of 1848, however, he contrived to make his escape from the capital following the death of Muḥammad Shāh.<sup>217</sup>

Back in Zanjān, it was clear that he aimed at the institution of radical changes in the city. According to °Abd al-Aḥad Zanjānī, the poor sat on the right side of the pulpit in his mosque and the rich on the left, while he consistently addressed himself to the poor.<sup>218</sup> He was as impatient as ever of the existing religious and secular powers. Following an incident in which two Bābīs stabbed a Muslim in the course of an altercation, one Bābī, named °Abd al-°Alī, was arrested and imprisoned on the orders of Amīr Aslan Khān, the governor. After a month, Zanjānī wrote to the governor demanding the release of this man, but was curtly refused on the grounds that this amounted to

interference in the affairs of the local administration. A second demand was also refused, whereupon Zanjānī's agent forcibly freed the Bābī prisoner, releasing at the same time other criminals held in the local gaol and threatening to kill anyone who tried to intervene. The whole episode received the approval of Zanjānī.<sup>219</sup> Following this incident, a decree for the death of Zanjānī and his followers was written by the local religious leaders and sent to the capital for ratification by Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh.<sup>220</sup> On 16 May 1850, fighting broke out between a mob organized by the clergy and a small force of Bābīs, in the course of which one of the latter was killed.<sup>221</sup> At some point, the clergy declared *jihād* against the Bābīs—on which ʿAbd al-Aḥad Zanjānī remarks that ‘had this religious war been against such as denied their faith, and law, and scripture, there had been no harm; but this war was against those who cried like themselves: “There is no god but God, Muḥammad is the Apostle of God, ʿAlī is the Friend of God!”’<sup>222</sup>

It certainly appears that, even before his conversion to Babism, Zanjānī had exhibited a strongly puritanical streak and had applied Islamic law rigorously; in one instance, he closed a brothel used for temporary marriage (which is legal under Shīʿī law), married off most of the women in it, and sent others into service.<sup>223</sup> Now, he seems to have continued to take a strong line on the application of the religious law, rigorously prohibiting the sale and manufacture of wine in the region.<sup>224</sup> ‘. . . under his jurisdiction,’ writes ʿAbd al-Aḥad, ‘Zanjān was purified in every way which you can conceive from unnatural crimes and fornications, and such things as are forbidden by Religion and Law’, while his followers were consistent in their observance of prayer and fasting, and would not ‘tolerate any misdeed which infringed the Law’.<sup>225</sup> It is, therefore, difficult to assess how far Zanjānī and his followers thought of themselves as Bābīs and how far as Muslims. According to Nicolas, Zanjānī even forbade his followers to take part in the struggle at Shaykh Ṭabarsī,<sup>226</sup> and it may well be that he regarded those who had abrogated the Islamic legal code as infidels. Quite obviously, our interpretation of the nature and intent of the struggle at Zanjān depends very much on finding clear answers to the questions raised here.

Following the first outbreak of trouble mentioned above, the governor of Zanjān ordered the city divided into two opposing camps, an act which made questions of allegiance particularly sharp.<sup>227</sup> An armed struggle now began which lasted until January 1851, in the course of which the Muslim population of Zanjān was reinforced by troops from the region and, later, from the central government.<sup>228</sup> Various accounts indicate that Zanjānī refused to declare *jihād* against the enemy, although he clearly regarded them as unbelievers and held *jihād* as such to be possible.<sup>229</sup>

This seems to me to be an over-simplification. If the Bābīs were not fighting some kind of *jihād*, then their action could not be justified or rendered legal in

any way and would be regarded simply as rebellion. Now, this was certainly how the defence of the Bābīs was looked on by their adversaries, but Zanjānī and his followers clearly did not see their own behaviour as insurrection, if only because they did not regard the secular government as legal. If the opposition clergy had declared *jihād* against them, then this was further evidence of the infidelity of the former and the rightness of the Bābī cause. The evidence suggests that Zanjānī did not declare an offensive but a defensive *jihād*. Thus, according to <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Aḥad, he asked the Muslim clergy: ‘. . . during all this period of strife, what day hath there been, or what night, wherein I have commanded a religious war, save only that I was constantly considering how we might ward off your assaults from our wives and children, for we have no choice but to defend ourselves?’<sup>230</sup>

In the absence of strictly contemporary documentation, it remains difficult to assess the motives and aims of the Bābīs at Zanjān; in general, there appear to be several factors involved, not all of them easily compatible. We can see the role played here, as at Shaykh Ṭabarsī, by religious fanaticism and a characteristically Shī‘ī fascination with martyrdom. On the other hand, the speed with which conversion to Babism appears to have occurred in Zanjān, and the numbers involved, suggest that other, social and economic factors were at work and that few of the combatants had a clear idea of the teachings of the Bāb or of the distinctness of Babism from Islam by 1850. Mullā Muḥammad <sup>c</sup>Alī himself seems to have retained his Muslim identity and to have been impelled as much by puritan and egalitarian motives as abstract spiritual convictions centred in the person of the Bāb. Unlike the Bābī leaders at Badasht and Shaykh Ṭabarsī, he had never been a Shaykhī and may have been less receptive to the metaphysical elements of the Bāb’s teaching. There is evidence, however, that he may have subscribed to the belief that the Bāb was the Qā’im and that the Day of Resurrection had appeared.<sup>231</sup> The use of the watchword ‘O Lord of the Age’ by the Bābīs suggests that messianic enthusiasm may have figured largely in the struggle, which, in its turn, implies that many may have regarded themselves as involved in the final *jihād* against the forces of Antichrist.

The Yazd and Nayrīz upheavals of 1850, led by Sayyid Yaḥyā Dārābī Vaḥīd, although on a much smaller scale than that of Zanjān, exhibit many features similar to it.<sup>232</sup> Dārābī was a highly popular religious leader who had the allegiance of large numbers in both towns. He himself seems to have been preparing for a holy war and is known to have tested the swords manufactured by Aqā Muḥammad Hādī Farhādī in Qazvīn.<sup>233</sup> On his arrival at Nayrīz, in opposition to the orders of the local governor, Zayn al-<sup>c</sup>Ābidīn Khān, he made his way to the principal mosque of the city, accompanied by some nine hundred heavily armed supporters, many with swords drawn, and ascended the pulpit in order to preach to a congregation of about one thousand five

hundred.<sup>234</sup> There is good reason to believe that very few of Dārābī's followers knew much of the teachings of the Bāb,<sup>235</sup> and it seems likely that social and political motives dominated the struggle. In Yazd, for example, there had been serious civil disturbance in the town prior to Dārābī's arrival, and at least one of those who lent him his support was a known agitator.<sup>236</sup> In Nayrīz also, the people had already been rebelling against the governor at the time of Dārābī's appearance in the town.<sup>237</sup> Like Zanjānī, the latter seems to have been regarded as an independent authority over against the existing civil powers. In one instance, Ḥājī Sayyid Ismā'īl, the Shaykh al-Islām of Bavānāt, ordered the arrest of a certain Mullā Bāqir, an ambassador en route from the governor of Nayrīz to Prince Fīrūz Mīrza in Shīrāz; the unfortunate man was brought before Dārābī by the village chief of Rastāq and put to death.<sup>238</sup> Dārābī similarly appointed his own officers and functionaries at the fort of Khāja in which he and his followers took refuge.<sup>239</sup> According to Zarandī, Dārābī disclaimed any intention of waging *jihād*.<sup>240</sup> As in the case of Zanjānī, if we mean by this offensive *jihād*, then it may be correct; but the spirit of the defence put up against the royalist forces strongly suggests that the struggle was seen as defensive *jihād*.

.....

In conclusion, then, we may note that in no instance do the Bābīs seem to have declared offensive *jihād* along the lines suggested in the *Qayyūm al-asmā'*, probably because it was regarded as wrong to declare a holy war unless there was a reasonable chance of success—a condition clearly lacking in the case of the Bābīs. But their refusal to recognize existing ecclesiastical and secular authority, their carrying of arms in situations of considerable political instability, and their generally aggressive manner resulted in clashes between them and the civilian population which quickly escalated into full-scale struggles. Once battle was joined, religious motifs of martyrdom, defensive *jihād* and 'perfecting the proof' (i.e. demonstrating the truth of the cause in the eyes of men) took precedence over social, economic and other features. In the case of Shaykh Ṭabarsī, religious motives seem to have predominated from the beginning, whereas in the cases of Zanjān, Yazd and Nayrīz, existing urban tensions played a central role which at times obscures the religious elements of these struggles. From the point of view of both local and national government, the Bābīs were manifestly insurrectionaries bent on subverting the existing religious and social order. The role of *jihād* in these struggles is, then, obscured by a multiplicity of motives and by the inability of the Bābīs to transform merely local upheavals into a more widely-based revolutionary struggle against the forces of unbelief. The Bābī ideal *jihād*, as represented in the works of the Bāb, and the reality, as seen at Shaykh Ṭabarsī, Nayrīz and Zanjān, were certainly not commensurate, and failure, once it came, was complete and permanent.

## NOTES

- 1 Much has been written on Babism, much of it unreliable. An up-to-date account of the background and history to 1848 may be found in my 'From Shaykhism to Babism: a study in charismatic renewal in Shi'ī Islam' (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 1979; University Microfilms 81-70,043). For more general surveys, see Alessandro Bausani 'Bāb' and 'Babism' in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (2nd. ed.) and my articles 'Bāb' and 'Babism' in the *Encyclopaedia Iranica* (forthcoming). A recent valuable addition to the literature on the subject is Moojan Momen (ed.) *The Babi and Baha'i Religions, 1844-1944: Some Contemporary Western Accounts*, Oxford, 1981. A comprehensive bibliography by the present author will appear in the forthcoming *Bibliographical Guide to Iran*.
- 2 M. Ivanov *Babidskie Vosstaniya v Irane* 'The Bābī Uprisings in Iran', Leningrad 1939.
- 3 Peter Avery *Modern Iran*, London 1965, pp. 54, 58.
- 4 Hamid Algar *Religion and State in Iran 1785-1906*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- 5 John Ferraby *All Things Made New*, London 1957, p. 195.
- 6 *Ibid.*, p. 196.
- 7 See (Mullā Muḥammad Nabīl Zarandī) *The Dawn-breakers: Nabīl's Narrative of the Early Days of the Bahā'ī Revelation* trans. and ed. Shoghi Effendi, Wilmette 1932, titles of chapters, 19, 22 and 24; Shoghi Effendi *God Passes By* (Wilmette 1944), title of chapter 3.
- 8 Shoghi Effendi *God Passes By*, p. 42.
- 9 *Ibid.*
- 10 Hasan Balyuzi *The Bāb*, Oxford, 1973, p. 177.
- 11 Shoghi Effendi *God Passes By*, p. 38.
- 12 *Ibid.*, p. 37.
- 13 *Ibid.*, p. 43.
- 14 Zarandī *Dawn-Breakers*, p. 396.
- 15 On the Islamic institution of *jihād* in general, see D.B. Macdonald 'Djihād' *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (1st. ed.), E. Tyan 'Djihād' *Ibid* (2nd. ed.), M. Khadduri *War and Peace in the Law of Islam*, Baltimore 1955.
- 16 M.M. Bravmann *The Spiritual Background of Early Islam*, Leiden 1972, pp. 7-26.
- 17 Qur'ān 33:40.
- 18 *Ibid.*, 34:28.
- 19 See *ibid.*, 3:20, 5:67, 7:62, 68, 79, 46:24.
- 20 See *ibid.*, 12:108, 13:36, 40:41, 42.
- 21 See *ibid.*, 47:7, 59:8.
- 22 *Ibid.*, 16:125. The next verse, which refers to reprisals equivalent to the degree of injury, was revealed later in Medina.
- 23 See Muhammad ibn Ishāq *The Life of Muhammad*, trans. A. Guillaume, Oxford University Press, Pakistan 1955, pp. 201-4.
- 24 Qur'ān 8:38-9.
- 25 *Muḥammad, Prophet and Statesman*, Oxford 1961, pp. 108-9.
- 26 Qur'ān 2:256.
- 27 *Ibid.*, 4:76.
- 28 *Ibid.*, 9:5.
- 29 See *ibid.*, 5:17, 72, 81-2.
- 30 *Ibid.*, 9:29.
- 31 *Ibid.*, 9:33, 48:29.
- 32 *Ibid.*, 8:39.

- 33 Some schools recognize a third division known as *dār al-ṣulḥ*, territory in tributary relationship to Islam.
- 34 Much of the information in the following section is based on Etan Kohlberg's excellent article 'The Development of the Imāmī Shī'ī Doctrine of *jihād*', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 126 (1976): 64–86. Apart from the sources cited there, the following may be regarded as among the fullest and most authoritative presentations of the law concerning *jihād* in works of Shī'ī *fiqh*: Shaykh Abū Ja'far Muḥammad al-Ṭūsī *Al-mabsūt* ed. Muḥammad Taqī al-Kashfī, 7 vols in 4 (Tehran, 1387/1967–8) vol. 2 pp. 2–32; Shaykh Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Hurr al-<sup>c</sup>Amilī *Wasā'il al-Shī'a* ed. <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Rahīm al-Rabbānī al-Shīrāzī, 20 vols. (2nd. ed., Tehran 1383/1963–4) vol. 6 pp. 4–392.
- 35 Kohlberg 'Shī'ī Doctrine of *jihād*', p. 80.
- 36 *Ibid.*, p. 81.
- 37 Thus Algar *Religion and State*, p. 79.
- 38 Thus Ḥasan-e Fasā'ī *History of Persia under Qājār Rule* trans. Heribert Busse, New York and London 1972, p. 127.
- 39 For passages from an abridged version, see Kohlberg 'Shī'ī Doctrine of *jihād*' p. 82.
- 40 Algar *Religion and State*, pp. 87–89.
- 41 W.K. Stuart *Journal of a Residence in Northern Persia and the Adjacent Provinces of Turkey*, London 1854, p. 296.
- 42 Algar *Religion and State*, p. 116.
- 43 *Ibid.*, pp. 154–5.
- 44 *Risāla-yi Nāsiriyya* printed in Karīm Khān Kirmānī *Majma' al-rasā'il Fārsī I* (Kirmān 1386/1966–7), pp. 296–398.
- 45 Abdul-Hadi Hairī *Shī'ism and Constitutionalism in Iran*, Leiden 1977, p. 121.
- 46 *Ibid.*, p. 124.
- 47 Kohlberg 'Shī'ī Doctrine of *jihād*', p. 69.
- 48 On this distinction, see traditions cited in Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn Ya'qūb al-Kulaynī *Al-uṣūl min al-Kāfī* ed. Muḥammad al-Bihbūdī and <sup>c</sup>Alī Akbar al-Ghaffārī, with Persian trans. and commentary by Āyat Allāh Ḥājj Shaykh Muḥammad Bāqir al-Kamra'ī, 4 vols. (Tehran, 1392/1972) vol. 3, pp. 44–50, 89–90; see also traditions cited in Ḥājj Muḥammad Khān Kirmānī *Al-kitāb al-mubīn* 2 vols. (2nd. ed., Kirmān, 1354 Sh/1975–6) vol. 1, pp. 363–72 (esp. 371–2). On *islām*, *imān* and *kufr*, see Ḥājj Muhammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī *Al-shihāb al-thāqib* (Kirmān 1353 Sh/1974–5), pp. 3–22.
- 49 Thus al-Shaykh al-Mufid *Awā'il al-maqālāt*, pp. 70–71, cited Kohlberg 'Shī'ī Doctrine of *jihād*' p. 69.
- 50 Kohlberg 'Shī'ī Doctrine of *jihād*', p. 70.
- 51 Algar *Religion and State*, p. 252.
- 52 Shaykh <sup>c</sup>Abd Allāh Māzandarānī, quoted Hairī *Shī'ism and Constitutionalism*, p. 99.
- 53 Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, p. 61.
- 54 Mīrzā Asad Allāh Faḍīl Māzandarānī *Kitāb-i zuhūr al-ḥaqq* vol. 3 (Cairo, n.d.), p. 285.
- 55 *Qayyūm al-asmā'* Cambridge University Library, Browne Or. Ms. F.11, f. 76b; cf. ff.89a, 142b.
- 56 *Ibid.*, ff. 26a, 46b.
- 57 *Ibid.*, f.3a, etc.
- 58 *Ibid.*, f.49b, etc.
- 59 *Ibid.*, f.41a; cf. f.68b.
- 60 *Ibid.*, f.3a.

- 61 Ibid., f.89b.  
 62 Ibid., f.102a.  
 63 Ibid., ff.26a, 121b.  
 64 Ibid., f. 185b.  
 65 Ibid., f.41b.  
 66 Ibid.  
 67 Ibid., f. 74b.  
 68 Ibid., f. 169b.  
 69 Ibid., f. 172b.  
 70 For a useful summary of traditions relating to the role of the Qā'im as holy warrior, in a pre-Bābī Shaykhī context, see Shaykh Aḥmad al-Aḥsā'ī *Ḥayāt al-naḥs* trans. Sayyid Kāzīm Rashū (2nd. ed., Kirmān 1353 Sh/1974–5) pp. 116–126.  
 71 *Qayyūm al-asmā'* f. 55a.  
 72 Ibid., f. 84b.  
 73 Ibid., f. 99b.  
 74 Ibid., f. 168b; cf. Qur'ān 2:216.  
 75 Ibid., cf. Qur'ān 8:45.  
 76 Ibid., ff. 169a, 170b; cf. Qur'ān 4:84.  
 77 Ibid., f. 169a.  
 78 Ibid., and f. 170b; cf. Qur'ān 9:5. These four months were originally held sacred by the pagan Arabs, by whom fighting in them had been prohibited.  
 79 Ibid., and f. 179b; cf. Qur'ān 5:2, 2:217.  
 80 Ibid., f. 169b.  
 81 Ibid., f. 170a; cf. Qur'ān 4:95.  
 82 Ibid., cf. Qur'ān 4:100.  
 83 Ibid., f. 170b; cf. Qur'ān 9:28.  
 84 Ibid., f. 171a; cf., in a somewhat different sense, Qur'ān 2:43 and 4:77. In the *Qayyūm al-asmā'* f. 89a, it is specifically the hidden Imām who thus associates these three ordinances; in this way, *jihād* appears to be formally elevated to the position of a pillar of the faith (see later discussion of *Risāla-yi furū' al-<sup>c</sup> Adliyya*).  
 85 Ibid., f. 172a. By contrast, the Qur'ān enjoins the acceptance of *jizya* (9:29).  
 86 Ibid., f. 172b.  
 87 Ibid., 173b; cf. Qur'ān 4:75, 98, 9:91, 48:17 (from which this is, approximately, a composite).  
 88 Ibid., f. 175a; cf. Qur'ān 2:191.  
 89 Ibid., f. 175b. This is possibly a reference to the imminence of the Mahdī's advent.  
 90 Ibid., f. 176a.  
 91 Ibid., 176b.  
 92 Ibid., 177a.  
 93 Ibid., f. 177b; cf. Qur'ān 8:17.  
 94 e.g. *ibid.* f. 29a.  
 95 For passages illustrating this attitude, see *ibid.* ff. 2a–2b, 7b, 104b, 106b, 123a, 158a.  
 96 Ibid., f. 158a.  
 97 Ibid., ff. 2a–2b.  
 98 Ibid., f. 7b.  
 99 Cambridge University Library, Browne Or. Ms. F. 8, f. 55b. See further *Qayyūm al-asmā'* ff. 79b, 88b, 90b, 159b, 169a.  
 100 *Qayyūm al-asmā'* f. 41b; cf. f. 84b.  
 101 Ibid., f. 170b.



- 102 Ibid., f. 179a.
- 103 'From Shaykhism to Babism', p. 190.
- 104 Māzandarānī *Zuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 235.
- 105 *Qayyūm al-asmā'*, f. 2b.
- 106 *Kitāb al-mutanabbīyūn*, section published as *Fitna-yi Bāb* ed. <sup>c</sup> Abd al-Ḥusayn Navā'ī (2nd. ed. Tehran 1351 Sh/1972-3), p. 35.
- 107 Letter in Cambridge University Library, Brown Or. Ms. F.28, item 7, p. 5.
- 108 Zarandī *Dawn-breakers* pp. 209-14; Ḥājī Mīrzā Jānī Kāshānī (?) *Kitāb-i-Nuqṭatu'l-Kāf* E.G. Browne (ed.) London and Leiden 1910, pp. 118-19.
- 109 Māzandarānī *Zuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 75.
- 110 *Risāla furū' al-<sup>c</sup> Adliyya* Tehran Bahā'ī Archives Ms. 5010. C., p. 114; cf. *Qayyūm al-asmā'*, ff. 89a. 171a.
- 111 Ibid.
- 112 Ibid., p. 115.
- 113 Ibid.
- 114 Ibid.
- 115 Ibid.
- 116 Ibid., p. 116; the last word here, 'unbelievers' (*kāfirūn*) differs from the original text, which reads 'evildoers' (*ẓālimūn*).
- 117 Ibid. In the preceding chapter, devoted to *khums* (a one-fifth levy imposed on booty, treasure, mines, pearl-fishing, trading profits, land belonging to protected peoples, and things combining what is legally allowable with what is forbidden), the Bāb adopts an orthodox Islamic position. Three points stand out here insofar as this regulation concerns *jihād*: firstly *khums* must be levied on property taken by the Muslims from unbelievers by the sword. Secondly, it is a duty to take the property of enemies of the Imāms—that is, 'dissenters'—and to pay *khums* on this property. Thirdly, the *khums* which is levied on booty taken in war belongs to the Imām and consists of spoils and land. (*Risāla furū' al-<sup>c</sup> Adliyya*, pp. 110-13). For summaries of the orthodox Shi'ī position on *khums*, see Shaykh Abū 'l-Qāsim al-Ḥillī *Al-mukhtaṣar al-nāfi<sup>c</sup>* (Tehran, 1387/1967-8) pp. 87-88; Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā *Aṣl al-Shi'ā wa uṣūlūhā*, 9th. ed., Najaf, 1381/1962, pp. 112-3.
- 118 *Bayān-i Fārsī* (n.p., n.d.) 5:5, p. 158.
- 119 Ibid.
- 120 Ibid., 7:16, p. 262; cf. *Haykal al-dīn*, published with *Al-Bayān al-<sup>c</sup> Arabī* (n.p., n.d.) p. 15.
- 121 Ibid.
- 122 Ibid., 4:5, pp. 119-20.
- 123 Ibid., p. 120.
- 124 Ibid., p. 118; cf. *Haykal al-dīn* p. 2.
- 125 Ibid., 5:5, p. 157; cf. *Al-Bayān al-<sup>c</sup> Arabī* pp. 18, 18-19, *Haykal al-dīn* p. 6.
- 126 Ibid., 5:6, pp. 159-60.
- 127 Ibid., 7:6, p. 245; cf. *Al-Bayān al-<sup>c</sup> Arabī* p. 30, *Haykal al-dīn* p. 28.
- 128 *Haykal al-dīn*, p. 15.
- 129 *Dalā'il-i sab'ā* (n.p., n.d.), p. 43.
- 130 *Bayān-i Fārsī* 6:4, p. 193; *al-Bayān al-<sup>c</sup> Arabī*, p. 24.
- 131 *Bayān-i Fārsī* 4:12, pp. 135-6.
- 132 Ibid., 6:6, pp. 198-9. Cf. the burning of all books but the Bible by the Anabaptists of Münster under the leadership of John Matthys in 1534.
- 133 Ibid., 5:14, p. 174.

- 134 Ibid., 7:16, p. 263
- 135 Ibid., 8:15, p. 298.
- 136 Ibid., 4:5, p. 119.
- 137 Ibid., 7:16, p. 262.
- 138 The concept of *mubāhāla* in Islam reverts to the Quranic verse 3:61, supposed to relate to a challenge issued by Muḥammad to a Christian delegation from Najrān. For the significance of *mubāhāla* in Shi'ism, see Henry Corbin *En Islam iranien* 4 vols., Paris 1971–2, vol. 3, pp. 210–3.
- 139 *Dalīl al-mutaḥayyirīn* (n.p., 1276/1859–60), p. 72.
- 140 *Qayyūm al-asmā'*, ff. 6b–7a.
- 141 Shaykh Kāẓim Samandar Qazvīnī *Tārīkh-i Samandar*, Tehran, 131 badī<sup>c</sup>/1974–5, p. 347.
- 142 Sayyid <sup>c</sup>Alī Muḥammad Shīrāzī *Ṣaḥīfa bayna 'l-haramayn* Cambridge University Library, Browne Or. Ms. F. 7 pp. 14–15; prayer of the Bāb's quoted Māzandarānī *Zuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 271.
- 143 See letter of the Bāb dated 7 Dhū 'l-Ḥijja 1262/26 November 1846, printed in <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Ḥusayn Āvāra *Al-kawākib al-durriyya* (n.p., n.d.) pp. 105–6; cf. *Nuḡtat al-kāf*, p. 118.
- 144 Samandar *Tārīkh*, pp. 97–8.
- 145 Letter to Muḥammad Shāh in *Muntakhabāt-i āyāt az Ḥaḍrat-i Nuḡta-yi Ulā*, Tehran 134/1977–8, p. 11; trans. in *Selections from the Writings of the Bāb* trans. Habib Taherzadeh, Haifa 1976, p. 21.
- 146 Letter quoted Māzandarānī *Zuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 274.
- 147 Samandar *Tārīkh* p. 347; letter of Qurrat al-<sup>c</sup>Ayn printed in Māzandarānī *Zuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 352.
- 148 <sup>c</sup>Abbās Effendi <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Bahā *Tadhkirat al-wafā* Haifa, 1924, p. 297; cf. Mīrẓā Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-Baghdādī *Risāla amriyya*, Cairo, 1919, p. 110.
- 149 Al-Baghdādī *Risāla*, p. 113.
- 150 Mullā Muḥammad Ja<sup>c</sup>far Qazvīnī *Tārīkh-i Mullā Muḥammad Ja<sup>c</sup>far Qazvīnī* published with Samandar *Tārīkh*, pp. 494–5.
- 151 Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, pp. 90–91.
- 152 Balyuzi *The Bāb* chapter 4; Momen *Bābī and Bahā'ī Religions*, pp. 83–90.
- 153 Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, pp. 144–8.
- 154 Al-Baghdādī *Risāla*, p. 117.
- 155 Samandar *Tārīkh*, p. 352.
- 156 Mullā Aḥmad Khurāsānī, letter quoted in <sup>c</sup>Alī al-Wardī *Lamaḥāt ijtimā'īyya min ta'rīkh al-<sup>c</sup>Irāq al-ḥadīth* at least 2 vols., Baghdād, 1969, vol. 2 p. 1562; <sup>c</sup>Abbās Effendi *Tadhkira* pp. 271–2, 296; Qurrat al-<sup>c</sup>Ayn, letter published in Māzandarānī *Zuhūr al-ḥaqq* pp. 354–5; cf. letter published in *ibid.*, p. 350.
- 157 Al-Baghdādī *Risāla*, pp. 113–4.
- 158 <sup>c</sup>Abbās Effendi *Tadhkira*, p. 299.
- 159 Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, pp. 235–6.
- 160 Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn Zavāra'ī *Waqāyī<sup>c</sup>-i mīmiyya* Cambridge University Library, Brown Or. Ms. F. 28 item 1, p. 7.
- 161 Māzandarānī *Zuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 374.
- 162 Samandar *Tārīkh*, pp. 64–66, 354–5.
- 163 *Ibid.*, pp. 191–3, 352; Māzandarānī *Zuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 383.
- 164 Samandar *Tārīkh*, pp. 191–3, 352.
- 165 For varying accounts of this incident, see Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, pp. 276–8, who seeks to attribute the murder to a single Shaykhī; Samandar *Tārīkh* p. 356; Mīrẓā

- Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān Tanakābunī *Qiṣaṣ al-ʿulamā* (Tehran, Intishārāt-i ʿIlmiyya-yi Islāmiyya, n.d.) p. 57. Muʿīn al-Salṭana Tabrizī gives the names of the assassins as Sayyid Husayn Qazvīnī, Mīrzā Šāliḥ Shīrāzī, and Mīrzā Hādī Farhādī, but states that Sayyid Husayn was a Shaykhī (*Tārīkh-i Muʿīn al-Salṭana* Tehran Bahāʾī Archives, Ms. 19, pp. 242–5)—the distinction between ‘Shaykhī’ and ‘Bābī’, was not always, if at all, clear at this period. The date of Muḥammad Taqī’s murder is given only in an anonymous account of it appended to a rare early edition of his *Majālis al-mutaqqīn* (n.p., 1280/1863–64), a copy of which is in the possession of the present author.
- 166 Zarandī *Dawn-breakers* p. 288; *Zavāraʾī Waqāyī*<sup>c</sup> p. 3; Mīrzā Muḥammad Taqī Lisān al-Mulk Sipīhr *Nāsikh al-tawārīkh: Salāṭīn-i Qājāriyya*, 4 vols. in 2, Tehran, 1385/1965–6, vol. 3 pp. 335–6.
- 167 Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, pp. 288–9.
- 168 *Zavāraʾī Waqāyī*<sup>c</sup>, pp. 6–8. It is not impossible that this incident and that described by Zarandī are, in fact, one and the same; but the difference in names and the contradictory statements as to the whereabouts of Bushrūʾī make it difficult to assert this categorically.
- 169 Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, pp. 324–429; Joseph Arthur Comte de Gobineau *Religions et philosophies dans l’Asie centrale*, 10th. ed., Paris, 1957, pp. 161–210; Lisān al-Mulk *Nāsikh al-tawārīkh*, vol. 3 pp. 233–263; A.L.M. Nicolas *Séyyèd Ali Mohammed dit le Bab*, Paris, 1905, pp. 289–330; Muḥammad ʿAlī Malik Khusravī *Tārīkh-i shuhadadā-yi amr*, 3 vols., Tehran, 130 badī<sup>c</sup>/1973–4, vols. 1 and 2; *Zavāraʾī Waqāyī*<sup>c</sup>; idem *Majlis-i shahādāt-i Ḥaḍrat-i auwal man āmana Qāʾim-i Khurāsānī* Cambridge University Library, Browne Or. Ms. F. 28 item 2 pp. 92–110; Luṭf ʿAlī Mīrzā Shīrāzī, untitled history, Cambridge University Library, Browne Or. Ms. F. 28 item 3; Momen *Bābī and Bahāʾī Religions*, pp. 91–113.
- 170 Māzandarānī *Zuhūr al-ḥaqq*, pp. 164–6.
- 171 Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, pp. 288–300.
- 172 Shoghi Effendi *God Passes By*, p. 31
- 173 *Al-kawākib al-durriyya*, p. 129.
- 174 *Séyyèd Ali Mohammed*, p. 289.
- 175 *Waqāyī*<sup>c</sup>, pp. 1, 3, and passim.
- 176 *Ibid.*, p. 54.
- 177 *Ibid.*, p. 70.
- 178 *Makātīb-i ʿAbd al-Bahā* vol. 2, Cairo 1330/1912, p. 254; cf. p. 252.
- 179 Luṭf ʿAlī Mīrzā history, p. 71.
- 180 *Nuḡtat al-kāf*, p. 152.
- 181 *Ibid.*, p. 199.
- 182 *Ibid.*, p. 202.
- 183 *Ibid.*, p. 154 and passim.
- 184 *Ibid.*, p. 181.
- 185 *Ibid.*
- 186 Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, pp. 324–5.
- 187 *Waqāyī*<sup>c</sup>, p. 48; cf. *Nuḡtat al-kāf*, p. 201.
- 188 *Waqāyī*<sup>c</sup>, pp. 18–19; Luṭf ʿAlī Mīrzā history, pp. 2–3.
- 189 Luṭf ʿAlī Mīrzā history, p. 18.
- 190 *Ibid.*, p. 86.
- 191 *Ibid.*, pp. 88–89.
- 192 *Ibid.*, p. 89.
- 193 *Ibid.*, p. 54.

- 194 *Waqāyi*<sup>c</sup>, pp. 71–72.
- 195 See *Nuqṭat al-kāf*, p. 204; Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, pp. 326, 344.
- 196 See Browne *Tārīkh-i-Jadīd* Appendix II, p. 337.
- 197 *Waqāyi*<sup>c</sup>, p. 25; cf. Luṭf<sup>c</sup> Alī Mīrzā history, p. 22.
- 198 *Nuqṭat al-kāf*, p. 166.
- 199 *Waqāyi*<sup>c</sup>, pp. 28–9.
- 200 *Ibid.*, pp. 29, 44, 52; cf. idem *Majlis-i shahādat*, pp. 102, 103.
- 201 *Waqāyi*<sup>c</sup>, p. 32; cf. idem *Majlis-i shahādat*, p. 94.
- 202 *Majlis-i shahādat*, p. 102.
- 203 *Ibid.*, p. 101; idem *Waqāyi*<sup>c</sup>, pp. 29, 58.
- 204 *Waqāyi*<sup>c</sup>, p. 38.
- 205 Luṭf<sup>c</sup> Alī Mīrzā history, p. 102; on the distinction between *jihād* and *difā*<sup>c</sup>, see Ḥājī Muḥammad Karīm Khān Kirmānī *Risāla dar radd-i Bāb-i murtād*, 2nd. ed Kirmān 1385/1965–66, p.30.
- 206 Luṭf<sup>c</sup> Alī Mīrzā history, p. 102.
- 207 *Ibid.*, p. 86
- 208 Dossier no. 177, Tehran, 1849; see *World Order* magazine 1:1 (1966), p. 19.
- 209 *Dalā'il-i sab'a*, p. 64.
- 210 Dossier no. 177, Tehran, 1849; *World Order* 1:1 p. 19.
- 211 *Ibid.*, p. 21.
- 212 'Personal Reminiscences of the Bābī Insurrection at Zanjān in 1850' trans. E.G. Brown *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 29 (1897), p. 774; Lisān al-Mulk gives the figure as 15,000: *Nāsikh al-tawārikh*, vol. 3, p. 285.
- 213 Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, pp. 529–30; Lisān al-Mulk indicates that he introduced several innovations in religious practice into the city: *Nāsikh al-tawārikh* vol. 3 p. 287.
- 214 Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, pp. 531–32.
- 215 *Ibid.*, p. 533.
- 216 *Ibid.*, p. 539.
- 217 Zanjānī 'Personal Reminiscences', p. 778.
- 218 *Ibid.*, p. 779.
- 219 *Ibid.*, pp. 780–2; cf. Zarandī, pp. 540–1.
- 220 *Ibid.*, p. 783.
- 221 Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, pp. 542–3.
- 222 Zanjānī, 'Personal Reminiscences', p. 786.
- 223 Nicolas *Séyyèd Ali Mohammed*, pp. 332–3.
- 224 Zanjānī 'Personal Reminiscences', p. 786.
- 225 *Ibid.*
- 226 *Séyyèd Ali Mohammed*, p. 338.
- 227 Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, p. 543.
- 228 Full accounts of the struggle can be found in: Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, pp. 527–81; Nicolas *Séyyèd Ali Mohammed*, pp. 331–78; Lisān al-Mulk *Nāsikh al-tawārikh*, vol. 3, pp. 285–97; Gobineau *Religions et philosophies*, pp. 211–29; Momen *Bābī and Bahā'ī Religions*, pp. 114–27.
- 229 Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, pp. 546, 551, 553; Zanjānī 'Personal Reminiscences', pp. 791, 800, 812.
- 230 Zanjānī 'Personal Reminiscences', pp. 810–11.
- 231 Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, p. 567.
- 232 For full accounts of these struggles, see: Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, pp. 465–99; Muḥammad Shafī<sup>c</sup> Rawḥānī Nayrizī *Lama'āt al-anwār*, vol. 1, Tehran 130

- badī<sup>c</sup>/1973–4; Muḥammad <sup>c</sup>Alī Fayḍī *Nayrīz-i mushkbīz*, Tehran 129 badī<sup>c</sup>/1972–3, pp. 7–102; Nicolas *Séyyèd Ali Mohammed*, chapter 9; Lisān al-Mulk *Nāsikh al-tawārīkh*, vol. 3 pp. 337–42; Momen *Bābī and Bahā'ī Religions*, pp. 106–13.
- 233 Māzandarānī *Zuhūr al-ḥaqq*, p. 374.
- 234 See account by Sayyid Ḥusayn Nayrīzī on the wall of the Masjid-i Jāmi<sup>c</sup> in Nayrīz, quoted Fayḍī *Nayrīz-i mushkbīz*, p. 94; Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, pp. 478–9.
- 235 Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, pp. 477, 482.
- 236 See Moojan Momen 'Some Problems Connected with the Yazd Episode of 1850', a paper read to the 3rd. Bahā'ī Studies Seminar, University of Lancaster 1977.
- 237 Lisān al-Mulk *Nāsikh al-tawārīkh*, vol. 3, p. 338.
- 238 Zarandī *Dawn-breakers*, pp. 484–5.
- 239 *Ibid.*, p. 483.
- 240 *Ibid.*, p. 469.

DENIS MACEOIN received his Ph.D. from Cambridge in 1979 and is currently lecturer in Islamic Studies in the Religious Studies Dept. of Newcastle University; he has numerous articles forthcoming in the *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, including 'Bab', 'Babism', and 'Bayan', and an article on religious heterodoxy in nineteenth century Iranian politics in *IJMES*; his research interests lie mainly in modern Shī'ism, Shaykhism, Babism and Baha'ism.

*Department of Religious Studies,  
The University, Newcastle-upon-Tyne NE1 7RU. England*